APPENDIX
J 11
.R

(103
8813A
10

Appendix

American-Flag Lines in Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. James A. Farrell, Jr., president, Farrell Lines, Inc., made at a luncheon sponsored by the World Trade Center in New England in Boston, on March 4, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Farrell has presented an excellent exposition showing the great contribution which our merchant marine has made to the economy and security of our Nation and of New England in particular. I am sure that everyone interested in the American-flag fleet will find Mr. Farrell's comments stimulating and rewarding.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. JAMES A. FARRELL, JR., PRESIDENT, FARRELL LINES, INC., BEFORE A LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY THE WORLD TRADE CENTER IN NEW ENGLAND, AT THE SHERATON-PLAZA HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., MARCH 4, 1958

It is a distinct privilege to be here with you today. While those of us in America's steamship indsutry are not the most garrrulous lot you could name you will find that when there is an industry opportunity to speak in New England, the competition among candidates become stiff, indeed.

This, of course, is because we can always anticipate a hearty welcome here in are cradle of our industry.

I am particularly pleased to be here, from a personal point of view, because New England is my home in every sense. My grandfather came to Connecticut from Ireland in 1838. My father was born in New Haven where I went to college. Now I reside in the Nutmeg State and vacation as often as I can at Martha's Vineyard.

Nor are my company's ships strangers to there parts. You will see Farrell Line flags flying in ports of New Bedford, Providence, Boston, and Portland.

So you can understand, perhaps, why I am grateful for this occasion to talk to my neighbors about this New England community of ours.

My assignment this afternoon is to share with you information picked up over the years on the impact of foreign trade and United States shipping on the economy and future of New England.

Those of you whose day-to-day professional activities involve you in matters of import and export may have some reservations—which, I frankly, share—that nothing I might say in a few minutes could adequately express in sufficiently forceful terms the tremendous influence of foreign trade and ocean shipping on this area.

It is of timely significance not only to New England, but to our country as a whole under present-day conditions, that foreign trade makes jobs.

Now, in respect to the other topic which I have been asked to discuss—the United States merchant marine—let me first acknowledge the obvious: that there is no area in the country in even the same league with New England when it comes to ocean shipping.

New Englanders wrote the book on the merchant marine.

Our merchant fleet and New England grew up together from colonial days.

The first seagoing vessel launched in America, in fact, was the *Virginia*, of Sagadahock, built on Maine's Kennebec River. Her master, George Popham—founder of the historic Popham Colony—told us in his log that she displaced all of 30 tons.

The first half of the 1800's saw Nantucket's famous whalers adding proud, colorful pages to the annals of our merchant marine during their 2- and 3-year voyages to Antarctic waters.

As a matter of fact, about that same time, New England had more sailors than farmers and New England's role in our gallant maritime history shone nowhere more brilliantly than in the Revolutionary War.

Time, unfortunately, doesn't permit a chronicle of all of New England's contributions to our Nation's maritime heritage.

It is a fascinating, real life drama of which this area can always be proud. Much of it has been faithfully retained at colorful Mystic seaport and the Marine Museum there. In its own way Mystic is as fine as the maritime museums of Salem, New Bedford, Nantucket, and Edgartown.

The great names that echo through the history of this industry bespeak volumes about our country's debt to New England:

Bowditch, for instance, Salem ship chandler's apprentice, whose text on navigation remains the standard work on the subject to this day.

Or Donald McKay, father of the famed clipper ships with which Boston will always be identified. McKay's greatest achievement, the *Flying Cloud*, on her maiden voyage logged 374 miles in a single day.

But this overlong concentration on sail, as is now well known, ironically sounded the death knell for America's supremacy of the seas. It delayed, too long, a timely acknowledgment of steam as the world's new propulsion system.

It was 100 years before America recaptured the blue ribbon of the Atlantic. This time it was with the *United States*—at an average speed of 35.59 knots; or, for the benefit of our lubberly friends, more than 40 miles per hour.

New England, of course, was again well represented. William Francis Gibbs, gifted designer of the *United States*, is a Harvard man.

The Nation today stands at a point where with a twelfth of the free world's population, we are consuming more than half of all the materials it produces.

As for exports, today the United States ships overseas about 9 percent of all the things we make.

Considering the volume of our Nation's trade, inbound and outbound, and the contribution of both to the economic strength on which our military security depends, it is plain why President Eisenhower has asked Congress to extend the reciprocal trade agreement program.

Indeed, when you take the long view—weighing dispassionately all the arguments of import competition against those for expanding our foreign markets and sources of supply—it is impossible not to find that the balance tips well toward the President's view.

It is clear that the trade-agreements program should be extended—and extended for a period sufficient to inspire confidence abroad in the stability of our foreign-trade policy.

Reflect with me for a moment on what international trade means to New England's 10 million persons in terms of steady employment and the prospects for increased income.

The area's share in 1956 of 9 United States exports, alone, was valued at $654 million, according to research recently conducted by the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

According to the World Trade Center, New England's share of our gross national product is about $25 billion.

The center's conservative estimate is that 1¾ million of this represents New England's stake in foreign business.

Altogether, some 1.2 million New England workers are in jobs that depend in whole or in part on the area's imports.

Think, for instance, what the 1956 import of 150 million hides meant to New England's leather and shoe industry, which produces more than a third of the Nation's shoes.

Or consider New England's rubber footwear industry—and the dependence of towns like Fall River, Malden, Naugatuck, and Providence on rubber and latex imports.

Sumner Street here in Boston means wool the world over—and wool is New England's most valuable import. Shipments in 1956 from Argentina, Australia, South Africa, and elsewhere were valued at $87 million. That year, in fact, more than half the wool used in the United States was imported.

I want to thank the World Trade Center in New England for being our host here this afternoon. I congratulate President Ernest Henderson, and his associates, for the progress the World Trade Center has already made in the short time since its founding. Nothing is more needed for this area than an organization to undertake here the same sort of world trade development work accomplished so successfully for the Mississippi Valley by New Orleans' famous International House.

In its first year, the center, I am informed, has been highly successful in placing buyers abroad in contact with New England producers; in placing overseas sellers in touch with New England buyers; in referring thousands of trade inquiries to New England exporters and importers; in establishing a meeting place where prospective transactions can take place; and in arranging conferences between New England businessmen and visitors from abroad representing trade, diplomatic, and governmental agencies.

Still another source of possible optimism for New England's economy is the impact that may be felt in this area as a result of what I view as a genuine rebirth of the American merchant marine. The renaissance of shipping has, to date, been most evident in actions taken by the members of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, of which our company is one.

These companies, 14 in all, are those engaged exclusively in foreign trade on the Nation's essential trade routes. They operate, as you may know, under contracts with the Government.

Under the terms of these contracts the lines are required to replace their ships periodically and prior to the expiration of their economic life.

APPENDIX
J11
.R

Since most of their vessels were constructed during World War II, the lines face the problem of block obsolescence.

To solve the impossible requirement of replacing over 300 passenger and cargo ships within a 4- or 5-year period, the lines, in cooperation with the Government, have undertaken a phased-out replacement program to modernize their fleet.

Already 4 of these ships are under construction and 15 are on order. It is difficult not to be confident that New England shipbuilding, already holding more than a billion dollars in orders, stands to benefit by its share of this replacement program.

We see promising evidence of what the future may hold in the leadership New England has already shown in the unfolding age of the atom and its application to the sea.

Witness that our Nation's first underwater nuclear vessel—the *Nautilus*—was launched from New London.

While the prototype of a future fleet of nuclear-powered merchant ships is being built in Camden, who is to say that other such ships will not be built in the shipyards of New England?

And let us not forget that much of the pioneering developmental work of applying nuclear propulsion to shipping was undertaken in the laboratories of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Already the contract lines have made long-range commitments totalling more than $2 billion for the construction of new ships over the next 15 years.

Think how New England industry, entirely apart from its shipbuilding sector, will prosper by the modernizing of this fleet.

Some 2,500 workers at General Electric plants in Lynn and Fitchburg are at work making propulsion turbines, reduction gears, turbo generators, and other marine equipment, much of it to be installed in American-flag ships.

For 134 years Plymouth Cordage Co., largest New England firm in the industry, has produced dependable products for America's merchant fleet. Annually, some 30 to 35 million pounds of cordage are consumed by the maritime industry alone. I am pleased note that our company—Farrell Lines—for 26 years has been privileged to serve and be served by Plymouth Cordage.

United States merchant ships without Raytheon radar equipment are hard to find these days.

Ships without Waterbury speed gears have always been hard to find.

Just a look at part of a list compiled by Grace Lines shows that Connecticut, for example, has provided many, many products for the line's new passenger ships, *Santa Rosa* and *Santa Paula:* Gaskets from Bridgeport; mosaic decorations from Litchfield, hinges from Beacon Falls; ceiling lights from Essex; stop valves from Stratford; electric cable from New Haven; and heating elements from Hartford.

New England's opportunity to benefit from our maritime construction program stems from a critical decision made by our Government 22 years ago. Then, as now, American shipowners could build their ships in foreign yards at half the cost of even the most efficient domestic yard.

But the Government recognized the need to maintain essential shipbuilding facilities and skills. With the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 it authorized payments to American shipyards to compensate them for their higher wage structure and put them on a competitive basis with foreign yards.

Why, you may ask, are the reasons for the Government's payments to the 14 American-flag lines in foreign trade?

If my estimate of the New Englander's free enterprise proclivities are accurate, there might be some among you who believe that if American ships cannot carry our trade as inexpensively as foreign lines, then let the foreign lines have it.

There are many reasons, which this country has learned through experience, why this may make a sensible theory, but proves disastrous in practice.

American-flag shipping has never sought a monopoly of the sea lanes, nor will it.

We recognize that ships of other nations give good service.

We are convinced that the American shipper benefits from the spirited competition provided over essential trade routes of the world by American-flag shipping.

Our Nation's maritime policy is based on reciprocity. We sell to foreign countries, and we buy from them. Their merchant fleets, and ours, participate in the carriage of these goods.

No American shipowner would expect more than a fair share of this two-way trade. But, conversely, he does not want to be excluded from the trade by artificial barriers and by discriminatory laws of other nations.

All this, of course, was carefully considered by Congress when it established the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The act called for a contractual relationship under which the Government agrees to make certain payments to American lines if they, in turn, agree to the terms of the Government contract.

Among other things, these contracts require American lines to build their ships, and repair them, in American yards; to man them with American crews; and to supply them, wherever feasible, from American sources.

In addition, the contract lines are required to serve on—and only on—certain clearly established trade routes classified as essential to the Nation's commerce. Currently, the 309 ships of the contract lines are plying 33 such routes over which 95 percent of the Nation's commerce is carried.

The lines are further required to sail on regular advertised schedules, leaving on time whether they are profitably loaded or not.

Acceptance of these contractual obligations inevitably place the American shipowner at a cost disadvantage with foreign lines. Recognizing this, Government seeks, in part, to compensate him.

This is accomplished through operating differential payments—subsidy—paid in return for discharge of his obligations to the Government.

An interesting aspect of these differential payments is that, when earnings permit, they must be repaid to the Government, up to the full amount of the payments received. This is the only Government program where Uncle Sam stands to get his money back while losing none of the benefits of this initial investment.

The maritime industry, along with millions of American factory workers dependent on exports and imports, owe a debt of gratitude to the many New Englanders who have worked for and supported a strong United States merchant marine. Sherman Adams, Joseph P. Kennedy, and his distinguished Senator son John, Leverett Saltonstall, John McCormack, Edward Cochrane, Sinclair Weeks, among others, will be long remembered for their part in assuring the Nation of reliable ocean transportation.

Certain it is that New England will continue to supply our merchant marine with outstandingly capable mariners, the men who prepare for a life at sea through such fine institutions as the Maine Maritime Academy at Castine, Maine; the Massachusetts Maritime Academy at Buzzards Bay, and the Coast Guard Academy at New London.

Basic, also, to New England's growth, whatever form its new endeavors may take, will be its other assets; its great financial institutions which have had such an influence on the course of the Nation's history; its unrivaled research and educational facilities; its outstanding training schools, for skilled labor and management alike; its great natural ports.

Match these assets with the indomitable spirit of the New Englander and the future of New England products, moving in both domestic and international commerce, seems bright indeed.

Need for Agricultural Research Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received many letters in recent days which eloquently plead for desperately needed increases in all the research budgets, but especially those requested and administered through the Department of Agriculture. One of these letters is from Dr. John R. Richards, chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and it categorically sets forth the logic for increasing the research budget in fiscal year 1959. Chancellor Richards directs his emphasis with great force on several striking points.

I hope every Senator will consider what Chancellor Richards has to say, and to that end I am asking unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE SYSTEM
OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR,
Eugene, Oreg., March 24, 1958.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: You are aware of the fact that Oregon agricultural research officials are urging support of a proposed $6 million increase in grants to the State experiment stations for projects in agriculture, home economics and forestry.

A March 21 letter from the Oregon Agriculture Research and Advisory Council urged such support and pointed out its importance to Oregon agriculture with its direct pay rolls of $144 million (1956).

I would like to add several points to the case for the added support as follows:

1. With added interest now developing in the training of scientists—both as research workers and teachers—it should be pointed out that graduate students in many fields of science receive research training and experience through graduate fellowships offered by the agricultural experiment stations. The Oregon station is now training over 100 such graduate students. Any increased funds directed to fellowships thus have twofold benefits—productive research and training of scientists.

2. Predicted population increases for the United States and in the world require that research enable us to produce food and fiber for this ever-increasing demand.

3. There is a great need for increased support for basic research with a constant demand and pressure on State funds for the solution of applied research problems. The Oregon station must rely on Federal funds

and other grants to strengthen its basic research programs.

4. At this time of increased unemployment we must recognize that the production and processing of agricultural products represent a direct payroll in Oregon in excess of $144 million annually. Oregon agriculture depends heavily on the experiment station for utilization and marketing research, disease control methods, quality improvement, and other research to keep the lands in a healthy and competitive position.

Your continuing interest in adequate support for agricultural research in the Northwest is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RICHARDS,
Chancellor.

Conditions in the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on March 19, 1958, Mr. Robert E. Pomeranz, president, Roberts Co., Sanford, N. C., gave a statement to the Small Business Administration in which he made some very pertinent suggestions regarding the situation presently prevailing in the textile industry of this country. I commend its reading to all Senators.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT E. POMERANZ, PRESIDENT, ROBERTS CO., TO THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, MARCH 19, 1958

The United States textile industry has long been stigmatized as sick and backward.

Yet, events of the past 10 years prove contrary to this popular misconception and reveal the industry to be possessed of tremendous energy and drive that has seen it make remarkable advances, both in the methods of its operation and in the variety and quality of its products.

Technological developments by this industry in the last decade alone can increase man-hour productivity in the mill by more than 50 percent, well above the average increase for all industry. A growing variety of new, better quality, and better designed fabrics have been introduced. The industry spent nearly $4.5 billion for new plant and equipment just since 1948.

These definitely are not the accomplishments of a sick and backward industry. Rather, this initiative, creativity, and capacity to adjust to change have given the textile industry the necessary resiliency to withstand frustrations and misunderstandings that would have long since scuttled a less dynamic industry.

Nevertheless, when the Government maintains a passive attitude toward the textile industry, as evidenced by the confused cotton situation and encouragement of foreign competition, the industry must eventually suffer the consequences no matter how dynamic it may be.

This is the serious situation in which the textile industry is caught and which prevents it from realizing its huge potential as a basic industry so necessary in our national economy. As unreasonable pressures continue to mount, and particularly in light of the current economic recession, the small and medium-size textile mills have been forced into an untenable position that threatens their existence.

This is a strange and certainly unwarranted fate to a majority of the 8,000 mills in an industry that employs a million workers, and upon whose profitable existence depends the livelihoods of millions more in the apparel and related industries as well as the populations of thousands of mill towns throughout the country.

With annual sales of about $13 billion, the textile industry itself pays wages of some $3.5 billion a year and in conjunction with the apparel industry provides employment for 1 out of every 7 production workers in the labor force.

If this industry is forced to retrench further, the resulting widespread unemployment would trigger a dangerous chain reaction to the whole economy. Just within the past year textile mill product employment declined 81,000.

It must be remembered that the textile industry is truly exemplary of our free enterprise system, being composed of a representative number of large companies in addition to its traditionally numerous small and medium-sized mills.

Through its technological achievements the industry now possesses the means of its own salvation with which to halt this attrition, elevate itself, and add immeasurably to a healthy national economy. But years of enduring an unwholesome economic climate, in which profits dwindled and normal reservoirs of credit became exhausted, have left the bulk of the small and medium-sized mills financially incapable of taking advantage of new capital equipment which can mean the difference between operating in the black or the red.

Banks are unable to meet adequately this pressing need—primarily because they are not permitted to lend moneys for capital equipment purchases on long terms.

It has become imperative today, more than ever before, for a better understanding and relationship to exist between the Government and this industry. I urge that the Small Business Administration use its powers to help achieve this much-needed cooperation.

It is a paradox that this country goes to great extremes to help foreign governments and foreign industry finance faltering or just starting industries abroad. Yet at the same time it overlooks the plight of a domestic industry.

I would like to propose a practical program for prompt consideration by the Government which would help solve a basic problem in the textile industry and enable it to flourish and expand on a sound economic basis. This program, to be administered by the Small Business Administration or some other appropriate agency, would include the following provisions:

1. A revolving loan fund to extend substantial credit on terms of 10 years.

2. A 10-year tax depreciation schedule for new textile capital equipment or mill modernization.

The establishment of a special revolving loan fund from which well-managed but financially-strapped textile mills may borrow at low interest rates, the necessary moneys to finance the purchase of modern, efficient and more productive machinery and modernization equipment would be a major stimulus toward stabilizing and modernizing this industry.

It is also necessary for the furtherance of such a program to establish it outside of the traditional SBA format.

A huge number of mills lacking the financial ability to pursue modernization fall outside the province of the Small Business Administration, even though they are considered small by industry standards. And, their financial needs for modernization almost always exceed the sums that can be borrowed from this agency.

The Government would lend money to these mills with the full expectation and assurance of getting it back. The capital equipment financed by such loans would be the collateral. This is not just a case of charity beginning at home, for the benefits of such a fund would be considerable and the whole economy would be favorably affected. Nor is it subsidization, because such loans would be repaid at low interest rates. Best of all, it would cost the Government and the taxpayer nothing.

It is understood that Treasury officials presently have under consideration revisions in the tables listing the useful life of machinery for tax purposes. This is welcome news to those cost-beset mills who have been further hampered in financing modernization programs by unrealistic depreciation rates on capital equipment. The old regulations were written more than 20 years ago and fail to take into consideration technological advances since then, or the much more intensive production schedules under which the industry operates today.

As of this date we do not know how extensively these outmoded tax laws will be changed. But we need a realistic depreciation rate which would allow the industry to write off the purchase of capital equipment for tax purposes within a period of 10 years rather than the much longer term now specified.

Present tax laws are as obsolete as much of the machinery they force the textile industry to work with, and have been resulting in the demise of many small- and medium-sized mills and the steady loss to industry of both domestic and world markets.

Inability to finance modernization programs is perhaps the biggest current roadblock to a healthy textile industry. This double-barreled proposal for a 10-year loan and 10-year tax depreciation is a perfect answer to the original depreciation intent. Repayments on the machinery loan match exactly depreciation amounts. It would be the profits resulting from use of the machinery so financed that would enable depreciation to be earned and the loan repaid.

Stymied in its attempts to modernize, the industry is operating under the shadow of creeping obsolescence that is estimated to have hit as high as 60 to 75 percent of its capital equipment. In spindles alone, by which the capacity of the cotton and synthetic textile industry is generally measured, some 60 percent of the 18 million operational spindles are over 10 years old and several million are over 30 years.

Mills that fail to curb the spread of obsolescence and old-fashioned, costly methods will find themselves further overwhelmed by domestic and foreign competition able to efficiently produce more and better quality goods at lower prices.

And as ridiculous as it may sound, if a group of experts had specifically developed a program calculated to depress or kill off an industry, it could not have come up with a better one than that which has been inadvertently brought to bear upon the textile industry.

Can you imagine any manufacturing company opening up its secrets and techniques to a competitor, helping this competitor finance installation of the most modern machinery and the purchase of raw materials, aiding the competitor to purchase materials cheaper than it itself can, paying its workers up to 10 times more than its competitor pays, and then buying back the competitor's finished goods when its own inventories are high?

Yet each and every one of these intolerable economic practices has been and still is forced upon the textile industry.

In cotton, for example, the United States Government controls the availability and price of this raw material to its domestic industry by restricting acreage and creating artificially high man-made prices via its price-support programs. At the same time it permits, rather dictates the sale of this cotton to foreign competitors at prices sharply lower than that available to domestic mills. United States moneys are used to help these foreign mills finance the purchase of raw material, machinery, and even build new plants.

These foreign mills also enjoy the advantages of rigid import quotas, favorable tax conditions, and very cheap labor in comparison with the high cost of United States labor. And to top it all off, the United States has been lowering its own tariff rates, thus enabling foreign soft goods produced with the advantage of United States aid and often of United States cotton to enter in large quantities an already glutted American market.

By all rights, the United States textile industry should have been thriving during the past decade under the stimulus of fast expanding markets created by a population that has leaped 29 million to over 172 million. But such is not the case.

Foreign aid and peaceful coexistence is something everybody wants. But this must work both ways. In all fairness, the textile industry needs recognition of its plight and equal opportunity rather than the discrimination it has had to endure under the present foreign-aid programs and domestic price-support policies.

Action is essential and past due on this problem which impedes a major and basic segment of our national economy. Action should and must be taken before it is too late.

Carl Sandburg—An Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a recent meeting in Raleigh, N. C., paid tribute to its adopted son, Carl Sandburg, the great poet and historian. Our scholarly State treasurer, Edwin Gill, delivered an inimitable address entitled "Carl Sandburg—An Appreciation." Inasmuch as this address presents such an accurate and illuminating analysis of the poetic and historical work of this great American writer, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARL SANDBURG—AN APPRECIATION
(By Edwin Gill)

On behalf of the State of North Carolina, I welcome Carl Sandburg to Raleigh and hereby declare him to be secure in the affections of our people. He has adopted us and we have adopted him.

Every generation produces artists, poets, and singers of songs who broadly echo the past. Although they show originality, it is usually disciplined by the prevailing mode, the accepted style, the approved canons of taste. Even in their daring they stay well within metes and bounds. Even in their innovations, there is an unmistakable air of conformity.

And then quite suddenly, without rhyme or reason, the human race produces an original—a personality so new, so fresh, so devoid of self-consciousness, so naive in its spirit, so starkly objective in its vision, and yet so loving in its approach as to render the usual tools of criticism quite inadequate.

In the presence of such a person we can only shout with joy—here is something that has never happened before. Here is something new under the sun.

Now our guest of honor, Carl Sandburg, is an original—something that has never happened before—something new under the sun. And how does this come about? Those schooled in science might call it a mutation. Those steeped in religion will call it a miracle. Of course, after making a bow, both to heredity and divine intervention, Mr. Sandburg might add that he had something to do with the result in terms of the sweat of hard work and the toil of patient effort.

I do not mean to suggest that men like Sandburg do not owe a debt to the past—all men do. I simply mean that they absorb all the influences of the past and with that alchemy that is the essence of genius, put words or other component parts of a masterpiece together in a way that is quite new and without precedent. And may I say that Mr. Sandburg, both in his method and in his outlook, is as modern as the latest invention of the space age and as timely as the morning paper.

In his autobiography Mr. Sandburg has told us in a heartwarming way of his parents who were so wonderfully strong and vital, but I am thinking now of his literary kinfolks. And I thought it would be interesting to speculate for a moment with respect to his uncles, cousins, and other literary relatives. Now it is perfectly natural for a southerner to discuss family ties and, when we feel so inclined, to claim kinships with even third and fourth cousins. On the other hand, we do not hesitate to disclaim relationship with those of whom we are not proud and, on occasion, to deny that we ever knew the proverbial black sheep. So, if I now have the temerity to assign certain literary kin to Mr. Sandburg, I would remind you and him of the right of disclaimer if it is felt that the alleged relationship is tenuous.

Surely free-swinging Walt Whitman was his great-uncle and shy, sensitive Emily Dickinson was his great-aunt. Among his distant relatives I find Bret Harte and Mark Twain, while his first cousins could be Vachel Lindsay, Edgar Lee Masters, and Robert Frost, and I would think that among his nephews we might even find our own Thomas Wolfe. But when I come to name his literary father, I hesitate, and then go on to say that he could have been that tall, angular man with the stovepipe hat who went to Gettysburg one day and made there a brief, immortal address. And if I were to be so bold as to attempt to name his spiritual ancestor, I would suggest that patriarch whose gifted hand wrote the book of Job.

Mr. Sandburg is a poet, a novelist, an essayist, a singer of songs, a teller of tales for children. He is also a biographer: Reverently, through the years, he has followed in the footsteps of Abe, saturating his mind and his heart with Lincoln's spirit. Had he done nothing more than give to us a clear picture of Lincoln—not the marble Lincoln in Washington, but the very human Lincoln who could laugh at good stories and yet was subject to dark moods, who could joke and gossip with the boys around the cracker barrel and yet could write like the psalmist—had he done nothing but show us Lincoln, that would have been enough for any one man to do. Mr. Sandburg, we can pay you no higher tribute than to say that if fate had allowed you and Abe to be neighbors, swapping stories and laughing together, Lincoln would have loved you.

The Bible speaks of those who having eyes see not and having ears hear not, suggesting that some of us are not fully aware of the world around us—that we are only half alive—that our senses are dulled and blunted—that only on rare occasions do we really sense the wonder of the world through which we move. So it is necessary that we have poets—and I include in the term "poet" artists, composers and all those creative minds that are gifted with inner vision—for poets are people whose senses are keener and more highly developed, who see, hear, taste, smell and touch with greater insight than the rank-and-file of men.

Through the wonderful poetry of Sandburg we experience sounds that we were never conscious of before: For instance, we may hear the stirring of the soil in springtime, the patter of the fog as it comes and goes, the movement of growing corn, the recoil of leaves and grasses as they are smitten by the frost. We may hear the slow but inevitable turning of the seasons. Now only a poet can hear such things—only a man like Sanburg can hear "the thunders of silence."

His verse can be as mild as mist and as consoling as rain, but it can also be as hard as steel and as raw as a slaughterhouse. When Sandburg sings his song of America, he does not hesitate to use the bold, pungent words that are required to convey his powerful meaning. And believe me, there is music in it all.

In Sandburg's verse you hear the plain talk of plain people, the gossip of farmers, laboring men, white collar workers, women talking with women about neighborhood affairs, the latest jokes, the brightest sayings, the pearls of wisdom, the fables that are on the lips of the common people in all the fields, factories, filling stations and crossroad stores—and through it all the contagious laughter of children.

He tells us that the people can blow hot and cold, that they can be cruel, misguided, foolish, but that they can also be brave, compassionate and capable of great sacrifice—and that in the great crisis of life, when the chips are down and the issues of right and wrong and of life and death are clear, the people can be magnificently right.

Jury Trials and Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jury Trials and Contempt," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 2, 1958. I call the attention of the Senate particularly to the excerpt from the opinion by Justice Frankfurter, in which he admonishes the Court not to become a third branch of the legislature. I sincerely hope that the Court will take the admonition seriously.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JURY TRIALS AND CONTEMPT

Last summer Congress fought for weeks over the use of juries in criminal contempt cases and finally compromised. Now the Supreme Court has wrestled with the same issue and divided 5 to 4. These isolated facts accurately measure the highly controversial nature of the issue. Yet it seems to us that the majority of the Court has come up with the best answer from the viewpoints of history, law, and orderly processes of government.

The Court has adhered to the concept of the contempt power that has been written into the law since the country was founded and which has been repeatedly upheld by the Court itself. Consequently it found no fault in the sentencing of Gilbert Green and Henry Winston, Smith Act convicts, to 3 years in prison (in addition to their 5-year sentences under the Smith Act) for contempt of court. Their contempt consisted of disappearing for 4½ years after they had been ordered to be present for sentencing.

Were the sentences unduly severe? Justice Harlan, writing for the Court, answered "no" because the contempt was a "most egregious one." The sentences were shorter by a year than that imposed on one other Communist fugitive in the Smith Act case. Congress has since provided a 5-year maximum penalty for bail-jumping.

Why were not the fugitives indicted and prosecuted for bail-jumping with a trial by jury? Nearly everyone seems to agree that this would have been the more satisfactory procedure. At the time the offenses were committed, however, bail-jumping was not a Federal crime. This fact would not, of course, justify the courts in resorting to arbitrary procedure. But it certainly left the door open for application of the contempt power in the same manner in which it has been used for a century and a half.

Justice Black's sweeping dissent, in which Chief Justice Warren and Justice Douglas joined, would outlaw this use of the contempt power as a violation of the Bill of Rights. In other words, these three dissenters (Justice Brennan stood on other ground) insisted that the defendants were entitled to be tried by a jury after indictment by a grand jury and in full accordance with all the procedural safeguards required by the Constitution for all criminal prosecutions. Justice Black hammered vehemently on his thesis that the Court has been wrong in the past and that it has an obligation to correct its error.

To this Justice Frankfurter replied in a concurring opinion that the power to punish summarily for contempt has been accepted without question by the Supreme Court in at least 40 cases. By way of making his point more effective he called the roll of 53 Justices who have participated in these decisions, including Marshall, Story, Bradley, Holmes, Hughes, Brandeis, Stone, Cardozo and Jackson. Mr. Frankfurter cut close to the heart of the issue when he wrote:

"To be sure, it is never too late for this Court to correct a misconception in an occasional decision, even on a rare occasion, to change a rule of law that may have long persisted but also have long been questioned and only fluctuatingly applied. To say that everybody on the Court has been wrong for 150 years and that that which has been deemed a part of the bone and sinew of the law should now be extirpated is quite another thing. Decisionmaking is not a mechanical process, but neither is this Court an originating lawmaker. The admonition of Mr. Justice Brandeis that we are not a third branch of the legislature should never be disregarded."

Congress may require jury trials in contempt cases when that seems appropriate, as it has sometimes done in the past. But when Congress has repeatedly given the courts power of summary punishment for contempt and when the country's ablest judges over a long period have found no barrier in the Constitution, it would be drastic indeed for a few justices to sweep away the whole structure. There is still much wisdom in judicial restraint.

Easy Prey for the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Courage Never Goes Out of Fashion", written by Mr. William Loeb, publisher, and published in the Manchester Union Leader of March 22, 1958.

The editorial lauds the reporting of Mr. Constantine Brown when he recently made a trip to some of the trouble spots of the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

COURAGE NEVER GOES OUT OF FASHION

(By William Loeb, publisher)

Constantine Brown, world-famous war correspondent and Washington observer and columnist, has been making an on-the-spot check of serious danger spots in the world. Some of his most interesting columns have been written from the Near East.

We would especially like to call your attention to some of his remarks on the courage and fighting spirit of the people who have come from all over the world to settle in the new state of Israel.

Brown tells of talking to an Israeli taxi driver who said: "I occasionally read English and American newspapers. It seems that you are in a hell of a fix because of the Russians. That comes from being too fat and comfortable. If some of your people were to come here and live for 24 hours a day, with the conviction that the Arabs will descend upon you at any moment, you will forget how to be scared and will think only how best to beat them back."

The taxi driver went on to speak of the settlers driving their tractors, with one hand on the steering wheel and the other on a rifle, and compared that spirit to that of the American Colonists who cleared their land with rifles always close at hand to defend themselves against surprise Indian attacks.

There is no doubt in this newspaper's mind, as we have repeatedly told our readers, that at the root of our wishy-washy appeasing foreign policy, which continually belly-crawls to the Russians, is the fact that by and large unfortunately, the leaders of the American people and many of the American people themselves have become so soft as to make comfort and ease their main objectives in life.

Such people are easy prey to the rough, tough, and ruthless Russians.

Unless we can recapture some of the rugged, virile, and vital traits of spirit, mind and body which characterized the Founding Fathers of the United States and which now shows up in the determined people of Israel, this nation will not survive because it will have lost the will to survive.

There is no use arguing about the justice or injustice of it. If the United States wants to continue to exist, the happy, easy, soft days are gone for all of us.

Commendatory Reviews of J. Edgar Hoover's Masters of Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the flow of words commending J. Edgar Hoover for his new book, Masters of Deceit, continues to grow with each passing day. And rightly so, for this is a story that needed to be told, told not in pedantic words of the detached observer, but in the living prose of the man who has for so long been on the direct firing line in the fight against subversion.

Too many people, otherwise well-informed people, in recent years have come to the conclusion that communism in the United States no longer poses a serious threat to our national security. The drop in the membership of the party has been used as a yardstick of its effectiveness.

I have never subscribed to the view that we should relax our antisubversive measures just because the threat which shows above the surface appears to be diminished. Now we have a book which should clear the air once and for all. Mr. Hoover strips away the veil of fallacy and exposes the Communist movement in its true light. He shows it is a conspiracy dependent not so much on numbers, but on position and dedicated discipline. He stresses that one zealot in the right spot, is more dangerous than a thousand who are not.

The role of the reviewer is an important one in gaining a wide readership for any book. Among the many fine reviews of Masters of Deceit which have been written are those by William Edwards of the Chicago Sunday Tribune and Roger Stuart of Scripps-Howard in the Washington Daily News. With clarity and perception they have told the story of the book and indicated its importance to all Americans. Under leave previously granted, I insert both reviews at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of March 9, 1958]

HOOVER WARNS OF COMMUNISM IN UNITED STATES

(Review of Masters of Deceit by Willard Edwards)

No American has delved more deeply into the nature of the American Communist movement than the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. For 38 years, he has been studying and analyzing this conspiracy under foreign control to establish a Soviet United States.

In this dawn of the space age, J. Edgar Hoover finds a nation largely apathetic to the activities of the Communist Party U. S. A. He has looked upon his fellow citizens and found their eyes focused on Russian satellites overhead, not on potential spies and saboteurs underground. Billions are being spent in frantic haste to cope with Soviet ICBM's; the Kremlin's record of conquests by boring from within is ignored.

Deeply disturbed, drawing upon the vast files of the FBI for supporting data, Hoover

has set himself the task of warning that the American Communist Party remains today a powerful conspiratorial group "operating under modern conditions as an arm of revolution."

This contention is bound to stir sharp dissent in certain intellectual circles where communism has never been regarded as much of a threat at any time. Party membership has dwindled from a peak of 80,000 in 1944 to a current level of some 20,000. The Daily Worker, party organ, has suspended publication. Communist leaders like Howard Fast and John Gates have deserted the ranks, crying that the party is dying and will quietly expire if left alone. The Supreme Court has set free a large number of convicted Communist agitators on the ground that they are just noisy talkers with no real harm in them.

Only a man of deep convictions, great knowledge, and immense prestige could have braved this climate of complacency. Of surface indications that the Communist Party is fading in influencec and power, Hoover cautions:

"Its present menace grows in direct ratio to the rising feeling that it is a small, dissident element and need not be feared. As we relax our protection and ease up on security measures, we move closer and closer to a fool's paradise."

Having stated his thesis, he proceeds to support it. Something close to a literary triumph has resulted. This professional policeman has produced a classic—a severely simple history of communism and its strategy, tactics, growth and operations above and underground. This is enlivened with colorful illustrations and anecdotes. The result is a vastly readable book.

The opening chapters under the heading, "How Communism Began," are brilliant. Marx, Lenin, and Stalin become living, breathing characters. Dialectical materialism is stripped of its mystery in six lines.

There is an illuminating discussion of the motives which induce native Americans to betray their country for a foreign tyranny. The everyday life of rank-and-file Communists is described. The deadly efficiency of Communist spies, skillfully directed from Moscow, is stressed. All this is buttressed with case histories from the FBI files.

Another section pinpoints the consistent anti-Semitism of the Soviet Union and punctures the "malicious myth" that those of Jewish faith have something in common with communism.

Hoover rigidly avoids controversy and sensationalism—to the rather extraordinary extent of ignoring the 1948–54 period when the Alger Hiss case and the Communists in Government issue stirred the Nation and excited world interest. These are curious omissions in a work subtitled, "The Story of Communism in America," but understandable in the light of the author's objective: to present a calm and factual recital, devoid of political implications, which will enable the American people to recognize and fight the enemy in our midst.

Here is a textbook which educates as it entertains. It ought to be in the hands of every college student. It is also recommended reading for the President of the United States, who confessed last year that he had difficulty arguing the comparative merits of communism and capitalism with a Soviet marshal.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 6, 1958]

NEW HOOVER BOOK EXPOSES UNITED STATES REDS

(By Roger Stuart)

Next week, a new kind of "do it yourself" book will hit the bookstalls: J. Edgar Hoover's Masters of Deceit. It is the story of communism in this country, designed to show how Americans can fight it.

Mr. Hoover's comprehensive knowledge of communism has been acquired over a period of nearly 4 decades. He's convinced that it was never a greater threat than it is now.

He has reason to know that an expanded program by a revitalized Communist Party in America has been launched in recent months. This follows the carefully planted myth that the party had cut itself off from Kremlin direction, which the FBI chief has sought, through speeches, articles, and testimony before congressional committees to controvert.

HE KNOWS

So the idea of the book was conceived. For, though his highly qualified investigative agency can do much, no one knows better than Mr. Hoover that the G-men alone cannot possibly win.

It is essential, he believes, that citizens throughout the Nation understand how communism originated, what its aims are and the frequently devious manner in which it operates.

So he has written a sort of textbook to help Americans preserve their way of life from a highly organized, day-and-night movement dedicated to the destruction of liberty.

Mr. Hoover says he hopes that Communists, too, will read his book. He believes that once they are shown how they were taken in, they will shed their allegiance to it.

This isn't the first time J. Edgar Hoover has written about the nature of communism. Not long ago he described in a year-end report to Attorney General William P. Rogers how the Communist Party within the past year had been encouraged by its success at invoking legal technicalities and delays in court actions against them, as well as by growing public complacency toward domestic threats to America's internal security.

It was an assignment from another Attorney General, some 39 years ago, that launched Mr. Hoover, then special assistant to the head of the Justice Department, on the road to acquiring his vast store of knowledge concerning communism.

In 1919, scarcely a year after the end of World War I, the new Soviet Government in Russia hardly had settled down to business. But already Red organizations were at work in the United States.

REQUEST

Mr. Hoover, an energetic young graduate from the George Washington University Law School (he's a native of the Capital City), was asked by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer to prepare a legal brief on the Reds.

In succeeding years, as the FBI (of which Mr. Hoover became director in 1924) has perfected its investigatory techniques, the veteran chief has learned a great deal.

Mr. Hoover hopes his fellow citizens will join him and the FBI in preventing it from capturing, by subterfuge and deceit, their birthright of freedom.

The Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by D. Bruce Shine, editor of the Pioneer, the student publication of Tusculum College at Greeneville, Tenn. I have known Bruce Shine very favorably for many years. He is an outstanding and highly intellectual young man. This is a thought-provoking comment by one of our youths of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pioneer of Tusculum College, November 8, 1957]

THE LIBERAL

(Written by Editor in Chief D. Bruce Shine)

Where has the college liberal of the twenties and thirties gone? Today on every major college campus in the Nation the average student is content to be satisfied with the everyday happenings of the world. Gone is the spirit of creative thought that perhaps here might be a better way than the present road our world is following.

We do not mean to be partisan in any respect when we suggest the college student should question the present world events. To find the true spirit one must go out and explore the new and free pathways of the world.

It seems in the machine age that we are living in today we tend to turn our minds into a mechanical apparatus. To us this is more than wrong, but rather an attempt to seal ourselves from the duties of life. Public service has always been of prime importance in the running of the world, but today fewer college students are entering into the field. If this is allowed to continue the world will find itself being run by a group of incompetents.

The college liberal has in the past served as a herald of a coming age, but today few, if any, such liberal souls appear on the scene. Why? We might ask ourselves. Could it be that one finds life far more enjoyable sitting at home after dinner reading the newspaper, rather than going out to do something to remedy the problems he easily reads about? There can be no room in our lives in the fear of speaking out on issues of prime importance, rather we say to you, "It's your duty." Criticism is always accepted when it is accompanied with constructive suggestions to help relieve the situation.

We have all witnessed people who perform one single task on a job; it might be the attaching of a button or tube to a piece of machinery. If the trend in our present-day life continues as it is, the educated citizen of today will become no more than that unskilled laborer. The world has never been guided by narrowminded individuals, but rather by the person who has entered life with a broader picture of the world and its problems.

It is our hope and our prayer that young America will grow quickly out of the trend to which it is heading. If we are to face tomorrow with the conviction of making this world a better place to live in we must alter our course considerably. If we fail to do this there can be no hope for our way of life, our ideals. Of this we are most certain.

Pensions for Former Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which follows appeared in the Monday, March 31, Kansas City Star,

and powerfully states the case for a bill which has been too long delayed:

PENSIONS FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

We recall from history the tragic story of Ulysses S. Grant, a dying man, devoting his waning energy to completing the memoirs that might pay his debts. The picture is brought to mind by the renewed effort in Washington to provide pensions for former Presidents. Such a bill passed the Senate last year and now Speaker RAYBURN and Representative MARTIN are pressing for House action. They deserve full bipartisan support.

Petty opposition developed in the lower Chamber last year because of the feeling toward Harry Truman. It was cheap politics. The question is not the need of Mr. Truman or Mr. Hoover, or the possible need of President Eisenhower after he leaves office. The question is a much broader one which deals with the attitude of the Nation toward any man who has held its highest office.

In the last quarter century we have become a pension-minded people. Yet we have done little (except for some free postage) for the retired citizens from the No. 1 office. Grover Cleveland, out of office, had considerable difficulty making ends meet until friends created a life-insurance trusteeship for him. Coolidge was in similar financial trouble.

Having led the most powerful Nation in the world, no man can slip into obscurity. Nor, unless he is independently wealthy, can he hope to save enough in office for a comfortable retirement.

The Senate bill would provide an annual compensation of $25,000 and other benefits for former Presidents. With an allowance of $70,000 a year for clerical staff the total cost would be about $100,000 a year for an ex-President. America has rewarded almost every retired civil service from judge to dog catcher. For far too long, however, we have neglected the men who must make the long move from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Dr. George

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1958

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when we meet together in this House after learning of the loss of one of our Members. I believe that serving together draws the Members more closely together than any other association of men and women.

An even deeper sense of grief than usual is mine today, because the Member we have lost is my very close and dear friend, GEORGE SHANNON LONG, affectionately known as Dr. GEORGE, not only by our Louisiana delegation but by the entire membership. Dr. GEORGE is one man, above all in my experience, who lived by the Golden Rule.

His deep religious and moral principles were reflected in every action in his daily life. It may truly be said that his dignity, courage, and diligence were in the highest traditions of this House. Yet, these attributes were fully equaled by his deeply sympathetic approach to the problems of others, and his thoughtfulness, courtesy, and friendliness to everyone who came in contact with him.

I have often felt, but have not taken the occasion to say it until this moment, that every individual who met or talked or worked with Dr. GEORGE was the better for the experience.

It has been my great privilege to enjoy the close personal friendship of GEORGE LONG and his fine family for many years. Time will not permit a recitation of his many kindnesses to me and to all of his associates. I know that these things will stand to his credit in a higher place.

Dr. LONG's life story is the story of a self-made man—a man who literally made a high place for himself in the councils of his State and his Nation. He is a credit to his chosen profession of dentistry and to the people of the Eighth District of Louisiana, whom he has represented so effectively since 1953 in this Congress. He was just coming into his own as one of the great leaders and statesmen that typify the outstanding leadership the South has furnished since the birth of the United States. It is not ours to question the wisdom of He who called Dr. GEORGE from among us. Dr. GEORGE had well and faithfully carried out his duties in this life. His absence will be felt and mourned, but his accomplishments will go on to benefit the people of his State and his country.

Dr. LONG, in his conscientious devotion to duty, simply drew too deeply on his vast reservoir of energy and vitality in his endeavor to achieve, in the span of his service in Congress, advances that would have taken many years longer in the hands of another man. He is truly a martyr to his devotion to duty.

Let us, then, count ourselves fortunate to have known this wonderful man, and to have had our paths in life cross his. Though mourning his loss, we may be consoled that the good he did lives on.

They cannot wholly pass away,
How far so e'er above;
Nor we, the lingerers, wholly stay
Apart from those we love:
For spirits in eternity,
As shadows in the sun,
Reach backward into time
As we, like lifted clouds, reach on.

The Magnificient, Humanitarian Work of UNICEF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great humanitarian organizations of this world is the United Nations Children's Fund—known popularly as UNICEF.

On many occasions it has been my pleasure and privilege to praise this outstanding organization. Last year, its 11th year of service, it aided no less than 45 million children and mothers throughout the world.

I was pleased to note in the publication issued by the United States Committee for UNICEF two very fine articles describing UNICEF's work. I may say that, dollar for dollar, I know of no single appropriation made by the Congress which does more good for more people than the modest eleven-or-so-million dollars which this country provides to this great organization.

I send to the desk the text of two articles from the United States committee's publication, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COMMITTEE FOR UNICEF,
UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.

Board of directors: Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, Jr., president; Clarence E. Pickett, vice president; Robert Thrun, vice president; Cass Canfield, treasurer; Mrs. Charles Poletti, secretary; Norman Acton, Mrs. Arthur F. Anderson, Gen. Frederick G. Atkinson, Mrs. Chester Bowles, Mrs. J. Cheever Cowdin, Miss Gertrude Ely, Miss Frances K. Kernohan, Mrs. E. Bliss Parkinson, Chauncey G. Paxson, Dr. Joseph Stokes, Mrs. George P. Taubman, Jr., staff; Norman Acton, executive director; Jeannette Fritsche, deputy executive director.

THE SIZE OF THE UNICEF DOLLAR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of a series of articles in which News of the World's Children will discuss the principal characteristics of UNICEF's operations. Comments and questions are welcome.)

An important reason for the broad base of support enjoyed by the United Nations Children's Fund is the success it achieves in translating available funds into maximum assistance to children. The total figures for any year provide ample evidence of this success. In 1956, for example, UNICEF assisted child health, nutrition, and welfare programs in nearly 100 countries and territories, programs which directly benefited an estimated 40 million children and mothers and indirectly aided uncounted millions more. In that year, net expenditures of the Children's Fund were only $17,690,357.

What makes a UNICEF dollar so large? Here are some of the factors:

Administrative costs are low. The Children's Fund practices rigid economy to insure that a maximum share of each dollar will actually go to the assistance of children and mothers. Taking 1956 as an example again, only 7.37 percent of expenditures was for administrative purposes. The balance of $16,386,618 was used to assist the programs and the children and mothers mentioned above.

The staff is small. The vast accomplishments of 1956 were realized with a total staff of 326. Headquarters assignments, including secretarial, clerical and warehousing tasks as well as professional direction, occupied 126 of these. The remaining 200 manned regional area, and country offices in 25 locations throughout the world.

Volume procurement and shipping reduce unit costs. By purchasing medicines, insecticides, vehicles, and other materials and equipment in large quantities on the international market, UNICEF achieves maximum economy. Thus, the shot of penicillin which cures a child of yaws costs only 5 cents, the sulfone tablets for 3 years' treatment of a child with leprosy costs only $1, the technical equipment for a small maternal and child health center costs only $54. The United States contributes surplus dried skim milk and UNICEF pays the ocean freight,

It is thus possible to provide a large glass of milk for one-fifth of a cent.

Operational costs are low. Governments receiving UNICEF aid accept the responsibility for the operation of services in their countries, with guidance from UNICEF and the U. N. specialized agencies. This not only encourages local initiative, it also holds the children's fund's expenditures for operational services to a minimum. In 1956, these accounted for only 6.47 percent of UNICEF expenditures.

The effect of a UNICEF dollar is measured not only by the factors listed above. It is measured also by the matching investments of the countries receiving aid, for in that factor rests evidence of the fund's success in mobilizing resources to solve the health, nutrition, and welfare problems of the world's children. Receiving countries are required to match the value of UNICEF aid on at least a dollar for dollar basis. In fact they greatly exceed the required ratio and in 1956 matching funds committed by the governments of the receiving countries amounted to $2.29 for each UNICEF dollar. Stated another way, the UNICEF Executive Board in 1956 approved allocations for assistance in that and future years totaling $22.4 million and brought about a mobilization of local resources for children in UNICEF-aided countries through commitments of their governments valued at $51.3 million.

Whether it comes through the Halloween trick or treat in the United States and Canada, through the sale of UNICEF greeting cards in some 70 countries, through private efforts in many other countries, or through the voluntary contributions of more than 80 governments the UNICEF dollar or pound or yen or franc or rupee or peso is a big coin. It buys full value in the health and happiness of children and in constructive cooperation among adults.

FOR THOSE WHO HELP THEMSELVES

(Editor's note: This is the second of a series of articles in which News of the World's Children will discuss the principal characteristics of UNICEF's operations. Comments and questions are welcome.)

In 1957, the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund approved allocations totaling $24,150,000 to bring to 320 the number of child health, nutrition, and welfare projects being assisted in 104 countries and territories. At the same time, the countries receiving this UNICEF aid committed $57 million as their matching investments in these same projects. Required by UNICEF policy to provide local services and facilities which match the fund's grants dollar for dollar, the assisted nations in 1957 far exceeded that formula. Their commitments averaged $2.79 for each UNICEF dollar.

Behind the above statistics lie many encouraging stories, but none is more significant for the future of the world's children than the story of how UNICEF aid stimulates initiative and action by people and governments whose children need help. With 600 million children living in needy areas, with sickness, hunger, and other suffering being the products of an inadequate standard of living for two-thirds of the world's people, it is obvious that real improvement will become permanent only when governments, communities, and parents have acquired the ability and the knowledge to create a better life for their children.

Here is how UNICEF stimulates self-help:

First, a government desiring aid from UNICEF, or from any member of the U. N. family, must request assistance. This request may be for a survey to determine what the problems are or for help in solving a known problem; in either case it means that the country has recognized a child health, nutrition, or welfare problem and has accepted responsibility to do something about it.

Next, in cooperation with UNICEF, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, or the U. N. Bureau of Social Affairs, the government must work out a plan to attack the problem. U. N. technical assistance representatives also participate when appropriate. Such a plan includes not only the technical and operational details, but also provisions for necessary administration, budget, local personnel, public education measures and building facilities. Thus there is established a framework of the ingredients essential to permanent child care programs. The participation of the U. N. agencies insures that the experience and skills of other nations are available to help make these plans a success.

When planning is complete and the proposed project goes to the UNICEF Executive Board for approval, the country requesting aid has completed a detailed plan of operations and agreed to accept the responsibility for the carrying out of the project. It is not a UNICEF project, or a WHO project, or an FAO project; it is a country project, assisted by one or more of the U. N. agencies for a stated period of time.

When operations are underway there is technical guidance when needed by international personnel, supervision by UNICEF of the utilization of the supplies and equipment it has provided, and reviews of progress by the participating agencies. But the work is carried out by the country concerned and the people it has enlisted, both through employment and as volunteers, in the execution of the plan. Thus, UNICEF staff in the field totals only some 200 at a time, when more than 100 countries and territories are carrying out fund-aided projects benefiting 45 million children and mothers annually.

Added together, these practices make possible the dramatic and far-reaching results obtained by the Children's Fund. Results which are measured, to be sure, in immediate and humanitarian accomplishment to save millions of children from disease, malnutrition, and other suffering; but which are also measured by the new willingness and ability of nation after nation to mobilize its own people and resources to the end that the future will be brighter for its children than it is today.

When some future historian sums up the role of UNICEF in the progress of mankind he will find value in the millions of children protected against malaria and tuberculosis, cured of yaws, trachoma, and leprosy, made stronger by improved nutrition, and made safer by adequate maternal and child-health services. We predict, however, that he will find even greater value in the fact that people, their voluntary organizations, and their governments, thanks to the Children's Fund, been encouraged and assisted to initiate, develop, and support their own services for the care of their own children—and their children's children.

Needless Handicap to an Industry in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the March 21, 1958, issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal which points out the need for a broadening of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDLESS HANDICAP TO AN INDUSTRY IN TENNESSEE

The development of a newsprint industry has been one of the significant factors in the economy of the South in the past decade. It uses large timber reserves that are otherwise of little value. It is operated under conditions that improve the forest regions of the South, rather than denuding them.

A major development was the building of a $100 million mill by Bowaters Southern Paper Corp. in the hill country of east Tennessee. Now an unexpected complication handicaps the success of the firm. Bowaters, in making the investment, had counted on running its own barges on the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers and on the inland waterway, in order to bring wood into the mill and to ship out newsprint to distant points at a reasonable rate.

Now it has been discovered that the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 provides that a corporation under foreign control cannot own or operate barges on the inland waterway. Bowaters is an American subsidiary of a British company.

The Merchant Marine Act was passed just after World War I, and obviously was intended to govern situations entirely different from the shipment of newsprint paper in peacetime. We can see no good reason why it should apply to the Bowaters operation. Neither can Senators KEFAUVER and SMATHERS, who are proposing an amendment to the 1920 act.

This new provision would extend the right of owning and shipping by barge to any corporation which could meet the following requirements: that a majority of the officers and directors, and 90 percent of the employees be citizens and residents of the United States, and that substantially all the raw material be purchased in this country. These provisions would allow Bowaters Southern to operate. In the interest of southern newspapers and of the economy of the South in general, we believe the Kefauver-Smathers amendment should be passed by Congress.

Questionnaire Results From Michigan's Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the results of a questionnaire sent to nearly every family in Michigan's Sixth Congressional District. The overall response of more than 11,500 questionnaires and the thousands of comments I received on a wide range of legislative subjects reflect the tremendous interest of my fellow citizens in the problems of their Government.

The results of the poll also indicate impressive support for President Eisenhower as well as his major foreign and domestic policies. The tabulation, con-

ducted by an impartial agency of IBM, showed that 68 percent of the respondents approve of the manner in which President Eisenhower is doing his job, with 21 percent opposed, and the remainder giving no opinion.

In view of the fact that the Sixth District is considered to have more automobile workers than any other single congressionad district in the United States, I feel that the reply to a question dealing with the administration's recommendations for labor-management legislation has particular significance. The tabulation shows that 87 percent of the respondents are in favor of this legislation, with 6 percent opposed, and the remainder giving no opinion.

I appreciate the cooperation of the many volunteer workers as well as the thousands of Sixth District residents who responded to make this survey such a resounding success. While I accept the final responsibility for casting my vote on the issues that come before the House, I am conscious that, in the results of this survey, I have a valid and very helpful indication of how the people back home are thinking. The results of the tabulation are as follows:

Poll results

Questions	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. In your opinion, does the world situation demand that we forego a balanced budget for reasons of national security?	51	39	10
2. Do you feel that Federal taxes should be reduced now?	35	57	8
3. Do you favor continuance of the mutual security program of military and economic aid to friendly nations?	62	25	13
4. Do you favor the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?	59	7	34
5. Should a separate Department of Science (with a Secretary of Cabinet rank) be created to promote and coordinate scientific research?	51	33	16
6. Do you feel a need exists for some form of Federal assistance to encourage scientific education?	55	36	9
7. Should college education be encouraged by allowing income tax deductions to parents?	62	31	7
8. Are you in favor of the Federal Government retaining its present regulator control over prices which producers can charge for natural gas?	81	9	10
9. Do you favor Secretary Benson's proposal for a flexible program of Federal price supports for basic farm products, ranging from 60 to 90 percent? (Answer only if engaged actively in farming, please.)	7	5	88
10. Do you favor, at this time, a Federal flood-control project for the Flint River (cost $2,500,000) and Grand River (cost $13,000,000)?	28	54	18
11. Do you approve of the proposal to establish pay television on a trial basis?	11	81	8
12. Do you favor the President's labor-management program?	87	6	7
(1) Filing public reports of welfare and pension funds.			
(2) Financial reports by labor unions.			
(3) Secret ballots for union elections.			
(4) Employer reports of financial dealings with unions.			
(5) Establish office of labor reports.			
(6) Make misuse of union funds a Federal offense.			
(7) Amend secondary boycott provisions.			
13. Do you feel that a nationwide civil defense atomic shelter program is needed now?	29	54	17
14. Do you favor increasing social-security benefits with corresponding increases in individual and employer contributions?	57	36	7
15. Do you favor a summit conference between President Eisenhower and Soviet leaders on current East-West differences?	54	29	17
16. In general, do you approve of the manner in which President Eisenhower is doing his job?	68	21	11

Citizens and Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for real economy and efficiency in the operations of the Federal Government is a never-ending one. Bureaucracy has an inbred capacity for expansion. Scores of governmental activities which were undertaken years ago as temporary expedients have become permanent elements in the Washington scheme. The Federal establishment has become so extensive that it is virtually impossible for the individual citizen to comprehend the scope of its operations.

Most Americans are conscious of waste and duplication of effort in Federal bureaus, but few of them are able to devote time to a study of specific cases. In this connection, an important service in public information is being performed by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a private organization campaigning for the effectuation of Hoover Commission recommendations on economy in Government.

Many of these recommendations called for action within the executive branch. Others urged legislation. While those of us in Congress who believe governmental functions should be held to the minimum demanded by the public interest may not agree with each and every Hoover Commission proposal, I think all of us recognize that we shall achieve just so much economy as public opinion demands and no more. The easy way is to leave things as they are—to reconcile ourselves to a steady growth in the Federal establishment.

In continuing to inform the public as to specific areas of waste and inefficiency in Government, therefore, the citizens committee shows that economy is practical—that it can be accomplished if citizens want it to be, and are articulate in their views.

The citizens committee has been particularly helpful in focusing attention on the thousands—yes, there are literally thousands—of Federal operations which compete with private enterprise. This week, at its climax drive workshop program in Washington, our Virginia colleague, BURR P. HARRISON, spoke to this point. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include his significant remarks on this occasion.

A year ago, I was privileged to take part in a conference similar to this. We met then, as we do today, to assess the progress, or lack of progress, made with respect to the various recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The atmosphere, then, seemed encouraging for real progress in the drive for greater efficiency and economy in the operation of the Federal Government. Citizens were aroused. They were taking pens in hand to write to the White House, and to Members of Congress, to demand vigorous action. The Appropriations Committees of the Congress took a stern view of Presidential budget estimates, and there was reason to hope that it was the year—the year in which we finally might reverse the tide.

Now, in the near-panicky preoccupation with trying to spend our way out of a recession, depression, or readjustment—call it what you will—we meet again in Washington. Presumably, we are here because, irrespective of political faith, we hold in common the conviction that the very future of our economic system may well depend on whether or not the citizens of the United States really want to part with the expensive socialism which is centered in the bureaucratic citadels of their Nation's Capital.

I did not come here to preach defeatism, but there is no point in denying that, if we are the defenders of the faith, we are sorely beset. There is something pathetically analagous to the proceedings in Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking Glass in our meeting to discuss economy in a city where talk of a balanced budget now draws only a cynical smile. It is grimly appropriate, perhaps, that we meet on April Fool's Day to urge again a reduction in the size and scope of Government, while all around us rage demands that the Government take a bigger hand in the manipulation of what we still claim is a free enterprise system.

The Federal Government continues to be the biggest lender, the biggest insurer, the biggest producer of electric power, the biggest promoter of housing projects. The Government has become so enmeshed in the construction industry that the economic well-being of this great industry, and of all its suppliers, is dependent on how many dams, office buildings, and post offices the Government plans to build, and how liberal it will be in guaranteeing home loans.

The Government is the biggest investor and subsidizer. It uses taxpayers' money in the support of steamship lines and airlines. Through unrealistic postal rates, it helps pay the operating costs of highly profitable national magazines. The direct mail advertisers insist they cannot survive without the Government as a financial backer.

I was assigned the topic, Government Competition Is Not Competition. Obviously, Government competition is not competition as we know it in the sphere of private enterprise. There it is a contest for consumer acceptance on the basis of relative production and merchandising ingenuity, with the competitors presumably starting the game all even. When the Federal Government takes a hand however, the cards are stacked, and the new player's pile of chips is virtually unlimited.

There are all sorts of excuses, of course, for putting the Government in business. In one instance, it may be contended that the operation is a "yardstick" to protect the Government from being gypped when it deals with private suppliers for similar merchandise or services. In another case, it may be contended that the operation is essential to keep Government employees happy, as in a commissary-type enterprise. The clincher argument, with which we are not supposed to differ, is defense necessity.

Nearly 2 centuries ago, William Pitt, a British statesman of some asperity, declared in the House of Commons:

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom."

As recently as 1956, a worldwide inventory of business-type governmental operations conducted by the Budget Bureau, turned up no less than 19,771 such operations. Undoubtedly, each one of these could be defended at length by the bureaucrats engaged in managing, or mismanaging it.

In 1933 a special committee of the House of Representatives studied Government competitive enterprises and located 232 such activities created to meet the emergency demands of World War I—but still existing 15 years after the war ended.

You might be interested in the conclusions this committee drew from finding 232 business-type operations. I quote from its report:

"The evidence in general indicates that the operations of the Federal Government in the field of private enterprise have reached a magnitude and diversity which threatens to reduce the private initiative, curtail the opportunities, and infringe upon the earning powers of tax-paying undertakings while steadily increasing the levies upon them."

That was a straight-from-the-shoulder observation calling public attention to a national problem. Imagine what this committee might have said had it discovered not 232 business operations, but upwards of 19,000 with a capital investment twice as great as the entire Federal budget in that long-ago year.

Last year, I was honored by an invitation from the citizens' committee to sponsor one of the bills intended to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This bill, H. R. 5826, is designed to pin down claimed justifications for any new business-type enterprises proposed to be established under Federal auspices, and to encourage the orderly liquidation of existing ones. Ten other Members of the House, from both sides of the aisle, offered similar bills, and companion measures were introduced in the Senate.

I do not happen to be a member of the committee to which my bill and its companions were referred. Before we waste any time in castigating the committee for inaction, however, let us recall that the advancement of legislation is a competitive enterprise. You and I might agree here and now that we have gotten together behind a fine bill; that there is no question about the desirability of its becoming the law of the land. But we have to face the fact that, so far, this legislation, in the argot of show business is not "box office." It has not generated widespread public excitement. At the moment, a bill to open a post exchange on the moon to serve our first space exploration expedition might have a much better chance.

The success of legislation to limit the Government's incursion into business endeavors depends on two things; first, evidence of an aroused public opinion which insists on congressional action—for, whatever its faults, Congress remains responsive to what it believes to be the public will. And, second and even more important, evidence of a determination in the executive branch to move vigorously to place the legislative policy in effect.

It has been estimated that 10 percent of the civilian personnel of the Federal Government are on the payroll of business-type activities. We know, too, that these activities generally fail to reveal their true cost to the taxpayers; that, except in rare instances, these activities pay no taxes and little or no interest on investment capital; that they seldom charge depreciation, and that they sometimes fail to carry their directing personnel on the payroll.

The citizens committee refers, hopefully to 1958 as the climax year—the year in which really substantial progress could be made toward effectuating the Hoover Commission recommendations. There have been a few glimmers of light, such as the congressional action on the budget reform proposals.

But let us make no mistake—this could be a climax year of another sort if we do not succeed in meeting and besting the forces of benevolent quasi-socialism now seizing on the business downturn as the ideal lever with which to raise public support for new Federal adventures in business. We could lose the game once and for all.

I said at this meeting last year, and the present clamor for the Government to do more about the state of business impels me to reemphasize it today—private enterprise, despite the vaunted prowess of its Madison Avenue sales psychologists, has not yet done the wide-spectrum selling job which must be done among all citizens if the Government is to be put out of business—out of business which could and should be handled by private capital and private management.

Any businessman, any trade association running to Washington today to plead for extended or increased subsidization, whether by liberalized Federal credit or by any other means, should pause and consider whether another shred of the tattered fabric of free enterprise is being bargained away to relieve an immediate economic pinch. Whenever business goes to Washington with pleas for financial cushions or bailing buckets, it is seeking to unload on taxpayers generally a poor business risk, a risk it admits it cannot get underwritten within the business community.

There does not seem to be much sex appeal any more in the old virtues of frugality, individual initiative and balanced budgets. Deficit financing, a horrid word a year ago, is viewed with complacency today.

Yes, this may well be the climax year, but a tremendous job of public education remains to be done if it is to be a climax favorable to the cause of lean and efficient government as envisioned by Thomas Jefferson. Public indignation built this Republic. Public indignation has spurred its defense in times of crisis. An aroused public still could chop the Government down to size, but the hour is late.

Tax-Exempt Fund Gets New Backer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a clipping from the New York Times relative to legislation first introduced by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, by me, and then by the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., of Florida. This measure would permit tax-exempt interest to be passed on, in the form of tax-exempt dividends, to stockholders in investment companies. We believe that this would provide a wider market for municipal and district bonds, and also that in the end it would not cost the United States Treasury any loss of revenue.

TAX-EXEMPT FUND GETS NEW BACKER
(By Paul Heffernan)

Recurring appeals for a broadening of the market for State and local government securities received timely support last week from the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.

Its tax division threw its weight behind proposals now before Congress that would permit tax-exempt interest to be passed on, in the form of tax-exempt dividends, to stockholders in investment companies.

Some of the proposals before Congress would restrict this privilege to companies that are at least 90 percent invested in local government bonds; others would give it to all investment companies.

The principle endorsed by the chamber group is not new. Economists and municipal finance interests have been plumping for it for years.

Probably it got widest notice 2 years ago when President Eisenhower came out for it as a means of keeping down the cost of local government borrowing and encouraging localities and States to bid in the public market on an enlarged basis for the use of the savings of the people.

The formal declaration of the Chamber limited itself to an endorsement of the general principle of communication of the tax-exemption to the dividends collected by shareholders of investment companies.

It did not mention any specific bills before Congress, of which there are six. Three of these bills—H. R. 8810, H. R. 8111, and H. R. 8112—would require 90 percent investment in local government securities to qualify for the exemption. The other bills—H. R. 8702, H. R. 10613, and H. R. 9058—carry no such limitation.

The latter approach has won the greatest support in municipal finance circles. Known as the broad proposal, it is backed by the American Muncipal Association, which represents 12,500 cities—including all those having a population of more than 100,000—as well as leagues of municipalities in most States. In behalf of the American Municipal Association, Harold M. Tollefson, former mayor of Tacoma, Wash., appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee this winter to urge enactment of the idea.

The broad proposal has also won the backing of the National Education Association, the National Association of County Officials, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Enactment of the broad proposal would give some incentive for an investment pool estimated at more than $19,400 million to buy local government bonds. Making up this pool are three great aggregates of investment assets, namely (1) assets of regulated investment companies of the mutual fund type, totaling $9,105 million (2) assets of regulated closed-end companies totaling $1,335,572,000, and (3) assets of unregulated investment companies totaling about $9 billion.

The appeal of the idea outside of the professional financial community is twofold. On the one hand, it holds out the promise of widening the market and thereby keeping down the cost of local government borrowing. On the other, it insists that the Treasury has nothing to lose.

The reasoning is this: The tax-exempt bonds, on whose interest income the Treasury will receive nothing, will be sold in any event. Whatever bonds are bought by investment companies in a broadened market represent just so many bonds that individual investors—usually rich persons taxable at a heavy rate—will not be able to buy.

This reasoning may be oversimplified, but there is enough substance in it to warrant the assertion of the proponents of the broad bill that the likely loser from the

legislation would be not Uncle Sam but the high-income refugee from taxes.

The prime beneficiary, of course, would be the municipal and State governments, for which a widened market would be made available. Secondary benefits would flow to investment companies, which would have a wider field in which to apply their managerial skill, and to their shareholders, whose tax liability would be lightened.

What gives timeliness to the legislation now before Congress is the recurring tendency in the bond market for the spread separating the yields of corporate bonds and municipal bonds to shrink to a point where the historic tax advantage loses much of its value.

Last month, for instance, New York State borrowed $50 million on bonds at a cost of 3.12 percent, tax-exempt. Only a fortnight before, bonds of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. were offered for public subscription at a yield of 3.65 percent.

There is real risk, then, that the tax advantage now enjoyed by local governments in market borrowing may be whittled down in forthcoming months by the impact of continuing large investment supply. This probably accounts for the support that municipal finance associations and other civic groups are giving to proposals to widen the investment market.

Missile-Carrying Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union Leader of March 25, 1958, "Missile-Carrying Submarines are 'Must'," written by Mr. William Loeb, publisher.

This editorial praisingly draws attention to the persistent efforts of my able colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire, Senator NORRIS COTTON, in calling for a large fleet of missile-firing submarines as a major defense in the future survival of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of March 25, 1958]

MISSILE-CARRYING SUBMARINES ARE "MUST"

(By William Loeb, publisher)

Again, more power to Senator COTTON in his persistent campaign for a large fleet of missile-firing submarines to beat the Soviet Union to the punch.

Senator COTTON is suggesting something very rash. This Government doesn't believe in beating the Russians to the punch. That isn't considered gentlemanly any more. This Governments prefers to let the Reds get in the first punch and then hope we'll live through it.

The Navy has requested authority to start six more missile-carrying submarines in 1958. Three submarines have already been ordered. Senator COTTON is disturbed and properly so, by the report that the Defense Department has slashed the Navy's request from 6 to 2 or 3 missile-carrying submarines.

As Cotton says: "Our national security demands immediate construction of far more than six. * * * The missile-firing submarine can provide us with the best defense at the lowest cost."

This Nation should have at least 100 missile-firing submarines. In this way we could have secret, movable hydrogen bomb and missile bases located where it would be almost impossible for the enemy to discover them. Moreover, they would be ready to attack the enemy at the first sign of threat.

Senator COTTON will serve New Hampshire and the United States best by carrying on continual battle until this Nation has a mighty battle fleet of missile-carrying submarines.

On COTTON'S winning this battle may very well depend no less than the future survival of the United States.

Oregon Wheat Growers League and Overseas Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, from time to time, I have called to the attention of the Senate the excellent overseas program of the Oregon Wheat Growers League as an instrumentality for goodwill in the Orient, where their work has centered. Evidence that this is recognized by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the State Department comes in the form of a news release issued from the league's headquarters in Pendleton, Oreg. So that all the members may have this information, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my brief statement.

The news release announces that the Trade Fairs Branch of the Department of Agriculture has appointed Jack L. Smith, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, to be the official United States wheat-barley commodity representative at the Osaka International Fair to be held at Osaka, Japan, April 12–24.

Recently we voted to extend the Public Law 480 program for 2 more years. In the course of the floor discussion, I made reference to the cooperative efforts of the Oregon Wheat Growers League in working with the people of Japan, South Korea, India, and Pakistan to increase the use of wheat in the oriental diet.

Following the 480 hearings last summer, I made extensive reference to the impressive testimony there given by Richard Baum, the league's executive officer, who has made four trips to Asia in the interest of this program. I included a substantial part of his statement in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. President, it well may be that long after this program of surplus food production has been forgotten, the people of the United States and the people of Japan, South Korea, India, and Pakistan will be enjoying the fruits of one another's respective labors to an even greater extent because of the vision and enterprise of some Oregon wheat farmers.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENDLETON, OREG., March 24, 1958.—Another laurel was handed the wheatgrowers of the Pacific Northwest when Jack L. Smith, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, was appointed official United States wheat-barley commodity representative by the Trade Fairs Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., at the Osaka International Fair to be held at Osaka, Japan, April 12–24.

Kenneth Krogh, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, pointed out that the United States Government will have exhibits representing all 5 basic commodities exported to Japan from the United States (wheat-barley, soybeans, cotton, tobacco, and dairy products) with each exhibit booth manned by a well-qualified American prominent in those commodity circles. Krogh stated that since the Oregon Wheat Growers League has been the No. 1 grain organization in the United States with a functioning overseas market development program, primarily designed for Far East markets, it is especially appropriate that its president should represent all United States grains at the Osaka Fair.

Smith will be a guest of the United States Department of Commerce, with all expenses borne by that Department, and paid in foreign currency derived from the sale of surplus farm commodities.

Smith, who was born on a ranch near Condon, Oreg., which he now farms, has long been active in wheat and farm affairs. He is currently vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers and has served on special assignments representing both the Oregon League and the National Association on legislative recommendations in Washington, D. C. He is a past winner of the State Soil Conservation Man of the Year award and was State chairman of the Soil Conservation Committee for 2 years. Active in the Congregational Church, married and with 4 children. He has served on many school and community projects. Smith will bid "Sayonara" to Oregon when he departs for Japan in early April. While in the Far East, he will confer with Joe Spiruta, Far East representative of the OWGL.

John P. Busarello Retires as President of District No. 5, United Mine Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the March 31 issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph. On April 1, 1958, John P. Busarello retired as president of District No. 5, United Mine Workers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa. He served in this capacity from 1942 until the time of his retirement. He has been associated with the coal industry for some 50 years. His first union office was that of secretary of the local union at McDonald, Pa. He was then only 15 years of age. During

the years he has established a fine record of service and achievement. He has devoted untiring efforts in behalf of the members of the UMWA and has always been deeply concerned for them and their welfare. His is a well-earned retirement and I want to join with all of his many other friends in extending best wishes for health, happiness, and good fishing in his new leisure. The article follows:

FIFTY-EIGHT YEARS WITH UMW, BUSARELLO RETIRING

(By George Shradle)

Memories from 58 years in western Pennsylvania's coalfield go with President John P. Busarello of United Mine Workers District 5 as he retires today.

The years spread from boyhood around the McDonald district pits through the hectic coal and iron police days of the futile 1925–28 strike and on to today's mechanized mines.

Mechanization is held partly responsible for the big reduction in the number of working miners; but Busarello reflects that it saved the mining industry and still provides some work.

As Busarello sees it:

"It's a good thing because otherwise there would be little or no mining.

"The cost of producing coal under the old hand method would have gone so high that other fuels would have been cheaper and would have replaced coal."

OFFICER AT AGE 15

The work force of miners has gradually dwindled through mechanization and the closing of scores of old mines but Busarello fears the day will come when there may not be enough men.

He explains that seniority rights keep unemployed men in line for job openings. This gives little chance for younger men to get started in the mines.

Busarello held the presidency of district 5 for 16 years after being in union offices for 55 years. His first office—at the age of 15—was that of secretary of UMW Local 1046 at the Partridge mine near McDonald.

He was born into a mining family 70 years ago in Baden, Germany.

His late father worked in ore and coal mines.

The family came to the United States in 1892 when John was 4 and settled at Primrose, near McDonald.

John has lived since then always within a 10-mile radius of McDonald. He will spend his retirement at his home in Oakdale, where he has lived since 1919.

At the age of 12 John went to work with his father as carboy in the old Primrose mine.

He explains that each miner was given only two cars a day. His father could have three with a carboy and that bought an extra loaf of bread.

Busarello became a trapper 6 months later at 50 cents a day. He soon became a pumper at $1 to be followed with driving the mine mules at $2.10 a day in 1904.

The union was being organized when he started in 1900 and 3 years later he became the local's secretary. In the years until 1916, he also was treasurer and president. He then was elected a district 5 representative.

THE COAL WARS

John remembers the brutality of the coal and iron police during the 1925–28 strike and relates how miners and their families were evicted from company houses and forced to live winter and summer in tents and barracks.

He has several souvenirs of those days. They include three police badges, a pistol, holster, and cartridge belt taken from police in rough-and-tumble struggles.

That strike broke the UMW but the union started reorganizing in 1933 with the advent of the NRA which gave labor the right to organize.

Busarello was assigned to the Youghiogheny River area from McKeesport to Perryopolis and organized 18 locals before being assigned as statistician at the district office.

John was elected district vice president in 1941 and 2 years later became president.

He saw the district comprised of Allegheny and Washington and parts of Fayette, Beaver, and Westmoreland Counties grow to 31,000 working members and dwindle to the present 7,300.

As he bade goodby to delegates at last Friday's constituitonal convention, John remarked:

"I've brought out my tools and am throwing them over the slate dump."

FISH AND FLOWERS

John retires as district 5 tightens its belt to cut operating costs by eliminating the vice presidency and by combining the offices of president and international board member. The board member, Joseph Yablonski, 48, assumes the dual post.

John has no plans other than to fish and help his wife, Bernice, in the flower garden.

Need for More Efficient Administration in Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bridges-Mansfield Bill," and published in one of New Hampshire's leading daily newspapers, the Manchester Union Leader, on Thursday, March 27, 1958.

The editorial, which expresses support of Senate bill 3544 recently introduced by the distinguished Senator from Montana and myself, points out clearly the necessity for retaining the integrity of the various branches of the military service, as well as the desirability of attaining more efficient administration of the Department of Defense.

In view of the vital importance which attaches to this question of defense reorganization, I believe this editorial warrants the careful attention of not only Members of Congress but the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES-MANSFIELD BILL

The bill recently introduced by Senator BRIDGES and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD to reduce the size of the Defense Department's civilian staff from 2,400 to 600 should have the support of every thinking American. BRIDGES and MANSFIELD will need that support, for the entrenched bureaucracy has ways of fighting back against those who would seek to halt its growth.

It's not that anyone in Washington will disagree with you when you point out the Defense Department's wasteful duplication of the work of the military departments. Not anyone will disagree with your contention that there has been a circumvention of the desire of the Congress that the military departments shall be separately administered by their respective secretaries under the control of the Secretary of Defense. It's just that few congressmen have had the courage to tackle this bureaucratic growth for fear of reprisals.

Senators BRIDGES and MANSFIELD are to be praised for their insistence on better and more efficient administration in the Defense Department.

The Consumer Is King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is often said that the consumer is king. I have a deep conviction that the eventuation of our American system, because of the standard of living which has been achieved, has enhanced the private economy of the United State in an increasingly beneficial way.

For this reason, I am deeply interested in the work of Life magazine's board of editors, led by Andrew Heiskell, publisher, concerning the part the consumer plays in our economy and what really makes him king.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on Life magazine's study of consumer expenditures for the year 1956, together with a detailed explanation of what was found by the study made by Richard H. Ostheimer.

Mr. President, I submit an estimate of $263.25 as the estimated cost of printing, and I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding, that the material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT ON LIFE MAGAZINE'S STUDY OF CONSUMER EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR 1956

(By Andrew Heiskell)

Life realizes that its future success, like that of the United States as a whole, is highly dependent upon the ability of American business to sell its products and services in quantity and at a profit. Life, both as a producer of a product to sell to the United States consumer and as an advertising medium for others to use to reach those consumers, has a big stake not only in the health of business in general but in the economic well-being of each of the hundreds of companies who use its advertising pages. It is this realization that prompted Life's study of consumer expenditures.

In 1954, when plans for this research project were being developed, the great need for more extensive and reliable marketing knowledge was already apparent. Since 1946, productivity per man-hour in manufacturing had been increasing at a rate in excess of 3 percent each year. But while production was thus steadily rising, it was evident that increases in distribution efficiency were not keeping pace. If this ability to produce goods continued to outstrip ability to distribute or market goods, American business could find itself in serious

imbalance. An obvious need was more marketing knowledge to match the technical knowledge already available in production.

It was to contribute to this need for marketing knowledge that Life undertook this study of consumer expenditures. For it was in the area of knowledge of the consumer, the ultimate buyer and user of what business produces, that explorations indicated a considerable lack of available marketing data. Business was being regularly supplied with valuable information on such things as the overall size of the market for various goods and services, on the relative market importance of various areas of the country, on the movement of products through specific retail channels, etc. But due to the difficulty and cost involved in obtaining extensive and reliable information on consumer markets, few companies possessed sufficient information to make possible increased efficiency at this level of the marketing process.

Valuable contributions to marketing knowledge have been made by various Government groups, the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, the Federal Reserve Board, etc., and by private companies and organizations through their explorations of consumer markets. It is Life's hope that the information from this study will add to that fund of knowledge and will spark business to additional and broader efforts to bring about more scientific marketing methods.

The first report from the Life study of consumer expenditures was released in the fall of 1957. It originates a series that Life plans to publish during the months ahead. Based on the findings of this study, subsequent reports will provide further analyses of consumer expenditures as related to other characteristics of the consumer population, to the retail place of purchase, to the seasonality of expenditures, to magazine audiences.

Here follows a description of the first report which will serve to introduce the reader to the research techniques applicable to the entire study as well as to provide a general definition of the findings contained in this report. The summary was prepared by Richard H. Ostheimer, Life market research manager, and appeared as an article in January 1958 issue of the Journal of Marketing.

Who Buys What? Life's Study of Consumer Expenditures

(By Richard H. Ostheimer)

Life magazine has published the first volume in its study of consumer expenditures. This initial report marks the beginning of a long-range program that will supply American business with current marketing facts which, when analyzed and interpreted in the light of other knowledge, can be applied to specific marketing decisions and thereby contribute to increased efficiency in marketing.

This first volume covers virtually the entire spectrum of consumer expenditures during 1956 as determined from a nationwide survey of United States households. The overall purpose is to describe the markets for each of the various goods and services which consumers buy. "Who spends how much on what?" This is answered by measuring how much of the total expenditures in each of the consumer markets is accounted for by households of various types.

The most recent source of data on this broad a scope is the survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics which covers 1950 expenditures in urban markets. These findings are currently being tabulated and published by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce under a grant from the Ford Foundation. In addition, more recent expenditures on particular goods and services are collected by the Department of Agriculture and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Description of Contents

Kinds of expenditures

The basic statistic presented in the first Life report is average annual dollar expenditures per household in 1956. Because these averages are computed from a probability selected sample of all households, the findings are projectable to the aggregate dollars spent by all 49 million households in the United States. Total current expenditures are divided among 8 major types of expenditure: food, beverages, and tobacco; clothing and accessories; home operation and improvement; home furnishings, equipment, and appliances; medical and personal care; automotive; recreation; and other. More detailed expenditure categories are then shown within each of these 8 major groups, such as baby foods and prepared mixes under food, men's and boys' footwear under clothing, and tires under automotive. In total, there are 57 such product groups, a relatively small number among all those collected.

To increase the report's value to marketing, individual products were classified according to the use consumers make of them, rather than according to the standard industrial classification which emphasizes where the item originates in the production process. Thus, ice cream, for example, was classified in this study under desserts, rather than in the standard industrial classification category of dairy products.

Kinds of households

Expenditures are analyzed by seven household characteristics: household income (1955 money income from all sources before taxes); age of the household head; occupation of the household head; education of the household head; stage of the household in the life cycle (young single persons or young married persons without children, households with children, etc.); geographic region (with metropolitan areas separated from nonmetropolitan areas within each region); and market location (within different market sizes, inside central-city areas are separated from the balance of the market area). Another household characteristic related to consumption is its size, and average number of persons per household is reported for the households in each classification.

Budget and market shares

In addition to average dollar expenditures per household, budget-type figures are computed which show what shares of all the money spent by all households in a given classification went for food, for clothing, etc. The third statistic is a percentage based on the projections of average expenditures per household to dollar totals. These percentages show what share of the total dollars spent on a product or product group were accounted for by households of various characteristics, thus directly describing the nature of the market for each of the variety of goods and services sold to consumers. The comparison of the share of total dollars accounted for by households described by a certain characteristic with the share these households numerically represent of all households offers a meaningful measure of the importance of this characteristic in the demand for a given product or service.

Present and future markets

A finding, for example, that 35 percent of all households are in a certain stage in the life cycle but account for 50 percent of the sales of some product has many marketing implications. One that comes quickly to mind is in long-range planning. Given projections of the number of households in this stage of the life cycle in future years, this relationship of life cycle to the purchasing of some product is a key to the sales outlook for this product in future years. In broader terms, by presenting the means for measuring the association between household characteristics and consuming habits, these findings provide the market analyst and economist with the bases for estimating the likely effects on consumption of the demographer's projections about the size and characteristics of the future population.

The universe of expenditures is the total of current expenditures on all goods and services made by housekeeping households for personal or nonbusiness purposes. Data were not collected on savings and income taxes, nor were capital expenditures such as downpayments on homes and purchases of stocks included. Emphasis is on those goods and services marketed through normal channels of distribution; and the totals exclude outlays for philanthropic gifts, educational expenditures, and vacation expenditures for accommodations and for travel.

Conduct of the Survey

The survey was conducted for Life by Alfred Politz Research, Inc. A separate technical report describes the methodology in detail, including sample validations and estimates of sampling errors. Following are some highlights of the techniques.

The sample

The sample was selected on a multistage area probability basis, using 103 primary sampling units covering 191 counties. Within each of the primary sampling units, 2,340 smaller areas (city blocks and clearly defined areas in open country) or locations were selected through a random process, and 1 segment averaging about 7 adjacent households was selected at random from within each location. These segments yielded 17,173 occupied households, of which 15,003 supplied some information. The expenditure finding in this first repart are based on the 10,243 households which supplied complete expenditure data. Since households that drop out tend to be associated with particular characteristics, ratio estimates on three of these characteristics were applied to make the 10,243 households more similar to the 15,003 households interviewed at least once. No substitutions or replacements were permitted at any time.

Four interviewing waves

The information was collected from each household in four interviews or waves. There was a 4-week interval between waves, and thus each household was interviewed 4 times over a 13-week period. Beginning in October 1955, over 200 new households entered the sample each week continuing through October 1956; and interviewing went on throughout the 15-month period ending in December 1956. While the average household was interviewed for 8 hours in total, the individual interview was made more palatable by being spread over 4 periods.

Period of recall

In an effort to minimize response errors—particularly errors which are the result of overtaxing the ability of respondents to remember accurately—two methods were used to collect expenditure information. In general, those expenditures which are relatively large and made infrequently, such as consumer durables, were obtained by standard recall questions with explicit reference to specific goods. The recall period was varied with the item, from within the last 12 months for automobiles to 3 months for mortgage payments.

A household record

All other expenditures were collected by a technique which combined the use of a diary, recall aids, and personal interview. On the fourth wave, the interviewer left with the household a household record in which all expenditures by the household within the following 10-day period were to be entered.

* * * * *

Housewife the recorder

The household member responsible for the major portion of the household expenditures—usually the housewife—was the principal source of the information. She had the responsibility for maintaining the household record and, in a sense, acted as the interviewer within the household by asking each member for his daily expenditures. Where it was not feasible for a household member, such as a nonrelated boarder, to reveal his expenditures, separate records and schedules were used for obtaining income and expenditure information which was subsequently combined with that of the rest of the household.

Some expenditures collected on the recall schedules, such as clothing, were obtained by interviewing each household member individually. On major purchases such as refrigerators, the housewife was the respondent but she was urged to consult with other members when there was any doubt in her mind. In the case of automobiles, expenditures were specifically asked of the household head.

Skilled interviewing

Highly trained interviewers worked under close supervision and quality checks. The principal means of obtaining cooperation was interviewing skill and perseverance, plus questions on a wide variety of subjects designed to arouse the interest of respondents (baseball, movies, neighborhood, juvenile delinquency, hobbies). As many as eleven callbacks were made in an attempt to complete a wave of questioning. If the household had moved to within a reasonable distance, the interviewer went to the new address. With the exception of an inexpensive clock mounted on a platform on which the daily record was kept and a small lint brush at wave two, no premiums were used.

Time reference

All expenditures obtained from the household record refer to 1956. Those obtained from the schedules refer to 1956, plus all or parts of 1955. Expenditures on automobiles, for example, represent an average of 1955, and 1956 expenditures (more accurately, the 2-year period of November 1954, through October 1956). All household characteristics are those at the time of the interview with the exception of income which is 1955 money earnings from all sources before taxes.

What is a household?

The recipient unit is the household or housekeeping dwelling unit. No criteria of blood relationship or pooled income were applied. To qualify as a separate unit, a household within a dwelling unit had to have at least its own mailbox, or entrance, or cooking facilities. When there were more than four boarders, a dwelling unit was treated as a hotel and excluded from the sample.

FINDINGS

Income and spending

The survey shows that the average United States household spent annually $4,110 for the goods and services which were measured, or a total of about $200 billion for all households. The dominant influence of income on expenditures is clearly evidenced in the findings. The top row of table 1 shows a consistent movement of larger total expenditures with higher incomes, but also a tendency for the increases in dollar expenditures to diminish as households move up the income scale. Up through incomes of around $3,500, an increase in income of $1,000 is associated with an increase in spending of about $900, but the increase in expenditures is only $400 to $500 in the range of $3,500 to $8,500 and probably about $350 per $1,000 income increment for incomes over $8,500. Income taxes, philanthropic gifts, educational and vacation expenses, and savings account for larger and larger shares of these income increments as income gets higher.

Expenditures actually tend to exceed income among the lower income households (under $4,000). While some of this dissaving represents the incurring of debts to be paid out of savings from future earnings, it also doubtless represents the dependence of retired persons on past savings (note the smaller household size among the lower-income groups).

TABLE 1.—*Percentage division of total spending among major goods and services*

	All households	Household income before taxes						
		Under $2,000	$2,000 to $3,000	$3,000 to $4,000	$4,000 to $5,000	$5,000 to $7,000	$7,000 to $10,000	$10,000 or over
Total annual expenditures per household	$4,110	$1,933	$2,924	$3,839	$4,363	$5,016	$6,063	$7,946
Percent of total expenditures	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Food, beverages, tobacco	29	36	33	30	29	28	26	24
Clothing, accessories	12	11	11	13	12	11	13	14
Home operation, improvement	19	17	20	18	19	19	18	18
Home furnishings, equipment, appliances	9	7	8	8	8	9	9	10
Medical, personal care	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	6
Automotive [1]	14	11	13	15	14	16	15	15
Recreation	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	6
Other [2]	7	6	5	6	7	7	9	7
Total United States households (thousands)	49,140	8,610	7,080	7,510	9,250	9,680	4,680	2,330
Sample base	10,243	1,940	1,546	1,544	1,882	1,934	913	484
Average number of persons per household	3.3	2.7	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.8

[1] Expenditures on automobiles in this category refer to net outlays after trade-in allowances.
[2] Includes life insurance premiums and nonmedical professional services.

Similar budgets

Table 1 shows how households of different incomes divide their total spending among major expenditure categories. As expected, least responsive to income are food expenditures, and hence they account for around a third of the total for households with incomes under $4,000, but for only a quarter for those with incomes over $7,000. With this exception, however, the dominant impression of these findings is the overall uniformity in the share each income group allots to satisfy these broad categories of needs and preferences. The spending patterns are very similar within the numerically large income group of $4,000 to $7,000. The fact that this group represents 39 percent of all the households and accounts for 44 percent of all the dollars spent in the market place gives increased emphasis to the concept of a mass market of homogeneous tastes. (When households are classified by incomes after taxes, the differences between income groups narrow still more because of the effects of progressive income taxes.)

Other tables in the report generally support this impression of conformity in overall spending habits among households of various types. The professional and managerial occupations are not radically different from the clerical, skilled, or unskilled workers in the shares of total expenditures going to each broad category. The findings are quite the same for households of different educational attainments and ages, and for households in different geographic regions. The proportionate distribution of the total dollar is even very similar among households in various stages of the life cycle. Metropolitan households, however, spend significantly larger shares on food, clothing, and shelter and smaller shares on durable goods (particularly automobiles) than do households in nonmetropolitan areas.

Market prospects

Conformity of spending habits as measured by the shares of the budget allotted to major categories does not mean that all households are equally good market prospects. Since income is so important in determining expenditures, upper income households account for disproportionately large shares of total spending relative to their numbers. Table 2, which divides all households roughly into thirds by income, shows that the top third ($5,000 and over incomes) accounts for almost half of all the dollars spent. The middle third, which earns $3,000 to $5,000, spends exactly in proportion to its numbers (34 percent); while the bottom third, households with incomes under $3,000, spends slightly less than a fifth of all the dollars. The expenditure categories most responsive to higher incomes are home furnishings, equipment, and appliances; alcoholic beverages; automotive, recreation, and clothing. Food and tobacco expenditures, on the other hand, are noticeably less income-sensitive.

Education and spending

The findings on more specific expenditures are of most interest in this question of identifying markets for the seller. By way of illustration, Table 3 shows 4 specific product groups from the 57 in the first report which show a particularly high positive association with the educational attainment of the household head. Although an underlying cause of this relationship is the close correlation between a household's income and the education of the household head, income does not explain all of the association between spending and education. Since income correlates very closely with total expenditures, we can roughly hold constant the effects of income by contrasting the behavior of expenditures on selected items with that of total expenditures. For instance, total expenditures by the college households average $5,442, slightly less than double the $2,807 spent by the households whose heads did not finish grade school. But the higher educated spent on the average 2½ times the amount on housing (rent, mortgage, school and land taxes) and communications (telephone), 3 times as much on frozen vegetables and juices, and 4 times as much on photographic equipment.

TABLE 2.—*Percentage division of total spending among households of various incomes*

	Household income before taxes		
	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $5,000	$5,000 or more
United States households	32	34	34
Total expenditures	19	34	47
Food, beverages, tobacco	22	35	43
Food	23	35	42
Alcoholic beverages	20	30	50
Tobacco	22	36	42
Clothing, accessories	17	35	48
Home operation, improvement	18	35	47
Home furnishings, equipment, appliances	17	32	51
Medical, personal care	21	33	46
Automotive	16	34	50
Recreation	17	34	49
Other [1]	16	33	51

[1] Includes life insurance premiums and nonmedical professional services.

TABLE 3.—*Expenditures on selected items by education of household head*

	All households	Did not finish grade school	Finished grade school	Some high school	Finished high school	Some college or beyond
Total United States households (thousands)	49,140	9,380	10,170	9,080	10,860	9,650
Average number of persons per household	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.2
AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE PER HOUSEHOLD						
Total expenditures	$4,110	$2,807	$3,576	$4,032	$4,612	$5,442
Frozen fruits, vegetables, and juices	14	8	10	13	17	23
Housing	442	260	334	432	514	663
Communications	39	21	31	38	48	54
Photographic equipment	11	4	7	11	14	17
PERCENTAGE DIVISION OF EXPENDITURES						
Total United States households	100	19	21	18	22	20
Total expenditures	100	13	18	18	25	26
Frozen fruits, vegetables, and juices	100	11	15	17	26	31
Housing	100	11	15	18	26	30
Communications	100	10	17	18	28	27
Photographic equipment	100	8	13	18	29	32
Sample base	10,243	2,143	2,186	1,907	2,188	1,819

The lower part of Table 3 presents the share-of-market statistics for these products. Combining the 2 upper groups into high-school graduation or beyond, this group constitutes 42 percent of all households and 51 percent of all the dollars spent, but 61 percent of the photographic-equipment dollars, 57 percent of the frozen-vegetable dollars, 56 percent of the housing dollars, and 55 percent of the communications dollars.

On the other hand, there are some products on which expenditures are inversely associated with educational achievement. One conspicuous example is cooking and baking ingredients; spending on this category tends to decrease as the educational and economic level and degree of urbanization—of the household rises.

Life cycle and spending

The stage of the household in the life cycle is another nonincome characteristic affecting the demand for many goods and services. Households with young children represent particularly good markets for prepared mixes, major appliances, and household waxes and cleaners—illustrations cited in Table 4. Items such as these (not to mention the more obvious ones of baby powder, cereals, and toys) rank high on the priority list of the budgets of these households and hence average expenditures are large relative to total spending. In 1956, these households with small children numbered 40 percent of all households and did 45 percent of the total spending, but they bought over half of all the consumer sales of prepared mixes, household polishes, and major appliances.

TABLE 4.—*Expenditures on selected items by stage in the life cycle*

	All households	No children, single or married head under 40	Children		No children	
			Under 10	10 to 19 only	Married, head 40 or over	Single, head 40 or over
Total United States households (thousands)	49,140	3,710	19,640	7,980	11,340	6,470
Average number of persons per household	3.3	1.9	4.7	3.8	2.3	1.4
AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE PER HOUSEHOLD						
Total expenditures	$4,110	$4,332	$4,607	$4,881	$3,639	$2,350
Prepared mixes	5	3	6	5	4	2
Major appliances	84	87	107	89	68	33
Household waxes, polishes, cleaners	5	4	7	5	5	2
Women's and girls' clothing	210	236	196	208	195	158
PERCENTAGE DIVISION OF EXPENDITURES						
Total United States households	100	8	40	16	23	13
Total expenditures	100	8	45	19	20	8
Prepared mixes	100	5	53	18	19	5
Major appliances	100	8	51	17	19	5
Household waxes, polishes, cleaners	100	6	52	16	20	6
Women's and girls' clothing	100	9	37	23	21	10
Sample base	10,243	726	4,103	1,676	2,474	1,264

Spending priorities change when the children of the house are in their teens. The expenditures on women's and girls' clothing shown in table 4 are particularly high for this group of households—accounting for 23 percent of the total of such expenditures, in contrast to 19 percent of all spending. Incomes on the average tend to be somewhat larger for this slightly older group, as indicated by the $275 increase in total spending over households with small children. However, this is only 6 percent larger, while expenditures on women's and girls' clothing are $100, or 50 percent, larger. The washing machines had been bought (average expenditures drop from $107 to $89 on major appliances), and the housewife was now better able to buy the clothes for herself which she had previously abstained from buying, and to buy the clothes necessary for her teen-age daughter.

Suburban spending

There is no doubt that suburban living, in some ways, establishes unique patterns of consumption. By way of an approximation of suburban dwelling, tables in the report separate those households within metropolitan markets which are in areas outside the limits of the central cities. The marketing significance of these households for particular industries is illustrated by the findings that they spent 47 percent of all the dollars on removable floor coverings (rugs and linoleum), 45 percent of the total on sports goods, and 40 percent of the dollars for prepared pet foods, while representing only 27 percent of all households and 31 percent of all spending. Their absolute dollar expenditures on these products were considerably higher than those by households in other market locations, and also higher relative to their larger total expenditures and income.

The 12 million rural households in nonmetropolitan places under 2,500 population account for a disproportionally small share (a fifth) of total expenditures. However, with some specific product groups, such as gasoline and oil, their expenditures are more important in the total market.

Regional differences

The importance of other household characteristics—notably regional location, age and occupation of the household head, as well as household income—in the demand for various products can be similarly inferred from the report. It may be observed, for example, that a good share of the variations in spending between geographic regions can be ascribed to different degrees of metropolitan market development, rather than to what might be interpreted to be characteristics of the region itself. The Northeast, for example, had the highest per household total expenditures ($4,637)—40 percent higher than the South which had the lowest per household spending. When between-region comparisons are made for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas separtely, the Northeast's lead over the South shrinks to 25 percent among metropolitan areas and 24 percent among nonmetropolitan areas. Differences between regions in the mix of the population in respect to characteristics which affect spending, such as age and occupation, underlie many regional differences in expenditures on particular products.

APPLICATIONS

The economist

Surveys of consumer expenditures, first of all, provide economists with the weights necessary for constructing indexes of prices. In addition, they make it possible to test theories which seek to explain consumer behavior and its role in aggregate economic activity. Knowledge, for example, of how expenditures vary among households of different incomes is the basis for estimating what effects a redistribution of incomes would have on the Nation's total propensity to consume. Underlying many of these kinds of analyses are projections into the future and guides to public policy in the areas of taxation, credit control, and social security. The primary purpose of the Life survey, however, was to describe the markets for a great variety of specific goods and services, with the consequence that some of the information which an economist would want for analysis was not collected, such as additions to savings and indebtedness, past and expected incomes, capital position, sources of income, and income and other taxes.

Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the past several years I have become increasingly alarmed about the policy of employers toward older job seekers. One has only to look at the help-wanted columns of our daily papers to learn how a man or woman's birth date is considered sufficient evidence to bar him from consideration for employment. In far too many instances no consideration is given to ability, experience, or the degree of willingness the applicant may possess.

Advertisements such as "wanted, secretary (under 40, please); draftsman—to 35; laborer (those over 40 need not apply); sales ladies—18 to 35" are common place. To the qualified worker beyond the specified age limits, such ads can mean only one thing—"We don't want you—your services are not needed." This treatment is not only an unwarranted economic blow to the older worker, who in all probability must provide for several dependents, but, in addition, it is bound to be a severe test to the morale of even the strongest and most determined individual.

Mr. President, some months ago this situation was brought forcefully and personally to my attention. I have described it, and have listed a number of steps which I think we should take to help alleviate the harsh and unfair condition, in an article I wrote for the Eagle magazine. I ask that "A Challenge for All," which appeared in the April issue of the Eagle, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE FOR ALL

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

"You've got to help me, Senator."

The man sitting beside my desk in the Senate Office Building was husky and appeared to be in good health. I estimated his age at 50 years, perhaps a year or 2 either way. His ruddy complexion indicated that a good part of his life had been spent out of doors, and the calloused hands that gripped the edge of his chair told me this man had known hard physical labor.

"I know you are a busy man," he went on, "but I just don't know where to turn." There was a certain desperation in his eyes, and it was obvious that he had encountered a force that could not be pushed aside by his strong hands alone. My secretary had asked what he wanted to discuss with me, and he told her that it was personal, so at that point I knew nothing of his problem. I was not a little disturbed when I learned what it was, and since that time I have done considerable investigating, and what I have found has shocked me.

He told me his story, haltingly and with some embarrassment. Here was a strong man who had worked hard since childhood, and had always provided well for his family and to whom the word unemployment signified a lack of ambition. Yet, here he was, in good health, more than willing to work and still he had not had steady employment for more than a year.

"They say I'm too old. I am 53 and have 2 daughters in high school and a boy in junior high. My wife is not well, and she worries about this. What can I say to them, Senator? Can I say, I cannot support you any more because I am too old? Can't the Government do something?" he pleaded.

Well, perhaps the Government can do something. Yes, we may have to do something to alleviate the unhealthy practice that has grown in our society of job discrimination on the basis of age. Senators NEUBERGER, KEFAUVER, MCNAMARA, and myself have introduced a bill into the Senate providing for a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President prior to December 31, 1958. One purpose of the conference will be to deal with the outmoded practices in the employment and compulsory premature retirement of middle-aged and older persons.

With the assistance of dedicated supporters such as Judge Robert Hansen and the Fraternal Order of Eagles, who have already done so much in this field, we will get this bill passed. However, our American employers can do much more and do it in a more efficient manner. Legislation is not always the final answer, but industry must realize that it is inevitable if the morale-destroying and economically foolish practice of job discrimination on the basis of age is not terminated.

Let us briefly analyze the background of this unfortunate situation. In the early days of our Nation, while our ancestors were fighting for survival in their battle with the elements, a high premium was placed on youth. Later on as we struggled for freedom and then began to push the frontier beyond the Mississippi, over the Great Plains, past the Rockies to the Pacific Ocean, the rugged life demanded a degree of physical prowess found only among the young. The rigors took their toll, and even as late as 1900 a man could expect to live only 46 years. So, of course, a person of 40 was old, and even a man of 35 had likely passed his most useful and productive years. Now things have changed, and a male child born in 1954 can reasonably expect to live 67 years and a female child 73 years. We have shifted from a country, largely agricultural, to a highly industrialized, essentially urban society. The physical challenges are no longer as great, and thanks to the wonderful progress in medicine and social services, our people can now not only live longer, but they are able to enjoy good health and extend their productive years far beyond the past expectations.

But unfortunately, the old ideas that persons of 40, 50, and 60 are not good employment risks, have remained with us. This is little more than a numbers game and an employer who arbitrarily limits the age of those he will consider for work is following a short-sighted policy. The shift in age composition has been dramatic and far reaching. The results have not yet been fully tabulated, but we do know that a very large part of our manpower resources now lies in this group of middle-aged and older men and women. Even though we were not faced with a battle for survival with the Communist countries, this productive force would be necessary to the continued economic growth of our Nation. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case.

Our Nation is faced with what is probably the gravest crisis in our history. We have fallen behind Soviet Russia in rocketry and other types of scientific military achievement. It is not an exaggeration to state that we could be in danger of becoming a second-class power. We will need all of our wisdom, courage, determination, and talent if we are to maintain our position as the leader of the Western World. Certainly, in a situation of this kind, the maximum utilization of the skills and productivity of all of our people no matter what their age, becomes essential.

Now, even were we to disregard the effect on the morale and lives of our older workers who encounter age discrimination and consider the problem only in an economic light, there is still no justification for this practice. The Department of Labor has made a number of comprehensive studies on the employment of older workers and among their findings they point out that these employees show a greater degree of stability and have fewer separations in proportion to their employment. In each of the seven large cities studied, this was the case. Also the investigators found out that the average output per man-hour shows no significant decline with age and that a great many older workers exceed the average output of younger age groups.

The University of Illinois bureau of business management, in a significant study of 3,077 persons, 60 years and older, went directly to the immediate supervisors to obtain evaluations of their older workers' performance. This is what they found:

1. Supervisors in business and in industry consider a majority of their workers, 60 years of age and older, to be as good as or superior to average younger workers with reference to overall performance, absenteeism, dependability, work volume, and human relations.

2. There is no specific age at which employees become unproductive.

3. Supervisors indicate that organizations which require employees to retire at a certain age, such as 65, are losing much valuable productivity.

4. Supervisors believe that one-fourth of their workers, 60 years and older, will be able to continue working indefinitely.

5. Supervisors said that they had experienced favorable results with new employees recruited from the ranks of the middle aged.

Almost without exception, studies have shown that the older worker experiences the greatest difficulty when his job is terminated for one reason or another through no fault of his own and then must seek new employment. It is at this point, when the ugly phrases such as "too slow, cannot meet production requirements, lacks skill and flexibility, cannot meet physical demands" are offered in the place of a job. It is little less than cruel and inhuman when an American citizen, in search of a job, must comb the columns of the help-wanted section of a newspaper to be greeted by "wanted, secretary (under 40, please); draftsman, to 35; laborer, those over 45 need not apply; sales ladies, 18 to 38." For the older persons who are seeking employment, this attitude can mean only one thing—we do not want you. You are no longer of value. I think that Dr. Edward L. Bortz, former president of the American Medical Association, has summed up the tragic paradox of forced unemployment, among older workers in periods of full employment, in one sentence. "With one hand, modern society does everything possible to extend the life of man; while with the other it writes him off as useless because of the date on his birth certificate."

So what can we do to alleviate this harsh and unfair condition?

1. Employers should be urged by citizens' committees and interdepartmental committees to investigate the advantages of flexible retirement policies. Many State governments are setting an example by establishing such practices for their employees.

2. States may pass legislation to ban discrimination due to age alone. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania now have such laws on the books. While we know that a law of this kind will not end discrimination, it will stop the discrimina-

tory want ads, will aid in the education program, and most certainly will jar employers into taking a second look at their archaic employment practices.

3. States could and should provide special counselors in the State employment service to guide older persons in employment, assist other public and private agencies in employment opportunities, and to instruct employment interviewers in ways to help the older job-seekers. Massachusetts and New York have recently instituted this program with encouraging results.

4. States may wish to take the lead in retraining and reclassifying their own employees when skills or abilities in one vocation lessen or become obsolete. Part-time work for the semiretired is also an area that should be investigated thoroughly. In addition, many study commissions have also determined that it is wise for States to take leadership in setting up a system for counseling their older workers in retirement problems. Retirement eventually comes to all of us and an activity of this sort can be of great assistance in finding ways to creative leisure and in meeting problems of finance and time budgeting that will be unfamiliar to many newly retired workers. The Department of Civil Service in New Jersey has instituted such a program and all employees retiring during the next 5 years will be counseled.

5. Federal and State governments, State and local committees and commissions, should undertake to a greater degree the task of educating employers and personnel directors to the desirability of giving the older worker a trial.

6. All of us must recognize the danger inherent to our people and our country if we permit an expanding and growing segment of our population to lapse into a feeling of rejection, loneliness, and insecurity. Mental deterioration is a real and terrible danger, unpleasant even to contemplate, but it is a threat unless our society makes sure that our older people enjoy their rightful role as contributors to our way of life, and live their twilight years with a feeling of pride in their day-to-day accomplishments. Human resources are the Nation's most valuable assets, and we cannot possibly afford to continue the shameful waste of the past. The still secret Gaither report and the Rockefeller report (recently made public) should be fair warning that we must act and act now to pull together all of the resources at our command. We need the skills and productivity of our older workers as never before.

Fortunately, we were able to locate a position in a fine Minnesota firm for the man whom I described at the beginning of this article. He is doing an excellent job and his employer is well pleased with his performance, but he was only one of the thousands and thousands of workers who are unemployed simply because they are over 40. All of us must do more. Business, Government, labor, and citizens groups can contribute in important ways. The problem is not insurmountable, but neither can we merely look the other way and wait for it to disappear.

Flint "You Auto Buy Now" Campaign Sets Pace for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following front-page editorial which appeared in the Flint Journal, Flint, Mich., entitled "'You Auto Buy Now.' But Where Is Reuther?"

I am proud of the effort being made by Flint merchants to stimulate sales of automobiles to counter the effects of the current decline in automotive production and the resultant unemployment. They are using the old-fashioned techniques of spirited competition and salesmanship which President Eisenhower advocated in his recent news conference. This campaign has spread from Flint to many other cities throughout the Nation.

The Flint Journal's editorial also urges that the present contracts between the United Auto Workers and the automobile manufacturers be extended to relieve uncertainty, pry loose hoarded funds, stimulate buying, not only of automobiles but of everything else, and be an important step toward the quick return of full employment.

As you will recall, this was my purpose in writing to Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, several weeks ago. I urged that he consider making a public declaration of the union's willingness to accept an extension of the present contracts. At the same time, I wrote to the leading automobile manufacturers urging a reevaluation of their price structure in the interest of stimulating automobile production and employment.

The "You Auto Buy Now" campaign, inaugurated by Flint businessmen, is an encouraging step. I hope that the Flint Journal's editorial will receive close study by all who are interested in restoring full employment to this important industry.

"YOU AUTO BUY NOW"—BUT WHERE IS REUTHER?

Today marks the start of a campaign in Flint designed to stimulate business, reduce unemployment, and bring back the kind of prosperity everyone so earnestly desires.

Literally thousands of people in Flint are participating, either directly or indirectly, in this effort. Under the slogan, "You Auto Buy Now," hundreds of automobile salesmen are out ringing doorbells, making telephone calls and personal contacts, asking everyone they meet, "Do you know anyone who wants to buy a car?"

We have heard such remarks as these: "I'm buying a new car just to help this thing along," and, "I don't really need a new car, but I could be talked into buying one."

All over the Nation, similar campaigns are being planned. That means that millions of people will take part in this great American effort to end the business slump. The campaign is not confined to automobile sales. It is sponsored in Flint by the auto dealers and the chamber of commerce. Thus all businesses are involved.

This voluntary, largely spontaneous campaign is encouraging because of the participation of so many people and organizations, and because of the enthusiasm being shown.

This is the American, the democratic way of tackling a problem, by individual and group initiatiye, determination, and aggressiveness.

The Government is participating. It has taken several steps designed to give our economy a shot in the arm. Defense contracts have been speeded, particularly to areas where unemployment has increased. Credit has been eased. A determined effort is being made to reduce or repeal the excise tax on cars. The highway program will be speeded. The same is true of Federal construction projects. The Government will provide a multibillion dollar stimulant through these and other projects.

But people everywhere are unwilling to wait for these Government measures to take effect. They are determined to help themselves. Who says the old American spirit of self-reliance is dead?

This is one of the most heartening developments in a long time. Nearly every segment of American life is represented in this campaign to pull ourselves out of the business slump.

But one important segment of American life is conspicuous by its absence, even though it stands to profit more by the success of the effort than the others.

Where, it must be asked, is Walter Reuther and the UAW–CIO in this effort to beat the recession?

The answer is not hard to find. At a time when everyone else is engaged in an enthusiastic, cooperative effort to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, Reuther and his cohorts, against the obvious wishes of the very people they represent, are stamping on those same boots, trying to drive them deeper into the economic mud.

Reuther, by his own admission, is out to get the biggest pay raise in history—at a time when such a pay raise can only harm the economy by bringing about even higher prices and more consumer resistance.

The economic climate calls for reasonableness, flexibility, and responsibility. He is being unreasonable, inflexible, and irresponsible.

At a time when he could allay fear of the future, help restore confidence in the economy, and stimulate the sales of the product upon which his members rely for their living, he is depressing confidence and promoting insecurity.

One simple act of labor statesmanship could remedy this—extension of the present contract.

That would relieve uncertainty, pry loose hoarded funds, stimulate buying—not only of automobiles but of everything else—and be an important step toward the quick return of full employment. It would be the "shot in the arm" our economy needs.

Reuther apparently has defective hearing regarding grassroots rumbling within his membership and from the general public. In common with such labor leaders, Reuther thinks his very job always depends on getting wage increases and additional fringe benefits each time a new contract is negotiated. In this instance he is making an issue of a garment not suited to the figure. There is no doubt that among the rank and file the predominant desire is to work. Rather than a strike or the risk of one, they would rather go to their jobs under present terms, which include the escalator clause which provides readjustments conforming to living costs.

This has been suggested by GM president Harlow H. Curtice. Reuther should bring his thinking up to date.

Accelerated Shipbuilding Program a Means of Combating Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column which appeared in the Independent-

Press-Telegram, Long Beach, Calif., on Sunday, March 23, 1958. This column, which discusses an accelerated shipbuilding program as a means of combating the recession, was written by an outstanding analyst and commentator, Mrs. Virginia Kelly.

In this article, Mrs. Kelly quotes a distinguished Member of Congress from California, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, as well as Rear Adm. A. G. Mumma, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, as stating the desirability of increasing our combatant ship production in the interest of national defense. I concur in this position and, with reference to the construction of new submarines, I earnestly hope that decision will be made to place even greater emphasis on submarine construction at such leading yards as Portsmouth, N. H.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSMER SEES SHIPBUILDING AS BIG HELP IN RECESSION FIGHT

(By Virginia Kelly)

Representative CRAIG HOSMER (Republican, California) believes an accelerated and augmented Navy shipbuilding program would be one of the soundest ways of fighting the recession. A Naval Reserve commander, Mr. HOSMER has just returned from Navy maneuvers at Guantanamo.

Mr. HOSMER stressed that the President has properly put his foot down on make-work programs. The Long Beach legislator said that a Navy shipbuilding program would not be leaf raking but would be necessary for adequate defense. The program, HOSMER said, would benefit not only shipbuilding areas but the entire Nation. For example, the Kaiser Steel Co. in Fontana, Calif., will start rolling plates for ships next summer.

Representative HOSMER said he would recommend building the nuclear carrier recently knocked out of the Navy building program, and the building of additional submarines. He said bluntly that the only way to hold in check the menace of 500 Soviet submarines—many of them missile bearing—is by an enlarged program of United States Navy submarines. At present, HOSMER said, the Polaris and hunter killer sub programs are battling for funds. The two programs should be separated, he asserted, and each should be given adequate funds.

From other sources, this reporter learned that Vice President NIXON is giving close study to the advantages of a shipbuilding program. The President and his advisers are contemplating restoring the nuclear carrier.

The Navy's Bureau of Ships Chief, Rear Adm. A. G. Mumma has completed the first draft of a paper showing the impact a Navy building program would have on the recession and unemployment.

Admiral Mumma has already discussed the matter with Navy Secretary Gates and with Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke. The Mumma paper makes no specific recommendations as to types of ships needed but Admiral Mumma said the nuclear carrier and additional submarines would be "very welcome." The admiral pointed out that steel and many other ship components would benefit the whole country as well as the most depressed areas in the Northwest, along the Great Lakes, and the Atlantic seaboard. Money availability is the present problem, Admiral Mumma said, but he recalled that 34 Navy ships were built under NIRA during the depression of the 1930's.

He refused to comment on the report current on Capitol Hill that Defense Secretary McElroy has cut back the Navy's Polaris submarine program from 9 to 5 or 6. Other sources assert that as of March 17, Secretary McElroy had not definitely issued the order to cut back.

Admiral Mumma said no announcement has been made as to the weaponry that the Navy's first atomic cruiser, the U. S. S. *Long Beach* will carry but he said it would be possible for the *Long Beach* to be armed with Polaris.

Navy Under Secretary William Franke believes badly needed Navy housing would be a useful way of fighting the recession.

Stand of Woman's Christian Temperance Union on Tobacco and Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an effective and informative excerpt from the Washington Letter by my friend, Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, which is a regular feature of the Union Signal, official magazine of the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

This article by Miss Smart asks why there has been no consideration of my proposed bill, S. 2569, to remove tobacco from the list of crops qualifying for Government price supports—particularly in view of recent medical bulletins regarding the adverse impact of cigarettes on human health.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Union Signal of March 8, 1958]

THE WASHINGTON LETTER

(By Elizabeth A. Smart)

Cigarettes and price supports. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who induced the United States Public Health Service to get out a leaflet warning the American public that tobacco can cause cancer, has introduced a bill (S. 2569) to get the Government out of the business of giving price supports to tobacco. He said in an article in the Christian Century: "If ever there was a situation where the left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth, it is in the policy of the United States Government with respect to tobacco and cigarettes. While one agency of Government warns that cigarettes may be a factor in causing the most terrible disease afflicting the human race, another Government agency subsidizes and encourages the growing of the product from which cigarettes are made.

"Late in July I introduced a bill in the Senate which reads as follows: *'Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, beginning with the 1958 crop, no price support, marketing quota, acreage allotment or acreage reserve program shall be effective with respect to tobacco.'

"The statement of Dr. Burney (Surgeon-General Leroy E. Burney) of the United States Public Health Service: 'Many independent studies thus have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and prolonged cigarette smoking.' Once the surgeon-general had issued such a statement, it seemed to me the height of irony for the Government to continue to regard tobacco as a 'basic' crop. If tobacco is a causative element in spreading the grimmest malady which may plague large numbers of Americans, then the growing of tobacco should not be subsidized out of the taxes collected from the American people."

You might ask your Senators why this bill has been indefinitely postponed.

Resolutions Adopted by the Detroit Common Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following three resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Detroit Common Council:

Inauguration of a food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods.

Reactivation and approval of housing project Michigan 1–11.

Continuation and acceleration of the urban renewal program.

All three programs are of vital importance to the city of Detroit and their enactment is long overdue.

Whereas housing project Michigan 1–11 has been approved by the Public Housing Administration and all agencies of the Government concerned; and

Whereas land for the first portion of this project has been acquired by the city of Detroit; and

Whereas prompt approval of the first 1,250 family dwellings of this project will provide urgently needed additional public housing for large families and for elderly single persons and couples of low income; and

Whereas the construction contracts and equipment contracts of this first 1,250 dwelling units will total more than $15 million and will aid materially and beneficially in relieving the unemployment situation in the Detroit area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Public Housing Administration be and is hereby requested to immediately reactivate the Michigan 1–11 project by prompt approval of the development of the first 1,250 dwelling units at a cost of approximately $17,600 per unit; and further

Resolved, That Detroit's Representatives in Congress and Senators MCNAMARA and POTTER are hereby requested to urge the approval of this project.

Adopted unanimously, March 27, 1958.

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed a desire for the quickening of the urban renewal program as a means of strengthening the national economy; and

Whereas the city of Detroit is mindful of this fact and has obligated itself in the undertaking of an expanded urban renewal program, both in the field of redevelopment and conservation in 55 neighborhood areas; and

Whereas the city of Detroit is aware of the great assistance afforded the construction and related trades in this type of program; and

Whereas the continuation and acceleration of the urban renewal program depends upon the provision of additional Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council take steps to advise the Federal Government of

its desire that additional funds be made available for the continuation and acceleration of the urban renewal program as a means of strengthening the national economy.

Adopted unanimously, March 27, 1958.

Whereas the city of Detroit since January 1955, has been engaged in distributing food commodities to needy citizens, including not only families receiving public assistance but other needy individuals; and

Whereas in the month of February 1958 the city distributed 120 tons of surplus foods to 20,946 families, representing 70,758 persons; and

Whereas it is reported that approximately 15 percent of the labor force in this area is unemployed thereby increasing the number of persons receiving food commodities; and

Whereas this common council has adopted resolutions urging the inauguration of the so-called food stamp plan, similar to the plan in effect during the years 1939 and 1943, which would eliminate the present complicated, cumbersome and costly plan of distribution of surplus commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this common council again urges that the food stamp plan be reactivated by the Federal Government to permit distribution of surplus foods in the normal business channels which has operated successfully at little expense; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Members of Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Adopted unanimously, March 25, 1958.

Vital Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I should like to submit a friendly letter received from one of my constituents this morning. Naturally I approve of the tone of his communication but I also think he has made a good point:

WILDWOOD, RED HOOK ON HUDSON, N. Y.,
March 31, 1958.

Hon. J. ERNEST WHARTON,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHARTON: For many weeks I have refrained from informing you of my views on vital matters of prospective legislation by Congress; and today I am addressing you a communication intended only for your indulgent scanning in a moment of respite from your important and difficult duties as a statesman in 1958. I hope that, in a mood of levity, you may find the vital statistics which I copy below from a New York City newspaper column as hilariously amusing as I have found them:

"From William H. Van Thusen, Inc., comes the following, which is labeled 'Some vital statistics.' Goes like this:

"Population of the United States, 173 million.

"Those over 65, 61 million; left to do the work, 112 million.

"Those under 21, 54 million; left to do the work, 58 million.

"Government employed, 25 million; left to do the work, 33 million.

"In the Armed Forces, 10 million; left to do the work, 23 million.

"In State or city work, 19 million; left to do the work, 4 million.

"In hospitals or asylums, 3,800,000; left to do the work, 200,000.

"Bums who won't work, 175,000; left to do the work, 25,000.

"In pens and in jails, 24,998; left to do the work, 2."

Or perhaps the paragraphs above quoted isn't as humorous as it sounds.

With every friendly wish for your continued health and your customary sane-and-sensible statesmanship on Capitol Hill, I remain,

Respectfully and sincerely yours,
HARRIS N. COOKINGHAM.

State Port Plan Needs Reciprocal Trade Spur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Jackson, Miss., State-Times:

STATE PORT PLAN NEEDS RECIPROCAL TRADE SPUR

(By Robert Webb)

Eager to develop its port cities, Mississippi has more than casual interest in the proposed extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Too often people away from port areas reject reciprocal trade agreements without thinking. They adopt the protectionist view that any program to lower tariffs and promote world trade harms the domestic economy.

Actually the opposite is true in that the international exchange of goods not only provides markets for domestic production but also encourages goodwill toward the lasting peace all wage earners and investors seek.

From the economic standpoint, Dr. Robert W. French, director of the port of New Orleans, has carefully analyzed the position of world trade as it influences living standards in Mississippi and throughout the midcontinent area. Not alone would further import-export freedom benefit New Orleans.

TRADE PURSUIT VITAL

Calling attention to Greenville and the other Mississippi River ports, as well as to the gulf coastal interest, Dr. French writes that "if the great potential assets of the river and region are to be fully realized, the United States must continue to pursue the kind of foreign trade policy represented by the reciprocal trade agreements."

A distinguished economist who formerly headed the Tulane University School of Business Administration, Dr. French took a leading role in the southern assembly on international stability and progress at Biloxi in January. Leaders of business, labor, agriculture, education, Government, and professions composed the assembly, which gave reciprocal trade agreements unequivocal endorsement.

As Dr. French's analysis makes clear, the phenomenal industrial development of the New Orleans-Baton Rouge area would have been partially checked, perhaps blocked, without these pacts which increased foreign trade. Industries need the foreign markets. And they need the raw material imports.

Almost $2 billion of new industrial development in the riverfront stretch from New Orleans to Baton Rouge is a good example of what Mississippi can do with its port development and support of the proposed Tombigbee Waterway. Gulfport, Biloxi, and Pascagoula, each with port programs of its own bid well to enhance the State economy through the trade impetus of reciprocal agreements.

GOOD NEIGHBOR SPURT

Since 1934, when the good neighbor policy was instituted, foreign trade has shot up as an economic and diplomatic servant of this country. At New Orleans, for example, the value of imports and exports soared from $226,200,000 in 1934 to just shy of $2 billion last year.

Admittedly these mutual agreements between the United States and other countries were not wholly responsible for this increase. But, as Dr. French said, they were a great factor.

In the estimate of Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks, urging extension of reciprocal trade, 4.5 million American workers owe their jobs to the export-import business. What the side benefits total defies the wildest estimate, but it must be fantastic.

Dr. French believes the whole South ought to get behind the bipartisan effort to extend and strengthen the ties of reciprocal trade. If you stand with Dr. French and the southern assembly, which included some of Mississippi's ablest representatives, your Congressman ought to know.

The Mid-Continent's Contribution to World Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under rule to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure for me to insert the address of Father John Francis Bannon, S. J., of St. Louis University at the World Trade Convention of the Midcontinent Trade Council in 1949.

This address is inspiring and heartening and in my opinion the thoughts projected by Father Bannon are just as timely today as they were when he delivered this beautiful address.

Illinois and our sister States have had an important part in our trade affairs and in the days just ahead, we will be playing an even greater part in world trade. When the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, Chicago will become a greater world port.

We have in the past, the midcontinent States will continue to contribute immeasurably to the safety, security, and economic progress of America.

THE MID-CONTINENT'S CONTRIBUTION TO WORLD PROSPERITY

(By John Francis Bannon)

From the Alleghenies to the Rockies, from the northern woods to the Gulf of Mexico, stretches a band of territory, half a continent, which is one of the richest and most resourceful in the world. Nature has blessed

this land with a bounteous hand. In its subsoil she had hidden precious treasures to serve man's needs; iron ore, coal, petroleum, natural gas, lead, zinc, bauxite, sulphur, and many more things of high value and utility. Its topsoil she has endowed with marvelous fertility, covered it with woodland stands and rich prairie grasses. Its climate ranges from the sultry heat of the subtropic Gulf Coast to the chill of the northern woods, with the largest expanse set in that temperate belt wherein man lives and works at his best. More than that, nature has stretched across the area a network of waterways, which permitted man both access and communication until the day when he was able to lay his machine-age lines of transit across the vast expanse. Down the middle of the strip runs the great "Father of Waters"; from both sides this "Ole Man River" can make connection with the farther reaches of his valley through numerous tributaries—the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Illinois, the Wisconsin, the mighty Missouri, the Arkansas, the Red, and more. This is the North American midcontinent.

Long before the white man came to North America, purposefully, to settle and exploit, this middle strip was the home of other men. Indians, Columbus misnamed them. These native Americans were not as numerous as one might imagine, noting the millions of later Americans who have made their homes in the midcontinent. Not being farmers, at least to no great degree, the Indians failed to sense the primary wealth of the lands which they occupied; that is to say, the fertility of the soil. The Indians were above all else hunter folk. Perhaps, as things turned out, the scattered character of the native American population was a blessing, since the white man, when he arrived, encountered no serious opposition as he occupied the territory in question.

The Spaniards were the first Europeans to venture into midcontinent. In the decade of the 1520's there were Cabeza de Vaca and his fellow castaways, who for years ranged through Texas, until, finally, they found their way to the white man's towns of Mexico, or New Spain, as it was known in those colonial centuries. Next, as the 1530's were waning, came the De Soto band, possibly even to this very site where today we recall their exploits. And about the same time Coronado was on the Great Plains farther west. Out of the New Mexican settlements in the next two centuries Spaniards betimes ventured out on Coronado trails and covered more of the central valley. But to the Spaniard the midcontinent proved a distinct disappointment. It gave no promise of immediate return in those two things which the Spaniard prized most: the precious metals and souls to be saved. The men of Spain, therefore, missed midcontinent's real treasure: its land and land's magnificent potentialities.

The 17th century was fast running out before Spain made a first move toward occupation of midcontinent. This and subsequent advances into the area were prompted almost wholly by strategic considerations. The French had recently established themselves on the gulf coast, in positions which one day might prove too convenient and ready springboards for aggressive expansion against prized portions of Spain's North American empire. For this reason Spain chose to make counterestablishments in the area of the future Texas. And back to those 18th-century days can be dated a later and important midcontinent industry, stock-breeding. The western cattleman is the economic heir of the vaquero of Spanish Texas.

Frenchmen had ventured into the upper reaches of midcontinent earlier in the 17th century. Jean Nicolet was on Green Bay in 1634, and there he picked up rumors of the great river to the west. Not many years after midcentury adventurous coureurs-debois, Radisson and Groseilliers, of Hudson Bay Co. fame, possibly touched the sources of that river, but fur fields farther north soon drew their attention and their energies. Not until 1673 was the great middle valley opened in a true sense, when Louis Jolliet and Père Jacques Marquette explored the Mississippi from the mouth of the Wisconsin to the mouth of the Arkansas and reported to the world on the land and its people. They resolved one torturing geographic question mark in the process—the great river flowed into the Gulf of Mexico and not into the Vermillion Sea (Gulf of California), as the French had hoped. Men were still interested in a gateway to trade with the Orient. Before long, however, nature's disposition of the Mississippi's course proved less a disappointment than was first thought.

In the next decade, the 1680's, intrepid La Salle followed the river to its mouth, worked back to Quebec, and made off to France with a scheme for occupying the gulf coast and for stringing a chain of forts along the western side of the Alleghenies to check expansion from the English-held Atlantic seaboard. A few years later at his Texas post, Fort Saint-Louis, La Salle met a violent death at the hands of untrue friends and his scheme threatened to collapse. But soon there were others of his countrymen to carry on, both in the middle valley and along the gulf. Fur traders were active in the upper and middle valley reaches; missionaries and settlers followed in their wake. In 1699, while Iberville and his companions were laying foundations along the gulf coast, seminary priests from Quebec were establishing headquarters at Cahokia, in the Illinois country. And before the new century was old, the Illinois country could boast of several settlements; Kaskaskia was the most important, but there was also Fort de Chartres, and a couple hundred French traders and farmers were in the area. During the same years towns and posts in the lower valley multiplied. In 1718 New Orleans was laid out and 4 years later superseded Mobile as Louisiana's capital. Even though the company in charge had blown the Mississippi bubble to a bursting point, the colony was not seriously hurt. Progress, though hardly phenomenal, continued.

The men of the Illinois country had made a momentous discovery. Traders had already begun to tap the fur resources of the western tributaries of the great river, and prospectors had uncovered rich lead deposits in the middle valley. But the farmers had come up with the most valuable find of all—the fertility of the soil. The Illinois country soon became a granary for both the older settlements of New France in the Great Lakes region and the Saint Lawrence Valley and for the less ancient posts of Louisiana. Again, another of the signal contributions of midcontinent to world prosperity thus had its humble beginnings in colonial times.

During these years, farther down the river, in Louisiana's capital, a trade center began to develop. True, this commerce did not take the men of New Orleans very far beyond France's island possessions in the Caribbean, but a pattern was set on which the future was destined to build. In these lower reaches of midcontinent several enterprises of later importance had a beginning, notably the cane industry, introduced from Santo Domingo by Jesuit missionaries around 1750.

In the decades around mid-18th century war clouds hovered over North America. In the 1750's the showdown fight for supremacy in the continent got underway. The eastern gateway to midcontinent, the forks of the Ohio, was a major prize, with France and England contesting warmly for control, both realizing very definitely the tremendous potentialities of the lands beyond. The English victory was sealed on many fronts, and a desperate and disheartened France, seeking to save something of her American empire for a future and brighter day, persuaded Bourbon cousins in Spain to accept the trans-Mississippi. Without too much enthusiasm, Spain yielded to the pressure, with the result that France came to the peace table of 1763 with only the trans-Allegheny portion of midcontinent to turn over to victorious Britain. France hoped at a later date to take the trans-Mississippi back from Spain and there to build an American empire which would endure.

In the days when the plenipotentiaries in Paris were drafting a new version of the North American map, the French Governor of Louisiana, unmindful of secret treaties and the peace dispositions in the homeland, was drawing up a patent for the firm of Maxent, Laclede & Co., granting the partners a trade monopoly along the Missouri and the right to found a post near its confluence with the Mississippi. St. Louis came into being the following year, 1764. Midcontinent was being readied for future greatness. To the anchor point near the valley's end was added a key at its center, and from the crest of the Alleghenies the pioneer flood was poised for its westward rush.

There were already trickles beginning to dribble down the Appalachian slopes. Pennsylvania traders, Virginia surveyors and land speculators, restless Carolinians, colonial militiamen with Braddock and with Forbes had seen the West and sensed its potentialities. Fearing grave dangers from the Indians, at least until the original owners could be rid of their French-inspired distrust of the Anglo-Americans, the British crown sought to stay the flow of men into the great valley. But Indians or no Indians, proclamation line or no, the colonials were not to be denied. Into midcontinent they moved—Boone, Henderson, Robertson, Harrod, Sevier, and hundreds more. And when the Colonies gained their independence and by treaty right added the trans-Allegheny to the national domain, the pace of the movement quickened. By 1792 Kentucky became the 15th State; 4 years later Tennessee added another white star to the field of blue. The new century was not old before enough Yankees were in Ohio to win her statehood; and more folk, from New England and the southern commonwealths, were lapping over into Indiana and into Illinois.

The year 1803 is a red-letter date in the midcontinent calendar. The young West had its problems, disquieting and distressing problems. France, having regained Louisiana from Spain and planning to reestablish herself in midcontinent, shut off the Mississippi outlet at New Orleans, the pioneer's only economically profitable gateway to a growing seaboard, as well as to a foreign market. He could not pack his bulky grain across the mountains, and Alexander Hamilton's excise tax kept him from turning it into whisky. He had to have the Mississippi and the deposit at New Orleans. Jefferson realized that not only was the prosperity of the West at stake but, also, perhaps, its very loyalty to the Union. He took instant action. His emissaries to Napoleon succeeded beyond expectations. Instead of New Orleans simply, the Emperor would part with the whole Louisiana claim—he could use the $15 million to fill his war chest, particularly with an invasion of Britain projected. By the Louisiana Purchase the young United States rounded out its midcontinent holding, except for Texas which was to be acquired at a later date. From the Appalachian highland to the Rocky Mountain cordilleras the land and its resources invited men of vision, energy, and hardihood to come to explore, to settle, to exploit.

The occupation of midcontinent during the next decades is one of the epic chapters in the United States story, and one of the more important. They came. The Yankees

up the Mohawk Valley, across the Genessee Tract, into the Western Reserve, the Seven Ranges, and beyond. The Pennsylvanians across the hills, along the old military roads, to the forks of the Ohio. Southerners—Virginians and Carolinians—through Cumberland Gap, along the Wilderness Road and the early traces. Once the highlands had been negotiated, the rivers did their bit and brought the frontiersmen into the heart of the continent. Before long Indiana was a State (1816); Illinois was filling up; and Missouri was no longer a region peopled only by Frenchmen. Explorers and fur men were heading up the Missouri and traders soon found a way across the plains to Santa Fe. Gradually, in the land of the trans-Allegheny, men forgot their initial prejudices against the prairie and learned to put its vast flat stretches to more profitable use than could be made of the timbered lands of the river valleys which had first drawn them westward.

Meanwhile, too, there was movement into the southern reaches of midcontinent. Eli Whitney's invention had turned cotton into a valuable crop, and England's mills offered a market readymade. The lands of the seaboard had almost worn out. If cotton was to be king, and the southerners had so decreed, then richer lands must be found for the new empire. Alabama's black and red belts and the Mississippi bottoms were inviting, and men quickly accepted the call. Louisiana had already attained statehood, in 1812. Before long bands of restless and ambitious folk began to eye Texas and schemed to wrest its vast stretches from the Mexicans.

The decades around midcentury witnessed two significant developments in midcontinent. First, this mid-America ceased to be a frontier and became both a gateway and a feeder for a farther West. Men forged out over the great trails—to Santa Fe, to Oregon, to California—as the inspiration of manifest destiny was born and grew in the American mind. Texans revolted against Mexico and, as soon as national politics allowed, were incorporated into the Union. The Oregon country agreement with Britain and the Mexican War added, officially, vast territories which pioneers had already usurped. As for the second development, these decades saw an important human element arrive, to fuse with pioneer predecessors in order to give birth to midcontinent's outstanding contribution, the American man.

Down to the 1830's the majority of westerners were of native stocks, that is to say, of families which had been in North America for, perhaps, several generations. They were not all Anglo-Saxon in origin, but the other stocks, such as the Scotch-Irish or the German of middle Pennsylvania or the Huguenots of the Carolinas, had already gone far along the road of Americanization. The second quarter of the 19th century, however, saw the beginnings of large-scale immigration, with the Germans leading the way. A number came in the 1830's, the so-called Dreizigers. More followed around midcentury, the forty-eighters, coming in the wake of the disturbances which shook middle Europe in that year and turned the eyes of many a thwarted liberal to fields afar. Most of the Germans sought out the Middle West, where land was easily available. They settled in Missouri in considerable numbers, both in St. Louis and outstate; others went a bit farther north, to the new territories of Wisconsin and Iowa; still others stayed in the older States of the old Northwest. In general, and this was particularly true of the liberal forty-eighters, the Germans steered away from the South, with its plantation economy and its aristocratic and slave-labor society. They objected to the violation of the human right of liberty, but even more they did not wish to compete in an economy built on slave production.

Around midcentury, too, the volume of Irish immigration increased. Many of the folk from the Emerald Isle remained in seaboard centers, often held there by lack of funds and not infrequently by the insistence of the clergy who feared leakages in the West, still understaffed with priests to keep the faith alive. However, many Irish did come west, to add another healthy element to the midcontinent meltingpot. Later decades brought other strong stocks to midcontinent, like the Scandinavians to the northern tier, the middle border, and new contingents of Germans and Irish. The Slavic peoples of East-Central and Eastern Europe and the folk from the Mediterranean, with one or other area excepted, have not exercised a predominant influence in the formation of the midcontinent type.

The tempo of development in midcontinent stepped up considerably in the latter half of the 19th century. The War Between the States brought a setback to the southern half of the area and, for the moment, disrupted life and work even in the Union States. But once the conflict was closed, progress took up where it had been halted. The railway network was flung across the Mississippi and on out to the Pacific; homesteaders and more immigrants poured into the vast unoccupied tracts; mines at the western rim of midcontinent gave up their treasures; the ranching industry moved northward from its Texas home; villages and little towns grew into cities, with bustling populations, expanding markets, and varied economic enterprises; and the industrial revolution with its machines began to invade sectors of midcontinent. As the century moved toward its final year, midcontinent man began to expand his vision and his dreams beyond his own area and to include more than even his Nation in plans for the future.

In evaluating midcontinent's contribution to world prosperity, there may be a tendency to confine attention simply to goods and products—of which, to be sure, the list is truly imposing. Mention has been made of what should be termed the greatest contribution, namely, the American type. Too much insistence cannot be laid on this point.

The pioneers crossed the Alleghenies still colonial in outlook, even though they may not at the time have been still dependent on the mother country in fact. Those folk who were left behind in the seaboard settlements were of like mind and often have not, even to this modern day, completely divested themselves of this colonial or imperial mentality. In subsequent decades other waves of Europeans touched North American shores, and many of the immigrants who remained on the Atlantic side of the mountains tended to perpetuate and feed this colonial mentality. Across the mountains, however, a new man was born, the American man, to whom Europe quickly became another world, one to which he might and frequently did look for inspiration and, perhaps, with fond remembrance, but one which soon ceased to be his land.

Midcontinent man transferred his loyalties to the woods and prairies, the hills and plains, the lakes and rivers of his new fatherland. Toward Europe he developed a sane and salutary realism. He refused to be content to live his life, even though in independence, in Europe's shadow. He recognized that he had a tremendous challenge set before him, half a continent to conquer. It was an all-absorbing task, and he set himself to it with energy and enthusiasm. The seaboard chided him as an isolationist. In reality he was an American realist. He knew that before his midcontinent could be put to the service of the world, its own potentialities had to be tested and developed, its transportation and market problems solved, its economic health strengthened and protected. It is true that for long years midcontinent man had no time for the rest of the world and felt that the Nation as a whole should have remained equally preoccupied with its own problems. Yet, even so, midcontinent was contributing in significant, if indirect, fashion to world prosperity. As it helped to clothe and feed the industrial East and to furnish a large share of its raw materials to her products, midcontinent shared in the world influence which the seaboard was developing.

If midcontinent was isolationist in the early states of her history, she is no longer so today. She looks east and west, north and south, always confident that she can serve them all. Her diversity is astounding, and her versatility. Yet when it is all added up, products and goods and raw materials, the American man remains midcontinent's great contribution to the world. This harried, worried, bungling world needs his energy, his optimism, his ingeniousness, his willingness to work, his quick human sympathy, in a word, his youth and his realism.

Executive Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Executive Secrecy?" published in the Northern Virginia Sun, of Arlington, Va., in the issue of March 26, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH EXECUTIVE SECRECY?—USE WITHOUT ABUSE

Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, of Missouri, is engaged in a battle with Attorney General Rogers about the legal authority of the executive branch of the Government to withhold documents from Congress.

Mr. Rogers contends that this authority stems from an 18th century statute which gives to executive departments the custody of their departmental records. This statute, he says, represents a recognition by Congress of a constitutional executive privilege to withhold internal documents.

Senator HENNINGS favors legislation which would forbid executive agencies from relying on that statute to withhold documents.

We have always believed that the executive branch must have a certain degree of privacy in its internal communications. This is essential to the proper separation of governmental powers.

The problem is how to permit the use but prevent the abuse of this privilege. As it is, the privilege is being invoked by numerous Government officers at many levels, high and low. Obviously, the excessive use of the privilege can bring the practice itself into disrepute, since it is never possible for an outsider to tell whether it is being used to protect truly secret communications or wrongdoing.

We suggest that the best way to control the use of the privilege of executive privacy is to limit the number of officers who can authorize that use. Perhaps there should be a requirement that the invocation of the privilege be personally authorized either by the President or by the head of the department or agency involved.

In any event, we think Senator HENNINGS is on the right track in seeking to limit, while not eliminating, the exercise of this executive privilege.

Railroad Conditions Subject of Real Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pasadena Star-News of Tuesday, March 11, 1958:

RAILROAD CONDITIONS SUBJECT OF REAL CONCERN

It is clear to those who follow the news that the country again has a railroad problem. In earlier years this was obviously cause for national concern. But now the question may be fairly asked, "Does the railroad problem really concern the general public?"

In this day of trucks and superhighways, planes and buses, is the railroad an anachronism? Will it go the way of the stagecoach and canal boat? If this is bound to happen anyway, why worry about all the inequities in governmental treatment of the railroads?

Perhaps, however, before the American people write the railroads off as obsolete they should look more closely into their true economic place in the scheme of things.

Such a close look is sure to prove that a widening gap between current, realistic conditions existing in the transportation industry and governmental regulations supposed to meet these conditions prevents railroads from capitalizing on their greatest inherent advantage—long, heavy hauls at low cost—and passing along these benefits to the public.

In a recent survey made by the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York this comment appears:

"The same political authority which has encouraged the development of competing modes of transportation, multiplied railroad taxes, and allowed the purchasing power of the dollar to fall while railroad costs rise to unprecedented heights is now denying the railroads the opportunity to compete freely."

Thus the railroads are unable to utilize their strongest competitive weapon—their ability to carry goods in large quantities over long distances at low cost.

Strikingly, since 1929, the railroads' share of commercial intercity freight traffic has declined from 75 percent to less than 50 percent, and their share of passenger traffic has dropped from 71 percent to 35 percent. During that same period their tax burden has almost tripled.

A portion of this revolutionary change in the position of the railroads is the result of governmental initiative and financial support for competing modes of transportation.

Highways, canals, airports, and river and harbor improvements have all been objects of public expense. The railroads have thus been placed in the position of paying taxes on their own facilities in order to finance their competitors.

The present regulatory policies of the Interstate Commerce Act were written about 75 years ago. They no longer apply to present-day conditions. Yet the railroads of the Nation are supposed to live by outmoded rules.

It is to be hoped that the Government will realize the continuing importance of railroad transportation and bring their regulations up to date before it is too late.

Greek Independence Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of delivering an address on the occasion of the 137th anniversary of the Greek independence celebration which was held at the Symphony Hall in Boston, Mass., on March 30, 1958.

This celebration was held under the auspices of the Greek Orthodox Communities of Greater Boston. Other speakers included the Ambassador George V. Melas; Thomas Pappas, Special United States Ambassador to Greece and head of the Greek war relief program; Charles Maliotis, president, Greek Orthodox Cathedral of New England; and the Right Reverend Athenagroas, Bishop of Elaias and Bishop of New England Diocese of the Greek Orthodox Church.

My remarks were as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Melas, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I feel very honored in having the opportunity to speak before this distinguished group this evening on the occasion of the 137th Greek independence celebration.

I do not have to remind you that the 25th of March 1821, is the day to be remembered by all the freedom-loving people of the world. It was on that day the Greek heritage of liberty took on a new meaning as the courageous Greek people threw off the yoke of the oppressors which had weighed them down for almost 400 years.

The heroism of Salamis, Marathon, and Thermopylae still excites the world. As with other freedom-loving people, the Greeks have had to fight for their freedom both governmentally and religiously. The heroic task of the people who kept both their religion and belief in their form of government alive is tremendous. The Greeks have also proved their devotion and skill in defense of their freedom. As a matter of fact, who can forget the courage of the Greek response to the Axis ultimatum and the heroism of the battles that followed in 1940 and 1941?

Today, Greece is a valued ally and a trusted member of NATO. Greece preached democracy to the world during the golden age of Greece and the lessons of that time have produced splendid results here in the United States. The foundation of American democracy is rooted deeply in the culture of ancient Greece. In fact, we of the West, owe much to them.

We are indebted to the Greeks for nearly all the noble ideals that have become distinct hallmarks of all civilized men. Perhaps the noblest of these are the ideas of liberty, of freedom, group, and national political independence.

I would like to point out that I had the privilege last fall of visiting Greece. I returned to the United States with vivid recollections of the courage and determination that are typical of Greece and her people. Greece has suffered, and has paid a tremendous price for freedom that has few parallels in the history of the world. Fortunately the Greeks are a resourceful people and the Greek-Americans have been most generous in their assistance. While in Greece I was told that over one-fourth of the population are now sustained by Greek-Americans. Much of this assistance has been on a private-citizen-to-private-citizen basis. CARE, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Church World Service, and other voluntary agencies have also made notable contributions. American foodstuff distributed by these agencies is literally keeping alive thousands of people.

In spite of terrible hardships, Greece provides one of the most spectacular examples of the value of foreign aid. Aid to Greece, a proven friend of the United States, has not only helped our national interest, but it has greatly aided the cause of freedom generally. Our assistance has helped Greece to recover from the German occupation of World War II, win a bitter guerrilla war, and make a significant contribution to NATO.

In my opinion Greece and the Greek people desperately need our continued support. We must continue to see that Greece gets sufficient economic aid so that her friendly government is not jeopardized. We must redouble our efforts in aiding their program for vocational education. Greece also needs more food and additional electric power.

This celebration gives us an opportunity to pay tribute to the influence of Greece on our civilization and our life. We, in Massachusetts, are proud of our fellow citizens of Greek ancestry and of their many contributions to our State, just as we are proud of the enrichment which has come to us from Plato, Aristotle, Homer, Pericles, and many others.

As we are gathered here tonight on this occasion I cannot help but think about Cyprus. Events of the last few years there only emphasize the love of freedom which characterizes the Greek people. The people of Cyprus will inevitably gain the right to choose their own government, which is the cornerstone of freedom. I hope the lessons of Greek Independence Day will sink into the hearts of those who possess the power to solve this problem so that justice and freedom will prevail in Cyprus.

In joining with the people of Greece and their sons and daughters around the world who have themselves done so much to enrich our culture, I express my deep appreciation for the heritage they have given us. May it soon be not only a western heritage, but the heritage of all the people of the earth.

In conclusion, let me say that I wish the Greeks nothing but peace and prosperity in their homeland of glory and splendor. Let us all join in sending our best wishes and our assurances that their past sufferings will not have been in vain.

GOP Fiddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article which appeared in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record on March 27, 1958:

GOP FIDDLING

Whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, it must be utterly obvious to all that

the Eisenhower administration is fiddling around and doing absolutely nothing while economic conditions get worse by the day.

There is absolutely no reason for the inaction. There was plenty of warning that we were facing into a recession and plenty of time to make at least some preliminary plans.

The wait-and-see policy cannot be tolerated any longer.

There are bread lines in Maine. Men are being laid off by the dozens and the hundreds right here in Chelsea.

Times are getting serious.

It's time for the Republicans to get off their seats and on their feet.

Pay Raise Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to insert in the extension of remarks the following article written by W. O. Rittenhouse which appeared in today's issue of the Government Employees' Exchange. The Exchange began in its December 11, 1957, issue to publish a cost-of-living survey form. The purpose was to solicit valid statistical data from employees which could be presented before Congress in an effort to emphasize their need for prompt action on pay legislation.

Beginning with the January 22, 1958, issue, the early results of this survey were published in articles developed by W. O. Rittenhouse. Additional comments on the survey have appeared in every issue since that date. As the survey now draws to a conclusion, completed questionnaires have been received from employees living in every one of the 48 States and the District of Columbia, as well as in some of the Territories of the United States and in some unidentified foreign countries.

The articles which have appeared in the Exchange on this subject have clearly demonstrated that many Federal employees are not able to maintain themselves and their families on their Government salaries. Neither are they able to invest in homes and otherwise establish their future economic security. In many cases, it requires the combined effort of husband and wife, both working at full-time jobs, and with the husband in some cases holding down a part-time job, to make ends meet.

I am certain my colleagues who have read these articles on the subject are impressed with the need for immediate action on pay legislation for Postal and Classification Act employees of the Federal Government. Further delays will only serve to reduce to a lower point the purchasing power of these deserving employees, with obvious adverse effects upon the economies of the communities in which they reside.

The article follows:

CONGRESS FOLLOWING DELAY WITH DELAY IN FEDERAL PAY RAISE ISSUE

(W. O. Rittenhouse)

Several years ago, a substantial salary increase was approved for Members of Congress. The bill was presented, referred to the responsible committee, approved and signed by the President with a matter of several weeks. The economic problems necessitating this action were not dramatized by extended hearings and costly surveys. It was the general consensus of opinion of Federal employees and other taxpayers that the increase was well deserved.

In returns to the cost-of-living survey conducted by the Exchange, several employees have expressed the wish that their economic problems were recognized with similar spontaneity. One employee in Philadelphia, Pa., wrote: "If our Congressmen were as considerate of our needs as they have on several occasions been of their own, a pay bill allowing a real increase would have been approved the day Congress met. Many of us in our local feel Congress has let us down by unnecessary delays on pay legislation."

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN PAY LEGISLATION

Adequate pay raise legislation for Postal and Classification Act employees has been needed since the last modest increase was approved in 1955. This need was not seriously recognized until January 1957, when about 30 bills on this subject were presented and referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. About this time last year, the several employee unions rallied in support of the proposed legislation. They dramatically and emphatically presented the economic problems that confronted their membership. Also, many employees expressed their individual opinions in correspondence with their Congressmen.

No agency of the Federal Government made strong representation in the interest of pay legislation last year. Representatives of civil service who appeared before the committee suggested that further study was needed of the entire pay structure within Government before action should be taken. As was reported in this column in the July 10, 1957, issue of the Exchange, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, in an exclusive interview, stated: "The failure on the part of the United States Civil Service Commission to realize its responsibility, as the so-called central personnel agency of the Government, to assure that Government employees receive remuneration on a level with employees in private industry, is in my considered opinion a dereliction of its duty. Opinions expressed by that agency have been neither realistic nor impressive." Since then, Civil Service has completed no study on the subject, nor has it especially encouraged prompt congressional action on pay legislation.

Several legislative proposals of interest to Federal employees were discussed in this column in the January 9, 1957, issue of the Exchange. The following forecast was made on pay legislation: "If any pay legislation is approved by Congress, and that possibility is remote, it will not be signed." As all employees clearly recall, Congress did approve a pay bill during the closing days of the last session. It was promptly vetoed by the President on the excuse that the modest increase proposed for a small and widely dispersed segment of our total working population would cause inflation in the United States.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT PROGRESS

The inflationary trend in the United States began long before 1957 and has continued at an increased pace since then. The Government last week reported that the cost of living, both in the Washington area and in the Nation as a whole, rose to new high levels in February 1958. The index for the District of Columbia area increased to 120.3 percent of the 1947–49 level. This was a rise of eight-tenths of 1 percent since November 1957, and was 2.4 percent higher than February 1957. The national index stood at 122.5 percent, which was two-tenths of 1 percent higher than in January, and up 3.2 percent from a year earlier.

In view of the continued upward trend in the cost of living and the action taken last year by Congress, several Members of Congress promptly introduced pay bills when this session convened in January 1958. Prominent among these were Congressmen RICHARD E. LANKFORD, of Maryland, and JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia. Every effort was made by these and some other distinguished Members of the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service to expedite committee consideration of the bills. Nothing new had to be added to the record by extended hearings. Congress had expressed a majority opinion last year, and it was an established fact that the cost of living had continued its upward trend. Further, the cost of living survey conducted by the Exchange served to emphasize the immediate need for favorable action on pay legislation. Yet, no conclusive action has been taken to date.

First, the chairman of the House Committee was ill for sometime. More recently, the chairman of the Senate Committee was absent from the city. Apparently, no provision could be made for reporting a bill out of committee until they resumed their duties. Starting April 3, Congress will take its 10-day Easter recess. The House-Senate conferees probably will not reach agreement on pay legislation until sometime in May.

ACTION NOW

Federal employees have in the meantime enjoyed no recess from the persistently mounting financial problems that have confronted them since 1955. Constant money worries have chafed them like an ill-fitting shoe. The communities in which they reside have suffered from the reduced buying power of Federal employees.

An employee in Long Beach, Calif., in response to the cost-of-living questionnaire, wrote: "Thank you for the opportunity to show you that I have exactly 20 cents left of my salary each week, and the future for myself and thousands of other classified Federal employees who must be in the same fix, does not seem very bright." One in Ogden, Utah, wrote: "It would require a 24 percent raise to break even." Another in Fort Bragg, N. C., commented: "I am trying to buy a mobile home and with wanting to own something, it has caused us much worry and no money for anything other than debts." One in Takoma Park, Md., observed: "I do believe that at least 10 percent to 12 percent is well justified for GS positions to come even equal to living expenses, or a job equal to mine in private industry."

An employee in the District of Columbia listed his expenditures, which approximated $272 a month, and commented: "Impossible you say when my monthly income is only $256.88? Well that's what is increasing loan company and credit union interest. I'd like to make enough to live off without borrowing." Another in Richmond, Va., carefully demonstrated how his $85 weekly take-home pay was used and closed with this prayerful statement: "Thank God my wife and myself are basically healthy. Sickness of any duration would plunge us into poverty very soon. We cannot afford hospitalization. We haven't had a vacation in 10 years. We wouldn't dare indulge in a hobby or recreation."

The statistical data reported in this column in previous issues of the Exchange, supplemented by comments from many employees, have clearly demonstrated the need for urgent congressional action. Economic conditions prevalent today add further arguments for adequate relief for Federal employees. The time for action is now for these full partners in the great business of Government.

The Right To Work Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have been reading Colorado press reports about the prospect of a long, hard-fought, bitter campaign involving the false and misleading slogan, "the right to work." Such a campaign will divide our people by creating hostility and animosity at the very time when we are just beginning to understand each other's problems.

I want the people of Colorado to know that these deceptive campaigns have been carried on in other States and it is crystal clear that the ideas, the propaganda, the plan, and pattern of action were mastermined from a national headquarters. Simply stated, this is an important part of a national plan to destroy the basic principles of collective bargaining between management and labor in the State of Colorado. I am happy to report that in most of the forward-looking, progressive States these deceitful campaigns have failed.

I am confident that the people of Colorado will continue our leadership as one of the most intelligent, constructive, and progressive States of our Nation. I believe the people of Colorado will resent this outside interference in the internal affairs of their State. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For my part, I am amazed at the colossal gall of these carpetbaggers who dare to spread their mischievous influence throughout the great and growing and prosperous State of Colorado in a bold and brazen attempt to sow the seeds of distrust, discord, and discontent at a time when management and labor are peacefully and harmoniously working together under present State and Federal laws.

I commend Gov. Steve McNichols, Mayor Will Nicholson, other public officials, civic and business leaders, and the leading newspapers of Colorado for their forthright stand against these troublemakers.

Five million Americans are pounding the streets today looking for work. Their families are suffering; so is their State and our Nation. They are not interested in a specious, phony discussion about the right to work; they want the opportunity to work; they want a job, a paying job. This is what they bargained for, collectively. The President, the Congress, and the people of the United States, collectively, will see to it that these unemployed Americans regain the opportunity to work. This is the democratic way, the majority way, the American way. This is the way we, as a people, have become the leader of the free nations of the world.

We in Colorado are especially fortunate and should be thankful that management and labor and our people in Colorado have not, as yet, been caught in the serious economic depression which exists in other parts of the Nation. All of us are deeply concerned with the very real and live pocketbook problems which must be solved in our own self-interest. Why, then, waste our time and our energy and our thinking on foolish questions. This is no time to tinker, in this fashion, with our State laws dealing with labor and management. Both have learned through bitter experience that collective bargaining is the best way, the democratic way, to settle our differences.

I realize that there are those in Colorado who have an honest difference of opinion about this matter and I defend their right to express their convictions. But I remind them that Colorado has been blessed with a minimum of labor strife, thanks to the enlightened attitude of employers, employees and those government officials whose responsibility it is to supervise existing laws. And I also say to them that if they persist in pressing for this type of an amendment to the Colorado Labor Peace Act they may easily sow the wind that reaps the whirlwind.

As for these outside masterminders, these buttinskis, let them mix and serve their devil's brew elsewhere, Colorado doesn't need it, Colorado doesn't want it.

Reynolds Technicians, Workers Build Entire Ballistic Shell of Jupiter-C

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, March 27, issue of the Florence Times, Florence, Ala.:

[From the Florence Times of March 27, 1958]

REYNOLDS TECHNICIANS, WORKERS BUILD ENTIRE BALLISTIC SHELL OF JUPITER-C

Reynolds Metals Co. missile plant at Sheffield, Ala., fabricated the entire ballistic shell of the Army Jupiter-C which just launched the third American satellite. Reynolds technicians built the tail section, the center section which contains the fuel tanks, the nose section of the main stage holding the guidance and control mechanisms, and the spinlauncher for the upper stages.

The ballistic shell was fabricated for assembly by Chrysler Corp., prime contractor for the Army's Redstone and Jupiter IRBM missile systems.

Reynolds missile plant constructed a number of other Jupiter-C ballistic shells on special contract for the Army Ballistic Missile Agency. One of these complete shells was used on the Army Jupiter-C which on August 8, 1957, successfully tested a nose cone. President Eisenhower, displaying this nose cone during his nationwide television address in November 1957, explained that it had gone hundreds of miles to outer space and returned intact. This test solved the difficult problem of preventing an object from burning up when it reentered the dense atmosphere of the earth.

BACKGROUND

Reynolds joined the United States Army missile program in 1952 when the firm's fabricating experts, under the personal direction of Vice President William G. Reynolds, helped Army scientists solve some aluminum construction problems on the Redstone ballistic missile shell.

Then Reynolds set up its missile plant at Sheffield, Ala., just 70 miles away from the Army missile center at Redstone Arsenal, and helped turn out some prototype ballistic shells for the Redstone missile.

When Army Ordnance decided to produce the Redstone missile in volume, Reynolds engineers and technicians then redesigned the Redstone ballistic shell so it could be produced in quantity utilizing available machine tools and industrial know-how. The Reynolds developments, for example, reduced the amount of welding required to form the aluminum fuel tanks, thus making them more reliable and cutting production costs.

Since then Reynolds has been fabricating Redstone missile ballistic shells for the Army as a subcontractor to the Chrysler Corp.

JUPITER-C BALLISTIC SHELLS

With this experience and accumulation of skills in design and development of aluminum shells for missiles, Reynolds was designated by the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to fabricate the more difficult ballistic shell for the Jupiter-C rockets.

The main stage for the Jupiter-C is a modified Redstone liquid fueled rocket. The modifications in fabrication of the more complex Jupiter-C missile and the Redstone demanded the highest degree of accuracy.

WELDING NOSE SECTION

For example, the nose section for the main stage of the Jupiter-C was formed from thin aluminum sheets welded together. In order to form these sheets into the exact tapered design, Reynolds technicians had to work with tolerances far more precise than the scientists had demanded.

Reynolds technicians welded these thin aluminum sheets on automatic welding machines at a speed of 60 inches per minute. Once the machine was started, it had to do a perfect job. Otherwise the welded joint might have weak spots and would not remain airtight. This nose section had to withstand rather high pressures. When it was tested under air pressure, the aluminum sides could be send ballooning out. Yet it remained airtight.

LIQUID FUEL TANKS

The same rigorous standards applied to the huge liquid fuel tanks. More than 13,500 inches of linear joints were welded on the Jupiter-C shell. Every inch of welding was X-rayed to insure that no weak spots existed. All fuel tanks were air tested under pressure, then pumped full of water, also under pressure, then every inch of welding examined for possible leaks.

In addition, 24,560 spot welds went into each Jupiter-C ballistic shell for extra strength.

SPIN-LAUNCHER

The spin-launcher, which gives gyroscopic stability to the upper stages of the Jupiter-C when they are fired, also had to be fabricated to exacting requirements. The launcher bucket which holds the upper stages was constructed from two sheets of aluminum, rolled to form a cylinder and then welded along the length. These welds, each 48 inches long, had to be absolutely perfect. No repairs were permitted. Once the high speed automatic welding machine had started, it could not be stopped. If the machine passed over a gap in the joint, the cylinder had to be rejected and another one started.

When the Jupiter-C started to blast off, this bucket was rotated by electric motors mounted within the nose section of the main

stage. The gear system which actually spun the bucket also was built to precise tolerances. The spinner wheel had to fit exactly and revolve on its shaft, otherwise the upper stages could have been thrown off course when fired. The orbiting satellites testify to the accuracy of the Reynolds technicians.

RUDDER TORSION BARS

The aluminum rudder torsion bars which connect the steering mechanism of the main stage with the rudders are also made to fit with the precision of a fine watch. If they varied more than a few thousandths of 1 inch, the main stage could not be steered with the absolute accuracy it achieved.

The proximity of the Reynolds missile plant to the Army Ballistic Missile Agency facilitated development of both the Redstone and Jupiter-C ballistic shells. Reynolds technicians are able to confer at a moment's notice with the Army scientists.

The aluminum company technicians worked from marked-up blueprints while building the Jupiter-C shell. Within days after the scientists modified the shell design, the changes were incorporated into the finished product. And these changes kept coming during the entire construction time.

DETAILED INSPECTION

The aluminum used to fabricate the Jupiter-C shell had to be perfect. To insure this, the plates used to form the missile skin were first inspected for scratches, blemishes and weak spots as soon as they entered the Reynolds missile plant. Inspectors examined the plates with electronic instruments, searching for weak spots that might fail under pressure. The width and thickness of each plate was measured to tolerances within a few thousands of 1 inch.

Samples were sent to the lab for chemical analysis. Each sheet of aluminum and every other part was assigned a lot number. A complete history was kept of all the components that went into each missile shell.

After each sheet passed inspection, it was covered on both sides with special adhesive paper to protect the surface from scratches and damage while it was being shaped into the shell. This paper guarded the mirror-like aluminum until the shell was ready for final finishing.

CLEANER THAN BABY'S BOTTLE

After the long center section certified to be perfectly free from possible weak spots, it was then scrubbed cleaner than a baby's bottle. The inside of the fuel tank was hand-washed, then purified by 8 hours of washing with a strong chemical cleanser. Once the fuel tanks had been pronounced surgically clean, they were sealed. The slightest speck of dirt could cause an explosion when the rocket fuels are pumped into the tanks.

To maintain the high degree of accuracy demanded in fabrication of the Jupiter-C (and Redstone shells) Reynolds uses one inspector for every three technicians in the missile plant. This represents a corps of inspectors comprising one-quarter of the total missile plant work force.

TO OUTER SPACE

The role of Reynolds Metals Co. in the United States missile program does not end at the firm's missile plant. It is probably the most unique part played by any firm participating in American missile development.

Reynolds' role goes all the way back to the basic raw material, the bauxite clay of earth which contains aluminum ore. In Arkansas and Jamaica, Reynolds miners extract the clay which is shipped to the United States where Reynolds refineries in Corpus Christi, Tex., and Hurrican Creek, Ark., convert it into powdery alumina (aluminum oxide).

Then Reynolds experts in six reduction plants in Listerhill, Ala.; Arkansas; Troutdale, Oreg.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; and Arkadelphia, Ark., produce the pure aluminum.

This then is converted into sheet and plate at Reynolds rolling mills in McCook, Ill., and Listerhill, Ala. From Phoenix, Ariz., comes aluminum extrusions and tubing. More extrusions are made in the Grand Rapids, Mich., plant, while Plant 12 in Louisville, Ky., stamps out the vital fuel tank bulkheads on a special 1,700-ton press.

Nearly all Reynolds workers thus have a hand in the process of converting the clay of earth into the gleaming aluminum shell of the space-conquering Jupiter-C missile.

Relief Up to Executive Whim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial concerning the textile industry which appeared in the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune, on March 31, 1958:

RELIEF UP TO EXECUTIVE WHIM

There is a slim ray of hope for the textile industry and the manner in which it has been injured by foreign competition.

President Eisenhower has assured United States industry that safeguards in the Trade Agreements Act are being strengthened to cope with the uneven impact of import competition. At the same time, however, he warns against any destruction of the statute which would tear down the reciprocal trade program and thereby injure the safety of the free world.

It should be gratifying to textiles to observe that the President has finally conceded that some import problems arising from free trade policies, and affecting particular industries, are real and identifiable and demanding of action.

This development cropped up late last week.

Previously, the President turned down proposals that more textiles and other goods be purchased from United States sources than through offshore program. This was his reply to representatives of textiles, who asked him to consider invoking restrictions on offshore procurement.

His refusal then just about took care of the request of all 12 New England senators who asked his Trade Policy committee to protect the woolen and cotton textile industry in this section from competition with foreign imports. They asked that imports of fabrics be regulated with duties and quotas to protect the American textile industry.

Whether or not the administration has the slightest intention of exposing any of this country's existing industries to alleged injury in order to obtain tariff concessions benefitting other industries remains to be seen.

For example, United States Labor Secretary Mitchell is of the opinion that the jobs of thousands of wool top and yarn makers depend on continued United States free-trade policies. When he believes that complaints of injury by domestic industries have been exaggerated he could not have taken a close look at the textile situation. United States textile interests have had their cards, as they relate to foreign competition, on the table for years.

Mills continue to close and thousands of textile operatives have to start all over again. All that is sought to help them is consideration along the lines of adequate duty and quota regulations.

Relief for industries which have suffered hardship under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program is left to executive whim by present law. The noble idea of the original good intentions of the reciprocal-trade theory—that foreigners would sell us goods which were in oversupply and which we needed, while we would sell them what they needed of our surpluses—has disintegrated.

It is a battle against the impossible competition of imports subsidized by the American taxpayer's dollar as far as textiles, and shoes too, are concerned.

Statement of Thomas J. Dodd, Former Representative From the State of Connecticut, Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Proposed Mutual Security Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the Congress are concerned over the present administration's lack of effective policies toward Latin America. On March 6, 1958, a former member of this House, Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and in straightforward language pointed out what must be done about this dangerous gap in our foreign policy.

In behalf that my colleagues will be interested in his carefully thought-out statement, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Mr. Dodd:

STATEMENT OF MARCH 6, 1958, OF THOMAS J. DODD, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the privilege of appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of a continuation of the mutual security program for fiscal year 1959.

As a former member of this committee and of its subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I want to say that it gives me a good feeling to be back here, seated at this table which has witnessed many long hours and weeks of hard work by this committee, which is truly the architect of many provisions of the mutual security legislation. I know from firsthand experience how thoroughly this committee considers proposed legislation and to what extent the imprint of its own experience, thinking and labor is impressed upon the legislative product as it emerges from the Congress.

It is only fitting, therefore, that I appear before this committee to discuss with you some of the principles which I feel need special emphasis in the mutual security program. It is my intention also to suggest certain changes and amendments in the draft of the proposed provisions submitted by the executive branch on the development loan fund.

I am, of course, aware of the importance of other areas of the world to United States security, United States economic interests, and the building of a free world. No area of the world is unimportant to us. This is true because of our fundamental American history and tradition. Our people spring from roots and traditions outside the United States in origin. We have a tradition of caring about other peoples and what happens to them. That is why we are so deeply concerned about the Communist menace. We know of the inhuman activities of the Communists, and we know of their future plans which remain constantly unchanged. We also know that if we are to have wholesome trade relations, we must have free and independent nations to deal with, and we are, of course, aware of the importance of having bases located in strategic areas of the world.

LATIN AMERICA

There is one area in particular which, it seems to me, merits constant attention by the United States through mutual programs that will benefit both the United States and that area. I refer to Latin America—that great area to the south embracing 20 republics and comprising a population larger than that of the United States—approximately 184 million, as compared to our population of some 170 million. I refer to that area—that great area to the south—making up almost 8 million square miles, as compared to the 3 million square miles in the United States.

While serving as a member of this committee and of its Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I became deeply impressed with the importance of Latin America to the United States and to the whole free world. It was my privilege to visit Latin America to conduct a study of conditions in that area while serving as a member of this committee. I know that you are likewise deeply concerned about our relations with our neighbors to the south. Some of the progress which has been made in United States-Latin American relations is due directly to your efforts. The reports of the various study missions conducted by this committee in Latin America attest to the real concern which you have with respect to our relations with Latin America.

It is, however, essential that there be created within the executive branch of our Government a deeper consciousness of the importance of this area, not only to the United States but to the whole free world, coupled with plans and programs of assistance to Latin America which will meet at least the minimum needs of the 184 million people of Latin America. This is an area seething with a tremendous urge to improve its social and economic conditions, with a population that has since World War II been rising about 2.3 percent a year. People want to be free of disease and hunger. People want to house, clothe, and educate their children. People want medical and hospital facilities. People want means of communication.

Latin America is a giant which is beginning to stir. How it stirs and to what it stirs depends largely upon United States foreign policy, policy translated into programs that will fit the various needs of the people of Latin America, rather than a policy which takes them for granted.

This is especially essential if we are to block any effective inroads by the Communists who have demonstrated that Latin America is an important area to them. What happened in Guatemala can happen elsewhere in Latin America. We must never permit this to take place.

While serving on this committee and while listening to the various presentations made by the executive branch on the mutual security program, I was impressed with the fact that Latin America was an area which was always treated last by the executive branch. It was always treated, as indeed it is treated this year by the executive branch, as the also ran of areas. There has been a certain condescension about the area—a certain attitude of "Well, they'll go along with us anyway."

As I glance through the little booklet prepared by the executive branch and titled "The Mutual Security Program, Fiscal Year 1959, a Summary Presentation, February 1958," beginning on page 109 which deals with Latin America, I find that Latin America is taken up the hill and then kicked down. The presentation booklet talks about Latin America in these terms: "Importance to the United States," "Latin America is important to United States trade," "United States is Latin America's best customer," "Latin America depends on United States capital," and so on. But when we translate these terms into programs, we find that the magnitude and extent of the programs proposed by the executive branch for Latin America for the next fiscal year total only $92,808,000. By contrast, the proposed program for fiscal year 1959 for the Far East and the Pacific, as outlined on page 97 of the presentation booklet, totals $1,027,120,000. I am fully aware of the fact that $399,120,000 is requested for military assistance and $595 million is requested for defense support for the Far East and the Pacific. I am also aware of the fact, as this committee is of course aware, that a huge program of military assistance to Latin America is not called for at this time—indeed it is not expected by the Latin Americans themselves.

However, the proposed program for the Far East demonstrates that there is a solicitude and that there is a desire to demonstrate that solicitude in tangible terms for an area which indeed is extremely important to the free world and to the United States. But why should not an equal solicitude be demonstrated in tangible terms for Latin America, this great area without whose support the United States would find itself in extreme danger?

We must remember this: Even if we should have successful policies toward the Far East, even if we should have successful policies toward Europe, even if we should have successful policies in other parts of the world, if we do not develop and maintain successful policies toward Latin America, the other policies would be meaningless and ineffective. It is abject folly to try to build up a free world without a strong and free Latin America. It is abject folly to hold the line against communism in Europe only to yield it to the Communists in Latin America, or to the Far East for that matter, as we seem to be doing.

I would respectively urge, therefore, that there be an end to programs of complacent cooperation. I would suggest that there must be developed a bold stroke of leadership that will catch the imagination and kindle the hope of the people of Latin America. To this end, there must be a mobilization of talent and of energy of our Government officials concerned with Latin American relations, in cooperation with American business and labor interests, large and small, dealing with Latin America to consider:

1. What have been the major principles of the United States Government and international agencies, such as the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Finance Corporation governing relations with Latin America?

2. How have those principles been implemented?

3. Reasons for Latin American dissatisfaction with United States policies and implementation thereof.

4. Reasons for American business dissatisfaction with United States policies and implementation thereof.

5. How can the United States meet the criticisms of our policies and to what extent can those criticisms be met?

(a) Through legislation;
(b) Through executive branch action;
(c) Through multilateral channels; and
(d) Through private enterprise channels.

I would like to see something of this kind embodied in the proposed mutual security legislation before this committee in the form of, perhaps, a sense resolution. The adoption of such sense resolution embodied in the mutual security legislation itself will create the proper climate through a new emphasis, an emphasis which will highlight the importance of Latin America, instead of treating it as a fourth-rate area, always last on the list of mutual aid. In connection with this proposal, I would urge further a detailed presentation by the executive branch of the problems of each of the 20 Latin American Republics. I would hope that there would be a fuller discussion of Latin America on the floor of the House in the context of the mutual security program. It is my earnest hope that this can be done without the necessity of a crisis such as Guatemala presented to the United States when it was under Communist domination. We must transform the atmosphere of disillusionment which prevails in Latin America with respect to the United States into an atmosphere of hope and then into a record of fulfillment and we must never again approach an inter-American economic conference with an empty briefcase, to borrow a phrase so appropriately used by Congressman JAMES G. FULTON, a gentleman who sits on the other side of this table and who has time and time again demonstrated his friendship for Latin America.

I am happy to say that the schoolchildren of Connecticut are acutely aware of the importance of Latin America to the United States. This awareness can be inferred from a news item which appeared in the February 23, 1958, issue of the Hartford Courant entitled "Third Graders Agree Spanish Rates Highest Among Favorite Studies". In the Town of Glastonbury, a community not far from Hartford, the third grade students are practically unanimous in choosing Spanish as their favorite subject. The plan to encourage students to learn Spanish has now spread to the practice teaching program at the Teachers College in New Britain, Conn., and the Yale Master of Arts teaching program in New Haven, Conn., and from reports which I have received, this interest in Spanish is spreading across the entire State of Connecticut.

I hope that the example set by Connecticut will be followed by other States. In this connection, Connecticut has produced a number of great linguists in Spanish. I am sure that you are all aware of the proficiency in Spanish of my former colleague and a member of this committee, Congressman AL MORANO. While serving on a study mission with him and other members of this committee to Central America in June 1955, we heard him address the legislative bodies of Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala in fluent Spanish.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

I now which to turn to the language in the committee print of the bill before you which is entitled "The Mutual Security Act of 1958," specifically those provisions proposed by the executive branch with respect to the Development Loan Fund.

For the sake of convenience, I refer to the Ramseyer rule print of the Mutual Security Act of 1958 dated February 20, 1958, a committee print document which is before you on the committee table. As you can see from page 10 of that print, the executive branch proposes to establish a board of directors of the fund consisting of a number of Government officials. I believe that there is some merit to the establishment of a

board of directors of the fund, with a managing director and a deputy managing director, and other officers as required. It is, however, essential that the fund not be hamstrung by interagency squabbles, rivalries and redtape. It should be noted from the executive branch proposed amendment to section 413 (b) (4) that the investment guaranty program, now administered by the International Cooperation Administration, will probably be transferred to the Development Loan Fund, if that amendment is adopted. That can be seen from the language which the executive branch proposes to delete from existing legislation as outlined on page 20 of the Ramseyer print. It is therefore essential that the management of the fund be reposed in those who are at least not unsympathetic to the investment guaranty program.

This committee well knows the maneuvering in the past, particularly by the former Director of the International Cooperation Administration, to divest that agency of the investment guaranty program and to transfer it to the Export-Import Bank. That attempt failed primarily because of the strong objections of this committee, which indeed has been the watchdog and ward of the investment guaranty program. Also, if the fund is to be administered with imagination and flexibility, it is imperative that the composition of the Board of Directors be carefully considered by this committee.

I do not agree with the composition proposed by the executive branch. I do not agree that the Board of Directors of the Development Loan Fund should include the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs as Chairman, nor the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank nor the United States Executive Director of the International Bank.

I respectfully urge this committee to adopt an amendment directed toward the composition of the board of directors of the fund. I would strongly urge that the managing director of the fund, whoever he might be, should be the chairman of the board of directors. The other members of the board should comprise the Secretary of State, to insure coordination with our overall foreign policy, the Administrator of the International Cooperation Administration or of any other agency administering nonmilitary assistance, and four members appointed from private life by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The four members so appointed should be respectively representative of labor, industry, small business and the public at large. I feel that such representation will insure a proper implementation by the executive branch of the intent of the Congress and of the legislative policies governing the administration of the fund. It would also insure that those agencies which have in the past indicated animosity toward the investment guaranty program would not be represented in the active management of the fund.

Because of the importance of his position, I would also recommend that the proposed Deputy Managing Director be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation.

It is essential that the Development Loan Fund not be bogged down in the mire of interagency conflicts, jealousies, and endless red tape. The fund is capable of exerting a tremendous impact on the economies of the underdeveloped countries. I believe that the composition as proposed by the executive branch might well lead to a stultification of the growth of the Fund as expected by the Congress. If the composition of the board of directors of the fund such as I have suggested, or something similar, should be adopted by this committee, I would then have no hesitancy in permitting a transfer of the administration of the investment guaranty program to the fund.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as this brings my statement to a close I cannot help but feel nostalgic and fondly remember those days when I served with you on this committee. To read off the provisions of the mutual security program, which you have written into the legislation, would take up much more time than I have consumed this afternoon. I wish at this point to salute you and commend you for the tremendous service you have rendered and are rendering to the people of the United States and to the free world. Frequently in my travels I find people who are not fully aware of the tremendous part played by the legislative branch in formulating foreign policy and in making the implementation of foreign policy possible. The mutual security legislation is your legislation—legislation which you have hammered out by dint of concentrated study and diligent work. Yours is not an easy task. I know personally that every recommendation made before this committee is carefully considered. It is with that note that I wish to thank you for affording me this opportunity to see you all again and to express my views on legislation which is so vital to the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of March 30, 1958, there appears the following article:

TOP UNITED STATES ENVOYS TO TAKE NEW LOOK AT LATIN TIES

A top-level stocktaking of the state of United States relations with Latin America apparently is in the making.

The review, to be carried out over the next few months, could lead to a reassessment of United States economic and political policies toward the 20 nations to the south.

It apparently is President Eisenhower's answer both to new Russian threats of economic—and political—penetration in Latin America and to congressional criticism that not enough attention is paid to that vital area.

STEPS ARE LISTED

The stocktaking will be done by:

1. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who last week announced that, at the President's request, he would make an 18-day swing through 8 South American nations, beginning April 26. The countries to be visited are Uruguay, Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela.

2. Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, brother of the President, who, as the President's personal representative, will make a goodwill tour of six Central American nations in June, according to a White House announcement yesterday.

3. Secretary of State Dulles, who is reported to be considering personal visits to individual countries. Brazil—omitted from Mr. NIXON's tour because of a 1956 visit—is regarded as one of the likeliest possibilities for such a stop.

4. President Eisenhower himself, who this week lunched with Costa Rican President-elect Mario Echandi, and who is scheduled to receive President Carlos Ibandez del Campo of Chile on a state visit in late April and early May.

OTHER TRIP RECALLED

The White House, in announcing Dr. Eisenhower's tour today, described it only as a good-will trip.

But it immediately was recalled that Dr. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University, in 1953 made a 30-day tour of the 10 South American nations, and later presented his brother with a detailed report.

The report made concrete recommendations on United States policy, some of which were acted upon later.

The announcement of the trips of the Vice President and Dr. Eisenhower follow closely on Red trade overtures to a number of South American nations with which Russia does not now have diplomatic relations.

The Soviets have been offering to buy Brazilian and Colombian coffee, Chilean copper, and have, in fact, bought considerable quantities of Cuban sugar and Uruguayan wool. Argentina recently sent an economic mission behind the Iron Curtain to see what it could purchase there.

United States economic experts also are known to be concerned over the effects on shaky Latin American economies of the recent declines in the prices of some minerals, particularly copper.

While it is too early to predict the results of such a stock-taking by the executive branch of United States-Latin American relations, it does indicate that forceful statements like those of Mr. Dodd are beginning to awaken the Department of State to a need for a vigorous policy toward Latin America rather than a policy of "complacent cooperation." Let us hope that such an apparent awakening leads to implementation.

Ambassador Menshikov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Menshikov Enjoys United States Type Satire but Wouldn't Recommend It at Home," written by Alfred Friendly, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 31, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MENSHIKOV ENJOYS UNITED STATES TYPE SATIRE BUT WOULDN'T RECOMMEND IT AT HOME

(By Alfred Friendly)

Mikhail A. Menshikov says he got a bang out of his attendance at the Gridiron dinner 2 weeks ago but doesn't see that famous Washington institution as suitable for his own country.

The new Russian Ambassador suggests that each nation has its own devices of criticism and what's appropriate for one may not be for the other. The ferocious, if hilarious, satire of the Gridiron doesn't fit the Russian way of life, he indicates.

Moreover, he says the Russians would never criticize their Government as a whole, because they believe in it and in what it is doing. Nor would they criticize the minor failings of any individual who is generally admired and respected.

UNDERSTOOD MOST OF IT

"Smiling Mike" was the first Russian Ambassador in many years to attend a Gridiron function. At its annual banquet March 15 he was observed by the audience as apparently enjoying himself.

In a recent interview he said he found the affair amusing. He thought he understood about two-thirds of what transpired.

The difficulty of following songs in a foreign language, and the topical nature of the gags accounted for the portions he missed.

In a mood considerably more dour and defensive than that in which he has generally displayed himself, Menshikov anticipated (correctly) a newsman's question on whether the American kind of press criticism—at its apotheosis in Gridiron operations—would be a good thing in the Soviet Union.

Press criticism, he observed, has been established here and if the Gridiron's glorified form of it satisfies everybody, that's all right with him. He would, he said, avoid statements bearing on any nation's form of internal life. He implied that it would be a good idea if there were some reciprocity on this attitude.

EACH TO HIS OWN

"Some countries have some other ways of making fun and of criticising themselves," he said.

"In our own country we have a lot of criticism. Sometimes it's called self-criticism. Those in charge criticize themselves. And sometimes it comes from outside sources. Self-criticism is the principal form, and actually it's encouraged because we think it has a good constructive purpose."

You can find criticism everywhere in public gatherings, he insisted. And although this may not always be reported in the press, you can find critical articles in every issue of the principal Russian papers, he declared.

Was there anything similar to the stem-to-stern satire by the Gridiron of all three branches of the Government, he was asked.

No, said Menshikov, Russians don't criticize their government as a whole; and if Americans are baffled by this, they must understand that the Russian way of life is different.

ON RUSSIAN ELECTIONS

"For example," he said, "Americans ask how is it possible that in Russian elections 100 percent of the people vote and all vote in favor of the candidates. You say 'something must be wrong because it doesn't happen that way here.'

"But the Russians are satisfied with their system and those candidates.

"If someone is universally respected, they don't make fun of him.

"If someone makes a mistake, or if something goes wrong, he is criticized, but the government isn't criticized, because our people believe in the government and in what it is doing."

Asked about the Gridiron's mordant spoof of President Eisenhower, though the song, "Every Day Is Labor Day With Him," Menshikov replied more in sorrow than in anger:

"I've found among all the people I've met that they respect the President." Accordingly, as to the critical song, "in our case, people wouldn't do that when the person is respected."

Russians love to crack jokes, he concluded, but they make fun of each other in family and social gatherings. As for the American system, "you're used to your way of life and think it good, so we have nothing against it."

Tony Pastor Reaches Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, last week, together with my Connecticut colleague the Honorable ALBERT CRETELLA, I had the pleasure of dining with an illustrious son of Connecticut, the famed musician and vocalist, Tony Pastor, whose orchestra is appearing at the beautiful Blue Room of the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington.

It was a thoroughly enjoyable evening. I learned that Tony Pastor has a similar background to mine. He is a first generation American of Italian descent. His parents were born in Sicily; mine were born in Cosenza.

Tony was born in Middletown, Conn., and was educated in Connecticut schools. The Italian love of music was deeply imbedded in his soul. But his father was a New England cabinetmaker and was determined that his son should follow in his footsteps.

Tony did learn woodworking. But from the day he got his cherished saxophone at the age of 16, he knew that music was the prime factor in his life.

Tony first reached musical prominence in the orchestra of another great Connecticut musician, the erudite and accomplished clarinetist from Hartford, Conn., Artie Shaw.

It was with the Vincent Lopez Orchestra that Tony started singing. But it was the Artie Shaw recording of Indian Love Call that skyrocketed Pastor into musical prominence as a vocalist.

The record, featuring the new vocal style of Tony Pastor, sold over 1 million copies. On the other side was an unheralded arrangement of Begin the Beguine, a record that has become identified with Artie Shaw and which became top best seller of all time.

The success of his initial record was Tony's biggest single break. It gave him a chance to organize his own orchestra, and after a series of trials and tribulations, he found himself a top maestro with a worldwide following.

The secrets of Tony Pastor's popularity are simple ones. His warmth, sincerity, and facility of expression are expressed in his music.

He has been strict in his adherence to the public's dancing demands. He gives his audiences just what they want. Whatever they play they play well, with just a little extra Pastor personality tossed in.

Tony's unique singing style has become so popular it has almost eclipsed his great talent as a saxophonist.

When I asked Tony to what he attributed his great success in an area where most new ventures are doomed to failure and where many successful bands diminish in public favor after a period of years, he replied "Style is the basis of musical success. The bands that gain a definite mark of recognition are in the best position to attain lasting popularity."

Tony is a firm believer in some sort of signature through music.

His own vocal ability and the manner which he renders a song are known to lovers of popular music everywhere. His voice, to say the least, is unusual, and he is very wisely particular in his choice of songs.

They must be suited for his style. That he has chosen his songs wisely and performed them exceptionally is proven by the fact that a very great percentage of his featured vocals have gone on to the top of the Nation's song hit parade and his records have enjoyed phenomenal success.

In 1955, Tony took his large organization to the frozen north, where they appeared for the GI's at Ladd Air Force Base in Fairbanks, Alaska. Not only his music, but his exhilarating personality made an immediate hit with the Air Force personnel in the far-off base. He remained there a full week.

Tony is married to the former Dorothy Petroissi of Hartford, Conn. The Pastors have three sons.

Guy, the oldest, 22, recently graduated from the University of Connecticut, and is now singing with his Dad's band. His vocal style contains the warm qualities of his father, but is more in the romantic style of the lyric Italian tenors. A great future is in store for the younger Pastor.

Of the two other sons, Tony, Jr., 22, is an actor; the other, John Francis, age 12, is in school.

The Pastors, a happy, talented, and close-knit American family, are now living in Beverly Hills, Calif., but make periodic trips to Connecticut to visit their mother, who still lives in Middletown.

Suggestions Designed To Stimulate Business Activity and Increase Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, it has been gratifying to me and I know to other Members to receive letters and suggestions from people in our respective districts who sincerely are interested in offering suggestions designed to stimulate business activity and increase employment.

One of the suggestions passed on to me is of special interest and I have forwarded it to various officials, not as my own suggestion but as an idea that is thought provoking.

The rather simple and perhaps incomplete suggestions to be used in meeting the present unemployment situation would involve three basic areas: First, automobiles; second, new homes; and third, industrial expansion.

First, a suggestion is offered that a tax credit, perhaps in the form of a refund, should be given to each person who purchases an automobile. This should have some limitation, perhaps $400 or $500 or whatever amount might be felt desirable to stimulate that particular industry.

A similar suggestion is made that a tax credit, not to exceed $1,000, should be allowed to each person who builds new houses.

For new industrial expansion, again it is suggested that a tax credit, perhaps not to exceed 50 percent of the present 52 percent corporation tax, should be allowed.

All of this, of course, would have a limitation of 6 months or 12 months, or

whatever period would seem to be advisable. The basic philosophy is to release some of the large amounts of money in savings, in credit unions, in investments, in cash or lockboxes; to encourage purchases of hard goods and specifically, automobiles; for the construction of new homes; for industrial expansion to make it possible to employ many more people who presently are unemployed and, also, to increase the demand for goods that would be used in the manufacture and building of these specific items.

This is an interesting approach which comes from a businessman in the fifth district of Indiana and it seems to offer an immediate method or approach that could be put into effect without a long delay and, perhaps, without the necessity for long-delayed legislation.

Science and the Control of Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made to the annual luncheon of the National Planning Association, Monday, March 31, 1958, by Richard S. Leghorn. Mr. Leghorn is the chairman of NPA's Committee on Security Through Arms Control:

SCIENCE AND THE CONTROL OF ARMS

(Remarks by Richard S. Leghorn, chairman, Committee on Security Through Arms Control, National Planning Association, for the annual luncheon of the National Planning Association, Washington, D. C., March 31, 1958)

Science and technology are well known in our land for their tremendous contribution to economic growth. They are well known for the creation of the fantastic weapons which now feed the unrestrained arms race. What is not generally recognized is that science and technology could also make a major contribution to bringing the arms race under control. Virtually no scientific and technological effort has yet been marshalled to deal with the perilous madness of the current competition in armaments.

A year ago, the National Planning Association established a Committee on Security Through Arms Control, to explore and demonstrate contributions which planning by private citizens might make to this critical issue of our age, and to help bring about a broad and sustained national effort to develop more rational world security arrangements.

Our committee has begun its work rather undramatically by estimating the world's arms situation in 1970. This survey has given us some insight into the nature of the problem, and will usefully serve our future work on solutions.

You will be interested in a brief review of some of our conclusions. Between now and 1970, which is less time than has passed since the end of World War II, the world will spend almost $2 trillion, that is $2,000 billion, on armament. For the United States this will represent about 10 percent of the gross national product and can be readily sustained. For Western Europe and Russia, the economic cost of the arms race is more consequential and represents a serious handicap to these less flourishing economies. The economic consequences are, of course, more serious still for the underdeveloped countries whose growth is retarded by the diversion of so many of the world's resources to the construction of arms.

And yet, the economic costs are far from the most serious. Of greater consequence are the technological costs. The United States, the most technologically advanced country of the world, is devoting 50 percent of its technological resources to the arms race. The world's second technological country, Russia, is devoting an even higher percentage to armaments. The third major scientific and technological group, that of Western Europe, is not far behind in these dismal percentages.

Even more important than this unbelievably high technological waste is the cost of the arms race in terms of human values. How can freedom flourish when all the world's peoples live under a Damoclesian sword of instantly poised, thermonuclear missiles and radioactive poisons? How can humanity advance its spiritual and cultural heritage when man's energies and creative skills are the slaves of the god of war?

Is it truly beyond the wit of man to devise a less costly and less perilous security system to protect him from organized violence by his fellow men?

Before suggesting ways in which man's wit can be channeled to this task, it will interest you to consider the world of 1970 without action in this field.

If man manages his present madness for another 12 years without sparking by miscalculation or accident a general nuclear war, what armaments are then most likely to be in the stockpiles?

We find that smaller nuclear explosions represent a more likely trend than larger explosions. Huge explosions, of course, are technically feasible. One occasionally hears talk of gigaton weapons representing the equivalent of billions of tons of TNT, but the military usefulness of such weapons is open to serious question.

More significant than the amount of explosive force will be the size of the weapons themselves. We already read of atomic and hydrogen weapons small enough for fighter aircraft, missiles, and artillery pieces. Suitcase A-bombs have been mentioned. We can expect the trend toward a bigger bang per cubic foot of bomb to continue further before practical limits are reached. Clean weapons, of course, represent another design trend, but it is not yet clear just how clean a nuclear device can become. Under many conditions of explosion, even clean weapons produce a dirty result in terms of radioactivity. But probably most of the long-persisting products can be avoided.

The world is beginning to test ballistic rockets whose speed approaches the velocity needed to escape from the earth. This means that the practical limits of velocity for terrestrial wars have been reached. While reentry speeds may become greater, we cannot expect the speed of weapons to targets on earth to increase significantly beyond the speeds now being tested. There will, however, be two significant trends in delivery systems.

First, bases will become more mobile, more dispersed, much smaller and less detectable, and therefore less vulnerable. In-hand or immediately foreseeable are rocket launchings from underground sites and from mobile platforms on the ground, on the sea, under the sea, and from aircraft. While launchings from space platforms will be technically feasible, it is not likely that space launching sites for terrestrial wars will offer advantages.

Second, what is known as the reaction time of delivery systems will shorten appreciably. Today the countdown time necessary to prepare long-range missiles for test firing is about the same—10 hours or so—that it takes long-range aircraft to fly between continents. But the development of missile systems, particularly improvements in solid propellants, will soon shorten the time needed for preparation. We can foresee that before many years 1,000- to 2,000-mile rocket weapons will be maintained in a state of readiness permitting nearly instantaneous firings. The readiness time of 6,000-mile missiles can be shortened to minutes instead of hours, and they may eventually be instantaneously ready. Thus, the reaction time from the instant of command to megaton explosions 1,000 to 6,000 miles away will soon run from about 10 minutes to about half an hour.

These trends in the design and development of weapons produce a number of troublesome consequences. For one thing, the arms race is already producing the so-called *n*th-country problem—known to the British as the fourth-country problem, and to the French as the fifth-country problem, and to others by various numbers. In the absence of arms controls, modern weapons will come into possession of more and more nations either through gift, sale, or local development. Ownership of modern weapons by many nations, some of which may be irresponsible or even fanatical, will introduce a major factor of instability into the world's security arrangements.

Furthermore, the increasingly fast and automatic response characteristics of modern weapons will lead to concentration and delegation of control. There will be much less time for investigation, diplomacy, and decision making. The dangers of accidental war or the accidental spread of limited war to total war become increasingly significant.

Finally, reliable physical inspection for possession of nuclear warheads is already impractical. With the decreasing size of warheads and the growing ease of hiding bases, many other inspection and control problems will approach practical insolubility. Man faces steadily increasing difficulties in backing out of the corner into which he is now boxing himself.

Thus the technologically unrestrained arms race not only represents fantastically huge charges against human progress; it also is a direct security threat in itself. Both capitalism and communism are just beginning to recognize that the chief security threat in both their futures lies not so much in the ideology or power of the opposing group, as in the perilous instabilities and civilization-destroying powers of the new weapons systems. These are fast becoming the common enemy, and the basis for hope of East-West agreement.

Can we construct a more rational world security system capable of blocking military aggression and simultaneously dealing with the threat of the arms race?

First, it is useful to ask just what is the purpose of arms control? I would like to suggest that at this moment in history, the object of arms control is not, as commonly assumed, either arms reduction or disarmament. I do not mean to infer that reductions and disarmament are not desirable objectives, or that the world might not ultimately achieve security arrangements where armaments are held by a world police establishment, controlled by the U. N. under a system of law enforceable on individuals. Such an ultimate goal is desirable and is to be advocated; it would be the world security system with the minimum level of armaments. But I do believe that such heaven on earth cannot today be the primary, immediate purpose of practical international politics.

Let me explain this notion in another way. Man can pursue international peace in three ways. First, he can endeavor to eliminate the causes of international con-

flict through political settlements, through strengthening peaceful methods for settling disputes and through trying to resolve ideological and economic causes of war. But necessary though these approaches are, it is difficult to believe that by themselves they can be successful in preventing war.

The second approach, popular particularly since the turn of the century, has been to say: "If we cannot eliminate the causes of international conflict, then let us eliminate the means of international wars. Let us disarm." The world has made three major attempts since the turn of the century to do just this. There was the European attempt lead by the Russians prior to World War I, in which the United States did not participate. There were the elaborate negotiations and naval treaty of the 1920's. And there is the post-war attempt, beginning with the Acheson-Lillianthal proposal of 1947 and continuing through the present work of the U. N. Disarmament Commission. Without attempting to analyze the reason for these failures to date I would simply point out that they have not born fruit, and that very probably attempts directly to eliminate the means of war cannot yet provide the key to the door we are trying to unlock.

But now let us examine the third approach man can take in seeking security from war. This approach in earlier centuries was known as the balance of power and in the current period is known as deterrence. The general idea is to present a potential aggressor with a situation where the probabilities are high that he will lose more than he can possibly gain through armed aggression. We should note that this is the same approach society has found successful in controlling and limiting violence by individuals. The potential criminal is presented with a situation—punishment—where the probabilities are high that he will lose more than he can probably gain.

The limitation and control of war through deterrence offers more immediate promise than does either the elimination of conflicts of interests or the elimination of the means of war. But in a world in the midst of technological revolution and organized as an anarchy of nations, the pursuit of deterrence presents two major problems.

The first difficulty with deterrence is that it is not self-stabilizing. A world security concept based only on national deterrent forces is, in a period of ideological conflict, a guaranty of an arms race.

The second difficulty is the problem of war initiated by accident, miscalculation, or fanaticism. This problem will become extremely serious in the coming decade of more and more nuclear nations and of global weapons of nearly instantaneous response times, whose control will become increasingly concentrated and delegated to the hands of minor officials—or even, if some advocates had their way, to electronic computers.

These two difficulties with deterrence can be minimized by arms controls. A broad international exchange of arms information would not only greatly reduce the dangers in deterrence but would at the same time greatly strengthen deterrence. It would warn of surprise attack and thus reduce the temptations of preemptive war. It would warn of any production or experimentation that might upset the stability of the security system. It would encourage and permit the abandonment by both sides of the so-called counterforce strategy, which is the current doctrinal source of the arms race. It will permit a much cheaper military standoff. And it would insure that potential aggressors would not underestimate the retaliatory strengths arrayed against them.

Lastly, such an exchange of information would become the basis for subsequent arms reductions. While we should recognize that the first purpose of arms control is to stabilize deterrence and check the arms race, arms reductions can be planned as a later phase in the building of a rational security system for our war-weary world.

In the 1950's, we have made much of weapons systems. I would suggest that in the 1960's we must make much of information systems. Weapons systems for deterrence and information systems for stability and control.

In this connection we should seize every reasonable opportunity the Soviets offer for exchanging inspection. On May 10, 1955, the Soviets offered a fairly elaborate exchange of ground-control posts to warn of surprise attack. We badly mishandled this opportunity. Last year, their counter-suggestion about partial aerial inspection was miserably dealt with in confusion and delays. Last year they also offered inspection in connection with a nuclear test suspension. It is now reported that the United States Government is seriously contemplating just such a plan. But our indecisiveness and delays may again seriously reduce a superb opportunity to press for inspection. If the Russians, as now rumored, unilaterally suspend tests, they may argue convincingly to the world that inspection is not necessary.

United States purposes in dealing with the nuclear-test issue should, I believe, be principally five:

1. To avoid at all costs any military inferiority vis-a-vis Russia (please note that I am not saying we should continue to seek military superiority).
2. To get started with mutual inspection.
3. To disengage from the disgraceful political position on tests into which we have drifted in the opinion of the world.
4. To inhibit the proliferation of nuclear weapons among additional powers.
5. To reduce to the very least possible the radioactive effects of nuclear weapons.

The latter purpose is, of course, the controversial one. But no physical inspection system has yet been conceived for nuclear warheads, and they will be around the world for a long, long time. Human frailty and history provide no encouragement that some or many will not be used, perhaps by accident, miscalculation, or fanaticism. A very strong case can be made for substantially decreasing the radioactive poisoning of nuclear weapons through development and testing.

Our 5 purposes in the nuclear test matter—to avoid military inferiority, to start inspection, to "get off the hook" politically, to inhibit the *n*th country problem, and to minimize the radioactive hazards from accidental war—these 5 purposes could be served by policies somewhat as follows. I offer these comments by way of illustration of a possible solution with no suggestion that they necessarily represent the optimum balance in the extremely complex problem-area.

1. While continuing to maintain pressure for the other disarmament steps, we would separate the nuclear-test issue from all others.

2. The United States would continue testing, but only for the purposes of developing nuclear dynamite for peaceful purposes and so-called "clean" weapons, i. e., those which produce quite small percentages of the long-lived fission products, such as strontium 90 and cesium 137. These tests would be registered in advance with the U. N., and we would invite the U. N. and other nations to observe them. After "clean" weapons are developed, we would negotiate in good faith with other nuclear powers for an exchange of clean weapons know-how. When nuclear dynamite is perfected, the United States will make it available to any user in the world, provided the use is approved in advance and controlled by an appropriate U. N. agency.

3. At the end of 1958, the United States will voluntarily suspend all tests of dirty weapons, i. e., those which produce relatively high percentages of the long-life fission products, and will continue the suspension provided (a) that before the end of 1959 an adequate number of mutual inspection stations, say a few dozen, have been established; (b) before the end of 1960, a full international agreement is reached providing for a worldwide inspection grid, for the registration and international inspection of all testing of clean weapons and peaceful devices, and providing for the prohibition of tests of all dirty devices, which can be detected by the inspection grid (this might be yields above 1 kiloton or 10 kilotons, depending on the effectiveness of the grid).

4. After the development of clean weapons, the United States will convert most of its dirty stockpile to a clean stockpile, reserving only sufficient dirty weapons to deter any nation from using dirty weapons against it. After adequate conversion of world stockpiles to a clean variety, the United States would be interested in further limitations on nuclear testing provided an international cutoff of nuclear production has been arranged. In deciding on these further test limitations, the United States is willing to negotiate internationally, or is willing to be subject to the will of a majority vote of the U. N. General Assembly.

How can science and technology help in this first phase of checking the arms race and stabilizing deterrence? There are countless possibilities. In closing these remarks, I would like to sketch one approach.

Consider a U. N. Arms Information and Research Agency. As with its predecessor in the League of Nations, this agency would compile and publish arms information from open sources. But additionally, it would collect information with the most modern means. It would receive and process information from inspection satellites, whose advent is imminent. It would receive and process photographic results from mutual aerial inspection, and operate its own aerial inspection force over areas of the world not covered by mutual agreements. It would man ground inspection stations instrumented with the vast array of detection devices which science is making available. The combination of ground, air, and space inspection could soon stabilize deterrence and bring the arms race under control.

But this agency would do more than collect, digest and distribute arms information. It would openly study and develop the tools of a world security system. Like the Rand Corp. for the Air Force, the Operations Research Office for the Army, and the Institute of Defense Analyses for the Defense Department, the scientists of this agency would employ the latest disciplines and tools of operations analysis, systems engineering and gaming. Deterrence would be openly researched and wars would be openly fought as games with teams of experts and with computers. The agency could probe for and publicize instabilities in the world's security arrangements and opportunities for force reductions. Human ingenuity would be marshaled to devise efficient and safe methods both to deter war and to control armaments.

Before science can be freed from the slavery of the arms race to serve the nobler purposes of man, it has one critical task to perform. Science must assist in the creation of a safe and decreasingly expensive world security system. Science, which has created the instruments of deterrence, must now turn its attention with even greater vigor to the problems of arms controls. To contribute to this reorientation of the Nation's scientific effort is the aspiration of N. P. A.'s newest activity, its Committee on Security through Arms Control.

Why Soviets Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an interesting, in fact, an amazing article written by Dr. Ellis A. Johnson, director, operations research office of Johns Hopkins University, appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe, of March 30, 1958.

The statement and charges made by Dr. Johnson are such that appropriate committees of Congress should look into them. If true, in whole or in part, the President and appropriate departments and agencies of the executive branch should take necessary steps to rectify the situation.

The article follows:

WHY SOVIETS LEAD—GAINED FIRST PLACE IN ARMAMENT RACE DESPITE OUR OVERWHELMING TECHNICAL SUPERIORITY BECAUSE OF PENTAGON INEFFICIENCY AND SECRETIVENESS

(By Dr. Ellis A. Johnson, director, operations research office, Johns Hopkins University)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Johnson, a former naval officer, is in charge of a just completed 16-volume study of American defense. The following remarks are excerpts from an article which he wrote for the April issue of the international magazine Western World.)

Inefficient use of research and development resources, poor organizational structure, deficiencies in planning, lack of incentives for industry, and excessive secrecy are mainly responsible for the free world's falling behind the Soviet Union in the development of military weapons.

In spite of the recent launching of the Explorer and other evidence of the free world's being well ahead of the Soviet Union in basic research, total technical resources, and other factors—all evidence points to our being behind the Soviet in the development of military weapons.

I will try to identify the factors responsible for this.

The guidance and management of industry's defense effort are in the hands of military officers in the Department of Defense.

Almost all civilians with military research and development experience have, with rare exceptions, been organized out of all the positions of management responsibility and authority for military research and development programs in the Department of Defense.

No civilian scientist, regardless of his status, can make any signficant or important decision in his field.

This is a deliberate action taken by the three armed services acting in concert, beginning shortly after the end of World War II, and culminating in the dissoltuion of the Research and Development Board and the Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD).

The direct influence of civilian science and engineering within the Department of Defense, and at higher echelons of the Government is now almost nil. It depends primarily on scientific advisory committees, with no responsibility or authority, and unacquainted with the military-technical problems involved.

Almost the entire creative burden of developing weapons, therefore, falls on private industry.

The industrial contractor, however, may learn the tactical and strategic military requirements, only after he has a contract. This has led, and still leads to study contracts, extensive informal discussions, formal or informal proposals by industry, a time consuming examination cycle on the compatibility of the proposal by the Defense Department and finally the returning of the requirement to industry for competitive bids.

This random and grotesque procedure not only extends the time from concept to beginning of development, but also diminishes the chances that the development chosen is the best suited to meet the strategic requirements of the United States.

This process can last as long as 5 years before actual development begins.

About the total time required by the Soviet Union to do the whole thing.

Even after a development is pronounced desirable, industry must still make a profit to survive. It must also give steady employment for scientists and engineers in its industrial laboratories.

It takes approximately 3 years to make a new employee fully productive and industry needs a large backlog of orders to provide steady employment.

Under such circumstances the development time for each project is stretched, increasing the lead time.

On the other hand, if there is no backlog of contracts for development, the work program on the current contract is slowed down, while the sales engineers of the company work desperately to get new contracts to ensure survival of the development laboratory.

Present estimates indicate that as many as three times too many development engineers are employed as are actually needed for each project in United States defense industry, which doubles the length of time for development, and brings the overall cost of defense research to six times what it ought to be.

Large and healthy profits as a reward for good performance would cut the Government's cost by half and might well double the rate of successful development. This is what we must have.

Insufficient planning also wreaks havoc.

Such planning is the task of an integrated pyramid of high level Government groups. They must guide the military development programs, yet not in such detail as to prevent the creation of new knowledge and new weapon systems. These groups are needed in the National Security Council, the Department of Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force, industry and military laboratories.

Such planning does not now exist in the United States, and the situation is even worse in other NATO countries.

Security regulations, also, are in the United States so rigidly enforced that classified libraries of industry do not contain accounts of prior or parallel work by other industrial or military laboratories * * * and an industrial laboratory is to make proposals based upon choice of the best.

This is not the fault of private industry but of the military managers of the Defense Department.

A research scientist can seldom give a blueprint of the specific thing he is trying to find, and yet it is often rambling search impossible of definition that brings about the most important scientific discovery. The value cannot be appreciated until it is found.

The need-to-know restriction also limits communication within the Department of Defense itself, resulting in repeated solving of old problems.

Obstacles within the Department of Defense itself definitely extend the development of weapons production.

In all honesty we must admire the achievements of the Soviet Union. However, the technical resources of NATO are so overwhelmingly superior that the Soviet research advantage need be only temporary.

By using existing NATO resources we can recapture our previous superiority.

Now, to remedy this whole situation, I suggest that the United States and the free world return immediately to the development methods used in World War II, when we and other countries were both speedy and productive in developing new weapons, including atomic weapons.

The methods used by the Soviet Union in weapons development are almost exactly similar to those the United States used at the peak of weapons development during World War II.

All evidence indicates that the Soviet Union considers its laboratories as permanent. Running out of work is never a problem for research and development personnel. The Soviet also provides firm support to applied research, component development and subsystem development prior to, or along with and independent of, specific end-item weapons production.

I can see only one lesson in this for the United States and the free world. Let's get back in the groove of our World War II weapons procedures.

Labor Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe attention should be called to an article entitled "Labor Rackets" which appeared in the March 31 issue of Newsweek magazine. I am inserting it in the RECORD.

This Democrat-controlled Congress is not interested in the enactment of remedial legislation so obviously needed for the protection of the rights of the individual union member. It is quite evident that the Democrats are beholden to labor-union leaders and seek to do everything they can to preserve them in their positions of arbitrary power, regardless of the rights of the union members, the average workingman, management, and the general public.

The article follows:

LABOR RACKETS: SHADOW OVER THE SENATE

The big, pressing question that hung over the Senate Labor Rackets Committee this week was that of the committee's own existence. Would it finish its second year of investigations or would it fall apart? The answer depended on the outcome of what, in the final analysis, was a test of political strength between the Republican members of the committee and 1 man: Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers.

The Republicans were determined that the committee should keep going long enough to give them a healthy crack at Reuther, whose power as a kingmaker in the Democratic Party was clearly shown at the last Democratic convention, where he shattered the Harriman boomlet not only by swinging the more than 40 UAW member delegates to Adlai Stevenson but also by persuading about 150 other CIO member delegates, and Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to come out for Stevenson, too.

On Reuther's side, a group of Senate Democrats were equally insistent that the investigation of his UAW's strikes should be wound up right now.

One day last week, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who since the committee's earliest days has been calling for a

hard look at the UAW chief, was talking to a reporter outside the Senate Chamber. He pointed dramatically toward the Chamber and explained: "It's extraordinary that Reuther's power can reach right into the Senate."

Senatorial courtesy would not let him go further. But there could be no doubt that what he had in mind was the scene on the Senate floor when 6 Democratic Senators arose to blast the current activities of the rackets committee and to call for its reformation or abolition. The 6, all of whom have received campaign contributions and help from the UAW, were PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan (a member of the committee); WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; JOHN CARROLL, of Colorado; RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon; PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

Such demonstrations are never spontaneous in the Senate. The content of the speeches must be prepared in advance. The statistics and tables placed in the record must be carefully worked up. It was evident that the 6 Senators were working as a team.

M'CLELLAN'S PLANS

Listening to their attacks on the committee was its chairman, Democrat JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Finally, looking pale and drawn—reflecting the high tension within the divided committee—JOHN MCCLELLAN took the floor: "Whenever I come to the conclusion that the usefulness of this committee has come to an end, I'll walk on the Senate floor and so report. If the Senate doesn't agree with me, I'll ask to be relieved of my arduous duties."

Later, MCCLELLAN indicated that he expected the labor-rackets committee to finish its allotted year. Its future investigations, he said, would cover the infiltration of the Mafia and other gangsters into unions and tie-ups with so-called management associations.

Meanwhile, the anxiety of the committee Republicans to keep the committee alive was responsible for their shelving temporarily an attack on counsel Robert F. Kennedy, whom they accuse of leaning to Reuther's side. Behind their proposed attack on Kennedy was this story:

As the current hearings on the Kohler strike dragged along, the witness stand was being held one day by Donald Rand, who has headed the UAW's efforts to have Kohler products nationally boycotted. Rand's answers to questions were vague, his memory was short. Republican Senator KARL MUNDT saw Bob Kennedy slip a note to attorney Joseph A. Rauh, Jr., counsel for the UAW. MUNDT asked to see it. At the end of the hearing, Kennedy retrieved the note and handed it, with a smile, to MUNDT. It read: "Rand, go home."

The incident was forgotten, but a day or so later, four Republican women visited the hearing and were seated just behind Attorney Rauh. At one point Bob Kennedy came up and said to Rauh: "How are we doing?" The women reported the incident to MUNDT. He in turn reported it to Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and said that he and his colleagues on the committee were considering making an issue of the episode. KNOWLAND told him to go ahead.

It was GOLDWATER'S urging that finally decided the Republican group to hold off. GOLDWATER pointed out that such an attack on Kennedy might light the fuse that would blow the committee out of existence—and that would be just what the Democrats wanted.

Meanwhile, the subcommittee was continuing hearings on the UAW strike at the Kohler plant, outside of Sheboygan, Wis. The witness was Leo Brierather, a former editor of the UAW strike bulletin. He read an affidavit from an elderly Sheboygan man who had been a Kohler employee at the time of the strike there in 1934 (with which the UAW had no connection). In the shooting by company guards that broke the strike, the former employee's affidavit stated, he had been wounded by shotgun pellets fired by a company man named Lyman C. Conger.

What made this far-off story dramatic was the fact that Lyman Conger is now the company's counsel at the hearings and he was sitting there as the affidavit was read. When Brierather finished reading, Conger rose and strode angrily forward. He denounced the affidavit as a lie and challenged anyone in the UAW to repeat the statement outside of the hearing room. It was brought out that Brierather himself, at the time of the 1934 strike, had been working on a farm 20 miles away.

Healey: How To Start Disengagement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the noted British member of Parliament, Denis Healey, entitled "How To Start Disengagement," from the March 31, 1958, issue of the New Republic magazine:

Stripped to its essentials, disengagement means drawing the armed forces of NATO and the Soviet Union apart from one another and establishing joint control over the area in between. It implies substituting cooperation for conflict along the sensitive frontier of the cold war. Now that the thermonuclear stalemate offers no alternative to coexistence but no existence, both sides can expect to benefit by disengagement, since it provides the possibility of peaceful change in areas of great instability, and reduces the danger of an unnecessary world war should that instability nevertheless erupt in violent explosion. Above all, it represents a first step toward ending the futile, back-breaking, and perilous weapons race by establishing a pilot project in the techniques of arms limitation and control.

I have outlined a concrete plan for disengagement in central Europe. What immediately emerges from study of such a plan is that it involves a solution of some of the most intractable political problems of the postwar world. And though these problems become infinitely easier to handle in the context of military disengagement, even with good will on both sides the process is likely to take years rather than months. Moreover, some of the purely military problems of disengagement—the problem of sanctions against aggression, for example—require the West to adapt its strategic doctrine and organization to the revolution in military technology. This adaptation is only just beginning, although it is just as necessary if the West is to produce a military posture suitable for protecting the existing status quo in Europe.

The idea of military disengagement has figured in the diplomatic proposals of both West and East more than once in the last few years, but largely as an element in the propaganda battle. Now for the first time both sides are beginning to consider it seriously, and are examining the risks and opportunities it offers with a caution they did not display before. Under careful scrutiny disengagement is seen to involve an unprecedented revolution in the political attitudes of both the West and Russia, since it assumes a form of positive cooperation going far beyond the negative principles of coexistence as defined in Communist doctrine. And some Western statesmen who are wont to see the cold war as a religious crusade are just as reluctant as the Communists to envisage lasting cooperation.

For all these reasons it is clear that at present neither side is likely to commit itself in advance to a thoroughgoing program of disengagement such as I have proposed. Disengagement can take place only by stages, each of which is complete in itself, in the sense that it is fully susceptible of control by both sides, and that either side can halt the process of disengagement there if it feels it would be too dangerous to go further. Moreover, my own impression after intensive discussion with representatives of all the counties concerned is that, whatever they may say for propaganda purposes, none of the great powers will commit itself in practice at the moment either to the political neutralization of the Central European States or to the total evacuation of foreign forces. Thus the first stage in disengagement must be restricted to the reduction, not evacuation, of forces in the area concerned, leaving the existing structure of alliances unimpaired.

In my opinion, the main western aim at the forthcoming summit conference should be to reach agreement with the Russians on a proposal for the limitation of armaments in Central Europe—this is by far the most important issue on which the bargaining poistions of the two sides are sufficiently close together to justify a moderate optimism. A few years ago Sir Anthony Eden made several proposals for a thinning out of troops in Central Europe, and it is often forgotten that he did so with the support of Mr. Dulles. The United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee last year came close to agreement on such a proposal: the main stumbling block was Western insistence on making a package deal which included agreement on several unrelated issues. There are signs that, having sacked Mr. Stassen, the United States administration may at last adopt his views on the unwisdom of seeking package deals: indeed the Disarmament Subcommittee of the United States Senate has already asked the Government to study plans for reduction of troops in Central Europe. Finally, the Communist governments have already tabled a proposal for arms limitation in Central Europe in the so-called Rapacki plan.

The Rapacki plan, as it stands, contains provisions which are so obviously weighted against the West that it can be considered only as an extreme position from which bargaining can begin. It proposes a total ban on the stationing or use of atomic weapons in Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, without any limitation on conventional forces in the same area. But the West cannot hope to counter the immense preponderance of Russian forces in Central Europe without the use of atomic weapons—although it is conceivable that NATO's atomic weapons might be stationed outside Germany in peacetime, without great military disadvantage. Moreover, the American and British NATO forces are being reorganized and reduced in number with a view to fighting with atomic weapons. If they were forbidden the use of these weapons, it is doubtful whether they would stay on the Continent at all.

In the second place, it is technically impossible to limit any disarmament plan to nuclear weapons alone. Much of the nuclear ammunition now available is small enough to be hidden as easily as footballs, and can be fired from conventional artillery or carried in small aircraft. Thus the inspection of a ban on nuclear ammunition would involve the right to examine every square yard of the territory concerned. Even so, it would

be impossible to prevent clandestine imports of nuclear ammunition in an emergency. If the ban were extended to all possible means of delivering nuclear weapons, it would cover almost all weapons except the rifle, i. e. would involve almost total demilitarization.

Finally, the Rapacki plan involves discrimination against Western Germany as the only member of NATO to be forbidden the possession of nuclear weapons, although she gets thing in return by way of progress toward reunifiction. On the contrary, insofar as the fear of German nuclear weapons provides Russia with an incentive to consider disengagement in its wider sense, the Rapacki plan would enormously weaken the West's bargaining position on German reunification. Moreover, by accepting formal discrimination against Germany, NATO would create resentment against itself which might in time lead the Federal Republic to make its own approach to Russia.

On the other hand, apart from limiting disarmament to nuclear weapons alone, the Rapacki plan includes several dramatic concessions to the western position. It is the first proposal ever made in which the Russians offer to equate Eastern Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia on their side of the Iron Curtain with Western Germany alone on the NATO side. In other words, they accept as an area for joint control very much the same countries as Mr. Gaitskell has proposed for his disengagement plan. In the second place they offer detailed provisions for physical supervision of the arms limitation through ground control teams—though the powers and location of such teams remain subject to negotiation. Finally, they have tried to meet western reluctance to have formal diplomatic contact with the Pankow regime in East Germany by agreeing that the agreement should be established through unilateral declarations by the governments concerned instead of by a common treaty.

Not the least important aspect of the Rapacki plan is that it originated last October in Warsaw without Soviet prompting or support. It represents the first important international initiative by a Communist regime which is trying to assert its independence within the Soviet bloc. Since Russia took up the Rapacki plan, it has been further developed in close cooperation with the other Communist states concerned. But there is overwhelming evidence to show that the Polish Government at least would welcome constructive criticism by the West, and hopes for counter proposals which will include a limitation on conventional forces in the area.

It is now urgent that the western governments should agree on concrete counter-proposals to the Rapacki plan which would aim at a balanced limitation of both conventional and nuclear armaments in the area. Such a proposal would involve no more inspection than the Rapacki plan itself—indeed it is the only way of making such inspection effective. The West could only gain by the establishment of arms limitation and control in central Europe. The Russians, too, would have every reason to accept it, if, as they say, they have no intention of using force to change the present status quo.

The main argument against such a plan—particularly in Western Germany—is that by reducing the dangers of the present division of Europe it reduces the incentive to end it. There is, of course, some truth in this argument. But I believe that the establishment of arms limitation and control in central Europe would do far more to encourage the forces on both sides which want peaceful change than to strengthen those who oppose it. The relaxation of tension would encourage the peace camp in Russia itself as well as in the satellite states. And those in Eastern Europe who saw it as the first step toward complete disengagement would be given hope where at present western policy offers them only despair. The danger of a surprise attack by Russia's overwhelming ground forces, which is NATO's main military preoccupation at present, would be enormously reduced, if not eliminated for good. Moreover, once the principle of a balanced reduction in both nuclear and conventional forces were accepted, it would be easy for the West to mobilize world support for massive reductions in Russia's European armies.

Inspection in itself would not be a major technical problem in central Europe, since both sides are able to inspect one another's forces there in great detail already through normal intelligence operations. What would be new if joint inspection were agreed is that the strength of the opposing forces could be published with international authority. For this reason it would be desirable to involve the United Nations directly in the agreement, and to include neutral representatives in the inspection teams. This would still further increase the political disadvantages and military difficulties of mounting a surprise attack.

In my opinion, the change in the whole climate of the cold war if such a scheme were put into practice would in itself encourage rapid further progress toward complete disengagement. And it would be possible in any case to set a time limit for the first stage—to insist that if further progress were not made within, say, 5 years, each side was free to denounce the agreement and return to the status quo ante. It is possible that such a time limit might be necessary to persuade the West German Government to accept a first stage in arms limitation without any progress toward reunification.

In any case, it will be easier to take the first step this year than at any time in the future. At the moment the power of decision lies overwhelmingly with the three nuclear great powers. As nuclear weapons become more widespread, either within the Western alliance or outside, it will become ever more difficult to coordinate a collective policy of disarmament and disengagement.

In my first article, I described the way in which the logic on thermonuclear strategy threatens to disintegrate the Atlantic alliance. The present failure of the leading Western powers to offer any political hope for an end to the cold war is equally damaging to allied unity. NATO will survive only if it adapts itself to the tremendous changes which have taken place in the world since it was founded 9 years ago. But if it fails to adapt itself collectively to these changes it cannot prevent its members from trying to adapt themselves individually. A policy of disengagement is not an alternative to the Western alliance—it is the only way of keeping the Western alliance effective. NATO will have a vital role even after the whole program of disengagement has been completed, as the indispensable basis to insure that the agreement is respected.

At this final stage in the argument, I find that supporters of official Western policy will concede that disengagement is in the Western interest, and start arguing that for this reason Russia will never accept it—and therefore we should not put it forward. I have tried to show that in fact disengagement is in the interests of humanity as a whole—the Russians have no less an interest in it than the West, because they live on the same planet. But even if the Russians do not accept it today, that is no reason why the West should not propose it. After all, we know for certain that Russia will not accept NATO's present policy for a European settlement. Moreover, she can reject NATO's present policy without suffering any harm in world opinion, since no one, even in the West, believes that our present demands are reasonable. If, on the other hand, the Kremlin rejected proposals for disengagement, it would lose heavily in support—among the peoples of the Communist states no less than in the West and the uncommitted world.

Even disengagement is not an end in itself. It must be seen only as part of a far wider development. Indeed it is doubtful whether it would be possible to preserve a system of disengagement in central Europe for long unless progress were made in other fields and other areas toward cooperation between the West and the Communist world. It would be difficult for the two camps to cooperate in Europe if they were in bitter conflict in the Middle East and the West Pacific. Moreover, the countries of central Europe would be unlikely to accept special limitations on their military and diplomatic freedom for long unless they saw hope of other countries accepting similar limitations. Thus disengagement must ultimately lead to world disarmament, involving America and Russia themselves as well as countries in between.

It may seem pathetically over-optimistic even to hint at such a thing today. Yet there is truth in the trite old platitude that in the long run world government is the only alternative to race suicide. The discovery of atomic power is a milestone in the history of mankind beside which even the discovery of fire assumes minor importance. For mankind has achieved the power to destroy itself at a time when its social organization as an anarchy of sovereign states accepts war as a normal means of producing change. Unless mankind can reorganize its international relations so as to eliminate war as an instrument of policy, the discovery of atomic power may prove to be not a milestone, but a gravestone. Disengagement offers hope of beginning this reorganization in the area where it is most urgent and necessary. If there is a better hope in any alternative, those who reject disengagement have a clear duty to say what it is.

Needed More Than Ever: Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been interested in vocational education and it is always up for extended comment each year that we have an appropriation before the House. Prof. H. M. Hamlin, chairman of agricultural education, University of Illinois, has written an article for the Nation's Schools for March 1958. I thought those Members of the House who have in the past been deeply interested in vocational education would be interested in the comments of Dr. Hamlin. Mr. Speaker, the article is herewith appended in full:

NEEDED MORE THAN EVER: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(By H. M. Hamlin)

We must not fail to recognize that vocational education is an important means of contributing to the solution of many of the critical problems of education that are now under discussion.

We want an educational program that will meet our national needs. Vocational education was brought into the schools because a national need for it was felt. It has contributed for more than 40 years to meeting national needs. The need for vocational education, sensed a half century ago, has been greatly intensified and it will increase.

It is a little odd that many who feared a few years ago that American educators were being influenced by Russia now want us to copy Russian education. If Russia is to be our example, we should at least be clear regarding the nature of Russian education. It is not, as some would have us believe, simply education of the intellectually elite in science, mathematics, and engineering.

THREE LEVELS IN RUSSIA

Counts has reported that "the system evolved in the first 10 years of Soviet power recognized 3 levels of occupational qualification and training—lower, middle, and higher. The first corresponds roughly to the category of semiskilled and skilled labor, the second to that of semiprofessional, and the third to that of professional. Based on the schools of general education and articulating with them at various points, a wide range of institutions was established to prepare youth for the three levels of qualification." [1]

The technicum, one of the institutions for nonprofessional vocational education, alone enrolled 1,800,000 students in 1954 compared with 1,600,000 enrolled in the higher institutions, according to Counts.[2] Many other institutions for providing vocational education, particularly for adults, have been developed, including institutions for offering evening, part-time and correspondence courses and programs for agricultural workers. The Soviets claim to have trained, during the last 15 years, more than 7½ million young workers in 500 narrowly specialized trades.[3]

ISSUES NOT NEW

But we do not have to look to Russia for the issues regarding vocational education. They were thoroughly discussed during the decade 1907 to 1917 before the adoption of the National Vocational Education Act. Unfortunately, most of this generation has forgotten the discussions of 40 years ago, or has never heard of them.

An eminent commission appointed by President Woodrow Wilson reported in 1914: "While many different kinds and grades of vocational education will always be required, the kind most urgently demanded at the present time is that which will prepare workers for the more common occupations in which the great mass of our people find useful employment."

This statement is equally true today. Said the commission: "There is a great and crying need of providing vocational education of this character for every part of the United States—to conserve and develop our resources; to promote a more productive and prosperous agriculture; to prevent the waste of human labor; to supplement apprenticeship; to increase the wage earning power of our productive workers; to meet the increasing demand for trained workmen; to offset the increased cost of living. Vocational education is therefore needed as a wise business investment for this Nation, because our national prosperity and happiness are at stake and our position in the markets of the world cannot otherwise be maintained.

"The social and educational need for vocational training is equally urgent. Widespread vocational training will democratize the education of the country: (1) by recognizing different tastes and abilities and giving an equal opportunity to all to prepare for their life work; (2) by extending education through part-time and evening instruction to those who are at work in the shop or on the farm. Vocational education will indirectly but positively affect the aims and methods of general education: (1) by developing a better teaching process through which the children who do not respond to book instruction alone may be reached and educated through learning by doing; (2) by introducing into our educational system the aim of utility, to take its place in dignity by the side of culture, and to connect education with life by making it purposeful and useful. Industrial and social unrest is due in large measure to a lack of a system of practical education fitting workers for their callings. Higher standards of living are a direct result of the better education which makes workers more efficient, thus increasing their wage earning capacity." [4]

Everything that has happened since 1914 emphasizes the wisdom of the commission's pronouncement. The acceptance of vocational education by the public has exceeded even the more optimistic expectations. Unanticipated values have emerged, particularly the contributions which have been made to the general purposes of our school systems in fields such as agricultural education and home-making education.

Enrollments in nationally aided classes grew to 3,413,159 in 1955–56. Though the national vocational education acts have required only that national funds be matched by State and local funds, the States and communities contributed more than $142 million and the National Government contributed only $33 million in 1955–56 to the cooperative program. In addition, the States and communities supplied the buildings and equipment used. The program has appealed to out-of-school youths and adults, as well as to high-school students; in 1955–56 1,855,630 of 3,413,159 enrolled were in part-time or evening classes.

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

For more than 40 years the Congress of the United States has repeatedly reaffirmed its support of vocational education. Its appropriation for 1957–58, $40,888,412, is the largest in our history.

State legislatures have uniformly added their endorsements. In a test vote on funds for vocational education in the Illinois General Assembly in 1957, the senate voted 53 to 0 and the house, 114 to 3, to continue the appropriation made in the previous biennium.

Thousands of advisory committees made up of representatives of agriculture, business, homemaking, and industry have been glad to spend extensive amounts of time in guiding and supporting local and State programs of vocational education.

A group of 23,928 Michigan citizens, most of them parents of schoolchildren, were asked in 1951–52 to indicate what they would be willing to pay for, in addition to good education in the 3 R's, health, and science, even if it might add to their school taxes. Seventy-four percent said they would be willing to pay for instruction in a vocation and 61 percent said they would pay for instruction in home and family living, one of its phases.

By any criterion, vocational education in the public schools has been one of the greatest successes of the century.

More and better vocational education is a modern necessity. Our civilization is dependent upon technology. Our national defense is dependent upon it. It has frequently been estimated that about 15 trained technical workers are necessary for each professionally trained person.

We should not deceive ourselves into believing that private businesses and industries will provide all of the vocational education needed. It is true that the largest businesses and industries do a remarkable job in training their workers. Their spokesmen are those most likely to be heard. There are, however, no adequate public provisions outside the public schools for the vocational education of farmers, housewives, and those engaged in the smaller businesses and industries. Those omitted from private training plans constitute at least 80 percent of the population. There are few businesses or industries that do not welcome related programs of vocational education in the local schools.

Neither should we be deluded by those who believe that public agencies other than the public schools, such as the extension service in agriculture and home economics, are doing the job so well that no activity on the part of the public schools is needed. Many of these agencies are serving exceedingly well the purposes they were created to serve, but they were always intended to supplement, not supersede, the public schools.

If we were thinking only of providing the best public schools possible, we should want strong programs of vocational education in them to care for individual differences, balance the theoretical with the practical, and relate public education to all elements of the public.

If we needed vocational education in the public schools in 1914, as President Wilson's commission thought, or in 1917, as the Congress of the United States thought, we need it far worse in 1958. If we should weaken or destroy it, we would "kill the goose that laid the golden egg."

One example may suffice. Before vocational education was introduced into the schools, there was fear in well-informed circles that population increases would occur faster than food for the population could be increased. We had been able to provide food for a growing metropolitan population by settling new land, but by 1910 almost all of the new land had been settled. The country was becoming industrialized and cities were growing at an unprecedented rate. However, for the last 10 years, our problem has been, not a shortage, but a surplus of food. In 1910, the farm population was one-third of the total population; now it is 12 percent of the total population.

There were more than 6 million farms in 1910; now about 2 million farms produce the food we consume. The Director of Research of the United States Department of Agriculture has estimated that, if farmers had farmed in 1950 as they were farming in 1940, the housewives of the country would have paid $10 billion more for food in 1950 than they actually paid. Many factors have brought about the revolutionary increases in agricultural efficiency, but vocational education in agriculture in the public schools must be listed as one of the most important.

Though great progress in public school vocational education has been accomplished, we are in an era when much thought needs to be given to its future. The rethinking of vocational education should involve boards of education, citizens committees, administrators, vocational teachers, and other teachers. Vocational education has never been what it should have been; rapid changes call for types of vocational education different from any that would have served in the past.

There has been too much separation of vocational and general educators, though John Dewey and many others have shown that vocational and general education can-

[1] Counts, George S.: The Challenge of Soviet Education, p. 158. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1957.

[2] Ibid., p. 164.

[3] American Vocational Journal, 32: 31 (December) 1957.

[4] Report of the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, vol. 1, p. 12. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. 1914.

not really be separated. But in spite of arrangements which separate artificially, there is more communication between vocational and general educators than there has been at any previous time, and the way seems open for cooperative thinking and planning.

We have attempted to do too large a part of the task of vocational education in the secondary schools. These schools can provide the beginnings of vocational education for some and they can provide counsel about vocations and preparation for vocations. But serious vocational education is largely to be done with persons beyond high school age. If we are ever to do what is needed in vocational education, we must forego the concept that schools are for children and youth, and accept the idea that schools are for any who need education, whenever in life they need it.

We need institutions for education beyond the high school, far different from the traditional 4-year colleges and universities, which will be accessible to everyone in the United States who is above high school age. We have pieces of these institutions of the future in the metropolitan communities; junior colleges, vocational schools, technical institutes. The smaller cities and the farming communities are largely unserved by any of them. Any post-high-school institution we build should provide adequately for preservice vocational education for youth and inservice vocational education for adults of all ages. Such an institution removes from the high school the burden of providing more vocational education than it can appropriately provide. It makes possible serious and realistic vocational education, given at ages when students can best use it.

Comprehensive, balanced, well-knit programs of vocational education are few. Many schools provide only 1 or 2 types of vocational education. Educational programs in agriculture, distributive occupations, homemaking, and trades and industries are much too commonly distinct programs. Counseling is not well related to vocational education. We have not yet made vocational education an integral part of our school systems as we had hoped.

Those who believe that the public schools may serve the public interest in ways that private education is unlikely to serve it may well be concerned about allowing private groups to assume the full responsibility for vocational education. If the public schools default, we shall have more and more vocational education by corporations, labor unions, and farmers organizations. These groups serve legitimate educational functions, but we would not turn over to them all responsibility for nonvocational education. There are equally good reasons why they should not have exclusive responsibility for vocational education.

Responsible school officials, school staffs, and representative citizens might well review their local situations to see whether they have not already gone too far in turning agricultural education over to farmers, industrial education to corporations and labor unions, and business education to business groups, though these types of education are conducted in the public schools and are presumably conducted in the public interest.

We want quality in our educational programs. There is no area of education in which quality performance is more easily seen than in vocational education. Serious students in vocational education must meet the standards of the vocation they are entering or have entered. Could there by any better way of getting quality?

We want our high school students to mature and to take their work seriously. Vocational education does more to mature them than other forms of education because of its close contacts with the serious business of life.

We must think more about local or area institutions which will provide vocational education and other types of education beyond the high school. We are worried about overcrowding our colleges. With 54 percent of our high school graduates going to college, we should be. It is obvious that 54 percent of them are not going to be needed in the professions, though some professions need more workers than they have. With an increasing percentage going to college, we are starting to remake our secondary schools into college preparatory schools on the premise that almost anyone may go to college. Thus we indicate that we expect that vocational education is to be provided by the colleges and that the local secondary schools will be absolved of any responsibility for it.

FUNCTIONAL TRAINING NEEDED

We want more teaching of science and mathematic and we want these subjects taught functionally. It should occur to us that the vocations for which training is needed require science and mathematics and that vocational educators must see that their students are taught these subjects thoroughly and functionally if they are to be proficient in their chosen occupations.

We don't want to waste those who are professionally trained in jobs others could do. We hear of a shortage of engineers, but we hear also that a high percentage of engineers are doing work of less-than-engineering grade. Vocational schools provide the helpers they need. Similar situations prevail with respect to all of the other professions.

We want butter as well as guns. It is possible to have it only if we produce more skilled workers than we have ever had; vocational education produces them.

Actually, there is no real danger that vocational education in the public schools will suffer as a result of current discussions which emphasize science, mathematics, college preparation, and education for an intellectual elite. The raucous voices we are currently hearing are drowning each other out. The public schools are still controlled by the people of 49,000 school districts, 48 States, and the Nation, and the people have made clear their intentions regarding vocational education.

The present danger is that schoolmen and school board members may not understand the public attitude toward vocational education and may temporarily heed the vocal minorities who do not understand it either. School administrators who would like to be around for a while would do well to give vocational education more attention, not less attention, during the next few years.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and related material:

MIAMI, FLA., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a former Prime Minister and President of the Cuban Senate, I read with unusual interest your remarks of March 20 on the floor of the House.

Heartiest congratulations for your courageous and gallant intervention in behalf of my country. Through such speeches, and by supplying such information to your colleagues in the House, you are contributing mightily to the defense of democracy in the Western Hemisphere and to amicable relations between your great country and mine.

You will be interested to know that I have just written a letter to the Honorable Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, in which I question the advisability of continuing American military assistance to Dictator Batista, especially in view of the fact that he has violated repeatedly the mutual defense agreement. I also pointed out in my letter that, since there exists in Cuba a state of domestic hostility or civil war, the Government of the United States can and should recall its military mission from Habana. To do nothing is to proclaim that the United States Government is backing Batista in his struggle to maintain himself in power, in opposition to the expressed wishes of the Cuban people.

I enclose, for your information, the following papers:

1. A newspaper report (before censorship was imposed) of the barbaric tortures inflicted upon a 50-year-old schoolteacher, and the courageous protest of the attendant doctor.

2. A copy of a letter written by a group of 11 magistrates to the supreme court, in which they stress the lack of guarantees for the judiciary in Cuba. Batista, through the armed forces, prevents the judges from acting.

3. A copy of my statements to the American press during my recent visit to Washington. You will note that I criticize the State Department, the Pentagon, and the Inter-American Defense Board.

4. My thoughts on why the Cuban Peace Commission was doomed to failure. Although this document is out of date because the Commission failed a few days after I prepared it, it does show that there is no solution to the Cuban crisis as long as Batista is in power.

Hoping you will continue to work for amicable Cuban-American relations, I remain,

Gratefully yours,
MANUEL ANTONIO DE VARONA.

TORTURES UNDER BATISTA

The distinguished educator, Miss Esther Milanés, was subjected to unbelievable tortures after she was arrested last February 24. She was kept at the 12th district police station until the 27th of that month, when she and another woman were released, after undergoing barbaric and cruel tortures. Here's how the doctor's report reads:

"The patient presents multiple bruises and lacerations in the gluteal regions (buttocks) as well as lesions over all her body, serious internal injuries in the vagina, and deafness due to destruction of her tympanum (eardrums)."

In connection with this case, Dr. J. A. Presno, a distinguished physician, has sent the following letter to the president of the supreme court:

HABANA, *March 8, 1958.*

"HONORABLE SIR: According to the press, Miss Esther Milanés has accused certain police officers of grave and inhuman treatment.

"The indescribable odyssey suffered by my patient, performed with inconceivable sadism, makes evident not only a threat to our most elemental human rights, but also a lack of respect toward womankind. This respect, which we men owe to all women, is tied up with the love we feel for our mothers, who gave us life.

"As a son, a husband, and a father, I appeal to this, the highest court in our land, to demand an investigation of these serious

charges" (as reported by the newspaper Excelsior, Havana, Cuba, March 9, 1958).

LACK OF GUARANTIES FOR THE JUDICIARY IN CUBA

The following letter, sent by a group of magistrates to the supreme court, demands guaranties for the judicial branch of the government and describes the terrible conditions prevailing now in Cuba:

"Never before in the history of our country had the administration of justice been so ridiculed and mocked. For example, a soldier shot to death a judge's 2 sons; 2 magistrate's homes were riddled with bullets, while a bomb exploded in another; a judge was imprisoned and kept without food; 2 men, due to appear in court, were found dead.

"All vices are exploited by the same people who are paid to prosecute them. The list of murdered citizens grows by day and the assassins are not prosecuted.

"A fire has broken out or a bomb has exploded in every single court building; a man was found shot to death a short distance from the supreme court and the killers have not been found

"In some municipalities violent deaths are reported daily, but the judges are prevented from acting by the armed forces." (Reported by the press on March 9, 1958, and signed by 11 magistrates.)

STATEMENTS TO THE AMERICAN PRESS BY DR. MANUEL ANTONIO DE VARONA, WHO WAS PRIME MINISTER AND PRESIDENT OF THE CUBAN SENATE IN CUBA'S LAST CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, WHICH WAS OVERTHROWN BY BATISTA ON MARCH 10, 1952

On my way through Washington, I wish to inform the press about the most recent barbaric acts committed by Batista's dictatorship.

In addition to the students, farmers, workers, and professionals murdered daily, Batista is employing physical torture on suspects and political prisoners, regardless of age, sex, or physical condition. The most tragic case is that of Esther Milanés, a 50-year-old schoolteacher, who was brutally beaten up by the police in Habana. This infamy has been denounced to the Supreme Court by Dr. J. A. Presno, a distinguished physician. Details are given in a separate sheet.

I feel it is ridiculous to tell the free world that Cuba belongs to the family of democratic nations and to keep an American military mission there. The mission, whose task is to train Cuban officers for continental defense, in reality only serves to prepare officers to defend a crumbling dictatorship which is finding an ever-increasing wave of popular resistance and to squash the democratic aspirations of all the Cubans who oppose Batista.

The concept of hemispheric defense and a mistaken interpretation of the principle of neutrality toward recognized governments, confuses public opinion in Latin America. Since this policy is applied equally to democratic governments and dictatorial regimes, Latin Americans see in this American attitude an open support of American dictatorships.

These errors may be due to the inexperience of ambassadors who are not career officers and who do not inform their government properly of the conditions prevalent in the dictatorship countries. Another source of errors is the Pentagon; still another is the American Defense Board. The designation of officers on good-will missions and the granting of medals to the high military officers who guide and direct the killings and tortures of the dictator's enemies usually come from these organizations.

In the case of Cuba, misguided policies are creating ill will among the Cubans and placing this Government in an untenable position, for it is contradictory to fight dictatorships in Europe and Asia, while not doing the same in Latin America.

It is impossible to play the part of world leaders of democracy while military and technical help, as well as arms, are given to despotic governments, enemies of democracy, which is one and indivisible.

In short, I protest against the military help being extended to Dictator Batista, first because it serves to keep in power an unpopular government, and, second, because Batista violates the letter and the spirit of the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement.

The worst instance to date of this violation was the inhuman attack against the open city of Cienfuegos, when tanks and airplanes put down by force the uprising of September 5, 1957. These were arms supplied to Batista by the United States Government in conformity with the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

WHY THE NEW CUBAN PEACE COMMISSION IS INVALIDATED FROM THE START

(Confidential to high U. S. Government officials and legislators)

As a former Prime Minister and President of the Cuban Senate, I would like to tell you, quite frankly, why the new Cuban Peace Commission is doomed to failure from the start.

1. Batista has already outmaneuvered the church. As you know, the Roman Catholic Church is very powerful in Cuba, but it had never before intervened in political affairs.

The proclamation made by the Cuban episcopacy was, at first, a hard blow to Batista. But the dictator is a master strategist. He managed to talk the church leaders into naming a peace commission formed by lay leaders with whom he has always maintained the closest friendship. Thus he tricked the church into turning over its efforts to a pro-Batista group. In other words, it's another stall to consolidate himself in power.

2. The men who make up the new peace commission are not qualified to carry out its high objectives impartially or adequately. Here's why:

Dr. Cuervo Rubio is a former Vice President who served under Batista and is the doctor of Batista's wife.

Dr. Raúl de Cárdenas has received big favors from Batista in the past.

Mr. Víctor Pedroso, banker, intimate friend of the Batista family, has had large financial dealings with the present regime.

Rev. R. P. González, prior to becoming a priest, was under secretary of agriculture in the Batista government. He also used to be assistant to Martínez Saenz, predient of the National Bank of Cuba.

Thus it is obvious that the above men could hardly be expected to tell Batista to go in order to make way for a new national government, as suggested by the episcopacy.

3. The opposition parties have already rejected the idea of any coalition government which includes Batista. There was a time when Cubans would have settled for elections, guaranteed civil rights or almost anything else. The Cuban situation has deteriorated to such an extent, however, that the only acceptable condition is: Batista must go. Unless the tyrant goes, the Cuban problem will remain unsolved.

In conclusion, if any one doubt Batista's intentions, let him read his speech, given today March 10, the sixth anniversary of his treacherous military coup. In very plain language he stated that there would be no concessions forthcoming, except elections in June on his own terms.

TO THE PEOPLE OF CUBA

Once again the Aggregate of Cuban Institutions—made up of religious, fraternal, professional, civic, and cultural organizations—wishes to express publicly its considered opinion in regard to the possibilities of solving, without bloodshed, the grave crisis affecting the nation, and to demand, from the government, the kind of decision this moment calls for, if we, in this last and desperate effort, are to avoid the impending collapse of our fundamental state institutions.

This association, whenever it has raised its voice, has done so with a sense of responsibility and a belligerent attitude for peace, and has often expressed, in frantic appeals, that it was necessary to arrive at a just solution of our grave national crisis. Fearful of the risk that uncontrolled passions would sink the nation into anarchy, it announced that, in such a contingency, these Cuban institutions would know how to fulfill their duty.

The moment has arrived. The government, by ignoring all the appeals for peace and by depending on armed might, has provoked with that attitude the reaction of the young men and women of Cuba, who have exchanged their schoolbooks for war equipment and have started a general movement full of heroism and sacrifices, now admired and followed by all the social classes in our country. Against them, through 6 long, agonizing years, the regime has mobilized its entire repressive apparatus, which has been systematically employed with unsurpassed cruelty. Upon defenseless women and helpless adolescents has fallen the continuous and unmerciful weight of security forces in a manner having no parallel in the history of civil wars.

The regime has refused to look into the motivations behind our youth's actions, and, after subverting the juridical order of our state through an act of force, has suspended again all constitutional guaranties, having just announced a new drive to recruit 7,000 soldiers that might silence, in a war of extermination, all protests. It will all be in vain: the number of victims will increase, but the rebel movement will extend itself, because next to the young people and with them, both openly and clandestinely, is standing by the whole nation.

The people, witnessing with utter amazement the continuous flow of blood of its best human reserves, fails to understand this war of extinction, and cannot comprehend why the military supporters of this regime are fighting so hard to defend a government repudiated by the people.

The spectacle which Cuba's martyrdom offers to the world has not roused the feelings of those who seized power and who pretend to keep it against the will of all. No one hears the loud and excruciating outcry of mothers. No one listens to the voice of institutions not devoted to any particular sect, while the word uttered with pain by our venerable episcopacy receives, by way of answer, the deceiving, harsh imposition of an obstinate will to rule.

The Aggregate of Cuban Institutions has, thus far, proposed reconcilable formulas and civilized understandings. But now, aware of the fact that our nation is on the verge of collapse, we serenely demand the end of the present regime, since it has been unable to carry on the normal functions of government and to fulfill the high aims of statehood. As we request the discontinuance of the present administration through the abdication of those in the executive branch, and the dissolution of Congress, we are moved mainly by the instinct of social preservation, our intention being to contribute, in this manner, to the reestablishment of peace by removing the only cause that prevents a civilized solution.

This petition visualizes and carries with it the formation of a provisional government, formed by citizens of outstanding prestige, designated by all the vital forces of our nation, and having, as its aim, the pacification of the country through the adoption of the

necessary measures that may lead, in a brief period, to free elections under full democratic guaranties, thus fulfilling our historic destiny.

To that end, the provisional government will confine itself to a minimum program, fundamentally containing the aims listed below. The said government will:

(a) Respect private property and be under obligation to fulfill all agreements and pacts, whether bilateral or in conjunction with the United Nations, as well as all promises and liabilities contracted by the republic, deferring to the congress the faculty of determining, at an opportune time, if they were contracted according to our constitution and our laws.

(b) Will declare null and void all the sentences dictated by the tribunals of the republic and courts-martial held after March 10, 1952, dealing with political offenses intended to overthrow the regime instituted on that date.

(c) Govern itself, insofar as its peculiar nature permits, by the constitution of 1940, which will prevail especially in regard to individual rights.

(d) Exercise the legislative powers of government, limiting itself to the promulgation of laws strictly necessary for its good functioning, thus facilitating the return to a constitutional regime by popular consent.

(e) Give preferential treatment to laws promoting the start and development of an electoral process culminating in the designation of constitutional officials.

It is the understanding of this association that this is the only solution to save Cuba from chaos at this dramatic hour of its existence. Conscious, as we are, that we lack the power to remove the regime by force, we urge our citizenry to resist oppression by uniting closely and by exercising the rights that the constitution grants to free men everywhere.

HABANA, *March 15, 1958.*

Signed by Confederacion Nacional de Profesionales Universitarios, Colegio Nacional de Abogados, Colegio Nacional de Agrimensores, Colegio de Abogados de la Habana, Colegio Nacional de Arquitectos, Contadores Publicos, Estomatologico Nacional, Doctores en Ciencia y en Filosofia y Letras, Farmaceutico Nacional, Federacion de Ingenieros, Ingenieros Civiles, Ingenieros Electricistas, Colegio Medico Nacional, Medico Municipal, Peritos Quimicos, Agronomos y Azucareros, Trabajadores Sociales, Medico Veterinario Provincial de la Habana, Provincial de Periodistas, Asociacion Nacional de Maestros de Escuelas Privadas, Profesores y Maestros de Ingles, Tecnicos Industriales, Juventud Masculina de Accion Catolica, Catolica Universitaria, Concilio Cubano de Iglesias Evangelicas, Club de Leones, Lyceum Lawn Tennis, Supremos Consejos de la Masoneria, Federacion Nacional de Escuelas Privadas, Logias, Ingenieros Quimicos e Industriales, Ingenieros Meconicos, Medico Veterinario Nacional.

MEMORANDUM TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS FROM THE CUBAN CONGRESSMEN IN EXILE

1. The undersigned, former members of the Cuban Congress, democratically elected before the military coup of March 10, 1952, have the honor to address the Members of the United States Congress in order to inform them about some aspects of the current state of relations between their two countries and, particularly, about certain facts and feelings that are impairing these relations.

2. There is at present a widespread belief in Cuba that the United States Government is supporting Batista's ruthless dictatorship in contradiction to the repeatedly declared American policy in favor of world freedom and democracy. This belief is buttressing Batista's dictatorship, prolonging the terrible civil war now ravaging the country and seriously impairing the prestige and good will of the United States in Cuba.

3. The generalized Cuban belief in the United States support to Batista is based on the following facts:

(a) The great zeal in the application of the Neutrality Act against anti-Batista exiles and the unnecessarily rude treatment applied to them, as shown by the recent (February 14, 1958) handcuffing of Dr. Carlos Prio Socarras, former constitutional president of Cuba, deposed by Batista;

(b) The public demonstrations of friendship from the United States Army to the Cuban Army, as shown by the bestowal of one of the highest United States military decorations to the chief of the Cuban Air Force (November 1957) shortly after Colonel (now General) Tabernilla had ordered and led the bombardment and strafing of the open city of Cienfuegos (September 5, 1957) and the widely publicized praise lavished upon Batista by General Shepherd, Chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board (December 1957).

(c) The continuous shipments of arms to Batista, supplied freely or almost freely under the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement of March 7, 1952, in spite of the openly known fact that Batista is using these arms to crush, and not defend, democracy in the Western Hemisphere, contradicting the purpose of the agreement and of the United States acts which authorized it and which supply the funds with which these shipments are financed; and

(d) The maintenance of a United States Army mission in Cuba that is giving the Cuban Army technical advice on the strategy and tactics of the current warfare against the Cuban people, in spite of the fact that article 5 of the Army Mission Agreement of August 28, 1951, clearly stipulates that the agreement "will be subject to cancellation at the initiative of Government of the United States or of the Government of Cuba, at any time, when any one of the two governments finds itself involved in internal or external hostilities" (the quote is a translation of the Spanish text).

4. The undersigned consider that it is not improper for them to inform their United States colleagues of the above-mentioned facts, that may be of interest to them because of their bearing on the foreign policy of the United States, on the current world struggle for freedom and democracy, on the American prestige and good will abroad and on the welfare of one of the three closest neighbors of the United States. The undersigned also consider that it is not improper for them to request the moral support of their United States colleagues for their noble cause and hope that this information and this request of sympathy will be thus interpreted by the United States Senators and Congressmen and not construed as an attempt to interfere in their affairs or influence their conduct.

5. If any United States Senator or Congressman would like to obtain additional information on the facts described in this memorandum, the undersigned would be pleased to supply it to them, either in writing or personally, going to Washington if necessary or desirable. Requests for additional information or personal contact should be sent to: Dr. Lincoln Rodon, 5121 Alton Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

MIAMI, March 27, 1958.

Dr. Lincoln Ródon (Demócrata Party) Former President of the House of Representatives; Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. José Manuel Gutierrez (Ortodoxo Party) Former Senator From Matanzas Province; Dr. Manuel Bisbé, Former Leader of the Ortodoxo Party in the House of Representatives; Former Congresaman From Havana Province, President of the Ortodoxo Party; Dr. Rafael Dominador Pérez (Ortodoxo Party), Former Congressman From Pinar Del Río Province; Dr. Roberto Garcia Ibañez (Ortodoxo Party), Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. Bernardo Utset (Ortodoxo Party), Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. Segundo Curti (Auténtico Party), Former Congresaman From Havana Province; Dr. Ruben Alonso (Auténtico Party), Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. Antonio Acosta Borges (Nacional Party), Former Congressman From Havana Province; Dr. Wifredo Figueras (Demócrata Party), Former Congressman From Camaguey Province.

ANNEX TO THE MEMORANDUM

1. For those Members of the United States Congress that may not be familiar with recent Cuban developments, a brief outline of the origins and evolution of Batista's dictatorship follows.

2. On March 10, 1952, 82 days before the scheduled presidential elections in which he himself was a candidate supported by a small minority, Fulgencio Batista led a military coup, making himself chief of state in charge of organising and directing the executive and legislative branches of government and assuming all their functions. Following the coup, Batista suspended the constitution, prevented Congress from meeting, actually shooting the capitol building when Congress tried to meet, prevailed over the courts, reorganized the army, navy, and police forces, dissolved the political parties and canceled the presidential elections scheduled for June 1, 1952.

3. Two and a half years after the coup, on November 1, 1954, Batista held rigged elections in which he was elected President. The elections were not only rigged but unilateral, Batista being the only candidate. All the opposition parties but one, abstained; and the one that did not abstain, withdrew a few days before the election, owing to the violence and fraud used against it. Even members of the parties supporting Batista admitted publicly that there had been frauds and violence in the November 1954 elections.

4. Batista continues in power and his regime continues to have the same dictatorial nature that it has had from its inception. The constitution was nominally reestablished after the 1954 elections, but its basic rights are continually being suspended and marital law declared. Furthermore, with or without martial law, Batista has violated all political freedoms and human rights, imprisoning, torturing and assasinating his political enemies with utter ignorance of the courts.

5. Batista has sabotaged all the efforts made by prominent Cuban citizens and institutions in favor of a peaceful and digni-

fied settlement of Cuba's problem. In March 1956, the great Cuban patriot and elder statesman, Dr. Cosme de la Torriente, President of the General Assembly of the League of Nations, invited delegates from Batista's and opposition parties to seat together and discuss a solution. The meeting raised great hopes but was broken by Batista's delegates on a point of procedure. The failure of the negotiations closed the door to peaceful solutions and lit the fire that has been ravaging Cuba since then; few weeks after the meeting broke a group of army officers revolted, led by Colonel Ramon Barquin, Cuban member of the Inter-American Defense Board and in successive months rebellion flamed in Matanzas and Santiago de Cuba; Fidel Castro landed and started its successful and ever growing guerrilla warfare, in Oriente; the presidential palace in Havana was attacked and almost taken; the Corinthia expedition landed in the northern coast of Oriente Province; the navy garrison of Cienfuegos uprose and occupied the city, that was later unmercifully bombarded by Batista's air force; several plots were discovered in the army, navy, and air force and Havana police; strong guerrillas began to operate in the central part of the island and Castro's men beat the army repeatedly and spread all throughout Oriente's Province. Simultaneously with these events, a wave of sabotage against cane fields, sugar mills, sugar warehouses, tobacco warehouses, manufacturing plants, hotels, movie houses public buildings, trains, and buses has been rising in tempo up to its current volume: at present, all schools are closed, trains do not circulate by night, movie houses and stores are empty, insurance premiums have risen twentyfold and each week costs the country hundreds of human lives and several million dollars.

6. It is not the purpose of this memorandum to describe Batista's terror or to enumerate its thousands of victims, which include women, children less than 15 years of age, students, workers, farmers, merchants, including two presidents of the National Students Federation, physicians, lawyers, and congressmen. Two fellow congressmen have fallen victim of Batista: Dr. Menelao Mora, member of the house of representatives for the Cuban Revolutionary Party (Autentico), killed while valiantly fighting in the attack on the Presidential Palace, and Dr. Pelayo Cuervo, senator for the party of the Cuban people (Ortodoxo) and its president and leader in the senate, arrested by members of the police forces and assasinated in the outskirts of Havana on March 13, 1957, under the direct orders of Dictator Batista.

7. Following a standard practice of Latin American dictators, Batista is at present trying to perpetuate himself in power by electing a puppet successor. Elections for this purpose were scheduled for the forthcoming June 1 and have been now postponed, owing to the current state of civil war, for November 3 of this year. The electoral plans are supported by Batista's men and some so-called opposition parties, but public opinion repudiates them as a fraud. On February 28, 1958, Cardinal Arteaga and all the archbishops and bishops of Cuba addressed the country requesting the formation of a government of national union, implicitly asking Batista to step aside. On March 15, the national colleges (associations) of lawyers, medical doctors, civil engineers, electrical engineers, agronomical engineers, mechanical engineers, architects, doctors in philosophy and literature, doctors in political and economic sciences, teachers, pharmacists, public accountants, dentists, veterinanians, chemists and sugar chemists; the Federation of Catholic Youth, the Cuban Council of Evangelical Churches, the Supreme Council Grade 33 of Freemasons, the women's club, and Lions club and 18 other national organizations signed a petition for Batista's resignation, for the sake of peace and freedom, in a momentous and historical document. These utterly unusual steps taken by the Catholic and Evangelical churches and by nonpolitical organizations that together represent the whole of Cuba's learned middle class show the state of desperation that the Cuban society has reached and announces the new dawn of democracy in Cuba.

Dr. Lincoln Ródon (Demócrata Party), Former President of the House of Representatives, Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. José Manuel Gutérrez (Ohtodoxo Party) Former Senator From Matanzaas Province; Dr. Manuel Bisbé, Former Leader of the Ortodoxo Party in the House of Representatives, Former Congressman From Havana Province, President of the Ortodoxo Party; Dr. Rafael Dominador Pérez (Ortodoxo Party), Former Congressman From Pinar Del Río Province; Dr. Roberto Garcia Ibañez (Ortodoxo Party), Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. Bernardo Utset (Ortodoxo Party), Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. Segundo Curit (Auténtico Party), Former Congressman From Havana Province; Dr. Ruben Alonso (Auténtico Party), Former Congressman From Oriente Province; Dr. Antonio Acosta Borges (Nacional Party), Former Congressman From Havana Province; Dr. Wifredo Figueras (Demócrata Party), Former Congressman From Camaguey Province.

MIAMI, *March 27, 1956.*

SPEECH BY DR. MANUEL BISBE

A paragraph of the speech made by Dr. Manuel Bisbe, president of the Cuban Peoples Party (Ortodoxo), in the meeting held in the Flagler Theater of Miami on the 16th of March 1958, honoring the memory of Dr. Pelayo Cuervo Navarro in the first anniversary of his death. In his speech Dr. Manuel Bisbe raises the issue of a revision of the Latin American policy of the State Department.

"The dictatorship of Batista is in its last stages. It will fall as fell the dictatorships of Rojas Pinilla in Colombia and of Perez Jimenez in Venezuela. The America of Bolivar, of Juarez, and of Marti will be free as is the America of Washington. But what hurts us is the support that is being given to dictators, and that arms sold to them for the defense of the hemisphere against the Communist danger, are used instead against the people. What hurts us is that a plan of general elections be supported despite facts that have proved that we were right and that Ambassador Smith was wrong. Batista cannot govern with a free press, and if he establishes censorship he cannot maintain order either. Let us go toward a democratic Latin America. Yet in the face of the grave situation of disorder that prevails in Cuba, how can the State Department think that general elections can be called notwithstanding the shameful collaboration that a few politicians of the so-called opposition are lending to the infamous comedy of general elections? The people of our America, with the support of decent army officers who are not willing to use their arms against democracy but to place them at its service, are helping to lay the foundations of a new era of freedom in our sister republics. Let Washington rectify its policy. You cannot hurt people and expect them to trust you afterward. Let the Americas be democratic, and if strength is made use of, let it be against dictatorships, and never against democracy, for I do not admit in the inter-American relationships any other attitude than to isolate dictatorial government, because the time has come that governments understand, as long ago our peoples have understood, that the blow stricken to democracy in any of our brother countries is a mortal blow to the very heart of our America."

Building Communism's Military Machine With the Hands of Non-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Committee of One Million:

LEADING AMERICANS APPEAL TO JAPAN ON RED CHINA TRADE—BIPARTISAN COMMITTEE WARNS THAT JAPANESE TRADE WITH RED CHINA MEANS DE FACTO RECOGNITION

In a statement issued today, the Committee of One Million (against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations) appealed to the Japanese people and government to reconsider the recent trade agreement signed by private Japanese businessmen and Red China. The statement was issued by the organization's steering committee, including Senators Paul H. Douglas (Democrat, Illinois) and H. Alexander Smith (Republican, New Jersey); Representatives Walter H. Judd (Republican, Minnesota) and Francis E. Walter (Democrat, Pennsylvania); Charles Edison, former Secretary of the Navy and Governor of New Jersey; Joseph C. Grew, former United States Ambassador to Japan and Under Secretary of State.

The Committee of One Million, which includes in its membership 22 United States Senators and 88 Congressmen, cited the political connotations inherent in this presumably "private" Sino-Japanese trade agreement which calls for "* * * favorable customs treatment and complete freedom of travel for Red China's representatives; the use of secret telegraphic codes needed for Red China's business operations in Japan; the right to have an unlimited number of Chinese Communist employees; and, perhaps most important to the Chinese Reds, the right to hoist the flag of Red China in Japan which is the beginning of de facto recognition of the Peiping regime."

The committee's statement said: "Such special concessions to Communist China amount to publicly inviting open subversives into Japan to strengthen the pro-Communist movement there and to exert added pressure for official recognition of the Peiping regime by Japan as well as to provide a cover for the widespread Red spy apparatus. This is a direct threat to the internal security of Japan and, indirectly, to the security of all free-world interests."

The committee said that it sympathized with Japan's need to trade and pledged that they, as individual Americans, would do all in their power to assure reciprocal trade between Japan and the United States. They stated however, that: "It makes it especially difficult for Americans who favor fair and reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and Japan to promote such a policy when our friends choose also to build the potential aggressive power of our enemy."

The committee cited some of the potential war material which the Japanese businessmen have agreed to ship to Red China as part of their agreement: "* * * rolling stock and railway equipment, ships and vessels, various types of heavy and precision

machinery, ingot copper, aluminum materials, steel plate, steel tubes, and sheet iron. Just as the scrap metal some Americans shipped to Japan was returned in the form of bombs, so may this materiel be returned—to Japan and the United States—in the same manner."

The bipartisan American committee appealed to Japan and our other allies "not to build communism's military machine—with the hands of noncommunists. * * * The Committee of One Million, which represents the sentiments of tens of millions of the American people against any strengthening of our common enemy, calls on all free nations to stand fast against tyranny by refusing to arm the tyrant with the products of free labor. We call on our friends, especially Japan, to think long and hard before ratifying any agreement with a regime which could only serve to weaken our common defense against Communist imperialism."

The Committee of One Million's statement warned against repeating the mistakes of the past: "One of the basic causes of the greatest tragedy our world has ever experienced, World War II, was the greed of some people in all the nations of the world who put the dollar, the yen, the franc, and the pound above the security of their own countries and, indeed, the lives of their own children. There are some in the United States who must share this blame. It was this relative handful who, for the sake of being 'realistic' about trade, shipped tons of scrap metal to Japan which enabled its war party to seize control of the Japanese Government, against the interests of both the people of the United States and Japan, and spread the horrors of war throughout Asia. It is these men who put profit above country and above honor—in Japan, in the United States, and throughout the world—who must forever share the responsibility of the deaths of tens of millions in World War II."

Among other leading members of the Committee of One Million with headquarters at 17 Park Avenue, New York City, are Gen. George C. Marshall, Mr. Henry R. Luce, Adm. William F. Halsey, Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, and Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

BUILDING COMMUNISM'S MILITARY MACHINE WITH THE HANDS OF NON-COMMUNISTS—AN APPEAL TO SANITY

(Complete text of Committee of One Million statement on trade with Red China, April 2, 1958)

On June 9, 1957, the Committee of One Million published "An appeal to all free men" in the international edition of the New York Times, entitled "No Trade With the Enemy."

At that time the committee stated: "Throughout history trade with the enemy, whether he be actual or potential, has been considered the lowest form of treason in all cultures and all nations. Any trade with Communist China would, in effect, be strengthening an avowed enemy of the free world. There are those individuals who cry out that opposition to trade with Red China is unrealistic. According to their concept it would be realistic for the free world to build up the economy and war machine of Red China, recognize its enslavement of the Chinese people, and destroy the Charter of the U. N. by admitting a regime which has warred on that body.

"The Committee of One Million, representing the point of view of the overwhelming majority of the American people, does not believe this to be a realistic policy. To follow such a course would invite disaster for all free men, just as the policy of appeasement of tyranny during the 1930's precipitated the holocaust of World War II. We do not believe it is realistic to commit suicide.

"The free world is faced with an issue of transcendent importance, namely the attempt to build up Communist China's economy and prestige through expansion of trade, universal recognition and its admission to the U. N. Such action would be a tragic mistake. It would effectively block efforts for peace and dishonor the philosophy of democratic freedom which all free men cherish."

THE ILLUSION OF 600 MILLION CUSTOMERS

In the months that followed, the situation regarding trade between Communist China and many nations of the free world has deteriorated. On May 30, 1957, Great Britain virtually ended its embargo on trade with Red China except for actual arms and ammunition embargo, which was imposed when the Peiping regime was actively fighting U. N. forces in Korea (including soldiers from Great Britain)—a war which has yet to be ended by the signing of a peace treaty.

Some other nations were quick to follow suit. One by one they relaxed and even dropped their embargoes, attracted by the illusion of profit and by belief in the Communist promises of 600 million customers on mainland China. They did not take into account, however, that slaves make poor customers. They still do not seem to recognize the impossibility of a free economy trying to compete on an equal basis with a government-controlled economy based on slave labor.

TRADE WEAPON FOR RED POLITICAL ADVANCES

Nations that attempt to foster economic relations with Communist China should look back at the words of Lenin on the subject of trade, which are dogma to the Communist world: "We Communists shall be able to direct our national economy if we succeed in utilizing the hands of the bourgeoisie in building up this economy of ours and in the meantime learn from this bourgeoisie and guide the economy along the road that we want it to go, that is, to build communism with the hands of non-Communists * * * sell at the higher prices, buy at the lowest price; 'when living among wolves, howl like wolves.' As for exterminating all the wolves, as would be done in a rational human society, we shall live up to the wise Russian proverb: 'Don't boast when going to war, boast when returning from war.'

The Communist mentality, as epitomized by its leaders who still boast that "we will bury you," and only recently announced "We declare (economic) war on you," cannot separate economics and trade from political advances for the Communist world. The tyrant has always used trade as a weapon. One of the basic causes of the greatest tragedy our world has ever experienced, World War II, was the greed of some people in all the nations of the world who put the dollar, the yen, the franc, and the pound above the security of their own countries and, indeed, the lives of their own children.

There are some in the United States who must share this blame. It was this relative handful who, for the sake of being "realistic" about trade—"if we don't do it, someone else will"—shipped tons of scrap metal and tankers of oil to Japan which enabled its war party to seize control of the Japanese Government, against the interests of both the people of the United States and Japan, and spread he horrors of war throughout Asia. It is these men who put profit above country and above honor—in the United States, in Japan, and throughout the world—who must forever share the responsibility of the deaths of tens of millions in World War II.

JAPAN, LATEST FREE NATION TO ATTEMPT TRADE WITH THE ENEMY

Once again, the world watches history repeat itself, leading us all slowly to another period of carnage and disaster. The latest step in this repetition of history is being made by a people whom we Americans consider as good friends and as one of our strongest allies today in the Far East—the free nation of Japan. On March 5, 1958 a "private" trade agreement was concluded in Peiping by a delegation of Japanese businessmen and a so-called independent Chinese Communist delegation. One of the independent Communist negotiators was Lei Jen-min, a Vice Minister of the Peiping Ministry of Foreign Trade. These Japanese businessmen have agreed to send to Red China, among other commodities, such potential war materiel as: rolling stock and railway equipment, ships and vessels, various types of heavy and precision machinery, ingot copper, aluminum materials, steel plate, steel tubes and sheet iron. Just as the scrap metal some Americans shipped to Japan was returned in the form of bombs, so may this materiel be returned to Japan—and the United States in the same manner.

RED POLITICAL DEMANDS ON JAPAN

In this so-called independent trade agreement the Communists have already included stiff political demands, demands which not only affect Japan but also affect freedom's stake in the Pacific. The agreement provides, among other benefits for Communist Chinese Government officials in Japan, favorable customs treatment and complete freedom to travel; the use of secret telegraphic codes needed for business operations; the right to have an unlimited number of employees; and, perhaps most important to the Chinese Reds, the right to hoist the flag of Red China in Japan which is the beginning of de facto recognition of the Peiping regime. Such special concessions to Communist China amount to publicly inviting open subversives into Japan to strengthen the pro-Communist movement there and to exert added pressure for official recognition of the Peiping regime by Japan, as well as to provide a cover for the widespread Red spy apparatus. This is a direct threat to the internal security of Japan and, indirectly, to the security of all free world interests. The Nippon Times, one of the most respected and influential newspapers in Japan, foresaw this danger over 7 years ago. In an editorial dated September 13, 1951, the Nippon Times said: "* * * the impact of a powerful nation with a fanatical ideology cannot fail to be felt here. China's trade must become a means of spreading its doctrine." Japan has recently been admitted to membership in the United Nations, which is still officially at war with the regime that sends its commercial representatives to infiltrate Japanese economic and political life. Even though this is an agreement between private Japanese businessmen and the government of Communist China, the Japanese Government must give its official sanction because of the political questions involved.

Another major political accomplishment of this agreement, favorable to the Communists' plan of divide and conquer, is the serious split it has caused between two of our strongest allies in the Far East—Free China and Japan.

AMERICAN PEOPLE RESPECT THE NEED FOR JAPANESE TRADE OUTLETS

We respect and sympathize with our Japanese friends' need to trade and we, as individual Americans, will do all in our power to assure reciprocal trade between allies. On March 27, 1958, the President of the United States called for a liberal foreign trade policy of reciprocity between ourselves and all our allies by saying that "* * * we cannot find safety in economic isolation at a time when the world is shrinking. * * * America will move forward strongly along the clear road to greater strength at home, expanding trade with other free nations to assure greater security and opportunity in a

friendlier world for this and succeeding generations * * * we can best serve this great mission today by keeping our country firmly on its chosen course of fostering life-giving trade among the nations."

President Eisenhower speaks of free trade among free nations. That is the field which offers tremendous opportunities and possibilities for expansion of beneficial trade. To seek trade by building up the aggressive political and economic power of such an avowed enemy of freedom, as Communist China is an act bordering on insanity and potential national and international suicide. It makes it especially difficult for Americans who favor fair and reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and Japan to promote such a policy when our friends choose also to build the potential aggressive power of our enemy.

AN APPEAL TO OUR FRIENDS

Once again, the Committee of One Million, which represents the sentiments of tens of millions of American people against any strengthening of our common enemy, calls on all free nations to stand fast against tyranny by refusing to arm the tyrant with the products of free labor. We call on our friends, especially Japan, to think long and hard before ratifying any agreement with a regime which could only serve to weaken our common defense against Communist imperialism.

What Makes the Mare Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Gerald W. Johnson, which appeared in the New Republic magazine of March 31, 1958.

Mr. Johnson properly takes this Republican administration to task for its failure to learn from past mistakes. It is indeed sad when the main program President Eisenhower comes forth with is exhortation to Madison Avenue for better advertising and advice to the consumer to look for bargains during a recession in which prices have gone up rather than declined.

The article follows:

WHAT MAKES THE MARE GO?

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

The most hopeless political comment ever uttered is, "They have learned nothing and forgotten nothing," a French pessimist's note on the restored Bourbons.

But when Herbert Hoover repeats word for word a speech he made in 1931; when the incumbent President repeats the former President's assurance that "prosperity is just around the corner"; and when the incoming president of the United States Chamber of Commerce echoes George F. Baer, the French comment becomes a most apt description of the restored Republicans in Washington.

Baer's unforgettable remark, made in the midst of a great coal strike in 1902, was, "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for—not by labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country."

In 1958 William A. McDonnell, new head of the United States Chamber of Commerce, says that the recession will be overcome "primarily in the marketplace rather than on Capitol Hill." That is to say, we shall all be "protected and cared for" by "the Christian men" who have control of property. Mr. McDonnell has neither forgotten Baer, nor learned wherein Baer was a jackass; Mr. Hoover has not forgotten his speech of 1931, and neither he nor Mr. Eisenhower has learned wherein that speech was ridiculous.

By the executive branch at this moment the "trickle down" theory of prosperity is believed as firmly as it was believed by Coolidge, who led us into the panic of 1929, and by Benjamin Harrison, who led us into the panic of 1893, and by Grant, who led us into the panic of 1873. None questioned the wisdom and virtue of "the Christian men." And in each case "the Christian men" played hell with prosperity.

They have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Eisenhower has the gall to declare that the present trouble centers in the durable-goods industry, so if we rescue heavy industry, all will be well. "What is good for General Motors is good for the United States." Assure Mr. Plutocrat continuance of his dividends and Mr. Plutocrat will "protect and care for Draggle-Tail Bill, for is not Mr. Plutocrat a Christian man to whom God in His wisdom has given property?

No attention is paid the opposing theory, that all too often Mr. Plutocrat is not a Christian man but a subspecies (Homo sus) of the Suidae, whose ruling passion is determination to get all four feet into the swill-trough. Yet Draggle-Tail Bill tends to entertain that theory when 5 million of his kind are jobless.

Nobody in the administration seems capable of mastering the simple idea that what has pinched off prosperity is the agonizing cost of living that has taken more and more of us out of the market for durable goods. Nobody in Washington seems able to imagine that bringing prices down would send buying up. The price structure is too holy to be touched.

For to lay unhallowed hands on prices might precipitate what is the ultimate horhor in the eyes of those who have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. This apocalyptic doom has been described, with immense financial success, in a piece of fiction turned out by some little sister of the rich under the title of "Atlas Shrugged." Atlas is another name for Baer's Christian men to whom God has given everything, including care of the rest of us. Atlas, in the story, got tired of our ingratitude and shrugged, whereupon we all pitched headlong into ruin.

Baer, starting life as a printer, could certainly read, and as a college man he could presumably read a book; therefore he might have winced at the literary style of this novel, but he would have approved its philosophy. Hoover and Eisenhower ought to approve, and their surrounding tycoons do approve as is shown by the way the book has sold.

Yet all this approval does not establish any relation between the fiction and the fact. The country is obviously on the descent to Avernus, but a great many Americans doubt that it is because Atlas shrugged. They incline to the opinion that Atlas has once more stumbled over his own feet and fallen flat on his silly face.

For when it comes to making things, whether swords and spears or plowshares and pruning-hooks, Atlas is good, Atlas indeed is matchless. But when it comes to lawgiving, which is to say, dealing with the minds and spirits of men, Atlas is out of his class and makes a godawful mess of it, because the acquisitive instinct, a powerful and valuable stimulant in the realm of economics, is rang poison in the realm of the arts, including the art of government.

Some of us superficial observers guessed this as early as 1953, when the first Eisenhower Cabinet turned out to be composed of nine millionaires and a plumber; for we knew, pace the proverb, that money alone does not make the mare go.

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Giddings Public School at Giddings, Tex., located in the 10th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, sponsored an essay contest among its students, the topic of which was "Democracy in Action."

Because of the nature of the subject, I feel that the Members of Congress will be interested in reading the essays of Miss Betty Ruth Schroeder and Miss Delores Wagner, who tied for the first place award.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully request that the following essays be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Delores Wagner)

"We the people of the United States"—simple words we may hear every day, yet not really realize the meaning of. Behind those words of the preamble of the Constitution is the heroic story of fear, bravery, suffering, hardships, war, bloodshed, and death of our forefathers to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Making ours a free and independent country is an amazing and picturesque battle, but the joys and freedoms we enjoy is another story in itself.

Simply expressed in the first amendment are our basic freedoms—as religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition. Our wide participation makes our Government one "of the people, by the people, and for the people." America is a many people—coming from different lands, worshiping in different ways, yet who have worked together to make the United States a world leader. This country has experienced two world wars and knows it needs to keep at a pitch of high running a thoroughly efficient armed force for the continued existence of a democracy.

People of foreign lands look to our country as the golden door—to the Statue of Liberty, which lifts her lamp to light the path which will lead to world peace around the globe.

The founding of the United States has been a bold and exciting experience of human intelligence, freedom, and brotherhood. So far, this policy, with the help and guidance of God, has been a success. Its future as a democracy depends on the intelligence, good will, and sense of responsibility of coming generations.

You—you are a symbol of democracy. What will you do?

If you are a good American, you will gladly say, "I am a symbol of democracy. I will do my part to keep this country strong and free, and help make it a country of which the

world will be proud. I will do my best, with the help of God, because I am an American."

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Betty Ruth Schroeder)

Democracy is the American way of life: This means a great deal to every man, woman, and child. American democracy is not a question of what race is superior, or what religion is best, or what class of people ought to run the country and enjoy its advantages. We say it's the individual that counts. Every citizen has as much to say about his welfare and the way he wants to see the country run as anybody else in it. Everybody has a right to believe anything he pleases. You may speak your mind freely on any subject under the sun, but you cannot force your ideas on another. You are free to do as you please just so long as you do not please to do something that interferes with the rights of somebody else. Every individual has a right to go where he pleases, to work at what every trade he pleases and to own whatever property he can purchase. The three words equality, liberty, and freedom belong to every individual. They mean more to any one than they can fully realize.

The hope of liberty more than anything else in the world, has given meaning to life. Liberty, we know, is gained only by struggle and it can be kept only by everlasting vigilance. This reminds us of the sacrifices of the veterans of our Nation. They paid a tremendous price to make us a free nation. Millions have given their lives for this great cause of freedom. Many others suffered physical or mental impairment. Moreover, there are tens of thousands of widows and orphans who mourn the death of husbands and fathers who died in battle or in the line of duty. All of these paid a price that we might enjoy liberty and our way of life.

There isn't any government in the world that protects the home as the American Government does. A home under the American plan is the most important institution in the Nation. There are many who wonder why the home is so important. Here are only a few reasons: It's the place where many powerful influences are at work to shape the attitude of the child toward life and his fellows. It's here that he first learns tolerance, charity, and love. He must learn to carry his share of the burdens and responsibilities of the family, and in return he shares in its happiness and achievements. He learns self-reliance and he learns loyalty and cooperation.

This week the students of all public schools in Texas should be especially reminded of their wonderful privileges of having a chance to attend schools. Most of the youths are able to finish high school and many are able to go to college. We are also given a right to choose our own careers. Most of the young people don't realize how lucky they are until they take a look at the Communist countries, where most of the boys and girls can only go as far as the fourth grade, because of the high tuitions. Few are able to go to high school, and very few can go to college. They cannot choose their career. The rights and privileges of free men under a constitution have a special place in the education of boys and girls in America. Free public education is a most important principle in a democracy. It is in our schools that we learn to accept the responsibilities of democratic living.

Here in America the people have more hours of leisure than the people in dictator countries. Hours we can use in the pursuit of happiness. We have time to visit our friends, to listen to the radio, watch television, go to the movies. We read books we want to read and not those we are told to read. Millions of us go to baseball, basketball, and football games. This is a great deal of freedom and a good bit of security. It is also a great deal of fun.

The only way America can reach its goal is for each individual, in his own life to hold fast to the great truths on which America was founded—freedom and justice for all. Surely, our democracy is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This country got started right. It is going to stay right so long as the people who live in it remember the way it got started, what it has tried to do, and what it stands for.

Our democracy was founded on noble principles and, by and large, we the people have stuck to them. However, it is true that some dark pages have crept into our history. We do not pretend that our record is perfect.

Perhaps all of us should stop a moment to breathe a short prayer of thanks to our God for having been so gracious, and helping us make America the greatest place on earth in which to live.

No More Little Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of this House another splendid article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

The article follows:

NO MORE LITTLE WARS

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Once again I am greatly concerned lest the United States make a tragic mistake in its military policy. We are watching the most confusing debate in history on our national defense.

Yet this is clear: We will not achieve the military strength we need to survive until our defense planners grasp one central fact. It is that unless we take leave of our strategic senses America will never again have to fight a limited war. I make this prediction because the logic against small wars, though little understood, is overwhelming.

I know that this statement will be challenged repeatedly. Protests may be even stronger than those made against three previous forecasts I made in This Week. But all three predictions have proved accurate. Now let's turn to prediction No. 4: No More Little Wars.

It has been argued that the United States and the U. S. S. R. are locked in a nuclear stalemate. Now that we have proved our ability to launch satellites, this deadlock has been extended into outer space. It has been concluded, therefore, that nuclear war is too horrible to contemplate and that both sides will try to resolve the issue by fighting limited wars. The case for America fighting such wars has already been well stated in the press, in the Rockefeller report and before Congress. I disagree. It is my conviction that it would be fatal to base our overall strategy on this concept. To explain my reasoning, I must first define the terms "total war" and "limited war."

Total war is one fought primarily between the United States and the U. S. S. R. in which each side makes a supreme effort to destroy completely the other's capacity to fight and in which any and all nuclear weapons are utilized.

Limited war is one in which the forces of communism and the United States may be involved but it originates in territory other than Russia's, America's, or their allies'. Neither side has any intention of letting the conflict spread to its homeland and each side believes that its objective can be accomplished by a limited investment of manpower and weapons. As part of this concept, some people assume (falsely, I believe) that each side would confine itself to conventional preatomic weapons, as was the case in Korea, Indochina, and Suez.

I am convinced that:

1. We cannot win a limited war fought with traditional forces, regardless of whether conventional or nuclear weapons are used.

2. We can make limited war impossible if we make clear to the world that we possess a retaliatory force with the strategic scope and tactical flexibility to crush aggression and so preserve the global status quo.

3. We can generate a great economic abundance to share with the rest of the world by concentrating on a single deterrent force, and thereby we can prove that freedom is dynamic and beneficent.

The average American may ask why it is necessary for him to be concerned with military theories. My answer is this: As long as our strategists see the need to prepare for little wars they will urge expenditures for an endless variety of weapons and limited-war forces to wage all kinds of action, all over the world. Thus our money and industrial and scientific effort will be wasted on all sorts of hardware and secondary projects, from invasion barges to aircraft carriers. This, in turn, is bound to bring unbearable taxes, rationing, price controls, and other distasteful features of a regimented society.

If we continue to scatter our energies, we will be unable to maintain the twin essentials to our survival as a free Nation: (1) The overwhelming deterrent stength which alone can prevent all-out war, plus (2) a healthy, expanding civilian economy.

LITTLE WARS BRING BANKRUPTCY

The logic of geography and the recent development of fantastically efficient atomic weapons mean that continued participation in little wars would, in time, bring us close to bankruptcy. Let me elaborate:

A glance at the globe will show that America is thousands of miles away from most of the world's trouble spots while Russia and her satellites are within easy reach of most of them. Remember that in the Korean war it took nine American divisions transported by a colossal sea- and air-lift to hold the Chinese and North Koreans at bay. And troops from several other nations fought beside us under the U. N. flag. In any future little war, we would need not just 9 divisions, but 90 or more, plus vastly multiplied transport facilities, because we would meet superbly-equipped Soviet forces supported by aviation that is at least equal to ours.

For Russia is far stronger in conventional forces than we are. This massive totalitarian state is able to commit more of her national resources and vast manpower for limited warfare than the United States.

THE SOVIET MARGIN

The Soviet Union has an estimated 4½ million men under arms compared to our 2½ million, and her Navy has more than 450 modern submarines while we have less than 150. Her margin in tanks and jet air transport is just about as great.

Pentagon officials often point to this disparity as an argument for increasing our surface forces. I take just the opposite view: we are under no compulsion to have a large standing army just because Russia is doing so. The United States has no political satellites to police. We operate from a friendly base and have no fear of our neighboring states, Canada and Mexico.

Thus geography, population, and economics all argue against conventional little wars. There is also the strong probability that any future limited war would be fought with nuclear weapons. For atomic explosives are

now both versatile and deadly. Some can obliterate a wide area, while others cna be confined to a pinpoint target. Since nuclear weapons are standard equipment in both Russia's and America's military arsenals, there is strong likelihood that they would be used in any future struggle.

That is why the distinction made by limited-war adherents between nuclear forces and conventional forces is out of date. So, let's not kid ourselves by assuming that any future local outbreak would be waged only with World War II weapons.

Furthermore, if atomic bombs are employed, the small nations involved are bound to be wiped out. Once this tragic possibility is understood, any uncommitted country may well realize that becoming a pawn for Russia's aggressive designs means national suicide.

But, even if started, a little war can only remain confined with the tacit consent of Russia and the United States. This, of course, would produce a stalemate, as was the case in Korea. Only, unlike Korea, since both sides possess equally efficient military technology, the cost would be enormous to both sides in human life.

The very same technology which makes total war between equally matched protagonists suicidal makes a nuclear limited war idiotic.

The only other possibility is that such a deadlock would explode into all-out war—which brings us right back to my primary conclusion that this is the only kind of war for which the United States must prepare.

It is clear to me that Russia has already sensed this new power relationship. That is why she desisted from further inciting Turkey and Syria against each other. Since then, she has continued demobilizing her conventional forces although they are still far larger than those in the United States. She has diverted that manpower toward increasing her strength in total war and broadening her industrial capacity to forge the tools of economic war.

What should our solution be? There are several answers: To meet the immediate danger, we must drastically cut back our land and sea forces while increasing our main retaliatory strength—the Strategic Air Command. To achieve a unity of command and split-second reaction to attack, all present offensive forces on land and on sea which employ planes or missiles should be immediately put under the operational control of SAC.

If Russia should take leave of her senses, this is the only way that the United States can nip in the bud any aggression and retain its overall retaliatory power.

SHORT-RANGE MEASURE

But this can only be a short-range, stopgap measure. For the long run, much more fundamental changes in our national defense must be made. Plans to reorganize the three services are now being studied. But none of them go far enough.

The time is long-overdue for us to integrate our 3 services into 1 single military force, with 1 uniform, 1 promotion list and a single staff. The new establishment must be, for all practical purposes, a congenial Department of Air and Space in which we have a Bureau of Naval Forces, a Bureau of Ground Forces and bureaus of other auxiliary units.

The outcry that the creation of a single staff headed by a single chief smacks of totaliarianism is utterly unwarranted. Such an organization in a dictatorship is one thing; the same organization working under the President and the Secretary of Defense, and under the control of Congress, is quite another.

WE MUST PRESS FOR CHANGE

The changes I have outlined cannot come from the Pentagon. Even though some of our top military leaders individually see their logic and timeliness, they are too regimented to speak out on questions of overall policy without fear of censure. There is only one source from which the necessary changes can come and that is the American people bringing pressure on their representatives in Congress.

Of course, building up our air, space, and missile strength under an integrated single service is not all that we must do. For the Communists are equally adept at taking over uncommitted areas by covert aggression—through infiltration and subversion. To resist this process, we, in turn, must use all our skills and intelligence in propaganda, diplomacy, and in economic aid.

But it is primarily up to our allies to prevent the spread of Communist infiltration, as distinct from all-out war. NATO troops, perhaps under U. N. direction, can police trouble spots and stiffen the will of those nations threatened by Communists. Meanwhile we can concentrate on our deterrent strength. We can mobilize our entire military effort toward building up a vast arsenal of a great variety of nuclear weapons as well as planes and missiles to deliver them swiftly to any kind of target anywhere in the world.

WE CAN LEAD THE WORLD

Our strategists must give up the misguided attempt to prepare for both small and big wars by creating two separate and distinct types of forces. This plan would exhaust our manpower and eventually lead us down the road to bankruptcy.

But if we concentrate on the major job, then the $40 billion already proposed in the coming year for military expenditures is sufficient for us to lead the world in both the offensive and defensive weapons needed to keep communism in check.

I believe that we are still the greatest industrial nation on earth and with 650,000 scientists and engineers in our midst, we have a greater pool of creative brainpower than the Communists. But we need courage too.

Above all, we need the moral courage to abandon the traditions, no matter how noble, which stand in the way of progress and the security of our Nation. Then we can be invincibly strong for the forseeable future. We can further increase our already high standard of living and have plenty to share with the rest of the world. Short of war, the world-wide economic struggle is bound to end in the collapse of the inferior ideology.

And if, in desperation, the Russians resort to force, our superior strength and capacity in the only field that counts—nuclear offense and defense—will minimize the ravages of such a war.

I am confident that freedom will triumph over slavery. I have unbounded faith in the collective wisdom of the American people. Once they understand the futility of limited wars, they will select the right course: a strategy that will provide us with a realistic offense and defense that is in tune with the technology of our times.

I mean by this an overwhelming nuclear deterrent force that can check communism anywhere, in all its forms, by swift action through air and space directly from this continent. Also, an insuperable electronic nuclear defense that can decimate the enemy should he dare to attack us.

Anti-Inflation Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Frank J. Ryan, 25 Kemper Road, Shaker Heights, Ohio, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter that he recently wrote to the President.

The letter follows:

ANTI-INFLATION DRIVE,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Regardless of politicians, pundits, and pollsters, more people in the United States and foreign countries have more faith in you than in any other national and world leader.

This majority includes AID—the new Anti-Inflation Drive—which appreciates and applauds your courage and capacity in resisting the forces of inflation.

In 1958 the American people are seeing a panic in Washington not unlike the panic in Washington in 1861. Today the immediate cause is the recession; 97 years ago it was the retreat from Bull Run. Now, as then, the Nation witnesses political opportunism and political cowardice rampant.

Just as the moral wrong of slavery produced the rebellion, the moral wrong of inflation (which the Federal Government embraced as a policy in 1933) has produced the recession.

As President Cleveland told Congress in 1895, "All history warns us against rash experiments which threaten violent changes in our monetary standard and the degradation of our currency. The past is full of lessons teaching not only the economic consequences but the national immorality that follow in the train of such experiments."

At this juncture, sir, it appears that you stand in a position as critical as that in which President Lincoln stood in 1861. More inflation, more debauchment of United States currency, will weaken our economy, vitiate the free world, and strengthen communism.

When selfish interests in business, labor, politics and Government put inflationary pressures on you, with the evil objective of exploiting the recession to aggrandize themselves, please do remember that tens of millions of American citizens who voted for you in 1952 and in 1956, now stand with you, for you, and sure of you.

As Lincoln won, may you win.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK J. RYAN.

The Retirement of Lt. Gen. James Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 31, 1958, commenting on the retirement on Monday of this week of Lt. Gen. James Gavin, famous commander of the 82d Airborne Division during World War II, and more recently Army Chief of Research and Development:

A SOLDIER RETIRES

Down at Fort Bragg, N. C. today, the 82d Airborne Division will pass in review before its wartime chief. This will be the last review that "Slim Jim" Gavin, lieutenant general, United States Army, will take in uniform.

General Gavin, Army Chief of Research and Development for the past 2½ years, idea man extraordinary, youthful World War II combat commander and paratrooper and leader of men, is retiring from the Army he loves. The man the airborne troopers are honoring today has given great energy, devotion and moral courage to the Army of the Nation. A soldier most of his life, it will seem strange to the Army and the Nation to think of him out of uniform. But he is still young and he has much to contribute in his new environment. The good wishes of the Nation will go with him.

Gallant Story of U. S. S. "Mississippi" Told at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following Associated Press newsfeature, as published in a number of newspapers over the Nation:

GALLANT STORY OF U. S. S. "MISSISSIPPI" TOLD AT LAST

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Many heroic exploits of World War II were lost in the maneuverings of huge armies, in the security-secrecy of battle or in the mere haste of the time. Here, in a salute to a famous and gallant lady, is the dramatic account of one such episode, which had its beginning in the invasion of Okinawa by American troops on April 1, 1945.)

(By Roger Greene)

How an American battleship broke the backbone of Japanese defense in the bitter struggle for Okinawa was a story lost in the mists of World War II.

Now the tale emerges as an epitaph to a gallant lady of the fleet.

The battleship was the *Mississippi*, oldest of the great battle queens in Navy service as late as mid-1956. She was just past her 39th birthday when wrecking crews tore her apart for scrap.

Her adversary, in what may have been one of the war's strangest engagements, was not a Japanese battleship but an ancient fortress called Shuri Castle.

With its massive stone walls 20 feet thick and 40 feet high, the castle was described by wartime Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal as "the most strongly fortified position encountered in the Pacific war."

The *Mississippi* was the second United States warship of that name to visit Shuri Castle.

In 1853 Commodore Matthew C. Perry sailed his flagship, the original *Mississippi*, on his famed mission to open Japan's long-closed trade doors to the world. On the way, he stopped at Shuri Castle to pay his respects to the royalty of the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is one.

In World War II the Japanese made the castle the cornerstone of their defense of Okinawa which United States troops invaded on April 1, 1945.

Assaulting American marines and soldiers of the 77th United States Infantry Division were stymied by the suicidal Japanese defenders.

By May 1945 the tactical situation was this:

Combined Army-Marine forces had driven the Japanese into the southern end of Okinawa on a line running from Naha on the west coast through Shuri Castle to Yonabaru Airport on the eastern shore.

The gun-bristling castle, built 401 years before, lay about 3,000 yards east of Naha, the capital city.

It would have taken an enormous toll to storm or flank the castle. Field artillery and aerial assault merely nicked the mammoth walls.

On the night of May 24, 1945, while Japanese kamakaze planes struck again and again at American warships offshore, an officer from the 77th Division set out in a small boat for the *Mississippi*. He carried an urgent plan.

"It's a hell of an order," he told Capt. H. J. Redfield, Jr., skipper of the *Ole Miss*, "but it's the only way we can get at the Japs."

The order called for the *Mississippi to* breach the high wall in two places and destroy the rock-ribbed castle itself.

Other warships had found that even direct hits with armor-piercing shells bounced off the walls like flies off a hot stove.

Captain Redfield summoned his gunnery officer, Comdr. Richard Lane.

"Now look here, Guns," he said, "we've got plenty of bullets. Find the range and pour it on thick!"

All through the night, the *Mississippi* navigator, Comdr. Richard E. Bly, studied charts and maps to plot a passage through treacherous shoals for a closer firing position. At 5:30 a. m., with the sun rising in a blurred red ball through the overcast, Bly was ready.

The harsh silhouette of Shuri Castle, shrouded in gray gloom on a distant ridge, was invisible from the ship's bridge. But bombardment expert, Lt. Comdr. John O'Leary, mathematically pinpointed the target range.

Precisely at 7:18 a. m. the right gun of No. 1 turret spewed a sheet of crimson flame into the mist—and the *Mississippi's* calling card was en route to Shuri Castle.

Through his binoculars Redfield tried to catch the wink of fire that would mark the explosion. He could see nothing.

Then, over the radio from an Army fire-control party ashore, came an exultant yell: "It was right in there—no change, no change."

Hour after hour the bombardment continued in six-gun doses. By nightfall the Army spotter reported that 90 percent of the *Mississippi's* shots had scored solid hits—but Shuri Castle looked as impregnable as ever.

Visibility was still bad. Relentlessly, the *Mississippi's* big guns hammered away at the castle all the next day.

On the third day the weather broke fair and clear.

Skipper Redfield called his navigator to the bridge at dawn.

"We're going in there close today, Bly, where we can get at them."

Bly reminded the captain that a few days earlier the destroyer *Longshaw* had run aground on shoals in the same waters. Japanese shore batteries had ripped it to bits.

"Get us in closer, Bly," the captain said.

Now a retired rear admiral, Redfield doesn't remember how close the *Mississippi* got.

"I know we could see the beach. I'm afraid I was too busy to notice the distance," he said in an interview at his home in Charlottesville, Va.

A lean, trim figure in tweeds, Redfield is today an associate professor of engineering at the University of Virginia. He retired from the Navy in 1947 after 31 years of service.

"It's a long time ago to recall details of a battle," he said, "but I'll never forget the Japanese shore batteries.

"They put up a terrific barrage as we approached. We turned sharply, almost went aground, then backed away. With shells dropped all around us, we silenced the batteries one by one."

At the wheel, the chief quartermaster moved the 40,000-ton battlewagon gingerly toward the beach, as her 14-inch guns threw salvo after salvo at smoke-enwreathed Shuri Castle.

The answering attack was so hot that the *Mississippi* was forced to hurry her blitz so ground troops could get in and finish the job.

As the day waned, Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., commanding Army forces on Okinawa, went up to the frontlines and decided the attack was a success.

Said Buckner who was killed later by a Japanese artillery shell: "Now we can move."

Just before nightfall a pilot sent to inspect the castle radioed back: "What castle"?

American leathernecks began cautiously picking their way through the rubble.

Inside, dazed and trembling from the 3-day ordeal, fewer than 50 Japanese survivors waited to surrender. Enemy dead, in bunches of 50 to 500, were scattered all over the castle's underground chambers and tunnels.

Maj. Gen. Pedro A. de Valle, commanding the First United States Marines, said he had feared the final assault would cost battalion-size casualties. Not an American life was lost.

The *Ole Miss* went on to other, less dramatic tasks before Okinawa was reported secured by American forces on June 21.

She was cited for heroism in action—and the citation covered her entire war record. But to her 2,084 officers and men perhaps their proudest memory was the conquest of the fortress of Shuri—where it took a queen to beat a castle in a strange and deadly game of wartime chess.

Do Not Increase Federal Share of Matched Grants for Highways From 50–50 to 70–30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include a part of my current newsletter, as follows:

Last week the Senate made a change in the system of Federal grants-in-aid for highway construction which is disadvantageous to our area. Federal grants-in-aid for the regular road systems heretofore had to be evenly matched by the States. To receive a million dollars in Federal funds, a State had to match that with a million dollars of State funds.

The new Senate provision lowered the required State matching to 30 percent in some cases. This applied to a $400 million appropriation for primary, secondary, and urban roads.

Federal grants-in-aid for highway construction were originally intended to help the States build roads of national importance, and appropriations were for post offices and post roads. Federal highway aid is divided up among the States under a formula which takes into consideration the area, road mileage, and population of each State. This system of distribution tends to favor the more thinly populated States at the expense of the more thickly settled and more heavily taxed States.

This inequality is, of course, greatly increased when the matching grant basis is changed from 50 percent Federal and 50 per-

cent State to 70 percent Federal and 30 percent State.

When Federal aid was confined to post roads some inequality in distribution was tolerable. But the tendency has been constantly to extend the program both in the amounts of money appropriated and in the types of roads covered.

In a speech to the House on the day following Senate passage of the bill making the above change, I vigorously opposed it, saying:

"With unlimited transferability, this new $400 million can be applied by some States largely to secondary roads, of which farm-to-market roads are a part. While sectional interest should not be overemphasized, the taxpayers of the more thickly populated States should not be asked to contribute indirectly on a basis of 70 percent Federal grants for this type of aid for highways of predominantly local interest."

Stalin Ghost Haunts Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an informative article, well thought out, and effectively analyzed, written by George Minot, and appearing in the Boston Sunday Herald of March 30, 1958:

STALIN GHOST HAUNTS SOVIET

(By George Minot)

According to the records, Joseph Stalin died 5 years ago this month. Yet such is the state of affairs in the land of the big lie that nobody knows for sure even now if he died when the Russians said he did. Nor do we know whether he died of natural causes, or whether he was done in as so many of his betters were.

The record is clear that 5 years ago Nikita S. Khrushchev officiated at his funeral and then 3 years later branded him from hell and beyond as a murderer, a knave and a betrayer of his people. To carry this fantastic set of facts just 1 degree further, you must not forget that 3 of the men who delivered eulogies of Stalin were Beria, Molotov and Malenkov. None lasted long after that.

THEY NOW DWELL ON HIS MERITS

Today, the Russians don't know what to make of Stalin's ghost. The kept press, the vapid voices of the speechmakers that are controlled by the high tyrants—all waver between condemnation of him and his acts and vindication of him and his memory. A year ago Pravda that is the nearest thing to an official government organ marked the 4th anniversary of his death by proclaiming him an outstanding revolutionary, a devoted Marxist-Leninist theoretician and a great organizer.

Those, of course, are weasel words like most of those that come out of Moscow, but they show that even the bosses don't know how to handle his shade. Only a couple of weeks ago a new picture of Stalin was presented in the latest volume of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia. His biography was cut from 46 to 6 pages in the new one, but he was depicted as a man of greatness, despite faults of character and mistaken judgment. That's letting him down easier than the encyclopedia of any other country would.

Meanwhile, in Russia itself the people seem disposed to let Stalin's memory alone. You might think that after their big boss Khrushchev had accused him of about every piece of tyranny known to humans, the slaughter of thousands on end and brands of cruelty unknown to civilized man that the Russian people might have turned their backs on his memory and relegated his ghost to the ashcan.

Instead, Stalin's embalmed corpse still lies in state with Lenin's. There has been no rechristening of the Stalingrads, Stalinabads, or Stalinos, and it is fashionable now in that dark land to dwell on the monster's merits rather than his vices.

NOTHING BUT BROKEN PROMISES

Perhaps that is not strange in a land filled with so many contradictions. The people have been abused and lied to for so many years, that you cannot wonder they can take little interest in where or when or how Stalin died or the extent of his misdeeds. They have seen so many monsters running the dank and bloody country that one must seem the same as another.

You only have to remember back to the 1917 military coup of Lenin and Trotsky. They promised to make Russia the freest and happiest country on earth. They promised the peasants the farmlands. They promised the middle class it could own its own stores, that the undercover police, the informers, the bureaucrats, and the soldiers would stop their pillage. They promised free elections.

It has been the same ever since then. As one set of tyrants dies or is liquidated another takes its place. Only the mass deportations, forced labor concentration camps, and the eradication of whole villages go on year after year. Beria outlived Stalin less than a year and then was murdered as a spy and traitor. Molotov, after living for years in fear Stalin would have him murdered, now is in exile, or at least somewhere he doesn't want to be.

SAME OLD POLICIES IN EFFECT

Perhaps the most diabolical downgrading of all was that of Marshal Zhukov, disgraced and demoted last year. He was tossed overboard because somebody was jealous or afraid of him, and the workers who have seen so much bloodshed in the last 40 years had nothing to say as to whether their great war hero lived or died. There is no better sign that the Soviet people live in a nightmare of fear than the fate of some of their high personages—Malenkov, Zhukov, Molotov, Stalin, Beria, and the rest.

The only thing clear is that the successors of these men obviously intend to carry out the basic policies of earlier tyrants. Thus you hear the same boasts, the same threats, the same decisions to put weapons and bombs ahead of the needs of the people. The present regime is the same power-hungry set of madmen that have been there for years.

At any minute you may again witness the obscene spectacle of another high and mighty one set upon by his friends and exposed, betrayed and destroyed. The world will stand ashamed and aghast, but in Russia it only will be another chapter in the story that has been repeated hundreds of times since the people thought they were getting freedom.

POLICY AS DECEITFUL AS EVER

The story is the same in Russia's relations with her friends and enemies outside her borders. Thus, although Stalin has been dead for 5 years, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, the Czechs and East Germans still are under the heel of men who were brought up and trained in tyranny. Their course in these countries is just the same as it was when their master was alive. Land still is being seized without payment, the press curbed and students who dare to open their mouths dragged off and shot without trials.

Some persons who profess to know say that Khrushchev is trying to ease some of the rugged Stalinist policies at home. Others will tell you exactly the opposite. Hungary proved that mass murder still is a commonplace weapon of the Kremlin. The same thing would be the case should a group of workers in Stalingrad revolt against their masters.

If there has been an improvement in Russia in the last 5 years it has not come to light. Only the dreamers and fellow travelers expect you to believe that the Russian peasants working for less than 2 dollars of our money a day and sometimes walking 10 miles to work are throwing their caps into the air in excitement and pride over scientific achievements of their lords.

Outside, the world can see no change in Russia's policy on the last 5 years. It is just as rigid, gloating, boastful and deceitful as ever, and designed to keep everybody in a ferment and to set no price on peace.

Plight of Small Firms Getting Steadily Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently a column by Sylvia Porter carried the heading "Plight of Small Firms Getting Steadily Worse." The article by this fine economist is thought provoking.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF SMALL FIRMS GETTING STEADILY WORSE

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—"Within 18 years, all manufacturing and most of the distribution and service business of the Nation will be controlled by corporations having more than $100 million of assets."

So predicted the House Small Business Committee back in January 1957. It qualified its forecast with only one if—"if small business failures and big business expansions continue at the rate of the past 5 years."

With a shiver, I report that the committee's timing for the triumph of industrial giantism in our land is beginning to appear conservative.

For the rate of small business failures is not just continuing. The rate is intensifying by the week.

So far in 1958, businesses are failing at the appalling pace of more than 306 a week, close to 16,000 a year. Businesses are dying at a rate topping anything seen since the thirties and week after week, Dun & Bradstreet's figures emphasize that most failures involve small firms.

At the same time, the business birth rate is slowing down.

In January new business incorporations were 2.3 percent below January a year ago. In 1957 business births were below both 1956 and 1955. In manufacturing and construction particularly, the business birth rate is off sharply.

Meanwhile, the merger trend is as strong as ever.

Voluntarily or involuntarily, dozens of medium-big firms merge and consolidate every day. In addition, the number of companies which do not fail but which disappear nevertheless through merger with stronger firms or through just simple dissolution runs from 350,000 to 400,000 a year now, authoritative sources estimate.

The squeeze of rising costs of materials and manpower is a major force. While this cost squeeze may pinch a big corporation, it often strangles a smaller one.

The difficulty of getting loans and capital is an immense factor. While stiff credit requirements may annoy a large corporation, they frequently destroy a smaller one.

Taxes are a brutal killer. In prosperous periods the tax burden doesn't permit a smaller firm to accumulate a nestegg to carry it through rougher times.

And this new era of fierce competition is proving the final blow to painful numbers of little businesses.

There's nothing new about the plight of small business in our country. The only thing new is that the plight is getting steadily worse.

There still is no convincing evidence of a major effort to solve the problems of financing and taxation of small business. And until this effort is made, our industrial giants will dominate our land more and more. And our economic system will continue to die—fast.

Memo by Hon. Clyde Doyle, of California, on House Un-American Activities Subcommittee Public Hearings Recently Held at Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I insert for the information of all the Members of Congress and any other readers, the following texts growing out of the week's work in Boston, Mass., recently of a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee. We were there in public hearings from Monday to Friday, inclusive.

The letter hereinafter set forth is typical of several I have received and I know, in addition to those which have come to me, our committee office has likewise received quite a few:

CANTON, MASS.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Through the splendid public service of radio station WBZ, Boston, which rebroadcast your entire House Un-American Activities hearings here last week, I was able to follow the splendid work your committee is doing. I had some insight into the problem as a member of Army intelligence during World War II, and as a county officer of the American Legion, am proud to know we are highly unpopular with the Communists, also that the Legion is strongly supporting your efforts.

I wrote my fellow Legionnaire DICK WIGGLESWORTH today, asking him to support H. R. 9937 as you requested. Please express my appreciation too, of the dignified way the hearings were conducted, and the patient way your members handled those frustrating witnesses.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. ABELY.

The editorial by the Boston Traveler for Friday, March 21, 1958, herein set forth is typical of editorials made concerning our subcommittee's work:

STRENGTH AT THE CORE

Anybody who's inclined to underrate the strength of the Communist Party in America had better change his opinion.

Testimony given in Boston this week before the House Committee on Un-American Activities has included mighty good evidence that the Reds are far from finished.

Stronger than ever before, is the way the vicious movement is described by Armando Penha, who spent 8 years in the Commie ranks as an FBI counterspy.

This is what FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has been saying all along. And certainly nobody, including most of the Reds themselves, knows more about what's going on in the party huddles than he does.

The fact that the Communists have pared their ranks does not mean that they've grown weaker. On the contrary, by dropping inept members they have trimmed down to a hard core of dedicated workers. They can work more effectively now than when they were handicapped by weaklings.

Hoover's recent book, Masters of Deceit, points a warning of this situation. And men like Penha, who know what they're talking about, can back him up.

Meanwhile, though, it's gratifying to know that we have a hard core of Americans working undercover in the Commie ranks. The Reds know these agents are around, but they don't know who they are. So much the better for us, to have the Communists biting their fingernails, wondering which men to trust.

Let's keep them bothered and bewildered.

Also, the editorial in the Boston Pilot for March 22, 1958, is also typical and significant. By the way, the Pilot was established by the second bishop of Boston in 1829.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE LEFT

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is now holding hearings in Boston and something like 40 witnesses will be heard before the local appearance of the committee is ended. Along with the old familiar names that have been mentioned for years we have added now a new batch of characters who, in the considered view of the committee, have some connection, present or past, with the Communist operation in America.

Many sophisticated Americans are likely to take the work of the committee lightly; they cannot bring themselves to believe that the Communist conspiracy in the United States is a serious one. It is acknowledged (it pretty much has to be) that we did have a time when a rather impressive section of our intellectuals in America were flirting with Marxism and its implications; further, it must be admitted that some became persuaded Communists, many became sympathizers, and positions of importance in Government, science, education, and communications were infiltrated for espionage and other reasons. Even when all this is allowed, however, many have the feeling that that is all in the past now and the few hard-shell Communists remaining are not significant in the life and thought of our country.

This has a reasonable flavor about it and one of its appeals is that it takes a sort of comfortable, unworried view of our national security. Unfortunately it is not nearly as rational as it appears and if used as a basis for action it can be so unrealistic as to be dangerous. It is true, we may be sure, that there are many less people of Marxist sympathy in Government than formerly, and it is also true that there are many less Communists in the country than in earlier times. People have also learned for the most part not to confuse genuine liberals, even if working for unpopular causes, with Reds or their sympathizers. All of this is gain. It does not however remove the core menace of communism in America.

If the Communist apparatus is pruned at the present time the parent tree is not for that reason less vigorous; the precise opposite may be true. When the peripheral appurtenances are removed the strength may be better conserved in the hard core that remains. This is not to say that its present danger is greater than formerly, it probably is less; it does suggest that its potential danger is still immense and made the more so because people consider it insignificant.

This is the message of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and this explains why it works to expose locally those still involved in the Communist conspiracy and those giving it even clandestine support. Care should be taken always, of course, to protect the reputations of the innocent and to show consideration to those who, once involved, have truly abandoned past connections and sympathies. The committee in its local appearance has shown its concern in this regard and has conducted itself with dignity.

An advertisement intended to welcome the committee to Boston carried, among several others, a text from the executive secretary of the American Civil Liberties Union stating that "The House Committee on Un-American activities ought never to have come into existence, and ought to be abolished." This is almost the only thing that cannot be properly offered against the committee. People can complain, if they choose, about its policy, its practice, its personnel or whatever; they cannot complain about its existence. Congress requires and must have information and assistance in planning its laws on national security and it must provide this through a committee working in this vital area. When it does its congressional duty in justice and dignity it deserves and should receive the respect of all our citizens.

And, Mr. Speaker, since my return from the Boston subcommittee assignment I have been asked by several Members of the House as to what sort of a closing statement I made on behalf of the committee at the close of the hearings. Hence, on account of such expressed interest I am including herewith my remarks publicly made in the court room for the information of all who are especially interested in the work of our House Un-American Activities Committee in connection with our public hearings:

STATEMENT READ PUBLICLY BY ACTING SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CLYDE DOYLE, CALIFORNIA, AT CLOSE OF HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AT BOSTON, MASS., ON MARCH 21, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I have made just a few notes here which I will refer to in my brief statement on behalf of the committee.

First, I wish to call your attention to the fact which has not yet been emphasized in these hearings, that this subcommittee here in Boston these four days is a subcommittee of a committee of nine. This House Un-American Activities Committee is not a special committee. It is a standing committee of the House of Representatives. It has been a standing regularly qualified committee approved unanimously by the House of Representatives on many occasions ever

since 1946. I will not take time to read the charter. It is here. It was adopted in 1946 and under that charter we are here, duly qualified and following our legal requirements.

I wish further to say this: that because of the thoroughness of the staff investigations and cooperation with the FBI agents, this committee knew in advance that on account of lack of time here in Boston these hearings would be necessarily brief. We could not possibly cover the extent of the Communist operations in this New England area. But we believe we had knowledge, and now we have more knowledge from all reliable sources, of a considerable extensive Communist Party subversive activities in the New England area, amounting to several hundred identified members in the Communist Party in the New England area. If we had time, therefore, we could call up to around 300 identified Communists in this area, your neighbors. To do so would have taken weeks of hearings, instead of just a few days. Furthermore it would require assignment of our capable staff to this area, whereas they have obligations in other areas also.

But in the few days that we have been here, we believe we have had a fair sampling of several phases of Communist subversive operations, especially in this area.

What then has been accomplished, in our judgment, as a result of these hearings? These are some of the objectives of accomplishment.

In the first place, we have seen repetition here in the Boston, New England area, of a pattern of Communist activities and techniques which verifies and confirms the very same pattern of secret and habitually deceitful and subversive activities and tactics throughout our Nation.

We also have brought forth reliable evidence proving that there is in this highly sensitive and important industrial area a Communist Party activity which should be paid more attention by the public officials, both municipal and statewide, in cooperation with the Federal officials. I respectfully make that suggestion.

More specifically, there has been developed here new and convincing evidence regarding the existing loopholes in the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and other existing legislation, designed to identify and stem the flood of Communist propaganda that is daily reaching the source of our Nation from Soviet Russia, and from other people, specifically doing it in cooperation with the Soviet Communist control of the Soviet Republic in this cold war.

And we wish to emphasize that this Communist subversive activity right here in the New England area and throughout our Nation is part of the cold war. It is not chickenfeed; it is not just merely propaganda. It is part of the cold war. There are no bullets being fired, but it is war nevertheless.

There has also been revealed further reliable factual Communist underground strategy and tactics penetrating entirely legitimate and loyal organizations, church groups, labor groups, youth groups, schools, lodges, and public offices.

It has also been revealed further definite information respecting efforts of the Communist Party and conspiracy to penetrate certain vital industries by way of colonizing by Communists, many of whom hold high educational degrees in education, bachelors of science and engineers; and yet fulfilling their Communist Party dedication, they take menial jobs, at far less salaries in sensitive industry in order to carry out Communist Party directives, than they could earn at the profession for which they are especially equipped and trained.

We will take back to Washington for consideration by the Congress all the factual material here gained in connection with our study and consideration for the enactment of legislation.

There is, however, a collateral result, which is very valuable and continuing, as a result of these hearings, which I believe will have a salutary and important effect to this entire geographical area. This should be a daily reminder for you folks who have the pleasure, privilege and inspiration of living in this area of the continuous Communist Party subversive threat, both day and night, not merely as a philosophical concept, but as a menacing dynamic force of intrigue and subversion, operating as part of the Soviet cold war against the American way of life, which was, in fact, born right here within a mile of this building, if you will recall.

We wish to thank the two former FBI agents.

I wish to say just a word. As I have sat here these 4 days, now and then I have noticed when the FBI was mentioned a sort of a sneer, and I mean a sneer, on the face of, thank God, very few in the courtroom. But I have noticed it. You have noticed it. And, of course, the citizen that sneers at the FBI sneers at the constitutional government in the United States.

We wish to thank, therefore, these two American citizens who gave up commensurate income and went to work for the FBI at a mere pittance in order to serve their country. We thank them for their helpfulness to us.

Now, before concluding, I would like to express the appreciation of our committee to our staff, our professional staff. It is no picnic that they have to come into an area and work day and night to try to get factual, reliable information. It is a hard, unpleasant task, and the committee appreciates the thoroughness with which our staff in this area have done their job. They always do it that way.

Then, too, we wish to thank the Federal judges, Francis Ford, the distinguished Federal judge who occupies this courtroom and courteously turned it over to us. We thank United States Marshal Ralph Gray, and all his most capable and thoughtful and helpful deputies. We thank, of course, Capt. Daniel Murphy, the department of public safety, of this great Commonwealth and his very able staff, for helping with our staff and with these hearings.

And then, too, I want to thank the listeners in the courtroom again who have been most courteous these 4 days, and we appreciate it very much.

Finally, I must not overlook, on behalf of the committee, the caretakers of this building, the janitors, the elevator operators, and all these men and women who have gone out of their way to, even after hours and other times, to make it convenient for us and our staff. We notice those things as American Congressmen. We notice those little things. They are very important.

And finally, I would like to express our unanimous and very cordial and sincere thanks to all members of the press, of the radio, and television profession and fraternity. We noticed the thoroughness and the accuracy and the very constructive way in which you have reported and shown these hearings. As a matter of fact, we might put you all on our staff as a part of our educational department. We thank you very much for your consideration to us.

We want to thank, too, the large number of people who have written to us or who have sent us orally their expressions of appreciation for what the United States Congress is trying to do in this difficult field.

Have you anything else, Mr. ARENS?

Mr. ARENS. No; thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. On behalf of the Congress, then, I thank you, and the United States Congress wishes you all well.

(Whereupon, at 11:58 a. m., Friday, March 21, 1958, the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

Summit Agenda Points—Russian Imperialism and the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, the position taken by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles with regard to another summit meeting is strongly supported by many national organizations in this country. One such organization is the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which is led by its national chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor at Georgetown University. It has been my pleasure to observe the constructive work of the UCCA branches in New Haven and the State of Connecticut.

In the view of this active organization, a summit meeting without a discussion of Russian Communist imperialist conquests and the eventual liberation of the captive nations would be tragic for the long-run interests of this Nation. The reasons and arguments sustaining this view have been expressed in a background to the present issue. This background of memorandums, which deserve a place in the public record, reveals a clear consistency of thought and a firm espousal of principles that no sober consideration of a summit agenda can possibly overlook.

The memorandums submitted by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to President Eisenhower on the occasions of the third Anglo-American Conference and the NATO Conference clearly show why this organization supports the present administration stand on the summit issue. In one of them Dr. Dobriansky partly rests its case on the authority of both the President and Secretary Dulles, whose declarations are more applicable now than ever before. As the President stated it:

> There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations, repressions of human beings on a gigantic scale. The domination of captive countries cannot longer be justified.

Secretary Dulles has declared:

> Let us also make apparent to the Soviet rulers our real purpose. We condemn and oppose their imperialism. We seek the liberation of the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these memorandums to the careful attention of our Members during this period of argument concerning another summit meeting. Under leave, I request that they be printed in the RECORD:

OCTOBER 22, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your meeting with Prime Minister Harold Macmillan will represent the third Anglo-American conference held within the span of 3½ years. On the two previous occasions, in 1954 and 1956, this committee of active American citizens felt it morally necessary to express its views on some of the foremost issues confronting our Nation.

In our letter-memoranda then (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, 1954, and February 16, 1956) we explained in detail the reasons justifying our certitude that the most basic weakness and vulnerability of Russian Communist imperialism exist in the captivity of non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. On the basis of this certitude, we specified what could be done to deter permanently the aggressive moves to Moscow. For, truly, a forced entity with unsteady foundations of loyalty could hardly risk the demands of global warfare. Then, as now, our views were tempered by the spirit of your own sound reflection that "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations, repressions of human beings on a gigantic scale. * * * The domination of captive countries cannot longer be justified" (August 1955).

On the occasion of this third conference and with the same certitude, we wish to advance certain concise points of consideration which we strongly feel are deserving of the studied endeavors of this vital conference. These points rest on the basic lines of analysis developed in the two preceding memoranda. In our considered judgment, although there have been significant military and technological changes in the past 3 years as concerns the two major power blocs, the fundamental issues and the political patterns have remained substantially the same. Various means have changed in quality and quantity, but the ends and objectives are very mush the same. Thus, we set forth the following points in tune with Secretary of State Dulles' fairly recent proposals: "Let us also make apparent to the Soviet rulers our real purpose. We condemn and oppose their imperialism. We seek the liberation of the captive nations" (April 22, 1957).

1. In the light of U. S. S. R.'s scientific, technologic, and military advances, we support the establishment of a free Western scientific pool of knowledge and ability not only to maintain superiority in fields of the highest priority but also to deprive Moscow of heavily propaganda advantages accruing from such advances;

2. Because of our fortunate present recognition that scientific, technologic, and military advances have considerable political and psychological impact upon all nations, we urge also a closer coordination between our psychological and political efforts and those of our Western allies, affixed to a single moral and political standard as provided by a universalized Declaration of Independence which our own Secretary of State advocated as early as 1952. We disagree most strenuously with some who hold that a persistent reaffirmation of principles—notably that of national self-determination, which, as a single standard, is applicable to all nations in Asia and Africa and, particularly, to the captive non-Russian nations both within and outside the Soviet Union—is mere moralizing and should be avoided at this conference;

3. In the rational belief that despite any scientific or technological advancement peoples are, and always will be, the most important factor of consideration for victory in either the cold war or a hot one, this committee advocates that such political and psychological coordination be aimed programmatically, and, in the true spirit of peaceful liberation, at an unceasing creation of pressures and challenges for freedom. With the prime case of Nazi Germany in mind, we cannot depend on the aimless forces of evolution by technical skill and growth. Nowhere can such pressures be more effectively exerted than among the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. Overt support of their aspirations for national independence would counteract the policy initiated by Moscow in 1954 to gain their loyalties and energies in a deceptively designed partnership for world imperialist enterprise. Such support, expressed in manifold ways, would clearly weaken the very foundations of the Soviet Union and make it incapable of encroaching upon the free world;

4. To undermine our support of the captive nations, Communist delegates in the U. N. are presently preparing to push through the U. N. the Draft Code of Offences Against the Peace and Security of Mankind. This code is designed to establish immunity for communism as regards political crimes and to neutralize our propaganda of truth against communism. We earnestly call upon both the United States and Great Britain to take immediate steps to thwart this move in the U. N.;

5. It is also our strong conviction that we have neglected to capitalize imaginatively on the Ukrainian and Byelorussian representation in the U. N. In the last decade, Great Britain saw a glimmer of possibility in this respect. Circumstances surrounding this matter have changed since then and warrant serious study of present possibilities; and

6. With an eye to the widespread cultivation of deep spiritual and psychological alliance of the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. with the West, we urge also on the part of western governments the formation of a cultural exchange program directed especially at the peoples of these nations and to be effected formally through their present governments.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that an unbalanced absorption with scientific and technological developments can cause us to overlook the prime factor in the potential for victory, namely peoples and nations. As shown by his insistence on coexistence during the Reston interview, Mr. Khruschchev would have us overlook the captive nations so that the Communist empire may enjoy a period of firm reconsolidation before further major moves of expansion can be made.

With full confidence in your leadership and trusting in a most productive outcome of this important conference, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

DECEMBER 12, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
United States Delegation to NATO Conference, the Embassy of the United States of America, Paris, France.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This national committee and its branches and membership throughout the country are greatly heartened by your rapid recovery and by the consequent fact that you are assuming the leadership of our delegation at the NATO Conference. Your inspiring presence at this Conference is undoubtedly a source of tremendous encouragement to all the peoples of Europe.

We are deeply confident that the best interests of the United States and of its many allies in this formal alliance will be served in the economic, military, scientific, and technologic spheres. Like most other Americans, we look forward to a general strengthening of NATO as a defense mechanism against the threats of Russian Communist imperialism. However, in our reasoned judgment, this alone will not be the adequate answer to the sputnik and its psychopolitical implications, nor will it insure the interests of world freedom and the future of our Nation.

Only with breadth of perspective, viewing the essential things in their rationally ordered places, and with depth of moral courage and will, accomplishing those deeds which our reason determines must be done, can we meet the Russian Communist challenge. Only by these agencies can we extricate ourselves from the mire of piecemeal adjustments, recurring frustrations, and unimaginative measures of passive reaction. We are strongly convinced that by these fundamental means of outlook the successive Moscow-created or Soviet-fanned tensions in the free world can be successfully converted into endless tensions within Moscow's farflung empire. For us and countless other Americans it is evident that we can never gain in this protracted struggle against Russian Communist imperialism by having to fight politically and psychologically on this side of the Iron Curtain.

It is in this spirit of thought that we submit views which should receive the fullest consideration of our delegation to this conference for the purpose of maintaining and fulfilling United States leadership in the world. Reflective of a body of thought which duly respects the interrelated nature of our foremost problems, these general views are as follows:

1. A maximum reinforcement of the containment base of America's policy of liberation. Our allies, including Western Germany, should be appropriately equipped with the latest weapons in order to enhance the defensive posture of the free world. In consideration of political and subversive factors, the dangerous notion of a mutual withdrawal from central Europe would be overtly repudiated by this action. The intellectual instability of those who entertain this naive notion is no better demonstrated than by one who allegedly authored the containment doctrine. This action would likewise provide a fitting reply to the propaganda-staged Bulganin notes which are typically designed to sow seeds of confusion, disunity, and delay.

2. A concatenation of NATO with the Baghdad powers, SETO, and free world allies in the Far East. A powerful defensive ring around the Russian Communist empire should be pressed for and speedily realized. Because of unprecedented Russian Communist penetrations in the Middle East, the United States should formally join the Middle East Treaty Organization. There is no reason whatsoever for us to be concerned about Moscow's expected encirclement propaganda. Such propaganda has no meaning for the captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the Communist empire. On the contrary, this encirclement of strength is a basis for sustained faith among these captives in that the future will not and cannot belong to the messianic Russians.

3. A proposal for combined endeavors through the United Nations on capital development projects and technical assistance for the underdeveloped countries in Asia and Africa. Our delegation should resist all attempts to create a NATO financial pool for this purpose. Instead, for maximum benefit, we should advocate U. N. undertakings in this respect. One of the greatest assets of American world leadership is its opposition to colonialism. It bears no stigma of past colonialism. Its standard of national self-determination and independence is revered everywhere, especially today among the captive nations in and outside the Soviet Union. At all costs we must maintain our single moral standard which is applicable both to certain areas in the free world and, vastly more important today, to all non-Russian areas in the Russian Communist empire.

4. A systematic buildup of the most basic deterrent against Russian Communist expansionism, namely the resistance of all captive non-Russian nations and peoples to Moscow. This calls for a full reaffirmation of our standard of national self-determination. It meant an intent to implement our policy of liberation. Nothing is further from the truth than the unthinking assertion that the free world is doing all that possibly could be done in this regard. Ways of doing more to prevent the outbreak of a

nuclear war have been shown time and time again. When the free world had a clearcut physical superiority over the enemy, the latter nevertheless made his advances and gains in many quarters of the world. A close arms race now will not alter this trend. The time is more urgent now than ever before to undertake a winning campaign in psycho-political warfare on the terrain of the enemy, which means not only in the so-called satellite area but, in fact more importantly, also in the broad non-Russian periphery of the U. S. S. R. The paramount problem of these nations is the same now confronting the nations of the free world, i. e., national independence, its recovery and its preservation. To depend on the notion of evolution within the Communist empire is a product of wishful thinking, not one of clear and perspectived thinking.

We earnestly hope that these views will gain expression through the various avenues open to our delegation in this conference. The broad outlines they suggest are directions of thought which we feel are prerequisite to actions necessitated by the symbolic significance of sputnik.

With every good wish for a successful conference inspired by your leadership, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

A Combat Veteran Sounds Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, a man who fought as an infantry officer in 3 wars, won 12 decorations, trained his regiment, and actively led it in combat from Omaha Beach to the Elbe River ought to know something about the military and does.

I knew Col. E. B. Crabill when we were both in the 83d Infantry Division then training at Camp Atterbury, Ind. Our colleague, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan, also served with the 83d Division and, in fact, stayed with that fine organization much longer than I did.

In the role of a staff officer with the First Army, I visited the 83d Infantry Division during combat in the Normandy invasion often enough to know of the outstanding job he did with his 329th Infantry and of his almost legendary reputation as a commander.

This month Colonel Crabill, now retired after combat duty in the Korean emergency has made one of his greatest contributions. In the April issue of Harper's magazine he is guest editor of the Easy Chair. Incisively, fearlessly, and bluntly he writes the truth about military leadership, military equipment, military personnel, and wars of the future.

From time to time I have taken the floor in discussion of military matters; universal military training, unification, Hoover Commission recommendations for a service of supply, and the current brass heavy pay-raise legislation. Colonel Crabill says many of the things I wanted to say with telling effect.

This was not an easy article for me to read. As a onetime staff officer on the Army level, his frank comments made me squirm. As a Legionnaire and VFW member representing the home district of the American Legion, his article makes me noticeably uncomfortable although I cannot agree with all his recommendations in this area. As a Congressman, his witty barbs strike home on a tender target.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert Colonel Crabill's article in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

THE EASY CHAIR—A COMBAT VETERAN SOUNDS OFF

(By Col. E. B. Crabill)

(This cantankerous guest editor is better equipped to discuss military matters than most of the experts now issuing daily statements in Washington. He served as an Infantry officer in 3 wars, won 12 decorations, and led the 329 Infantry Regiment in combat from Omaha Beach to the Elbe River. In its many battles, including St. Malo, Hurtgen Forest, and the Bulge, it captured more than 40,000 Germans and lost about 5,000 in killed and wounded. He recently retired after serving as Chief of Research and Development of Infantry Weapons and Equipment in the Army Field Forces.)

Since the Korean war the citizens of the United States have been handed an annual tax bill of about $70 billion. Instead of diminishing, this bill shows every sign of increasing to $80 billion, $90 billion, or $100 billion, unless something more radical is done than the manicuring job normally performed by Congress.

The primary excuse for this astronomical bite is that sacrosanct monstrosity labeled "National Defense—Do not touch." It takes the major part of the taxes now and shows every indication of growing bigger. Why should it be a sacred cow? Have the people so much confidence in the Defense Department that they think it can do no wrong? Isn't there a possibility of a little empire-building mixed up with the real requirements? Isn't is possible that billions are being wasted because of incorrect conceptions of future wars?

Is it true that the only war of the future will be an atomic war, with its attendant suicidal destruction? Isn't it also true that the United States, in spite of these enormous expenditures, may find itself without the means to fight more probable wars? Isn't it possible that by spending on personnel a fraction of the money going into expensive and useless equipment, a better defense force could be built? Have the people in the United States become so intrigued with the glamor of airplanes, guided missiles, and atomic bombs that they have forgotten that ground can be taken and occupied only by men on foot?

What the defense setup needs is a good tough inspection. Let's take a hard look at some of the prevailing sophisms that are responsible for this astronomical spending. Any of them could be the subject of a complete article. For the sake of brevity each will only be touched on here.

THE ARGUMENTS

1. The military leaders in our country are best able to determine our needs for national defense. They might be if they were able to rise above their prejudices, but they are not.

It might be possible to approach a solution by asking an admiral what the Army needs, an Army general what the Air Force needs, and an Air Force general what the Navy needs, but to ask each what his own service needs is like opening the doors of the Treasury and handing him a shovel.

There is an old building in Washington that used to be called the State, War, and Navy Building. Whenever one of our admirals or generals passes it he must shudder because not so long ago it used to house them all and the State Department besides. The empires that have been built in the Pentagon have become so complex that there is a saying in the services that it is impossible for anyone to go there and get a "Yes" or "No" answer to anything.

There is a related evil that goes along with this—the staff buildup, the Indians that do the chief's work for him. The more Indians, the bigger the chief. All Indians have found out that the way to get to be chief is to be on the staff of a chief, ready to step into his job. It is also much pleasanter than to be out in the rain and mud, dodging shells. The result is that the smart boys do bird-dogging for the chiefs and the dumb ones lead the troops in combat. This has two evils—it tends to build up the staffs and it is a little hard on the troops.

2. The money appropriated for military equipment is necessary for the defense of the country. It is about as necessary as it is to furnish each voter in the country with an air-conditioned Cadillac.

The characteristics demanded by the services in their airplanes, ships, weapons, and vehicles are now so expensive that the cost of them is from 2 to 10 times as great as that—with a small loss in comfort, efficiency, or accuracy—of a serviceable substitute. In World War II, a satisfactory liaison airplane cost about $1,500. Ask what the present job costs and hold onto your pocketbook. The Russians have a heavy trench mortar that looks as though it had been machined with a sledge hammer, but it throws a lethal shell a long distance.

The accuracy of our weapons is so far superior to the accuracy of the persons manning them as to be ridiculous. So far I have never seen a time in combat when such accuracy was either necessary or humanly obtainable, though I have seen more combat than most officers. The advent of "human engineering," in recent years, has aggravated this problem. In the old, tough days the personal comfort of service personnel was not a consideration. Nowadays it is one of the most important considerations, which has the dual disadvantage of being extremely expensive and making softies out of the military.

3. It takes 9 men in the rear to keep 1 man at the front. This is a great understatement. It started as least as far back as the British pacification of India, where animal transportation was all that was available and communication was by runner. Nowadays with motor and air transportation, and radio and telephone communication, the proportion of rear-area personnel, instead of decreasing, has increased. In World War II, we who were in combat estimated that all the actual fighting was done by from 2 to 5 percent of the personnel in the battle zone. Within the range of enemy artillery fire there was little visible movement and very few troops to be seen. If you started to the rear however, every mile the clutter of vehicles, the masses of administrative, supply, engineer, ordnance, military police, transportation, signal, medical, and other staff units increased progressively. What they all did we of the infantry could not imagine. The artillery and tanks supported us and we needed daily rations, water, and gasoline, but that required only a small number. The others, as near as we could see, must have been taking in each other's washing.

In Korea I had the task of inspecting some of these rear-area troops. I found not a single unit that was as much as 50 percent efficient—that is, not a single administrative unit turned out as many as half of its assigned personnel for its primary duty. Where were the others? On guard, on kitch-

en police, sick, a. w. o. l., on rest and rehabilitation, running typewriters, answering telephones, or doing bunk fatigue. Most were on duty shifts of 8 hours. The soldiers at the front? Twenty-four hours a day, 7 days a week.

Can anything be done about this? Yes, but it probably will not be done. Why? The big headquarters are always in the rear areas. They want lots of communications so they can keep up their battle maps. That requires signal troops. They want comfortable housing. That requires engineers. They want good food. That requires mess personnel. They want aspirin. That requires medical officers. Then want lots of staff officers so they can get the answer to any problem that arises without having to dig it out themselves. All these people, in turn, have to be furnished rations, shelter, telephones, medical attention, and so on. If there are enough of them around they will be so busy taking care of each other they will have little time left for the troops in the combat areas.

The Red Cross, Special Services, and USO, particularly the feminine personnel, are needed to keep rear-area personnel entertained. Obviously, these entertainment people couldn't go up into the fighting areas, so they are never seen by the combat troops except the rare times the infantryman gets a pass. In World War II, Paris was so completely occupied by rear-area troops that combat troops in reserve couldn't go there because there was no room for them. A more recent example of this is the report by Time magazine of how a naval caretaking detachment in Naples, originally consisting of 45 men, has been parlayed into a Shangri-La of 2,103 military, 534 civilians, and 3,166 wives and children; to take care of NATO South, an organization of 692 officers and men.

4. The officers in our services are brave, intelligent, zealous, and unselfish and the enlisted men, when they put on the uniform, are metamorphosed into crusaders rarin' to fight and die for the good old United Nations and the four freedoms. I would call this about 20 percent correct. We owe our success in wars to a very small group of heroes. The rest just go along for the ride. Nor is this small group made up more of generals than privates or vice versa. It is about the same in all ranks.

George Washington's statement that the patriotism of citizens of the United States was dependent upon what would best serve their selfish interests is as true today as it was then. In order to get one officer who is a real leader it is necessary to hire about three. If Congress ever thought it a good idea to pay service personnel a living wage, as compared to equivalent jobs in civil life, the services could probably get along with half their present boss personnel. Since Congress doesn't see fit to do this, the services manufacture a number of jobs and hope that by hiring three $5,000-a-year men they will get one $10,000 man. This is not only expensive but takes up a lot of time in trial and error, not to mention the casualties caused by poor leadership.

The same economics apply to enlisted men. Two enlisted men in uniform will look alike, but one will fight and the other hide. One is worth 10 times the amount he is paid and the other is a liability. If we paid enlisted men a living wage, instead of babying juvenile delinquents who couldn't get a job elsewhere, the services could eliminate half their personnel who are now in baby-sitting jobs such as military police, excess administrative duty, excess instruction, special service, recruiting, and the like. Military service is just like any other business and it could be run a great deal more effectively on business principles, rather than by the politico-paternalistic methods now in vogue.

5. All soldiers, sailors, and airmen contribute equally to their country's defense and should be equally entitled to veterans' benefits. Baloney.

If you believe this, go out some night when it is raining—it always rains in combat—dig yourself a foxhole with about 4 inches of water in the bottom and spend a couple of weeks there, living on canned rations. Even without the mortar and artillery fire, the ever-present danger of having your arm or leg blown off, or of being killed, about 2 weeks should make a Christian of you. Add the hazards of combat, and if you still think all veterans should be treated alike you should run for Congress.

Battles are won by a very few unusually brave men who are able to do the right thing at a critical time. Battlefronts are now usually too wide for the wily strategy of a Stonewall Jackson or the personal leadership of a Napoleon. More often they are decided by the boldness of some lieutenant or sergeant who makes a breakthrough which is then exploited by higher leaders.

The great mass of so-called veterans in the United States never, in the words of an old Indian fighter, "heard the whine of an hostile's bullet." They probably gave up some personal advantage in return for conversational resources that will last them all their lives. The veterans' organizations are too well entrenched politically to do much about this, but as far as justice to the ex-serviceman is concerned, Congress is shoveling out money indiscriminately so that a few deserving men will get a little of it. Being often handicapped, the deserving will probably be trampled in the rush.

6. Wars of the future will be all-out wars like World Wars I and II. This is highly improbable. The United States military machine is now geared for only one purpose—to fight Russia. This plays directly into the hands of the Russians, who obviously have no intention of getting into an all-out war with the United States. They can gain their desired ends much more easily and effectively by piecemeal tactics. Every time there is a disturbance or outburst of violence anywhere in the world, look for the Communists. If they don't instigate it themselves they will be there shortly after the trouble starts.

"Why," they say, "take a lot of punishment conquering the world the hard way when you can take it a country at a time the easy way, using non-Russian troops?" If they can suck untrained United States troops into a few more Koreas—fine. Every one of them will hurt the United States. If we sand United States troops into the Middle East, after getting Britain and France out, the Russians can hang the invader label on us. They also know they have nothing to fear from the United States where it counts—on the ground. As long as they can keep away from airplanes, atomic bombs, and sea battles, they can have it easy. They have five divisions to our one, and ours are too badly scattered to be assembled for combat anywhere. When the awe-inspiring Sixth Fleet moved into the eastern Mediterranean in the Suez crisis it had just 1,800 ground-fighting troops—one battalion of Marines.

7. Wars of the future will be decided by atomic bombs, airplanes, and guided missiles. Don't you believe it. Any time she chooses to do so, Russia can march across Europe in about 3 months. There is nothing in Europe to stop her. There is nothing that the United States has that could stop her. It is hardly thinkable that if the Russians occupied Bonn we would kill hundreds of thousands of Germans just to stop their vanguard. Nor would it be feasible to destroy Vienna to prevent the Russians from occupying it. It would not be possible to saturate Europe with atomic bombs. The Russians would seek out the unbombed places as the tides of the sea go around the headlands. They might possibly be stopped at the source, by bombing Russian cities and bases. Are we prepared to sacrifice the east coast of the United States for this? That is, are we prepared to commit suicide for a principle? Any Air Force officer knows that no defense will stop all the bombers. It would take only one to destroy a city.

8. Atomic weapons are so devastating that they will eliminate war as a means of settling international disagreements. Don't believe that one either. History is replete with weapons so devastating that war would be impossible. Recent examples are poison gas in World War I, tanks in World War I, saturation bombing, V–1 and V–2 guided missiles in World War II. They had their effects in past wars and may be used again in future wars, but no weapon will ever stop all wars.

In April 1945, when I stood on a hill overlooking the devastation wreaked by American and English bombers on the Ruhr complex, the whole area appeared to me to be completely destroyed. An examining group, after hostilities ended, reported that in spite of this bombing the manufacture of weapons was operating at nearly 80 percent of efficiency when the Ruhr was overrun by United States ground troops.

9. Wars are won by the nations having the best machines. This follows the old saying that God is on the side of the heaviest artillery, and it is not to be depended on. History has too many instances in which a rabble poorly armed and trained but possessing high morale has defeated well-trained and well-equipped armies.

The last and most painful example of this was Korea, though in this instance the troops were not well trained. In Korea, the United Nations forces had complete control of the sea, complete control of the air, and overwhelming superiority in tanks and artillery, but they were unable to defeat a howling mob of uneducated peasants armed with weapons mostly of World War I vintage. In this instance the explanation given was that we were not allowed to bomb beyond the Yalu River. Since our bombers regularly destroyed the bridges south of the Yalu, only to have them back in operation the next day, this appears—to one who was there—to be only an alibi. The Korean war was an infantry war and we failed to win because we did not have enough infantry and the infantry we had was not good enough.

Weapons are superior only if the persons handling them are superior and have high morale. The troops of Israel, recently, went across the border into Egypt and took away from the Egyptians, like taking candy from a baby, the mass of modern weapons that had been furnished them by the Communists.

A BETTER WAY

It is an accepted principle that nobody should criticize the way things are being done unless he is prepared to offer a better way. In compliance with this principle, I offer the following recommendations, none of which I expect to see carried out:

1. Stop depending on guided missiles, atomic bombs, and airplanes to solve allied defense problems. They probably won't be used in small wars and will be suicidal to use in big wars.

2. Keep ready and available in the continental United States at least a dozen tough and well-trained divisions of professional soldiers that can be moved anywhere to back up decisions of the United Nations. Three or four of them should be airborne. They should contain no recruits and should have no administrative duties. They should be provided with sufficient troop-carrying aircraft, under Army control, to transport them with their equipment to any threatened area.

3. Reduce by 50 percent the personnel on duty in the Pentagon, including assistant secretaries, admirals, and generals. Require all lower headquarters to reduce their noncombat personnel 50 percent either by eliminating installations or by reducing personnel in existing installations. The amount

of administrative work deemed necessary always equals the number of people available to do the work. The source of administration is the Pentagon. Reduce it and all other headquarters can be reduced.

4. Revise the military characteristics of war materiel, to eliminate requirements that make it expensive without proportionately increasing its combat value. The excessive cost of war materiel is our most serious problem.

5. Start the pay of enlisted men at $50 a week, of officers at $6,000 a year. This would probably eliminate the draft. To compensate for the increased costs, eliminate all fringe benefits, including transportation. Transport no dependents overseas. Make the minimum tour of duty at 1 post 3 years in the United States and 1 year overseas. Sharply curtain the Military Air Transport Service.

6. Eliminate the Corps of Military Police. This is an outstanding waste of good manpower. Have minimum military police in tactical units. Discharge soldiers who misbehave. Sharply reduce such military activities as Special Service, Information Service, Food Service, and Recruiting Service. Have combat units take care of their own maintenance, recreation, communications, recruiting, and police work.

7. Reduce individual clothing and equipment of military personnel to that which can be carried on their backs or in their unit transportation. They will throw the excess away when they get in combat anyway. The criterion should be not what might add to their comfort—there is no comfort in battle—but what is the minimum with which they can operate effectively.

8. Follow General Bradley's recommendation that hospitalization of veterans at the taxpayer's expense be limited to those whose disabilities were the result of wounds or injuries received in the war.

9. Build no anti-atomic personnel shelters. No presently available warning system would allow time to occupy them, particularly since the bombing would be at night, when the factories and office buildings are empty.

Finally let me forecast the probable trend of the next war. It will start as the Korea, Indochina, or Middle East war started. It will gradually involve Communist nations on one side and non-Communist nations on the other. There will be no declaration of war. No atomic weapons will be used. No guided missiles will be used. No strategic bombers will be used. No sea battles will be fought. First there will be an air war between fighter planes for control of the air, which will be indecisive or won by the non-Communists. This will settle nothing, and the non-Communist force will look around for somebody to take the ground and settle the war. Since only a few ground troops are available, the decision will either go to the Communists or will be delayed a year while the non-Communist countries can assemble some unwilling civilians, train them as soldiers, and put them on the battlefields, to die or be maimed for a cause in which they are not interested.

Hans Christian Andersen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 153d anniversary of the birth of Hans Christian Andersen, Denmark's most famous author. Through his writing he has brought joy to generations in all parts of the world.

Andersen's life story is an inspiration and a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Danish people. He was raised in poverty in the town of Odouse. At 14 he left home to seek his fortune in Copenhagen. His name was brought to the attention of King Frederick VI and he was sent to school at public expense. His first work was published at the age of 24 and 6 years later his first volume of fairy tales appeared. Andersen continued to write his world-famous fairy tales at the average rate of one volume a year. In 1875 this gifted life came to an end.

But Hans Christian Andersen's spirit lives on in his many stories. He has left a legacy for the entire world and I'm sure we all join with the Danish people today in commemoration of the birth of this genius of the fairy tale.

A Suggestion To Relieve Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from the Honorable Ralph R. Ferguson, mayor of the city of Anderson, Ind.

It offers a suggestion which the mayor would propose on a local level to relieve unemployment and to stimulate business activity.

The letter follows:

CITY OF ANDERSON,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Anderson, Ind., March 28, 1958.

Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: All good citizens have been following the proposed legislation discussed in both the House and the Senate to combat the recession.

I am not in position to judge the merits or the shortcomings of the many and varied proposals to bolster and strengthen our economy. However, it appears that all of the proposals would require consideration and administration before they can become effective and have any noticeable impact on local communities.

The city of Anderson is a typical industrial city, and we now have many unemployed men and women in the community. Many of these people have exhausted their unemployment benefits and are without funds to purchase the bare necessities of life for themselves and their families.

I am of the opinion that what is needed, is a program that will immediately provide gainful employment for these unemployed. Such a program could be best administered by the city administrations throughout the country. As I pointed out earlier in my letter, I believe Anderson to be a typical industrial community.

If Federal funds could be made available for employment on a local level of persons now idle, there could be many projects undertaken which would be of direct and lasting benefit to this community. These projects include, but are not limited to, repair and rebuilding of streets and thoroughfares; repair of sidewalks, curbs, and gutters; repair enlargement and extension of inadequate sewer systems; the building of dykes, levees, and flood-control projects; the rehabilitation of neglected real estate, establishment of parks and playgrounds; and many other worthwhile constructive programs.

The city of Anderson and all other cities have the machinery and the tools and in most instances budgets out of which to purchase materials and provide proper engineering supervision and inspection. With the coming of the construction season, if Federal money were to be made available to the cities for payroll purposes, many thousands of unemployed persons could be put to work immediately, thus bolstering the economy in every community throughout the country. Inauguration of such projects would create a strong force toward combatting the recession and alleviating the suffering that is now become widespread throughout the country.

I earnestly beg you to give this type of program immediate consideration.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. FERGUSON,
Mayor.

John Stillman: Public Official and Party Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, John S. Stillman is the type of young American whom we would all like to have maintain his interest in good government. He also would like to maintain his interest in a major political party. He is presently chairman of the Orange County Democratic committee and also holds the nonsalaried position of chairman of the New York State Bridge Authority. He devotes his entire time to these positions and brings to them great ability, energy, and high purpose. Much has and I suppose a great deal more will be said critical of those political leaders who hold public positions. It is, therefore, refreshing to read the following excerpt from a broadcast by Bill Forrest, of New York, on the point:

FOOTNOTES ON THE HEADLINES
(Excerpt from broadcast by Bill Forrest)

The controversy over whether John S. Stillman should resign 1 of his 2 chairmanships—that of chairman of the bridge authority and/or that of chairman of the Orange County Democratic Committee—on the grounds that the two posts are not compatible, does not impress the average citizen, regardless of his political faith, very strongly. A somewhat similar issue was raised years ago in Middletown by a group of political purists, who happened to be Republicans. It was their contention that it was detrimental to good government for those holding public office to retain membership on the party committee. For a short time an attempt was made to enforce a self-imposed rule that committeemen elected to public office should resign their party posts, but the rule was discarded soon after it was adopted. The reason was quite evident. The elimination from the committee of those committeemen who were capable of being elected to

city or county offices weakened the party organization by removing from the committee those with the ability to supply the necessary leadership to keep the committee functioning. Whether we like to admit it or not, there are few men who are willing to devote the time that is required in the building of a political organization without some promise that their efforts will be rewarded through advancement as candidates for public office or through appointment to political jobs. After all, political leadership is one of the best tests of ability to serve in public office. The leader who is able to keep his party operating without too much friction stands at least a fair chance of being able to get along with the public and with being able to organize his unit of government so that it will function with some degree of smoothness. Not many men are available who are willing to devote the major portion of their time and ability to public affairs without compensation. But even when they are in a position to render a public service, they frequently find themselves the target of attacks from those of opposite political faiths, or from within the ranks of their own party. That is the way of politics, and there appears to be no way to change it.

Nuclear Weapons Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles, one by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times, the other by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star.

[From the New York Times]

WHERE PERFORMANCE IS A TOTAL STRANGER TO PROMISE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The Soviet Union has given its word that, on some unspecified date and for an unspecified period, it will make no further tests of nuclear weapons. So prominent among the issues this pronouncement raises is, How good is the word of the Soviet Union?

If it were absolutely established among scientists who devised the detector systems that these infallibly will register any such test, or if the Soviet Union has also agreed to an effective check on its compliance, the integrity of the Kremlin's pledge would not be high among the issues it evokes. But, in the absence of both circumstances and in the presence of others, it inevitably is.

The very announcement made by Foreign Minister Gromyko to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow today ignores for the *n*th time a solemn contract of the U. S. S. R. This is its signature on the Charter of the United Nations, which includes these 2 articles, 26 and 47:

"26. In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security, with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assitance of the Military Staff Committee * * * plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

"47 [in part]. The Military Staff Committee [shall] assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the * * * Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament."

The other nuclear powers resorted to this medium in conformity with their contract, and the General Assembly also set up a commission. Soviet Russia boycotted the commission after rejecting every disarmament pattern other nations have drawn (including nuclear) in the United Nations, beginning with the Baruch plan.

UNVARYING REPUDIATION

This conduct is wholly consistent with a long series of other contractual repudiations by Soviet Russia. In a staff study made for a Senate subcommittee in 1956 of nearly a thousand treaties * * *, both bilateral and multilateral, which the Soviets have entered into it was documented that in the 38 years of its existence the Soviet Union had broken its word to virtually every country to which it gave a signed promise. For example, it was violating the first agreement it ever signed with the United States at the very moment the Soviet envoy, Litvinov, was putting his signature to that agreement. And the burden of proof is crushing on anyone who contends that the word of the Kremlin Government under Khrushchev is any more to be relied on than that of the Government under Stalin.

But even if Khrushchev should find it compatible with the maintenance of the Soviet's military strength to suspend nuclear tests for a considerable period, that would merely establish the phony nature of the pledge. The Russians have just completed a long round of experiments with nuclear weapons that they have proclaimed as successful, and, according to our experts, they will require from 8 months to a year to get ready for the next round. The British are still on the way to their comparable objective. And, if the United States is to attain its present goal of reducing to a minimum the perilous fallout of atomic weapons, it must finish that program by the tests it has scheduled. For both nations now to suspend their programs, without a check system on Soviet activities in the field of nuclear weapons, would be to leave half done what the Russians, to their obvious satisfaction, have completed.

The only basis for the suspension would be the concept that thereby the international propaganda effects of the Gromyko announcement would in some measure be countered. And in view of the stakes involved, this not only would be the flimsiest and most perilous basis conceivable for major military policy, it would greatly help to confirm the estimate, among peoples gullible enough to believe this, that a Soviet Union dedicated to peace has forced a way to that peace on a Great Britain and United States whose objective is war.

Nevertheless, from comments made by influential and sincere persons in the United States and abroad, it already is obvious that as a propaganda stroke the Soviet move was effective. These citizens argue it could have been averted by a prior announcement of the same kind by the United States. We had the time and the occasion to do that. Yet implicit in the action would have been a blind or reckless disregard of these factors:

The signed adherence of the United States to the United Nations Charter. A major policy split with the British Government, which made clear it would not suspend its scheduled tests. The certainty of some of the greatest experts in the field that detection can be evaded in the vast spaces of the Soviet Union. The United States progress toward perfecting a "clean bomb." And above all the historic proof that the Kremlin makes promises, even specious ones like this, only to break them.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

SOVIET DECEIT ON BANNING A TESTS—REDS VIEWED AS USING FALLOUT HYSTERIA AS PROPAGANDA TOOL TO EMBARRASS UNITED STATES

(By David Lawrence)

The biggest hoax of our time is the Soviet-inspired drive to stop the testing of nuclear weapons.

Many well-meaning loyal citizens have been misled by the propaganda, and many people throughout the world have been scared about the supposed ill effects of fallout from the tests.

Authoritative evidence has been produced again and again by reputable scientists that fallout from nuclear weapons tests has not added any real danger. But somehow this evidence is constantly ignored, and the Soviet propaganda campaign moves on because the truth is not conspicuously displayed.

Over the weekend came a joint statement from 160 scientists gathered as Lausanne, Switzerland, where, under the auspices of the Swiss Academy of Medicine, a 3-day symposium was held "to determine all the long-range consequences of radioactivity." There were representatives present from the United States, France, Italy, West Germany, The Netherlands, Belgium, Norway and Switzerland. An invitation to attend was declined by Soviet scientists.

This is what the imposing group of scientists assembled in Switzerland had to say in their formal communique:

"Thanks mainly to the extensive and painstaking research conducted in the Anglo-Saxon countries, it appears well established that the increase in atmospheric radioactivity and in radioactive fallout does not play any essential part and does not have any practical importance when compared to natural radiation.

"The values which have been recorded do not, in any case, constitute a danger to the health of mankind."

Nothing could be more explicit and reassuring. Yet this very point has been made again and again, as, for instance, by the National Academy of Sciences in America. But within a short time after such pronouncements are issued, there are always a few scientists who come out with rebuttals or with arguments that the layman cannot understand, but which keep the scare going. Nothing pleases Moscow more.

It may or may not be significant that some of the persons in the scientific field here and abroad who hold ideological attitudes similar to the Communists are among the most ardent of the advocates of the theory that nuclear-weapons tests are highly dangerous. One of the scientists in the forefront of the agitation is a man who was refused security clearance by our Government in certain research work. He may have been unjustly accused, and it may, of course, be sheer coincidence that he is arguing so vehemently against the determination made by the Atomic Energy Commission to continue testing.

The agitation is not confined to this country. West Germany is in the midst of demonstrations fomented by Communist sympathizers who want no atomic weapons supplied to NATO forces there.

As for our tests, it is worth noting that Dr. Willard F. Libby, famed scientist who is a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, said in a speech at the Switzerland meeting last week that a bomb had been fired underground in recent tests in Nevada and that essentially no radioactivity, even that belonging to such a volatile material as radioactive krypton, escaped to any considerable degree.

Dr. Libby says this means "it is possible at least in certain types of weapons tests to contain and eliminate radioactive fallouts." He points out, too, that "persons living at

high altitudes on granitic rocks always have received extra radiation many times greater than is contained in the radioactive fallout from the testing of nuclear weapons, and even those living on certain sedimentary rocks at sea level always have received about 10 to 20 times the present fallout dose."

Despite the existence of biological hazards of one kind or another constantly affecting a small percentage of the world's population due to medical X-rays, the sun's rays and other natural causes, life has to go on. Exploratory tests are needed to advance peaceful as well as military uses of atomic energy. Testing is important, moreover, because deterrent weapons have to be developed by the United States so as to keep some one-man government from suddenly plunging the world into a war that could wipe out millions of lives. If Soviet Russia could prevent the use of nuclear bombs, her conventional forces are big enough today to conquer Western Europe. So the Soviet game is to get the West to give up nuclear weapons while the Communist armies of Russia and Red China dominate Europe and Asia.

Red Ink Spending Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial which was published in the March 28 issue of the Idaho Daily Statesman at Boise, Idaho. This article is of such significance and is so appropriate at this time that I would commend its reading to every Member of Congress:

RED INK SPENDING FAILS

Except notably for Virginia's redoubtable Senator BYRD, nobody seems to have been very much disturbed when the Congress approved, and the President signed, recently a bill to hike the national debt limit from $275 billion to a new alltime record high at $280 billion.

Yet it's a matter of direct concern to every American—to say nothing of aliens abroad who seem to regard American assistance as something they have a right to demand, and to depend upon.

An indication of its importance is to be found in current estimates showing that the national debt, when lately calibrated, represents a debt of somewhat more than $1,700 for each man, woman, and child in this country.

The bill for interest on this debt last year was $7.4 billion, which was money paid out for nothing more than the hire of money that the Government had already spent or hypothecated. Significance of this figure is pointed up in Senator DWORSHAK'S recent statement that it represents a take of $14 a month from the income of each family in Idaho.

Contemplation of this huge debt burden must be disturbing. But it becomes alarming when it is considered that the national debt, with brief intervals of minor retrenchments in 1947 and 1950 and 1953, has been growing steadily larger, and if we keep on adding to it, as Idaho's senior Senator warns, we will be "giving our children and grandchildren an inheritance of crushing debt."

The red-ink spending policy, started out on a grand scale amid pretty general acclaim some 25 years ago when we were assured that "we owe it to ourselves," was supposed to have some mystic properties as a panacea for economic ills. It was supposed to provide for spending more of public funds for pump priming when times were bad, and then, when conditions improved, to cut back public spending and apply the saving to reduction of the public debt. Thus the national economy was to have been kept on a plane of equilibrium.

But it hasn't worked out quite that way.

Every time there's been a prospect that taxes would provide a surplus over current requirements that might be applied on debt reduction, it's been seized upon by eager spenders as an invitation for financing new schemes for putting the Government more and more into the field of directing everybody's affairs. And so beguiling have been so many of these welfare schemes that most of us haven't resisted, but have more or less complacently gone along with them.

Invariably, every time one of these schemes gains a roothold, it has flourished and spread like the banyan tree whose branches send out aerial roots that go down to the soil and form additional trunks.

Thus whatever chance there may have been for accumulating any substantial debt-paying surplus of revenues has been obliterated. Tax levies continue on a high-altitude range, and the process of turning the social order into strange channels goes on almost without interruption.

Then when there's an economic readjustment, or a recession or whatever it is that we're now experiencing to provide the makings for a political carnival, the Government, on which we've come to depend so much, may be hard put to come through with the succor that we seem so generally to expect.

There is currently raging a furious controversy over the question of how much further Government can, or should, go along the way of stepped-up spending—curiously mixed up with proposals for coincident reduction of Government revenues—in order to provide the economy to which almost everybody has been accustomed.

How to accomplish this, if it's possible, without getting ensnared in unwise policy that could hurt us badly in the future, is the big question.

And the outcome of this great debate is still in doubt.

Meanwhile it should be evident that it's a proper time for review of the lesson that a great many Americans learned the hard way back in the depression days of the early thirties, which is that the time to save money and pay debts is when one's making money.

And even now it must be apparent that some signs of real economy could be most reassuring.

In Defense of Mr. Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which I place in the Appendix under leave heretofore granted, was printed in the Wall Street Journal, March 24. It needs no introduction.

IN DEFENSE OF MR. BENSON

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The editorial page of your paper is on my regular diet of reading matter and most of the time I enjoy it very much, but there are times when the implications that appear on that page irk me, to say the least. The last one that made me feel that way was entitled "Immovable Mr. Benson" by Albert Clark (March 3). I refer especially to Mr. Clark's introduction wherein he states that the simple answer to Mr. Benson's survival as the Secretary of Agriculture is that his main surviving friend happens to be a man named "Ike." The implication here is that Mr. Benson is almost friendless.

The facts are that Mr. Benson has many more friends than is generally realized and more and more of them are getting more enthusiastic about supporting him. We hear it every day on the streets of this and neighboring towns, when we meet at conventions, and other circles, that he is admired as a man of courage and integrity and these people are yearning to see more of his caliber in the Nation's Capital.

Farmers who have been more or less aloof to him in the past are beginning to sit up and take notice of the fight that is going on between Mr. Benson and the weak-kneed politicians that hope to ride into office on his lack of acceptance by a noisy segment of the farming population. This segment is continually losing ground both in respect and in numbers.

N. O. FOLLAND,
KARLSTAD, MINN.

Agricultural Policies Desired by Our Farmers of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Alfred D. Stedman, of the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of March 16, 1958:

CALL TO BE FREE

A letter came the other day from the farmers of tomorrow. It was signed by 19 members of the veterans' agricultural classes of Mankato.

How this amazing document found a way past all of the laments of the oncoming doom of the family farm, demands for Soil Bank payments and for fixed dairy and wheat price supports, we don't know.

Anyhow, here it is, true as life, with each name in the signer's handwriting. If anyone imagines that these farmers of the future are beaten by adversity, or believe all they hear, or have stopped doing their own thinking, he should study this letter.

For these are all young men, mostly 24 to 30 years old, married, veterans largely of the Korean war, who are starting farming. They are beginning at a time of high costs of land and equipment. They are exposed to the small farm, dairying, price and cost handicaps that other farmers face. Uncle Sam provides their on-farm training, but it's up to them to acquire land to farm.

If any farmers anywhere have a stake in the future, these veterans have. If anybody knows about the squeeze on the family farm, or the troubles of dairymen, or the effects of price pegging, they should know it. Their letter:

"The veterans agricultural classes of Mankato," it begins, "after having discussed the farm problem in their classes, would like to make the following suggestions:

"1. Cancel dairy support prices in exchange for a free market for grade A milk throughout the entire United States.

"2. Cancel crop supports in exchange for the Department of Agriculture handing over all of the surplus commodities it holds to the State Department who would use it to fight communism. These commodities would be held off national and world markets. Commodities going out of condition could be sold on the national market and replaced with fresh stock from the national market.

"We believe that without the load of all the Government-held surpluses, we can adjust production to the present demand.

"3. We do not believe that the family farm is in danger of dying. It is just becoming larger.

"4. We would like to see some program developed to help rehabilitate those farmers who are squeezed out as family farms grow in size.

"5. We endorse Public Law 480 (providing for sales of farm exports for foreign currencies) and would like to have more research in developing new crops and more uses for old crops.

"6. The Government program of renting land from farmers is dangerous if it returns the farmer over 5 percent on his investment as it may attact outside investors. However, it could be a good safety factor in case of a depression if it paid enough to cover taxes and bare cost of living."

Of the 19 signers, Robert Carleton and Ed Tapio are instructors. The other signers are Luverne J. Carey, Jerome Peters, Marvin Rosin, Alvis More, Eugene Hager, George Scholtz, John H. Gehms, Martin Ulmen, Donald Thompson, Marlyn Doss, Robert Vogel, Gordon Holmgren, Robert J. Fasnacht, Russell Christensen, Erwin Tischer, Maurice Jongbloedt, and Ronald Kozitza.

So there's food for your farm thinging. Agree with them or not, you must admit that these young veterans brought home from Korea a lot of courage and readiness to ask a fair field and fewer favors for tomorrow.

Compton, Calif., Junior High School Orchestra Wins National Recognition—The Only Elementary School Orchestra To Be Thus Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I have pleasure and natural pride in presenting to your attention the following article which appeared in the Compton Herald-American, Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif., a valued newspaper issued daily in the great 23d District which I represent this my 12th year in this great legislative today.

You will note therefore that this channel of important news in that important city headlined its issue for Thursday, March 27, 1958, emphasizing that the Compton City Schools Festival Orchestra had received worthy national recognition.

I know you and all the other Members of this Congress join with me in congratulating all those connected with the Compton City Schools Festival Orchestra.

The newspaper article follows:

SCHOOL ORCHESTRA WINS NATIONAL RECOGNITION—RALPH MATESKY IN SPOTLIGHT WITH 102 LOCAL PUPILS FETED

The Compton City Schools Festival Orcherstra, under the direction of Ralph Matesky, has received the distinctive honor of being the only elementary school orchestra in the United States to be officially invited to perform at the National Music Educators' conference being held in Los Angeles this week. The orchestra consists of 102 pupils from the Compton city schools. Although there are 130 children in the regular festival orchestra, the conference officials requested that only 100 pupils participate because of the limited accommodations at the Biltmore ballroom where the orchestra performed on Tuesday of this week. The children who took part were chosen on the basis of musicianship, scholarship, amount and quality of practice, and the kind of instrument played.

YEAR AND ONE-HALF TIME

The average length of time that these youngsters have studied is a little over a year and a half. The orchestra consists of fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade pupils, and one third-grade child. Not more than 40 percent of the children take private lessons. About one-half are fifth-grade children who have had only 1 year of beginning training in the Compton City schools, and no orchestra training before October of the current school year. The orchestra has established a nationwide reputation from its previous appearances, and has received many superior ratings in group competition.

The music played at the performances, much of which was written or arranged by the conductor, Ralph Matesky, is of junior high difficulty and most of it has been learned since the first of the year. The selections played at the concert were Holy, Holy, Holy, Dykes-Matesky; Hymn of Brotherhood, Beethoven-Matesky; Andante from Surprise Symphony, Haydn-Isaac; Cowboy Rhapsody, Ralph Matesky; Allegretta Grazioso, Shubert-Gordon; Train Ride, Ralph Matesky; When Johnny Comes Marching Home, Lambert-Matesky.

The members of the Festival Orchestra who participated in the performance are:

First violins: Cindy Richter, Julie Tupy, Jeanne Goodhue, Lynda Adkins, Sherry Boatwright, Patty Pursley, Carl Bell, Janice Budd, Elizabeth Chase, Judy Kennedy, Melody Newman, Evelyn Gonzales, Kathleen Joseph, Ronnie Franklin, Cathy O'Neal, Robin Berson, Celestine Ash, Susan Swift, Carolyn Joseph, Christine Ford, Pamela Fountain.

Second violins: Candace Halverson, Carole Weekes, Joyce Wynn, Cathy Oswald, Pamela Thompson, John Kendrick, Rita Winters, Julie Sprague, Roberta Sims, Diane Gardner, Karen Risvold, Doris Wilberg, Roberta Haft, Cheryl Bak, Brenda Watts, Shirley Shields.

Cellos: Barbara Morrison, Denise Mills, Shannon McWhorter, Mary Lou Taylor, Mary Sue Kennedy, Margaret Kuehl, Sharon Tahue, Brenda Hudspeth, Jodine Causey, Carolyn Reed, Andrea Flemons, Stephenie Moore, Marilyn Reed, Susan Hust, Debra Haslitt.

String basses: Mary McVay, Carolyn Lee, Jerry Scott.

First flutes: Marilyn Thornton, Jeanette Moon, Lenore Schwankovsky, Nancy DeFoer, Ryba Tregilgas.

Second flutes: James Foreman, Mary Alice Snapp, Sharon Jones, John Fitzgerald, Penny Hayward.

First clarinets: Jerry Criner, Bill Holt, Keith Pernworth, David Blosover, John Grady.

Second clarinets: Bruce Emarine, Ronnie Eddings, Tommy Bruster, Gary Lefman, John Belmer.

Saxophones: John Lerwick, Don Myers, Tommy Corbett, Bill Lahr.

Bassoon: Joan Caldwell.

First trumpets: Fred DeLeon, Wayne Wartian, Davis Sweet, Mike Pringle, Mike Gordon.

Second trumpets: Steven Smith, Danny Bent, Irvin Dixon, James Church, Robert Tropez.

Trombones: Mike Melvin, Marc Berger, Danny Fry, Mike Preston, Paul Rogers, Bobby Baker.

Percussion: Danny Miller, Fred Lenk, Mike Buller, Richard Elsmore, Paul Hale.

Piano: Margaret Mueller, Janice Waller, Beverly Wood.

Secretary Benson Still Has Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in these days, when most of the country seems to take delight in attacking Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, it is heartening to me to find that two of Arizona's outstanding newspapers back Ezra Taft Benson.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Secretary Benson Still Looks Good," published in the Arizona Daily Star of March 5, 1958, and an editorial entitled, "Benson's Farm Goals Worth Backing," published in the Phoenix Gazette of March 10, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON STILL LOOKS GOOD

The stanch defense of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson by President Eisenhower is a credit, not only to the Secretary, but to the President who refuses to sacrifice sound service for expediency.

Secretary Benson has advocated flexible price supports for agriculture, which would only aid commodities when they needed aid and which would eliminate a portion of the ever-mounting surplus. A surplus which, despite the advocates of rigid price supports, increased steadily under that system.

The political critics of Secretary Benson, or at least most of them, are in position to know that he has been telling the truth about agricultural price supports and surpluses. But the truth is not politically palatable, so they attack the Secretary and demand his resignation. This demand has been bluntly rejected by the President.

It is to be hoped, for the benefit of real agriculture, that Secretary Benson stays on. For it will be only through the acceptance of several hard truths that agriculture will be able to come near standing on its own feet and begin producing for use rather than for waste in storehouses and for price supports.

It is true that in some instances the land-bank experiment did not work out as satisfactorily as Secretary Benson had hoped. It is true that it was exploited in some instances by agriculturists, but that exploitation was made possible by the technicalities of the law, as passed by Congress, and not by the administration of it.

Most certainly the record of the high, rigid price supports is one which no true farmer

wishes to continue. In cotton, for example, they brought into the business a group of opportunists who put marginal land into production purely for the Government subsidy attached. The rigid price supports boosted the cotton price beyond its true value in the markets of the world and brought into being numerous substitutes for cotton, substitutes which took over jobs cotton had been doing very well. The better cotton farmers have bluntly repudiated this program.

One of the most unpalatable truths Mr. Benson has told his political critics is that the marginal farmer with the too-small unit, who cannot survive without Government aid, and whose farm provides an extremely small portion of the Nation's produce, cannot be justified economically.

Within the past week some of those Republican Congressmen who have been calling for Benson's scalp have changed their tune. They have finally come to admit that the true farmers believe Benson, even when he tells them that he cannot cure all their ills at once, and that the political farmers should not be the deciding voice in the matter.

It appears that the President's hope for a sound agriculture is gaining ground and mostly so because of his stanch support of a man who has placed his bets on the common sense of the common people.

BENSON'S FARM GOALS WORTH BACKING

President Eisenhower should be sustained by the people for putting principle above politics in refusing to dismiss Secretary of Agriculture Benson. In all cases of expediency, versus the broad national interest the latter should be paramount. Both Mr. Benson and Mr. Eisenhower are to be congratulated for adhering to that fundamental in the face of carping criticism coming from temporary interest.

Mr. Benson has been fighting the farmers' battle. Even most of the politicians acknowledge privately that high rigid price supports have aggravated the difficulties of the farmers and have caused, not reduced, the massive surpluses which have plagued both farmers and taxpayers.

The Secretary of Agriculture has won the respect and confidence of large segments of voters because he is courageous and honest, because he is pursuing constructive policies.

His policies are helping most farmers. Farm prices in January were 4 percent above a year ago and 10 percent above 2 years ago. Income per person on farms last year was the highest on record. Farm exports last year were 68 percent higher than in 1953. The buildup of surpluses has been reversed, and higher prices have resulted.

The real problem the farmers face today is the excessive cost of the things they have to buy. Congressmen who really want to help the farmers should turn their attention to that end of the stick.

Meanwhile, they should realize that the best politics is what is right. In this case, that means helping, not hindering, Ezra Taft Benson in his efforts toward gradually freeing American agriculture from the government meddling.

Capitol Prayer Room

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Poet Albert Brighton, recently paused to comment on the Prayer Room set aside in the Nation's Capitol. I thought it appropriate during this Easter season to share with you Brighton's words written under the title "Lawmaker's Refuge":

A place of prayer where Congressmen,
Great Senators, and men
Representing God, and people
Of our country enter when
There is cause for meditation,
A grave decision to be made.
Men of wisdom, from our sod
Seek greater wisdom from our God.
Men who link their destinies
With Him who knows before
How distant is our harbor,
How peaceful is our shore.
How pure the hearts professing
Their faith in Him to know,
The things that we have need of,
The course our step should go.

Shopping By Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it seems that those with things to sell are slow to realize that the buying public is waiting for price cuts.

There have been examples around over the country which amply illustrate that people will buy if they feel the prices are right. The greatest stimulus we can have toward ending this recession would be to have price adjustments to get the people who have the money saved up back into the habit of buying.

There appeared in the Wall Street Journal a couple of days ago a front-page article entitled "Shopping By Mail."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOPPING BY MAIL

(By Kenneth G. Slocum)

CHICAGO.—"We priced a cotton sheet blanket at 99 cents, just about cost, in a recent catalog sale circular and figured we should sell about 7,000 of them. Instead we sold 37,737."

Speaking is Harold F. Dysart, veteran mail order executive of Montgomery Ward & Co. Other mail order officials have noted similar evidence that people are looking harder for bargains.

"People are shopping a lot more carefully than they did a few months ago," says Modie J. Spiegel, chairman of Spiegel, Inc., another large Chicago-based mail-order firm. "The lower prices featured in the catalogs are luring people away from retail stores. We have noticed a marked pickup in new mail-order customers in recent months."

PRICE FACTORS

Lower prices are one of the key reasons why catalog sales are running counter to the downtrend in business experienced by many types of retailers. Catalog prices, exclusive of delivery charges, average about 5 percent lower than the charges for the same items in the retail stores of Ward and Sears, Roebuck & Co., officials of these two firms say.

But there are other important factors behind the mail order sales surge. For one thing, the catalog business is particularly strong in nonindustrial sections of the country, many of which have been relatively unaffected by the recession. Even in urban areas, mail-order men reason, a growing number of consumers are turning to catalogs rather than buck traffic jams and parking problems.

In any case, mail-order firms are striving mightly to take full advantage of their upturn. They're stepping up catalog promotion efforts and are offering a wider selection of more stylish, colorfully displayed goods.

Upshot: "In the first half of 1957, catalog sales were up a bit over the first half of the prior year," says Montgomery Ward's Mr. Dysart. "But in the second half, they climbed even more. In January and February they were strong as horseradish."

GREATER STRENGTH

Comments John A. Barr, the company's chairman: "In this period of depressed business, it's interesting to note that overall catalog sales are showing greater strength than are our retail stores."

Ward's catalogs, which contribute about one-third of the company's total sales, were the major factor in the 14.9 percent increase in sales in January, compared with the like month a year earlier, the company says. Catalog sales also increased in February, although total Ward volume, which included 553 department stores, declined very slightly. Catalog sales are running well ahead of a year ago in March while overall sales are on the soft side, the company says.

"Sales in January and February were more than 8 percent over the like months of 1957," comments Mr. Spiegel of Spiegel, Inc., which does some 99 percent of its volume through catalogs. This rise in sales followed a fourth quarter in which the company's catalog sales reached a record high.

"Catalog sales since January fared relatively better than did retail," reports a Sears spokesman. A similar report comes from Robert W. Jackson, president of Aldens, another big mail order house.

MARKED CONTRAST

The catalog sales climb contrasts not only with these companies own stores' business, but also with the experience of nonfood retailers generally. Department store sales, as indicated by Federal Reserve Board figures, slipped below year-earlier levels last fall. They have lagged about 2 percent behind 1957 thus far this year.

Ireland and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD the address I delivered on March 17, over radio station WERE in Cleveland, titled "Ireland and the Irish":

IRELAND AND THE IRISH

The virtues of St. Patrick have been extolled by enlightened speakers for many centuries, particularly on the historic occasion which we celebrate today. It is on this day that the Irish the world over claim all of the great virtues of St. Patrick as a birthright

and laud the great benefits he brought to all mankind.

The world of our times is gripped by tensions, the intensity and scope of which have never before been known. These tensions result from issues which go to the very root of civilization and challenge every essential of the existing order. The world is cruelly divided. This division is represented on the one side by the many nations and millions upon millions of people who are subjected against their will, to the humiliations of life under atheistic communism. On the other side are the still free nations of the world who are struggling to maintain those great human values which St. Patrick inculcated in the Irish race and which formed the foundation of the civilization of which we, as Americans, are a part. Never before has the world been so divided into two opposing camps in which there appears to be no room for compromise without abandoning our principles and in which there is so much at stake.

This cruel division of humanity did not occur by accident or overnight. It has been long in the making and traces itself to the rise of materialism as a philosophy of life, when men began to take the position that there was no place for God or the laws of God in the affairs of men. With the advancement of these concepts, the struggle in which we are now engaged began. Long before Karl Marx and his perverted concept of life was enunciated in the Communist manifesto, others had advanced the notion that man was nothing more than an animal who was born to die without responsibility to a Creator and without the necessity of accounting to that Creator when the toils of this life are done. It was Karl Marx, however, who formulated all these ill-conceived concepts into a doctrine and added to it unworkable economic theories which spring from the belief that man is no more than a pawn in the industrial age.

The roots of the present crisis began when Karl Marx and his handful of associates issued the Communist Manifesto in 1848. This Manifesto was the rule book of gross materialism and the guidebook for the militant atheists of all hues and colors. Historically, it is important to note that it was at this time that the great human values epitomized by the life and times of St. Patrick were brought into sharp and open conflict with the new dogma of atheistic materialism.

The greatest gift St. Patrick brought to the people of Ireland, and thus to the world, was an appreciation of the individual dignity of man. St. Patrick taught that man as a creature of God, held a sacred place, and therefore, demanded respect and reverence from his fellow man. Man, as St. Patrick taught, was the highest creature of God, being imbued with an immortal soul and being on earth for a few fleeting years during which he is given the free will to perform good acts or evil acts in relation to himself and to his fellow man. It was thus that the Irish people learned of the special dignity of man and the great responsibility that accompanies that dignity. The responsibility being that each of us would be required to give an accounting to our Maker for our stewardship.

From these teachings of St. Patrick the Irish race became imbued with the belief in the dignity of man. This belief, in times of great trial and tribulation, is supported by their belief in the fatherhood of God. Both by teaching and by hard experience they learned that they could not fail in the great mission which had been assigned to them by St. Patrick. That is, the Irish could not fail in their mission on earth, so long as they remained steadfastly attached to the teachings of St. Patrick.

This explains the happy fact that everywhere the Irish went in the world—and there is scarcely a place on earth untouched by the influence of the Irish—they brought with them this great and inspiring message of the dignity of man. It is understandable therefore, how the Irish quickly became a part of their newly adopted lands, rising to offices of the highest public trust in practically every new country. Possessed of great physical and mental vigor they were endowed with many other human characteristics which make them lovable to their fellowman. By nature they were always prepared to make whatever sacrifice was necessary for the good and betterment of their fellowman, but above all else, the Irish brought the message of the dignity of man to their daily work, in the discharge of their responsibilities, and indeed even in their humiliation in the face of intolerance and persecution. It is dedication to that belief which made the Irish revolutionaries and fighters for those inspiring ideals which cause men to rise above the ordinary.

Teh Declaration of Independence reflects the desire of the Founding Fathers to build a nation under law based upon a recognition of the dignity of man while seeking protection of Divine Providence in the pursuit of a better and happier life for all. The challenging words of the American Declaration of Independence struck the hearts and minds of men all over the world—so strong was its appeal for justice, individual liberty and human freedom. It was natural that millions of Irish would flock to the shores of America and would seek to play their part in the fulfilment of the great dream expressed in that Declaration by our Founding Fathers.

It has always been the mission of the Irish in the United States, no matter how many generations removed from the old sod, to give life and meaning to the inspiring promises of the American Declaration of Independence. With each passing generation this opportunity brought new challenges and sacrifices, together with epics of heroism and sadness which grow out of periods of severe trials and national crises. In these circumstances, the Irish have made their indelible mark in the annals of American history.

Today our Nation faces its greatest test as we seek the path of justice and freedom for ourselves and all our fellow men. The cruel division of humanity caused by the application of atheistic materialism by the Russian Communists to almost one-third of the population of the world is forcing decisions upon us which could well spell the difference between peace and another war in our times. It is this unnatural division of humanity which is responsible for the dangerous political tensions which grip the world. The sad experiences of our own lifetime teach us that such political tensions, unless checked, lead to war.

The Russian leaders have been clamoring for another conference at the summit with leaders of the free world. They claim that such a conference is necessary to remove political tensions. In their vast public propaganda drive to force such a summit conference, they hold out both the threat of atomic warfare and a skillfully disguised illusion of disarmament. The technique of threat and escape, for which the Russians are historically notorious, is offered to the people of the world who hunger for a just and lasting peace. The threat is that unless the Russian terms for peace are accepted, all mankind will be doomed to the spectre of atomic warfare, delivered by intercontinental missiles. The escape offered is that by accepting the Russian terms we in America and other free people will be spared the horrors of atomic missiles only to be taken over and ruled by the Russian Communists through more peaceful methods. This is precisely what the Russians mean by their offers of peaceful coexistence, the technique through which they would cause us and other free nations to abandon our national defenses and after a few humiliating years be forced to surrender our individual liberties and meekly submit to the tyrannical rule of atheistic materialism.

The Russian package deal is as follows:

1. That the United States give formal recognition to the status quo as it now exists in the world. In other words, we are being asked to recognize the right of the Russians to occupy, exploit, and destroy all the many nations now under occupation by the Red army or controlled by the Communist puppet regimes set up by the Russians. We are thus being asked to sanction the cruel division of humanity which is responsible for world tensions. This would mean turning our backs upon our proven allies, the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain, and deserting all the moral and political principles which rest at the very foundation of our civilization. In a very special sense this would mean condemning our brethren now suffering under the heel of atheistic communism to a perpetual hell on earth.

2. That a general disarmament agreement be entered into, which hard experience tells us would not be worth the paper it was written on, whereby the free world would denounce the use of the weapons of defense which alone have stood in the way of further Russian armed aggression against the nations on the periphery of the vastly expanded Russian empire. We are being asked to trust the Russian Communists, to believe that they will abide by such an agreement. The record shows that any agreement entered into by the Russians is good only so long as it serves their objective of world conquest, and no longer.

This is the package deal the Russians are presenting as their price for peace. They have it well disguised but only the most naive fail to see this pattern.

If, in a moment of weakness, we acceded to such package deal, we would set our country and the entire world upon an unavoidable course of war. Freemen will never surrender peacefully to the tyrant, and war would thereby result at a time selected by the Russian leaders and in circumstances which they believed promised swift and certain victory.

Nevertheless, there are strange voices in our midst calling for a try at peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communists. Others support recognition of the status quo on the basis that by so doing we would in some mystic manner wipe the slate clean and cleanse the world of all tensions and strife. But these strange voices seem unmindful of and have no concern for the dignity of the individual and the inherent right of all people and nations to liberty, freedom, and self-government.

The road to a just and lasting peace, at best, is not an easy one. It demands patience, courage, sacrifice, and unwavering support of those basic ideals and principles which grow out of a recognition of the essential dignity of man. It permits no room for compromise of those ideals and principles and rejects secret agreements arrived at in the tempting atmosphere behind closed doors.

It is dedication to this spirit which causes the Irish Government to be denied membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, because to gain membership she would be required to sign an agreement to recognize the status quo in Ireland for a period of 20 years. Ireland by right belongs in NATO but the price of admission would have required her to desert her ideals and principles. She could not more recognize the right of the British Government to maintain the unnatural division of Ireland than we Americans would wish NATO to recognize the unnatural division of Europe caused by the Russian Communists.

It is paradoxical that NATO, by proclamation has adopted the principle of the right of all people and nations to self-determination and self-government, yet the British as members of NATO refuse this right to Ireland and thus exclude her from membership in NATO.

Third Annual Compton, Calif., AMVETS Has Community Importance and Great Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a newspaper article appearing in the Compton Herald-American for Thursday, March 27, 1958, showing that the national patriotic group designated as AMVETS in the important city of Compton, Calif., has for this third year sponsored an important community-wide annual spelling bee therein between the several junior high schools located in that important city in the great 23d District which I represent this my 12th year in this great legislative body.

I know you and all the other Members of this Congress will join with me in congratulating this great patriotic order on continuing this sponsorship, and the winners thereof, and also congratulating the adult members of the faculty of the respective schools which entered same:

TOP SPELLERS GET HONORS IN COMPTON

The AMVETS-sponsored third annual spelling bee found 2 pupils of Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High School taking first and second place out of the first 3 awards. This competition, held at the Roosevelt school's auditorium Thursday evening, March 20, was between the top 5 ninth-grade spellers in each of the 6 junior high schools of the Compton Union High School District. Roosevelt won the beautiful AMVETS trophy last year, also, when Roosevelt pupils took the first four places in the 1957 contest

Miss Carolyn Miller, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Miller, of 1010 North Soan Avenue, Compton, as first-place winner, will have her name engraved on the AMVET trophy. Miss Leanna Grimm, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Grimm, of 607 South Pannes, Compton, was the winner of the second place award.

THIRTY TOP SPELLERS

This AMVETS spelling bee not only brought honor to the 30 top spellers of the 6 district schools, but to teachers and community leaders alike. Teachers spent many hours a week for several weeks coaching the contestants, working with the pupils before and after school hours. It is significant that the pupils did not miss other classes to drill on spelling, but gave of their own free time, as did their teachers; those at Roosevelt being Mrs. Virginia Adams and Mr. Edwin Burk, English teachers, as well as Mrs. Lenna Hawks and Mr. John Comrie.

The public-spirited community leaders taking part in the contest may have a better idea of the impact they made on the youth of our schools through the words of Paulette Runyon, one of the Roosevelt participants, who said:

"The AMVETS spelling bee brought high honors to Roosevelt pupils, but the spelling participants weren't the entire program. Of course, the part I'm speaking of are the judges. They gave each contestant the benefit of a doubt, and made certain that the speller had made an error before saying so."

NAME JUDGES

The judges were Joseph L. Causey, member of the board of education; Lloyd Bulloch, Compton city attorney; and Mrs. Mary Holmes, teacher of English at Enterprise Junior High School.

Praise was also given to Miss Blanche Goodrich, district curriculum coordinator, for the patience and clarity which she pronounced the words.

AMVETS Comdr. William C. White, and Contest Chairman Joseph L. Causey have the thanks of the entire district for making the spelling bee possible.

Thanks go also to the following assistants for their part in making the whole affair go so smoothly: Mrs. Frances Alexander, Willowbrook; Mrs. Louise Harrison, Whaley; Mrs. Estelle Schultz, Walton; Mrs. Helen Tibby, Roosevelt; and Mr. Ed Moore, Roosevelt principal, chairman.

Honorable mention and special recognition go also to all the contestants, who by their consistent and untiring efforts won the right to represent their schools in the contest. These are the 1958 contestants: Bunche Junior High School, Clarence Broussard, Janet Dening, Yvonne Hicks, Nancy Ramirez, Linda Valdivia, Louise Amos, alternate; Enterprise Junior High School, Robert Dixon, Juanita Dunn, James Hammond, Roy Jefferson, Jo Ann McCauley; Roosevelt Junior High School, Leanna Grimm, Janice Lindsay, Carolyn Miller, Jane Nelson, Paulette Runyon; Walton Junior High School, Irene Cooper, Hideko Kawahara, Bonnie Marnach, Ken Perkins, Margaret Shaw, Carol McCrellias, alternate; Whaley Junior High School, Marsha Greenwood, Ken Hauck, Valera Hilliard, Janet Jones, Luke Swartz, Arthur Jarman, alternate; Willowbrook Junior High School, Elaine Coleman, Lynn Harris, Katherine Owens, Helen Reynolds, Mamie Scott, Bonnie Downey, alternate.

Some Thoughts on the Winning of the First 8-Hour Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United Mine Workers Journal of April 1, 1958:

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE WINNING OF THE FIRST 8-HOUR DAY

April 1, 1958, is the 60th anniversary of the winning of the first 8-hour day agreement between coal operators and the then infant United Mine Workers of America. It was on the 1st day of April in 1898 that the UMWA realized the No. 1 objective it had been struggling for since its establishment on January 25, 1890, in Columbus, Ohio.

First efforts to win a shorter work day from the coal operators in 1890 had been unsuccessful, and the union called a strike in 1891. But the shutdown failed except in a very few areas. Seven years later the shock troops of American labor succeeded as they have succeeded time and time again down through their history.

They succeeded, as President John L. Lewis has said, because "a man who works in a coal mine is not afraid of anything except his God; * * * he is not afraid of injunctions, or politicians, or threats or denunciations, or verbal castigation, or slander. * * * He does not fear death."

It would be well for the younger men in the UMWA to reflect on the struggles that their brothers of the 1890's and early 1900's went through to win the benefits that are enjoyed by America's mine workers today.

It would be well to pay honor to the memory of the UMWA's fourth international president, Michael D. Ratchford, who, with his fellow negotiators, wrested the first effective 8-hour day victory from the central competitive field operators (western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois).

There is no final victory in the struggle of freemen to better their lot. The benefits of today probably would be incomprehensible to the men of 1898.

But all the goals have not been reached, and all the victories have not been won.

The men of the United Mine Workers of America must bear this always in mind.

Meany Amends Gompers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Senate Labor Subcommittee, which Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is chairman, has recently held hearings on labor legislation.

Yesterday the syndicated column of John Herling had a very thoughtful analysis of the labor problem confronting not only the Senate Labor Subcommittee but the entire Congress.

I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading this interesting article, Meany Amends Gompers, which was published in yesterday's Washington Daily News.

The article follows:

MEANY AMENDS GOMPERS

(By John Herling)

AFL–CIO President George Meany apparently has decided to modernize the basic political philosophy of the late great Samuel Gompers, founder of the American labor movement. Mr. Gompers said, "Labor must reward its friends and punish its enemies." Last week Mr. Meany told Chairman JOHN F. KENNEDY (Democrat, of Massachusetts), of the Senate Labor Subcommittee, "God protect us from our friends." Senator KENNEDY, eyeing Mr. Meany intently, said, "I think so, too."

This open clash between the AFL–CIO president and the senatorial sponsor of many legislative bills regarded indispensable by organized labor surprised and shocked the packed old Supreme Court chambers where this exchange took place.

Senator KENNEDY has taken the lead as an advocate of bills to raise and strengthen unemployment compensation through the use of Federal standards, to widen the minimum-wage coverage to embrace 6 million more workers, and to protect communities which may be hit by imports.

Mr. Meany, with the barest film of civility, hit out at a bill introduced by the Massachusetts Senator on the disclosure of union finances and the regulation of union trusteeships.

Although Mr. Meany was also testifying on the administration bills, which are far more restrictive, his clear and present target seemed to be Mr. KENNEDY.

When the Massachusetts Senator explained that his bill was in fact a mild measure and was the product of consultation with a group of leading teachers and professors at Harvard, MIT, Yale, Brown, and Princeton, friendly to the labor movement, Mr. Meany exploded with his wrathy remarks about friendship and the labor movement.

Why did Mr. Meany lash out as he did? First, he was mad at Senator KENNEDY for signing the majority report of the McClellan committee which he insists was a smear on the whole labor movement. Second, Mr. Meany has been under considerable pressure from many of the building trades unions who have been under investigative fire—with more of such probes to come. Mr. Meany had resisted such pressure for more than a year. Building trades spokesmen have been especially mad at AFL–CIO support of the McClellan committee. Third, Mr. Meany fears that consideration of any labor bills—however mild—might open up a whole series of antilabor proposals which could not be controlled.

Senator KENNEDY reminded Mr. Meany that organized labor's failure to offer alternatives to the Taft-Hartley law resulted in the passage of that law in 1947. He urged AFL-CIO leaders to make their own suggestions, not just rely on blanket opposition to everything in this field.

Prof. Archibald Cox of Harvard Law School, head of the advisory group on the Kennedy bills, said: "We deeply believe in a strong and independent labor movement. Senator KENNEDY's bill offers mild measures aimed at serious abuses. It contains nothing which could impair the strength or activity of any union; otherwise none of us would support the measure. The labor movement would be stronger and more effective if the bill were enacted and the abuses were stamped out."

Col. William T. Roy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was ill with an influenza virus and unable to be present on the floor when many Members joined in felicitating Bill Roy on the occasion of his birthday and expressed their sincere regrets that he was retiring as assistant parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

It was my good fortune to meet this fine gentleman when I came to Washington a few days after my first election. No one was more helpful to me at that time, and through the years that have followed he was never too busy to give me of his time and wealth of knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House. It was therefore a shock to me to learn earlier this year that he contemplated retirement.

Bill Roy is not only a parliamentarian of unquestioned knowledge and repute; he is an oustanding American citizen. A zealous defender of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, he also knew full well the meaning of the Constitution in its relation to orderly government and the preservation of this republic.

This public servant has made a valuable contribution to his country and I wish both he and his wife all the good things of life in their retirement.

Taxes, Tariffs, the Taft-Hartley Act, and Socialized Hospitalization and Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alfred F. Metz, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J., has sent recently to the Members of the New Jersey congressional delegation a statement giving his views on taxes, tariffs, the Taft-Hartley Act, and socialized hospitalization and medicine. The statement follows:

THE OKONITE CO.,
Passaic, N. J., March 12, 1958.

TAXES

For many years industrial job growth has been retarded for the lack of risk capital. As it takes considerable risk capital to provide a productive job, we have for the last 25 years prevented several million jobs from ever coming into being simply because of the thoughtless high progressive rates in individual income taxes. As a matter of fact, these high rates have undoubtedly restricted revenue rather than promoted it. The Sadlak-Herlong bills provide a sane approach to ultimate higher revenue and more productive jobs. I strongly urge your support of this legislation.

TARIFFS

Why the frenzy on the part of our administration should continue to destroy the substance of our skilled crafts and large investment in industries which should be protected not only from an employment standpoint but from a defense standpoint, is beyond my comprehension. There is no one qualified legally or morally to say who should stay in business or who should lose jobs and investment. We have for years been trying to assist all countries in making themselves completely independent industrially and yet our administration apparently now would sacrifice any domestic industry at the drop of a hat. I submit that every industrial craft and industrial investment for jobs in this country deserves the loyal support of our Government. Without all of them, the present attractive markets in the United States would disappear. It is true that we should welcome foreign competition but it is wishful thinking to expect that we could possibly compete without tariff corrections to take care of disparities in wage levels and standards of living. We have always contributed a large volume to international trade and at the same time have protected our industries until recently. Unless sanity in this respect prevails, we will lose many industries and many jobs. There are altogether too many irresponsible statements made as to the offsetting jobs created by either exports or imports. We need all of our industries and all of our jobs and foreign competition on an equitable basis can be had. Peril point and escape clauses are not even palliative as one must face bankruptcy before relief is available. I strongly urge that any reciprocal-trade program be carefully drawn to give all of our industries a reasonable opportunity to compete domestically.

TAFT-HARTLEY

It should now be evident that labor leadership cannot be allowed to run rampant if our workers are to be reasonably protected and reasonably free from dictatorship controls. Certainly, the union member is entitled to know exactly what has been done with his contributions to unions. He is entitled to vote secretly for strikes, he is surely entitled to vote secretly for union officers and to require majorities of entire memberships when voting for union officials. He is entitled to the right to join or not to join a union. He is also entitled to protection from secondary boycotts under any circumstances. I strongly urge your support of the individual workman who has a right to expect your recognition of his freedom from domination by either employer or union leadership. S. 76 and H. R. 9307 embrace necessary boycott curbs for the protection of the livelihood of the individual union member.

SOCIALIZED HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICINE

The degree of advance in the care of the sick and disabled is unlimited in the hands of voluntary organizations. We have come a long way in providing insurance for these hazards, we will continue to improve and extend such insurance under voluntary auspices. Such measures as the so-called Forand bill (H. R. 9467) will unquestionably lead to socialized hospitalization and medicine and additional social security taxes. This bill is essentially the same as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills of 1941–51 except that for the time being it would only apply to a smaller segment of the population. I am a governor of the Passaic-General Hospital and find that every voluntary hospital to whom I have spoken is strongly opposed to the Forand bill. I strongly believe that it would create objectionable controls on the part of the Federal Government, it would become much too expensive, would open the door to political expediency and excessive cost and would ultimately destroy the roots of the individual efforts which are solely responsible for our advance in the case of the sick and disabled. The needy are getting reasonable attention from both doctors and hospitals. Improved care is noticeable. I strongly urge your opposition to H. R. 9467.

For Benson Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following which appeared in the Tuesday, February 25, issue of the Kansas City Times. It is an excellent appraisal of Mr. Benson. I am sure it will be read with interest by my colleagues.

FOR BENSON SUPPORT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It's politics—and some consider it the politics necessary to survive—which is causing a group of Midwestern Republican Congressmen to try to force President Eisenhower to fire his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson.

Have no doubt about it, Mr. Benson is not going to cave in. He is not going to resign unless the President tells him to resign. And every bit of evidence to date is that Mr. Benson has the President's full confidence, that his farm policies are carrying forward exactly what Mr. Eisenhower favors and that the White House believes that to offer up the Secretary of Agriculture as a symbolic sacrifice for the short-term gain of a few votes would damage the Republican party far more than it would help.

My own conviction is that Secretary Benson is a source of strength to the administration and that his political execution would hurt the Republican party. True, his efforts in behalf of agriculture have offended some farmers and some farm politicians. But Mr. Benson has prestige and respect and popularity throughout the Nation and with all segments of voters because he is honest and courageous and because he is pursuing a constructive, even if partly unpopular, set of policies.

Most of the politicans, both Republican and Democratic, know that high, rigid price supports have aggravated the difficulties of the American farmer and have caused, not solved, the massive surpluses. Mr. Benson has had the guts to say so and to act upon his convictions in the interest of dealing with the causes, not just with symptoms, of the farm problem.

The real problem the farmer faces today is not a declining income from what he sells, but the rising prices he has to pay for what he buys. The post-Korean downtrend in farm prices, which started in 1951, has been stopped. Income per person on farms last year, including income from all sources, was the highest on record. Farm exports last year were 68 percent higher than in 1953. The buildup of surpluses has been reversed.

Right now Mr. Benson looks exceedingly secure. There are not too many public officials of his transcendent integrity and moral stamina available to any administration. I incline to the view that the President can't afford to lose him.

Rehabilitation and Restoration of the East Front of the Capitol Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, interest grows throughout the Nation in favor of an understanding rehabilitation and restoration of the east front of the Capitol Building rather than its destruction and the substitution of a 20th century imitation of modern marble.

I have received mail from many different areas of the United States, as well as from my own district in Indiana, urging the preservation of the Capitol by passing legislation such as H. R. 11113, which I introduced to prevent the razing of this historic east front. These are letters from historians, architects, teachers, club women, and other informed citizens sensitive to the mood of history. They cannot understand how legislation to destroy this front and move it 32 feet further to the east was ever acted on favorably by Congress.

Their criticisms fall into different categories:

First are those who believe the destruction of this historic facade demonstrates unnecessary irreverence for a historic shrine. Fifty-eight years after President Washington laid the first cornerstone on September 18, 1793, a manuscript by Daniel Webster was deposited in another stone. This message in his own handwriting, concluded:

All here assembled, whether belonging to public life or to private life, with hearts devotedly thankful to Almighty God for the preservation of the liberty and happiness of the country, unite in sincere and fervent prayers that this deposit, and the walls and arches, the domes and towers, the columns and entablatures, now to be erected over it, may endure forever.

Others question the wisdom of spending from 10 to 17 million dollars to gain so little floor space. One constituent writes:

There have been 96 Members of the Senate and 435 Members of the House of Representatives for many years now. What makes you fellows think you need to spend well over a hundred million dollars for new buildings and destroy the front of our Capitol? What are you doing with the square footage already available in the Captitol building * * * using it or hoarding it?

An effective interest in the remodelling of the Capitol without defacing the east front has been evidenced by the widely known editor of the Indianapolis News, C. Walter McCarty who has devoted four of his recent columns to a discussion of this issue. When Mickey McCarty says, Indiana listens, for his reputation as a toastmaster, friendly seer and Hoosier citizen is second to none.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD his columns from the March 12, March 13, March 17, and March 19 issues of the Indianapolis News. I am only sorry the format of the RECORD does not let us print the familiar picture of the smiling Irish editor who writes such good sense under the caption "Mickey McCarty Says":

[From the Indianapolis News of March 12, 1958]

MICKEY MCCARTY SAYS

Fellow taxpayers, a mounting tide of opposition appears to be developing throughout the 48 States to plans of a congressional commission headed by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, to alter the historic east front of the United States Capitol, the cornerstone of which was laid by George Washington 165 years ago.

The opposition has been rising rapidly, not only in Congress but outside as well. Such organizations as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the American Institute of Architects, the Society of Architectural Historians, the Daughters of the American Revolution and other patriotic and professional groups have protested what they term the "proposed desecration of this national shrine."

FEASIBILITY

However, Marion County's Congressman CHARLES (CHUCK) BROWNSON has thrown a monkey wrench into the plans of the Commission by introducing a bill in the House to block the project. At the same time Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, has introduced a measure in the Senate calling for a delay on the proposed Capitol changes until there is a more thorough investigation of the feasibility of the move.

The east front of the Capitol is the side facing the plaza, where tourists try to find parking places, and where every United States President since John Quincy Adams has been inaugurated. It is estimated the changes will cost—as a starter—$10,100,000. They would add enough space to the central part of the Capitol for 62 new offices, 2 large restaurants, 9 storage rooms, and a private corridor through which Congressmen could walk without bumping into constituents or sightseers.

ARGUMENT

The new east front of the Capitol would be a duplicate of the present one, except that it would be built of marble rather than sandstone. However, the appearance of the entire building would be different because of the change in its profile. Capitol Architect J. George Stewart says it would improve the looks of the Capitol by getting the dome more nearly in the center. Opponents think otherwise.

The storm of criticism has so far had no detectable impact on the special Commission which Congress created in 1955, and armed with blank-check authority to do the remodeling. In addition to Speaker RAYBURN, the Commission is composed of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Senate Republican Leader William F. Knowland, House Republican Leader Joseph W. Martin, Jr., and Stewart.

INSPIRATION

Speaking on behalf of his bill to block the project, Congressman BROWNSON said: "Many Americans make a pilgrimage to Washington and their Capitol but once in a lifetime. For many of them that happy visit of inspiration comes while they are in high school. If this plan is carried out they will be denied the historic view of their Capitol for 3½ years while construction is underway. They never again will see the work of three of the Nation's early and most gifted architects, Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe, and Charles Bulfinch."

BROWNSON said that at a time when there is so much concern about money for defense and money for sparking the economy, the sum of $10 million seems a pretty high price to pay for a noontime restaurant, a few more committee rooms, and a private passageway to keep legislators away from their constituents.

"Perhaps, instead of providing a new east front to the Capitol," he added, "the taxpayers may decide to provide the historic Capitol with "a new group of less-expensive Congressmen if this spending spree isn't stopped."

[From the Indianapolis News of March 13, 1958]

MICKEY MCCARTY SAYS

Fellow taxpayers, Indiana architects, historians, and other interested groups are mobilizing their forces to oppose the proposal of a congressional commission to remodel the front of the United States Capitol at a cost to the taxpayers variously estimated from $10 million to $25 million.

Edward D. James, Indianapolis architect, who for several years has been serving as a member of the Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings for the American Institute of Architects, and who also is a member of the American Society of Architectural Historians, is devoting his time and effort these days to rallying opposition to the move to alter the Capitol.

OUTLINED

In a letter to Congressman CHARLES (CHUCK) BROWNSON, who has a bill pending in the House to block the project, James out-

lined the view of the groups he represents in opposition to the alterations. He feels that in the proposed changes, Americans "will lose a most treasured piece of our heritage we never will be able to regain."

His letter to BROWNSON, in part, reads as follows:

"In the years I have been in the practice of architecture, I have been vitally interested in the restoration, and in the preservation of existing architecture which has significance in our American way of life. Most of my activity has been centered around Indiana and I have left the rest of the country up to other people. However, I find that the east facade of the Capitol is about to be destroyed and the fine architecture of Dr. William Thornton, which was approved by George Washington, will disappear with that destruction."

HOT ARGUMENT

Continuing, the James letter said:

"I feel the urgency to advise you that the architects of America, and I am sure many hundreds of thousands of other people, are interested in blocking this expansion program and in solving the necessity for expansion in a different manner. I understand the plans have been completed and contracts have been awarded. I hope you believe as much in the preservation of this Capitol Building as I do, and I hope you will join this fight for a different solution for this necessary construction."

The proposal to remodel the Capitol has set off about the hottest architectural argument since President Truman built a back porch on the White House. Opponents use such terms as "vandalism" and "desecration" to describe their feelings about substituting a modern replica for the actual walls that have served as a backdrop for so many historic events, particularly the inauguration of our Presidents.

BRITISH TRIED

One frequently voiced complaint has been that the congressional commission, headed by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, is about to do what the British where unable to do when they tried to destroy the Capitol by fire in the war of 1812.

Critics say the extra office space added to the Capitol would be the most expensive ever built—an average cost of $200 per square foot. They point out this is about 10 times the going rate for public buildings. They also note that Congress will get huge amounts of additional floor space soon from two buildings already under construction. These are a $64 million third House Office Building and a $23,400,000 second Senate Office Building.

If its extra room that's needed these two new structures should be more than ample to satisfy money-spending Representatives and Senators.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 17, 1958]

MICKEY MCCARTY SAYS

Fellow taxpayers, for the past week or so, news reports out of Washington have contained various suggested panaceas by administration leaders for perking up our sagging economy. Included among them have been tax cuts, public-works programs and others, but not one word has been heard so far about a reduction in Government spending.

Tax cuts and huge public-works projects won't mean a thing unless they are accompanied by a parallel reduction in spending. Otherwise there's likely to be more runaway inflation. A review of the proposed military and foreign-aid budgets should find a fertile field in which to begin trimming. And, of course, there are many other spots where millions in taxpayers' money could be saved.

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS

One of the latter, in the belief of many, would be to put a stop to the proposed expenditure by a congressional commission of a sum variously estimated from $10 to $25 million to rebuild the historic east front of the Capitol Building to provide more offices and restaurants. A bill to halt this project has been sent to the Senate floor with the unanimous endorsement of the Senate Public Works Committee, and soon will be ready for floor action.

A somewhat similar bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman CHARLES (CHUCK) BROWNSON, of Indianapolis. It apparently is still resting in a committee in the House, the speaker of which is SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who is chairman of the 5-man Commission which had slipped through an appropriation for the Capitol changes without a hearing.

REJECTED

The Senate bill would remove the requirement that expansion of the Capitol plant for offices and restaurants be according to a 1905 plan of pushing the east front of the Capitol about 32½ feet out into the plaza. This plan had been rejected 3 times because of public demand before it was authorized by Congress in 1955 in the unusual legislation practice of inserting it in an appropriations bill. No hearings on it were held.

Among those who have voiced objections to the proposed changes in the Capitol is Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat, Virginia). He said that after studying the report of J. George Stewart, architect of the Capitol, he could find nothing "which justifies the proposal to destroy one of the most historic facades in the world." He said the Capitol should be maintained in a safe state of repair and in condition befitting the majesty of the Nation. Changing the appearance, he added, "would be both undesirable and nonessential."

COSTLIEST

The American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Daughters of the American Revolution and other historic and patriotic groups across the country are waging a vigorous fight to stop the Capitol project. The Architectural Forum has estimated, if the present plans are carried out, the cost will be $200 a square foot, which is close to four times the costliest working space ever erected. Some one likened it to the time they paved the lobby of the old Teller Hotel in Central City, Colo., in gold.

The idea of changing this architectural masterpiece just to give Congressmen more elbowroom at lunch and a more convenient place to park, appears to many as utterly ridiculous. As a Baltimore newspaper said: "It makes about as much sense as modernizing the Washington Monument by plastering it with pastel-colored porcelain, or putting aluminum trim on the White House to bring it up to date."

[From the Indianapolis News of March 19, 1958]

MICKEY MCCARTY SAYS

Fellow taxpayers, maybe we are in such a big hurry to get into outer space and to the moon that we cannot afford to waste any time on symbols of the past. At least that is the way it looks as a congressional commission keeps moving ahead in its efforts to change the east front of the United States Capitol.

Though opposition to the change has been mounting daily from the American Society of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Society of Architectural Historians, Daughters of the American Revolution and various State and local historical societies, the congressional commission, headed by Speaker SAM RAYBURN of Texas, continues to ride roughshod over the opposing groups.

HEARING

However, the Senator Public Works Committee last week unanimously voted a favorable report on a bill to block the project and the measure is due to come up for action on the Senate floor at any time. Earlier, the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, conducted a 1-day public hearing when, for the first time, architects, historians and others presented arguments against the changes. A bill similar to the one in the Senate has been introduced in the House by Congressman CHARLES (CHUCK) BROWNSON, of Indianapolis.

Under the proposed plans, that section of the historic Capitol, for which George Washington laid the cornerstone in 1793, will vanish and will be supplanted by a new and shiny marble front. Down also will come the portico where every president since John Quincy Adams has taken the oath of office. The walls which the British were unable to destroy when they fired the Capitol in 1814 also will disappear.

REMINDER

The Commission, which is ready to let contracts for the changes in the Capitol apparently is operating on the theory that "it's none of the people's business." However, in the past, men in public office have been made aware in no uncertain terms that the buildings in which they work don't belong to them, but to the people.

This was the case when President Truman tried to revamp the executive offices at the White House in 1946. Public demand stopped the project. There are many parallels in the White House proposal and the one now being pushed to redo the east front of the Capitol. Both plans were conceived and put into motion without public hearings. No authorized legislation went through Congress. Funds for the projects were tacked on at the last minute to appropriation bills.

WRECKERS

President Truman had wanted additional office space, a cafeteria, and a 2-story auditorium added to the west wing of the White House. Historical and architectural organizations led a last-ditch fight against the changes. When the project finally was halted by Congress, a section of fence had been torn down and wreckers were at work in the basement of the building.

Later, when the main section of the White House was found to be in need of repair, the interior was rebuilt from cellar to roof without damage to the exterior walls and without destroying the architectural beauty of the building. Walls just as historic as those of the White House will disappear if the east front of the Capitol is reconstructed in accordance with proposed plans. If you want to stop this you better write your Senators and Congressmen right away.

Weather Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, recently I began the reading of the final report of the Advisory Committee on Weather

Control and soon noted what appeared to be inconsistencies, if not contradictions.

Unable to resolve these conflicts in the reports and findings of the advisory committee, I wrote to Mr. H. C. S. Thom, Chief Climatologist of the United States Weather Bureau, a veteran of that service and a participant in the studies that were made.

For the information of my colleagues I present herewith the reply from Mr. Thom:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
WEATHER BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1958.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: I can readily appreciate the concern expressed in your letter over the apparent inconsistency in the final report of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. In one place that report states that no increase was detected from seeding in flatland areas while in another place it implies that an effect was detected in the flatlands. The flatlands, of course, include the State of Iowa and all of the area east of the Rocky Mountains. I am glad, therefore, to aid in whatever way I can to clear up this conflict and to help explain the results of the report for those who may wish to use these results in forming their own judgments.

The evaluation of seeding operations in the flatlands for winter operations (October through May) were under my immediate direction. The results we obtained for the flatlands and other areas were clearly stated in volume II, Technical Report No. 2, page 44, lower right column. The so-called physical type methods of evaluation (vol. II, p. 257) which produced the confusion had already been reviewed in Technical Report I, page 7, first paragraph, and rejected on the basis of our experience and the considerable experience of others as being totally lacking in adequate sensitivity for objectively detecting increases from cloud seeding. Most commercial operators who had originally invented these methods had long since discarded them as unsatisfactory for demonstrating effects.

Although these methods are alleged to be physical they are, if anything, more dependent on statistical methods than the statistical evaluations prepared by the committee. This arises from the fact that the results produced by the method are of a highly subjective nature and therefore subject to widely varied conclusions by different meteorologists. This being the case a statistical method of summarizing such impressions is imperative in order to reach a single conclusion in the scientific sense. However, the results furnished by the method are in terms of ratios or percentages of rainfall which are really statistics with the unfortunate property of being highly variable and very difficult to analyze. This makes it very difficult to compare and give meaning to such ratios or percentages in respect to cloud seeding effects.

Notwithstanding the critical role of statistical methods in the interpretation of the results from such physical evaluation, neither the methods nor the results were referred to the committee's panel of outside statistical experts for review and recommendation. This panel is now repudiating these results as giving no evidence either for or against of the effectiveness of cloud seeding in the flatland areas. The committe itself, long before this matter came to the attention of the statistical panel, had ordered an erratum note to be inserted in volume I. This in effect removed the Atlanta Project for Study of Flatland Cloud Seeding, pages 22–23, from volume I placing it in volume II, outside the scope of findings by the committee itself. This action was based on the fact as stated by the committee that the Atlanta project report "has not been reviewed by the committee and consequently is no part of the committee findings." It is unfortunate that the Committee Final Report, volumes I and II, had already been printed before this erratum was prepared since there is the possibility that the erratum may not come to the attention of all readers.

The following summary is given with a full realization of the critical economic importance of water to the farmer and others not only in Iowa but in much drier areas of our country. Having experienced the critical drought of 1947 in Iowa and having studied the general drought problem in other more critical circumstances, I could be under no illusions about the importance of the water shortage problem. This problem, however, must be faced realistically, for it will lead to nothing but bitter discouragement to promise results from methods which have little possibility of bearing fruit. Rainfall cannot be created from clear air where there are no clouds or by false methods, any more than 0.1 inch of water will break a drought.

The results of the committee's evaluations of the effect of cloud seeding in the augmentation of rainfall may be summarized simply as follows:

1. No increases from cloud seeding were detected under either winter- or summertime conditions in the flatland area, which includes Iowa and the area east of the Rocky Mountains.

2. Increases averaging about 15 percent were detected in wintertime seeding over mountainous areas along our west coast and in a similar mountainous climatic area of France.

These latter results are not essentially different from those reported by the United States Weather Bureau as early as 1953. They are interesting for several reasons: (a) they are based on by far the largest amount of actual operating data ever assembled. (b) The same methods showed both increases and no increases, indicating that the methods were capable of recognizing either situation. (c) The results agreed exactly with a set of physical hypotheses concerning cloud seeding effects stated 9 years ago by the highly regarded Scandinavian meteorologist, Prof. Tor Bergeron.

Professor Bergeron summarizes his views in the Swedish journal Tellus, January 1949 as follows: "The discussion * * * can be summarized by stating that any seeding, natural or artificial, mostly will be of little direct use for supplying water to the earth's surface, especially at low levels if there is no condensation by systematic lifting going on within the clouds, even when they are releasable but not released. Having shown on the other hand, that the convective (flatland summer) and frontal clouds (flatland winter), on an average, cancel from the list of such clouds, the main remaining possibility for systematically causing abundant artificial rain must consist in seeding cloud masses produced by a stationary and slanting upward motion. * * * These conditions are, as a rule, only realized within very special orographic cloud systems." (Like those occurring on our mountainous west coast.)

Several other important facts are now clear from Bergeron's work, the work of others, and our own work. Cloud and rain-producing processes must be already present if known methods of seeding are to have a chance of being effective. Thus, cloud seeding is definitely not at present a means for combating or overcoming drought. Furthermore, the processes which Bergeron and the work of others have indicated as effective can only produce very small rates of rainfall, on the order of less than 0.1 inch per hour. This requires that rainfall must persist for several or many hours before appreciable amounts could accumulate. In summer in Iowa such rates of precipitation even if possible, would hardly wet the surface of the soil if they only lasted the duration of a typical afternoon thunderstorm. There is no physical basis or convincing experimental evidence that one can seed a summer cloud from the ground or from an airplane by known seeding methods and produce a shower of rain which does not evaporate before reaching the ground.

The effect on thunderstorms during the summer months over the flatland area is so doubtful that it is not even certain that seeding might not decrease rainfall instead of increasing it. For example, there are some vague indications (see Technical Report 4, p. 55, vol. II) that cloud seeding might suppress hail formation when used properly. If this is possible, then it would follow that such suppression might also be accompanied by a reduction in rainfall. This, however, does not seem to be a point of very much importance, for the number of silver iodide generators generally used in present commercial seeding practice is so small that there is great doubt whether the output of the ordinary generator network ever effectively reaches a thunderstorm except under unusual circumstances. For hail-suppression experiments I have recommended a generator for at least each 10 square miles of area to insure that a thunderstorm sucks up the output of at least 1 generator. This far exceeds the present density in most commercial operations.

Following the preliminary issuance of our evaluation reports and following much other development by a large number of scientists working in the field of weather modification, the American Meteorological Society saw fit to issue the following statement on weather modification in the bulletin of that society for June 1957:

Although this statement covers a broader field and is aimed more at the scientific than the practical aspects it is not in disagreement with our findings or the discussion given above.

"STATEMENT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION

"The Council of the American Meteorological Society has assumed the responsibility for issuing periodic statements on the scientific aspects of weather modification and control. Two previous statements were issued in 1951 and 1953. In view of the additional information on this subject that has become available in the interim the council deems it desirable to issue a revised statement of its opinion at this time. The statement on weather modification approved by the society's council at a meeting in Washington, D. C., on April 29, 1957 is as follows:

"1. The seeding of a supercooled cloud with dry ice will usually convert at least a portion of the cloud to ice crystals. Under appropriate conditions such seeding may release variable amounts of precipitation from fairly deep and active cumulus clouds in which the natural release of precipitation has not already started. Small, inactive cumulus clouds are usually dissipated when they are seeded with dry ice. Holes or valleys may be produced in supercooled layer clouds or supercooled fogs by seeding them with dry ice.

"2. The injection of water drops or hygroscopic salt particles into active, warm (non-supercooled) cumulus clouds may release some rain. Small, inactive, warm cumulus may often be partially or completely dissipated by seeding them from above with water drops or other particles; such dissipation may occasionally be accompanied by the release of very light rain.

"3. In some cases warm fog and stratus may be dissipated in restricted regions by the use of certain hygroscopic materials.

"4 At temperatures below about −5° C. silver iodide crystals are known to affect supercooled clouds in much the same way as dry ice. The frequent absence of clear-

cut results following the operation of ground-based silver iodide generators is believed to be due to one or more of the following causes: (a) the failure of the seeding material to reach the supercooled clouds, (b) the absence of clouds that could be affected by seeding, (c) the decay of the silver iodide, (d) the presence of an ample supply of natural ice crystals, (e) topographical influences which defy quantitative measurement.

"5. Cloud seeding acts only to trigger the release of precipitation from existing clouds. The release of substantial amounts of precipitation by either natural or artificial means requires the preexistence of an extensive moisture supply in the form of moist air currents and of active cloud-forming processes. For this reason the meteorological conditions most favorable for the artificial release of precipitation are very much the same as those which usually lead to the natural release of precipitation. This factor plus the extreme natural variability of precipitation makes the evaluation of the effects of seeding difficult and often inconclusive.

"6. Evaluations performed by independent agencies have yielded reasonably convincing evidence of increases of precipitation due to the operation of ground-based silver iodide generators only for operations conducted in cold weather in regions where forced lifting of the air over a mountain range is an important factor. No convincing evidence has been presented which indicates that ground-based silver iodide seeding affects the amount or character of the precipitation over flat country. This does not prove that there are no such effects but suggests that if present they are too small to be detected by statistical analyses of data available to this date.

"7. In the absence of a truly quantitative theory of precipitation the best present means for obtaining a quantitative estimate of the effect of seeding on precipitation is through the statistical evaluation of randomized cloud seeding experiments. The randomization is necessary to insure valid interpretation of the results and a long series of such experiments may be necessary to detect small effects.

"8. Present knowledge of atmospheric processes offers no real basis for the belief that the weather or climate of a large portion of the country can be significantly modified by cloud seeding. It is not intended to rule out the possibility of large-scale modifications of the weather at some future time, but it is believed that, if possible at all, this will require methods that alter the large-scale atmospheric circulations, possibly through changes in the radiation balance.

"9. All cloud seeding operations should be considered as experiments since the techniques are still under development and there is no sound basis for the quantitative estimation of the results in advance of the operation. As experiments they should be designed primarily to yield optimum scientific results. There is good reason to believe that improved returns from cloud seeding will result from a sound experimental approach and this should be fostered by all concerned."

It would be farthest from my desires to leave the impression that I do not favor research in this field. I am firmly convinced that it is in the national interest to move ahead by further systematic research and sound experimentation, as my previous statements and published work will show. However, research is in the future, and the farmer and businessman deserve to know the present status of our efforts which is what I have tried to give above.

Sincerely,

H. C. S. THOM,
Chief Climatologist, Office of Climatology.

Mental-Retardation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in a pamphlet entitled "The Educator's Viewpoint on the Retarded Child," the authors begin their presentation with the following statement:

One after another of our major health and welfare problems is responding to scientific and social advances—furthered by vigorous public action. Now, one of the most heartbreaking of all handicaps * * * mental retardation—stands at the gateway of public enlightenment.

I have long felt that it is not only important that we see this tragic problem which faces so many in its proper perspective, but that every possible action be taken to alleviate the suffering of both parent and child.

Connecticut's Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL has played a leading role in developing legislative and community approaches which will have a great and positive effect. I know that the parents of retarded youngsters and the people interested in their education are indeed grateful to Senator PURTELL. Today, I would like to join the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in his efforts to broaden the program for the education of the mentally retarded.

Statistics are indeed cold, but they can be used to clearly demonstrate the necessity for understanding and action. Every day there are born in the United States 300 children who are destined to be mentally retarded. On the basis of every 100,000 of population, 3,000 children suffer from mental retardation; 700 from rheumatic heart; 350 from cerebral palsy; 300 from polio of the permanent variety; and 200 from congenital blindness. Rheumatic heart, cerebral palsy, and blindness have received considerable attention from the general public and are today reasonably well understood. Much work remains to be done in these fields, but a strong start has been made. Unfortunately, this is not the case with mental retardation. Research in this field has been, until very recently, limited to a few brilliant and dedicated men. Action to raise required funds and educating the public has been solely in the hands of the retarded children's associations throughout the Nation. These are small groups of parents of retarded youngsters who have voluntarily banded together to solve their own particular problems.

The National Association for Retarded Children has done yeoman work and is to be highly commended. Perhaps it would be well at this time, Mr. Speaker, to define mental retardation. It is a condition of impaired or incomplete mental development dating from birth or an early age—usually associated with slowness to develop and limited ability to learn, reduction of social aptitudes, and limited vocational capacity. This is a definition provided by the national association.

For too many years, the general public and, yes, even medical science have felt that institutionalization was the most intelligent course to follow. They are beginning to think in other terms, particularly along the lines of education. Small cooperative schools have sprung up all over the country. They are performing well a considerable task. The objectives of education for the retarded are divided into roughly three categories.

First. The educable or marginally independent—these individuals have an I. Q. ranging from 50 to 75. They can be trained to become useful members of society, performing many manual tasks that are necessary to our economy and society.

The second group are known as trainable or semi-independent—their I. Q.'s may range from 25 to 50. Here the objective is to train them in adequate habits of personal behavior and self-care.

In the third category, we have those referred to as dependent. Their I. Q.'s are under 30. These youngsters can be helped with proper training to indulge in many interesting activities and their personalities made more compatible. At present, only about one-sixth of the estimated three-fourths millions educable retarded are receiving schooling. Many things are required to correct this situation, but in my mind, the most important thing is to make provisions for the training of teachers especially qualified to instruct and aid the retarded.

Today, I am introducing a companion bill to that sponsored by Senator PURTELL, S. 395. It is designed to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children by grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies. In the first instance, the bill would grant the Commissioner of Education authority to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct training of teachers in fields related to education of mentally retarded children.

In the second place, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining directly or through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, fellowships, or traineeships for training personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of mentally retarded children or as supervisors of such teachers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents, I believe, a sound approach vitally needed, which will be a major stride forward in solving the problem of educating and training the thousands of mentally retarded youngsters born every year. They can and must become useful members of society. I strongly urge action by the Congress in this session.

Charles Evans Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, 96 years ago, on April 11, 1862, Charles Evans Hughes was born in Glens Falls, N. Y. From the day he received his law degree from Columbia University until his death on August 27, 1948, his was a career of dedicated accomplishment.

Mr. Hughes could be long remembered for his judicial wisdom and honesty. He was appointed Associate Justice of the Supreme Court by President Taft in 1910. He served 6 years in that capacity, resigning from the Court on the same day he received the Republican nomination for President. President Hoover appointed him Chief Justice in 1930, in which office he served until his retirement in 1941.

Mr. Hughes has gone down in history as a brilliant administrator. He ably served the State of New York as its Governor from 1906 to 1910. He devoted his talents to keeping the troubled peace as Secretary of State under both President Harding and President Coolidge.

Mr. Hughes was a courageous fighter in the political arena. As Republican candidate for President, he lost to President Wilson by the slim majority of 254 electoral votes to 277.

But, in my opinion, the highest claim to fame of Charles Evans Hughes was as an American patriot. Never have I heard words which moved me as much as what Mr. Hughes said on the 150th anniversary meeting of the First Congress of the United States, March 4, 1939. His speech will live in our hearts, as has Lincoln's Gettysburg speech. I inserted this speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 2, 1942. I am honored to have the privilege of inserting it once more, so that another generation of Americans may know the glory of their heritage.

Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, members of the diplomatic corps, ladies and gentlemen: I thank Senator Barkley from the depths of my heart for his very generous words.

Gentlemen of the Senate and House of Representatives, the most significant fact in connection with this anniversary is that after 150 years, notwithstanding expansion of territory, enormous increase in population, and profound economic changes, despite direct attack and subversive influences, there is every indication that the vastly preponderant sentiment of the American people is that our form of government shall be preserved.

We come from our distinct departments of governmental activity to testify to our unity of aim in maintaining that form of government in accordance with our common pledge. We are here not as masters but as servants, not to glory in power but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by our sovereign, the people of the United States, in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority. If as such representatives we have, as Benjamin Franklin said, "no more durable preeminence than the different grains in an hourglass," we serve our hour by unremitting devotion to the principles which have given our Government both stability and capacity for orderly progress in a world of turmoil and revolutionary upheavals. Gratifying as is the record of achievement, it would be extreme folly to engage in mere laudation or to surrender to the enticing delusions of a thoughtless optimism. Forms of government, however well contrived, cannot assure their own permanence. If we owe to the wisdom and restraint of the fathers a system of government which has thus far stood the test, we all recognize that it is only by wisdom and restraint in our own day that we can make that system last. If today we find ground for confidence that our institutions which have made for liberty and strength will be maintained, it will not be due to abundance of physical resources or to productive capacity, but because these are at the command of a people who still cherish the principles which underlie our system and because of the general appreciation of what is essentially sound in our governmental structure.

With respect to the influences which shape public opinion, we live in a new world. Never have these influences operated more directly, or with such variety of facile instruments, or with such overwhelming force. We have mass production in opinion as well as in goods. The grasp of tradition and of sectional prejudgment is loosened. Postulates of the past must show cause. Our institutions will not be preserved by veneration of what is old, if that is simply expressed in the formal ritual of a shrine. The American people are eager and responsive. They listen attentively to a vast multitude of appeals and, with this receptivity, it is only upon their sound judgment that we can base our hope for a wise conservatism with continued progress and appropriate adaptation to new needs.

We shall do well on this anniversary if the thought of the people is directed to the essentials of our democracy. Here in this body we find the living exponents of the principle of representative government—not government by direct mass action but by representation which means leadership as well as responsiveness and accountability.

Here the ground swells of autocracy, destructive of parliamentary independence, have not yet upset or even disturbed the authority and responsibility of the essential legislative branch of democratic institutions. We have a National Government equipped with vast powers which have proved to be adequate to the development of a great nation, and at the same time maintaining the balance between centralized authority and local autonomy. It has been said that to preserve that balance, if we did not have States we should have to create them. In our 48 States we have the separate sources of power necessary to protect local interests and thus also to preserve the central authority, in the vast variety of our concerns, from breaking down under its own weight. Our States, each with her historic background and supported by the loyal sentiment of her citizens, afford opportunity for the essential activity of political units, the advantages of which no artificial territorial arrangement could secure. If our checks and balances sometimes prevent the speedy action which is thought desirable, they also assure in the long run a more deliberate judgment. And what the people really want, they generally get. With the ultimate power of change through amendment in their hands they are always able to obtain whatever a preponderant and abiding sentiment demands.

We not only praise individual liberty but our constitutional system has the unique distinction of insuring it. Our guaranties of fair trials, of due process in the protection of life, liberty and property—which stands between the citizenry and arbitrary power—of religious freedom, of free speech, free press and free assembly, are the safeguards which have been erected against the abuses threatened by gusts of passion and prejudice which in misguided zeal would destroy the basic interests of democracy. We protect the fundamental right of minorities, in order to save democratic government from destroying itself by the excesses of its own power. The firmest ground for confidence in the future is that more than ever we realize that, while democracy must have its organization and controls, its vital breath is individual liberty.

I am happy to be here as the representative of the tribunal which is charged with the duty of maintaining, through the decision of controversies, these constitutional guaranties. We are a separate but not an independent arm of government. You, not we, have the purse and the sword. You, not we, determine the establishment and the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts and the bounds of the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The Congress first assembled on March 4, 1789, and on September 24, 1789, as its 20th enactment, passed the Judiciary Act—to establish the judicial courts of the United States—a statute which is a monument of wisdom, one of the most satisfactory acts in the long history of notable congressional legislation. It may be said to take rank in our annals as next in importance to the Constitution itself.

In thus providing the judicial establishment, and in equipping and sustaining it, you have made possible the effective functioning of the department of government which is designed to safeguard with judicial impartiality and independence the interests of liberty. But in the great enterprise of making democracy workable we are all partners. One member of our body politic cannot say to another: "I have no need of thee." We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own functions, and all to the spirit which pervades our institutions, exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power, and finding the ultimate security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the promise of continued stability and a rational progress in the good sense of the American people.

Billboards Mar Scenery Along New Interstate Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 85th Congress I have been fighting for legislation to control billboards on our 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System. I have repeatedly pointed out that unless appropriate action was taken, this multi-billion-dollar public investment would soon be defaced by the billboard blight.

My predictions about the billboard menace are coming true right in my own State of Maine, as well as elsewhere. Maine opened its first section of the Interstate Highway last fall from Freeport to Brunswick. This highway passes

through some of the beautiful countryside so typical of our State.

But as the Portland Press Herald points out in an editorial, this stretch of highway "is beginning to go to pot." The scenic roadside areas are being camouflaged by ugly billboards. The Press Herald says:

The tourist who comes to Maine for a change of scene might just as well be driving through the Jersey marshes.

Thus Maine is one of many States vitally interested in the passage of legislation to help control billboards. My State has a $200 million tourist industry which, as it begins to thrive with the approach of summer, will help considerably to revive the Maine economy.

But the thousands of tourists who ordinarily flock to our scenic State certainly will not be inclined to return if they are fenced in by unsightly billboards.

I appeal to the House, on behalf of Maine and the entire American public, to vote tomorrow to accept the conference report on our highway bill. This report does make some provision for the protection of our new highways from the vilification and vulgarization of billboards.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Portland Press Herald of March 24, 1958:

BILLBOARDS MAR SCENERY ALONG NEW INTERSTATE HIGHWAY

Last fall Maine opened its first section of the Interstate Highway from Freeport to Brunswick.

The road is a pleasure to drive, not only because it is a smooth, limited-access highway, but because it passes through some beautiful Maine countryside, with evergreen woods and fields on either side.

But because the legislature and Congress have failed to provide safeguards, already Maine's new highway is beginning to go to pot. The concrete surface is still smooth enough. But the landscape is disappearing behind ugly billboards.

The tourist who comes to Maine for a change of scene might just as well be driving through the Jersey marshes.

Interstate Route 95 through Freeport is fast becoming a potent argument for Congressman HALE'S continuing efforts to write billboard restrictions into interstate highway legislation.

Nixon Helps Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON has been carrying the ball effectively regarding the mutual-security program. Long Beach Press-Telegram columnist Virginia Kelly has taken occasion to comment on the effectiveness of his work amongst Members from both sides of the aisle in the following column:

NIXON MADE BIG HIT WITH DEMOCRATS

"Come now and let us reason together" is a quotation from Isaiah which might serve as a text for Vice President NIXON. The Vice President would be astonished to know that he reasoned successfully a few days ago with a number of Truman Democrats.

The occasion was the bipartisan Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security called by Eric Johnston at the request of the President. Mr. NIXON spoke and conducted a question-and-answer period at the conference.

In private conversations this week several Democrats have said that they found Mr. NIXON tremendously appealing because he spoke frankly and knew what he was talking about. They liked his modest and reasonable manner—"the soft sell" approach which did not attempt to ram his opinions down the throats of others.

One of the canniest Democrats who served in the Truman administration said: "Democrats are all crowing about the expected victory in 1958 and 1960. I believe we will win the Congress in 1958—but in 1960 NIXON will be a hard man to beat. I don't see anyone on our side as persuasive and attractive."

At his March 5 press conference the President commented on the Johnston conference and said that he plans to set up similar conferences on the State and local levels—which he hopes will win general support for his foreign-aid program.

To many Washingtonians it seems that Vice President NIXON could greatly benefit the President's program—and the GOP chances in 1958 and 1960 if Mr. NIXON were to speak at some of these key conferences.

The President said he did not know if any Congressmen were persuaded to change their votes on foreign aid by the conference. If the poeple are persuaded by State and city conferences—the Congress must abide by the decision of the people.

Ohio Bishops Oppose Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of a statement of the Ohio Catholic Welfare Conference in opposition to the right-to-work proposal. The statement appeared in the Denver Register and was edited by Mr. John Wilfred.

OHIO BISHOPS' STATEMENT ON RIGHT-TO-WORK MOVE

Following is the text of a statement released by the Ohio Catholic Welfare Conference and signed by the bishops of the six sees in the State, expressing opposition to a proposal for a right-to-work laws amendment to the Ohio constitution. The movement is really a national one:

"On previous occasions attention has been called to the necessary distinction which must be made between the wisdom of enacting a law and the moral right to do so. Laws at times have been morally valid in themselves but inept and mischievous in their results.

"Right-to-work laws seem to fall into this category where a distinction is necessary. Man has a right and duty to work for his livelihood.

"This right cannot be circumscribed to the extent that a man loses his liberty of choice of a vocation, nor to the extent that he is deprived of an opportunity to support himself and his family. It does not follow that a man has the unconditional right to work in any and every industry or business at will."

RIGHT-TO-WORK LIMITS SHOWN

"For reasons of social justice it may be desirable and often advantageous to the common good that man's right be restricted by certain specified conditions.

"One of these imposed conditions may require that he belong to a labor union or at least be obliged to join the union subsequently, so as to share responsibility with his fellow workmen in support of the union.

"Just as a citizen of the United States is free to live in Ohio, Kentucky, or Pennsylvania, yet is obliged to observe the laws of the particular State as a condition of citizenship, so also in respect to his right to work; he is free to work in any industry of his choice, but only on condition that he abides by the rules adopted by that particular industry as a condition of employment.

"In other words, the right to work is a general right and cannot be denied to men in the aggregate; but the right to work in a specified industrial plant or business can be subject to special conditions."

INTERVENTION NOT ADVISABLE

"If State statutes were to make such a condition of union maintenance mandatory, we would oppose them as unwise, if not unjust.

"If State statutes, however, were to forbid the enforcement of such a condition, when mutually accepted by management and labor through collective bargaining, then we would be equally opposed. We believe it is unwise to encourage State intervention in this matter, whether it be in favor of right-to-work laws or against them.

"There are certain abuses which sometimes creep into the labor movement, but we are convinced that right-to-work laws are not the proper means to correct them. Corruption of certain labor leaders has been one of these current abuses.

"The denial of the democratic processes and the denial thereby of responsibility to the rank and file of union membership, whether in election to office or in the determination of union policy, are prolific causes of these abuses.

"The right to strike, for instance, cannot be denied under certain definite conditions; but it is a right which must be carefully circumscribed and limited by ethical or moral considerations.

"It cannot be exercised willfully, that is, without just and adequate cause, and even then only in matters of grave importance; with a favorable issue reasonably secure; and, lastly but most importantly, after all other peaceful means have failed.

"The right to picket is a concomitant right if a justified strike is called, but violence against persons and property is absolutely wrong and indefensible in conscience.

"Even the right of mass picketing is a very questionable procedure because of the physical intimidation involved and the proximate danger of overt acts of violence ensuing.

"There have been other issues which cause public concern, such as jurisdictional disputes where innocent third parties are made the victims. There are questions also of secondary boycott, which involve serious moral questions.

"All of these should be solved by an increased sense of social responsibility on the part of labor; and if that procedure fails to correct the evils then recourse would be had to regulatory legislation.

"If we have pointed out certain abuses in the labor movement, we do so not because we think their leaders alone are at fault. There have been serious abuses also on the part of management, such as unreasonable and unjust opposition to the right of union

organization, monopoly prices and profits, misrepresentation of products, and bribery and corruption not infrequently. Two wrongs, however, do not make a right, and the two evils do not cancel each other, but intensify the damage done to the common good.

"Much progress has been made in creating mutually satisfactory conditions in recent years in our labor-management relations. It would be socially undesirable to jeopardize the gains achieved by precipitating new causes of strife and ill will."

ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR OUR ECONOMY

"We think it is high time to introduce sound ethical standards into all phases of our economy. The present preoccupation with right-to-work laws may be a good occasion for all our leaders in the field of labor and in the field of management to examine their consciences as to their honest motivation, their ideals, and their practices.

"As to the present issue before the electorate in Ohio, we are convinced that a right-to-work amendment would not solve our problems, but might lead to a more intensified struggle for domination and thus postpone an era of peaceful cooperation.

"Most Rev. KARL J. ALTER,
"Archbishop of Cincinnati.
"Most Rev. EDWARD F. HOBAN,
"Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland.
"Most Rev. EMMET M. WALSH,
"Bishop of Youngstown.
"Most Rev. GEORGE J. REHRING,
"Bishop of Toledo.
"Most Rev. JOHN K. MUSSIO,
"Bishop of Steubenville.
"Most Rev. CLARENCE G. ISSENMANN,
"Bishop of Columbus."

Earmarks of Another Red Phony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, consonant with the remarks I made on the floor of the House today, I enclose the following editorial published in Tuesday, April 1, issue of the St. Louis Globe Democrat, which points up with clarity Russia's most recent propaganda coup. As I mentioned today it is absolutely essential that we be realistic about the Russian overtures for the cessation of atomic-bomb testings. This fine editorial merits the reading of my colleagues.

EARMARKS OF ANOTHER RED PHONY

The Soviet announcement yesterday of a unilateral halt in nuclear weapons tests has all the significance of a unilateral venture in flapping propaganda. It promises little or nothing else.

Foreign Secretary Gromyko in a grandiloquent gesture proposed that Russia abandon future explosions of nuclear arms in furtherance of world peace. The idea is to prove to the whole globe, anyhow the most fearful and ill-informed areas, that Communist Moscow is the outstanding champion of international amity, the courageous foe of nuclear peril.

The Kremlin did not say when it would stop tests. It did not say for how long. It gave no guarantee it would fulfill its glittering pledge, save its own facile word.

The Communist Soviet's word has meant nothing during the history of the last decade. In more than 40 instances of solemn Russian treaties, formal pacts, top-level conventions, and promises, it has wantonly violated all but 5.

Mr. Gromyko did assert that if the United States, Britain, and other powers did not follow suit and bar atom and hydrogen tests, Russia naturally would have to reconsider its decision against such testing.

Obviously what the Kremlin seeks to accomplish is to pressure America, England, Canada, and all states into forsaking trial atomic explosions. The western nations would keep their word if they made such agreement. Moscow knows that. On its record there is little confidence, or none at all, that the Soviet would.

So the Kremlin postured before a nuclear-scared world as the great red father of peace. This is supposed to be a triumph of propaganda diplomacy, and doubtless will be greeted as such in many quarters.

We deeply doubt the sincerity of Nikita Khrushchev's Soviet. Unless the world is more naive than seems possible to conceive, the value of the propaganda rabbit whisked from the Red hat may be heavily discounted.

Russia has just completed a nextensive series of nuclear tests. It does not need to conduct any more for quite a while, nor does it want to. The United States long ago announced it planned tests in the Pacific during the summer. The Soviet would like to prevent these tests.

If Moscow were in earnest about curbing or junking nuclear weapons, it has the obvious and realistic opportunity—by negotiating through the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The Kremlin has boycotted this forum, which it contends is prejudiced.

What could be prejudiced about a pact to outlaw atomic warfare, for all nations under universal guarantees of inspection applicable to all on the same precise basis?

Let us not forget that the United States offered, voluntarily, to turn all its nuclear secrets and weapons over to an international agency after World War II. We then had all atom weapons in existence.

Russia refused. It wanted to develop its own nuclear arsenal. It still refuses to stop making nuclear weapons. It still refuses safeguards that would banish atomic war from the face of the globe.

Under these conditions America has no alternative but to continue testing, in our own manifest defense interests, until a realistic agreement can be made to end the nuclear hazard. The present Russian gesture has all the earmarks of a propaganda phony.

Ike Blows Whistle on Gravy Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following article from the Sunday, March 23, Patriot-News, Harrisburg, Pa.

I thought this was a very timely editorial and want to have it made a part of the RECORD in order that a lot of people may have the benefit of reading it and, too, because it refers to our good friend and most popular Congressman STEVE DEROUNIAN, of New York.

IKE BLOWS WHISTLE ON GRAVY TRAIN

A New York Republican Congressman belted the political farm legislation just passed by the politically-minded Congress as a gravy train for the giant farmer.

Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN really has something there. The hastily enacted farm bill, freezing subsidies and acreage allotments and throwing the Eisenhower administration's flexible farm program into the wastebasket, is one of those gravy deals under which a big Mississippi cotton corporation farm gratefully accepted just short of $1.8 million from Uncle Sam for its 1954 crop and then came along 2 years later and unloaded its cotton on the Federal Government for nearly $1.5 million. A big Texas rice corporation farm cashed a Government check for $830,000 last year in return for pouring its rice into the surplus storage bins. And even the State of Mississippi just this past year collected $71,000 for not planting cotton on acreage of the Mississippi Penitentiary farm. These are only a few of the dollar-studded examples in a program of handouts so many argue is the salvation of our family farms.

Who fuels this long gravy train which has distributed some $14 billion in subsidies in the postwar years?

Just stop reading here for a moment and go look in a mirror. You'll see the answer.

You have a lot of company, American taxpayer and consumer.

You pay the tab twice, not only in taxes but in artificial higher prices.

That goes especially for the city slickers, the millions of them in this land. But it doesn't just break on city-country lines. The small farmer, who has to buy feed grain for his cattle, pays it, too, in this two-way stretch. And just look on in the supermarkets when farm families come to town. The weekly grocery bill is a family budget problem for them on a par with that of the factory hand whose only soil adventuring is a small patch of ground usually given over to a crop of crabgrass.

Talk to the Pennsylvanians who operate family farms. They don't have the rolling acreage, stretching out farther than a man can possibly walk in a couple of days, so wide an expanse that corporation-hired managers keep track of their farm activities by traveling around in an airplane. And then there is the bigtime individual farm operator, who isn't incorporated but who really knows how to cry the economy blues. His farm income is down so much that he's still driving last year's Cadillac.

Now there are many farmers in the South, Southwest, Midwest, and West who don't live on this lush plain of private airplanes and limousines. They aren't starving to death, but Uncle Sam's subsidies have kept them going. And they take as dim a view as any city slicker of these bigtime operators whose major crop isa million-dollar annual check from Uncle Sam or the not-quite-so-big-time farmers who are only in the hundred-thousand-dollar class.

This is a big part and parcel of the emergency program our political farmers in Congress now are claiming is needed to pull the little farmer out of the recession. The little farmer benefits the least from these discredited high and fixed subsidies, acreage allotments and mountainous surpluses.

If the surplus-producing farm program embodied in this Congress-passed bill had worked in the past, its advocates would be in a position from which the antirecession argument could be advanced. But that isn't true.

This is a program which promises no great benefits to the American farmer and no hope of making a gradual transition from governmental handouts and control to a position where he would stand on his own economic feet. And it would serve only as a dollar-

consuming drain on the pocketbook of the American consumer and taxpayer.

No wonder President Eisenhower has promised to veto this bill.

Four Million Five Hundred Thousand Americans Engaged in Import and Export Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the House will again consider an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Believing it will be of interest to all of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled, "The Education of Mr. Weeks." The editorial follows:

THE EDUCATION OF MR. WEEKS

To single out any one man as cleanup hitter from the long lineup of talent which went to bat this past week for reciprocal trade might appear presumptuous—the more so since we intend to pass over President Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, and other luminaries.

Our hero is Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks.

Three years ago, when the question of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act last was under consideration, the Department of Commerce played strictly handsoff. The real reason why has been disclosed by Mr. Weeks himself:

"I once was president of the Home Market Club—a protectionist organization—which later drifted into the American Tariff League," he admitted to a congressional hearing.

This we've known for years about Sinny Weeks, that he formerly was an ardent protectionist. His interests in a large New England silver company well may have influenced this position.

A man can grow, however. Time changes many things. Again, by his own recent admission to Congress, Mr. Weeks said:

"Don't infer from this that I've become a freetrader; I'm no more a freetrader than I am a hardshell protectionist. Basically, I consider myself a moderate."

Essentially, Weeks added, we need legislation to "make jobs and to protect jobs"—those 4,500,000 Americans engaged in import and export trade.

"It's either more trade or more trouble," he emphasized.

The metamorphosis of Sinclair Weeks has not been confined solely to speeches. He set the Commerce Department to work studying how exports and imports affected business within certain congressional districts, whenever and wherever Members of Congress sought this information.

Five studies were made on request—1 in Alabama, 2 in Michigan, and 2 in Connecticut. Four found that foreign trade contributed greatly to the welfare of residents of those districts. The last deemed it essential.

There was honest admission that foreign competition creates a certain small amount of dislocation in some industries. But this was not felt enough to merit torpedoing the greater benefits to the greater number.

Mr. Weeks recognizes these facts. He's changed. He knows the world has changed. And he's sold on reciprocal trade as the soundest method in the world of 1958.

If a charter member of the high-button-shoes protection society can be convinced, others should be too. Sinclair Weeks puts the Nation first.

Reflection During Holy Week Holds the Answer to Our Confusion and Uncertainty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of Holy Week, it is appropriate that we free our thoughts from the burden of concern with material problems and reflect on the ills of the spirit that are a heavier weight on man.

So often do we hear it said "we live in a time of crisis when the very future of humanity is at stake." Surely this is true. But man has always lived in peril. The pages of history run full with the story of the decline of civilizations. Vast populations have been decimated by plague. Kingdoms have toppled before the onslaught of new philosophies.

So our crisis is not man's first confrontation by an uncertain destiny. Our crisis is only of larger magnitude.

The following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 30, written by the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, bishop of the Catholic diocese of Belleville, Ill., is an eloquent commentary on the meaning of Holy Week:

HOLY WEEK HOLDS THE ANSWER

(By the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, bishop of Belleville)

Since the end of World War II, the United States has experienced an unprecedented era of prosperity. Abundance of jobs and higher wages enabled Americans to reach a standard of living higher than ever achieved by any nation. In all material affairs we have surpassed anything that history had known before. Small deposits, time-payment plans adjusted to income, sent everyone on a buying binge. As our material prosperity surged to dizzy heights, our spiritual status failed to keep apace. Men forgot the fundamental truth: "For here we have no permanent city but we seek for the city that is to come" (Hebrews 13: 14).

Recent unemployment reports have caused some to consider seriously and to take inventory of both material and spiritual resources. What they have found has been disconcerting. It is evident that economic security is dependent on many factors and not the least of these is recognition of God as Supreme Lord and Master of the Universe and our dependence upon Him. Every child of God must be aware that God and His Divine Son have been forgotten and completely neglected by many while we enjoyed the blessings and benefits of material prosperity.

We are at the threshold of the sacred season when Christians should become aware of Christ's infinite love. Today begins the most sacred week in the Christian calendar. It is known as Holy Week, a week of special spiritual significance. It begins with the blessing of the palms and reaches a climax on Good Friday afternoon.

Palm Sunday commemorates our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem; Spy Wednesday recalls Judas' secret session with the leaders of those who hated Christ, bargaining for Christ's betrayal; Holy Thursday records the last supper of the Master with His disciples and the institution of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist; Good Friday tells the sorrowful story of our Savior's journey to Calvary, His crucifixion and death upon the cross. These are the great days of great sorrow. They begin with the crowds shouting joyous hosannas to the triumphant Christ and end with the same crowds becoming unruly mobs yelling: "He saved others, himself he cannot save. Let the Christ, the King of Israel, come down now from the cross, that we may see and believe him" (Mark 15: 32).

During Holy Week every Christian should follow in prayerful spirit the Saviour along the Way of Calvary. He should try to understand and appreciate the suffering, humiliation, and death of Christ, who died that "we may have life, and have it more abundantly." Particularly, should we recall that Christ died for us. His infinate love for mankind was a personal affair, and I was included in that love. This love for me He proved by making the supreme sacrifice on Calvary, and with His dying breath pleaded with His Heavenly Father: "Father, forgive them." This is the week of the year when we should thank God for His infinite love that saved us from sin and from hell. It is the week of the year when we beg for the grace to accept our crosses, sorrows, ills of life in reparation for our sins.

In this hour of confusion and uncertainty, Holy Week holds the answer to our problem. It is recognition of Christ, restoration of Him to His proper place in society, and a daily life of gratitude toward the loving, suffering, and dying of Christ of Calvary. "For without me you can do nothing." He says, and unless we restore Him to His rightful place in society, we will not solve our present economic difficulties. There can be no justice, no charity, no peace, no lasting joy without Christ. We have sung our Palm Sunday Hosannas, and now we must take our place at the foot of the cross, not with the howling mob who demanded Christ's death, but with the Sorrowful Mother of God and her holy companions.

Only a Real Reciprocal Trade Bill Can Save Our Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, unemployment and small business failures are on the increase. Farm surpluses are piling up. It is imperative that Congress enact a reciprocal trade bill that will gain us new foreign markets and increase exports to our present markets. Such a bill, H. R. 11250, based upon the reciprocal trade concepts of the late Cordell Hull, is presently before this Congress. I strongly commend to the attention of this House the following letter written by Mr. Donald Comer of Bonita Springs, Fla.

BONITA SPRINGS, FLA.,
March 28, 1958.

EDITOR,
Miami News,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR SIR: Because of the cartoon in your paper of March 10 defending free trade, I

wrote you in defense of tariff and quota protection for our textile industry and although there has been no acknowledgement, I am tempted to write you again because of Ralph Magill's column in your paper of March 25 and of Hal Hendrix's article in your issue of March 26.

President Eisenhower in the beginning promised that this legislation would be administered so as to injure no American industry. Congressman DORN's bill provides additional protective clauses that will safeguard the President's promise.

Mr. Hal Hendrix would have us think that we, together with other threatened industries, are jeopardizing our trade with Latin America. So far as I know, the objections to the President's bill apply principally to the imports from Europe and Asia, of which we already have an overabundance and manufactured competitively.

The imports from Latin America, iron ore, tin, nitrates, bananas, coffee, etc., are all needed and wanted in this country. These things displace no American product and shut down no America mill. If every American ate as many bananas and Brazil nuts and drank as much coffee as I do, they couldn't supply the demand.

Secretary Hull, the father of the reciprocal-trade program, meant it to be reciprocal and is quoted as interpreting it to mean: "Shipping what we have in overabundance that another country needs, and taking in payment what they have in overabundance that we need with some three-way trading." Such a program does not hurt our Latin American trade. I have recently heard some complaint from South America because of the slowing down of their iron-ore shipments to us. They surely know that this is because of the slowing down of our steel industry, because of the slowing down of our auto industry, because of the increasing imports of autos from Europe, particularly Germany. So what? Our immediate concern is Japanese and Hong Kong imports which are coming into this country only because they are cheap, and cheap only because they are made with wages only one-tenth of ours (highest in the world) and which are regulated by our Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD COMER,
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.

P. S.—Since writing the above, President Eisenhower spoke on the radio last night in defense of his misnamed reciprocal trade program. The morning paper headline reads: "Warns of Losses of Jobs at Home if Program Fails." Our concern (and his promised concern) is for the jobs already lost. We feel we are entitled to his first concern for these jobs and for their restoration in the plywood, California and New England fisheries, chinaware, silk scarfs, velveteens, textile fabric and garments, etc., with a growing threat of many more, all from Japan and, of course, I could mention many other things from Europe including wire and automobiles. The President in speaking of the things that we need from other countries in support of his reciprocal trade program listed such items as tin, nickel, rubber, iron ore. I could add to that list, of course, coffee, cocoa, bananas, nitrates, bauxite, etc.

The President knows and I think should have told his audience last evening that there is no lobby in Washington opposing the imports of such products and we already are paying for them with many things that we have in overabundance that these countries need, operating well within Mr. Hull's interpretation of his reciprocal trade policy: "Swapping what we have in overabundance that other countries need and taking in pay what the other countries have in overabundance that we need with some three-way trading."

The President mentioned the need of some countries for our surplus farm products. He could have reminded his audience that our farm surpluses were largely the result of Government subsidies and are sold at a loss at world prices. Would it not be better to give them away outright than to take partial pay in imports that shut down American industry. Give Japan some cotton, pay them to weave it and give it to the naked people of New Guinea and Borneo and Africa. They may like shirts and become new customers and may be new friends. We missed out in Russia and China.

The President in listing last night the imports we need over which there is no controversy unfortunately failed to mention those items I listed above, which yesterday and today are hurting American industry. This is why there is opposition to his reciprocal program, and why American industry must have the additional safeguards that are embodied in Congressman DORN's bill. Did the President see the picture of the breadline in the textile town of Biddeford, Maine. We want world trade and are supporting the Dorn bill, but the President forgets that the American wage is the highest in the world, undergirded by the Government itself, and what we make has to be protected from things made under such different conditions and different wage standards. We are not greedy nor whining, we refuse to be expended, and we are sorry that we can't get our story told under the same sponsorship the President furnished last night, he is the President of all the people, and our side is our honest opinion.

Alaska Treatment Shameful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, statehood for Alaska is long overdue. For nearly a century we have continued to hold Alaska in semicolonial status, granting to Alaskans only the benefits of second-class citizenship. That such a situation cannot be allowed to continue seems to me elementary and I trust that Congress will act promptly to remedy it.

A recent letter by Mr. C. Girard Davidson, Democratic national committeeman for Oregon, appearing in the March 30 issue of the Portland Oregonian, points up the need for immediate statehood for Alaska. I think Mr. Davidson presents cogent arguments which dictate action at this time. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Davidson's letter:

ALASKA TREATMENT SHAMEFUL

To the EDITOR:

Ninety-one years ago today, William H. Seward, Secretary of State under President Johnson, bought Alaska from Russia for $7,200,000.

In the Treaty of Cession, signed March 30, 1867, the United States guaranteed Alaska citizens that "The inhabitants of the ceded Territory * * * shall be admitted to all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

That was the pledge, made 91 years ago. The United States has not kept that pledge. Yet a treaty is the highest law of the land. And it is made in the clear view of all mankind.

For 91 years we have maintained Alaska, for all intents and purposes, as a colony. The world is in revolt against colonialism. The United States—in international affairs—claims leadership for the cause of democracy and against the evils of colonialism. Twelve years ago, the United States signed the United Nations Charter, agreeing in section 73 (which deals with territories) to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions."

Only 3 years ago, through the Pacific Charter, the United States again pledged itself to uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples.

In spite of these noble statements, ignoring our promises and guaranties set forth in our Treaty of Cessions, disregarding our position of leadership in the cause of democracy, we have held Alaska in colonial status for 91 neglectful years.

For 91 years, Alaskans have been taxed but denied representation; have observed the laws and regulations promulgated by both Democratic and Republican administrations; but have never been allowed to vote for a President or Vice President of the United States. Alaskans have been forced to develop their own trade and industries, but have not been given possession of their own land—98 percent of which is still held as Federal (untaxable) domain.

Alaskan sons have been conscripted to serve in the Armed Forces, but Alaskans have not been allowed the representation in the Congress through which they could voice opinions and cast votes as to the wars in which their sons were to serve.

Frequently, working under overwhelming, antiquated Federal laws and regulations, Alaskans have been compelled to develop their natural resources with little or no assistance from the United States; and, in the case of their rapidly dwindling fish resources, the Federal Government has actually prevented Alaskans from conserving their own natural wealth.

Our record in regard to Alaska is shameful. In spite of United States oppression, Alaska has moved steadily and resolutely forward and is today, with a population already 30 percent greater than that of Nevada, the fastest growing land under the American flag.

Similar to the resolute pioneers who settled Oregon 100 years ago, Alaskans are strong-willed, indomitable individualists, equal to the rugged terrain and harsh elements of the Territory. They have spoken out loudly and clearly in their desire for statehood. In three elections, the cause has carried overwhelmingly and in a recent preference poll, Alaskans voted 12 to 1 for statehood. Yet, our Government, for stingy and selfish political reasons, refuses their plea.

Oregon can benefit mightily from this vast and rapidly developing land. Oregonians in speaking out for statehood have done much to develop lasting friendship with Alaskans. The Oregonian's strong editorial support and leadership is recognized and appreciated by Alaskans. Oregon badly needs the markets provided by an industrialized Alaska; Oregon's delegation will benefit from the like-minded assistance of two Senators and one Representative serving in the United States Congress.

Forgetting political partisanship and allegiances, all Americans need now to move forward to assure justice and democracy to Alaskans. We need now to fulfill our 91-year-old treaty guaranty. We must not allow another Alaska day to pass and mark another year of broken promises. Alaska must be given statehood now.

C. GIRARD DAVIDSON,
Democratic, National Committeeman for Oregon.

Petition Relative to Reciprocal Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition signed by several hundred of my constituents and also residents of the First District of West Virginia relative to the reciprocal trade legislation:

MARCH 4, 1958.

TO OUR CONGRESSMAN:

We, the undersigned, are employees of the Taylor, Smith & Taylor Co., Chester, W. Va., manufacturers of semivitreous dinnerware.

Many plants in our industry have been forced to close their doors, and certainly many more plants will be forced to follow suit if the Trade Agreements Act is extended again. Under present conditions, we have nothing to look forward to except less and less hours of work and insecurity for our homes and families.

We urge you to oppose the administration's trade agreements bill H. R. 10368, and return to congressional authority to regulate foreign commerce as provided in the Davis bill, H. R. 10818:

E. S. Morse, East Liverpool, Ohio; Juanita Cline, Chester, W. Va.; P. J. Frantone, Wellsville, Ohio; Suzanne Simcox, Chester, W. Va.; Betty Miller, Mary Ellis Rayne, Ruth M. Kind, H. F. Schneidmiller, East Liverpool, Ohio; S. J. Reber, Chester, W. Va.; Joanne Hall, June Dailey, C. C. Davidson, East Liverpool, Ohio; Elaine Smith, Chester, W. Va.; Ruth M. Russell, East Liverpool, Ohio; Eva Mae Staats, Lisbon, Ohio; W. L. Smith III, Eileen West, Barbara Rushton, East Liverpool, Ohio; Ruby Pugh, Beverly Bickerstaff, Chester, W. Va.; Joyce Ridge, East Liverpool, Ohio; Wilma Elliott, Bonnie Shaw, Chester, W. Va.; Wilma Eardley, East Liverpool, Ohio; Sara Sturme, Virginia L. Rigby, Chester, W. Va.; Margaret Castello, East Liverpool, Ohio.

Lucille Carter, Mrs. Warren Dreussi, Noah Show, Harriet McElhaney, Ward A. Wheeler, Maxine Maley, Olive Burson, Melvina Dorrell, Victor Dorrel, East Liverpool, Ohio; Jack Mumaw, J. C. Barriss, Dominic Ruggire, Noah Wood, Chester, W. Va.; Arthur Cunningham, East Liverpool, Ohio; James B. Yoho, Chester, W. Va.; Willie Sturgeon, Negley, Ohio; Donald Humphreys, Carl Ward, East Liverpool, Ohio; Paul D. Conkle, Chester, W. Va.; Elizabeth Stoppe, East Liverpool, Ohio; Miriam Reed, Joe Meymone, Artie E. Bates, Belra Morris, Chester, W. Va.; Gladys Calhoun, Newell, W. Va.; Glennis Ryland, East Liverpool, Ohio.; Mary Ambrose, Chester, W. Va.; Rickard Jackson, Eugene Mathes, East Liverpool, Ohio; Ida Allison, Chester, W. Va.; Marie Roberts, East Liverpool, Ohio; Carrie Brannon, Sistersville, W. Va.; Bessie Nelson, East Liverpool, Ohio; Wilmer Pugh, Jr., Chester, W. Va.; Lawrence Dickey, Jerry McCune, Dale McElhaney, Harry Brown, East Liverpool, Ohio; James Goppurt, Chester, W. Va.; Charles Elliott, East Liverpool, Ohio; Clyde Reed, Chester, W. Va.; P. R. Woods, William W. Price, East Liverpool, Ohio; Robert Severs, Chester, W. Va.; James L. Allison, East Liverpool, Ohio; William Hulme, Audrey Wright, Chester, W. Va.; Paul D. Hardy, Vida M. Allison, East Liverpool, Ohio; Madge Milan, Chester, W. Va.; Lula Brooks, Newell, W. Va.; Leonard Richard, East Liverpool, Ohio; Robert D. Fraser, Wellsville, Ohio; Paul Franklin, East Liverpool, Ohio.

Minnie Sauers, Chester, W. Va.; Janet Brand, Patricia Blankenship, Hazel Russell, Hayward L. Goldsmith, East Liverpool, Ohio; Robert G. Reed, Zella G. Ash, Chester, W. Va.; Tessie Henrich, East Liverpool, Ohio; Dorothea Garrett, Hannah Lyons, Florence Powell, Chester, W. Va.; Joseph Martin, East Liverpool, Ohio; Floyd Van Nuy, Wellsville, Ohio; Esther Morgan, Toronto, Ohio; Robina Deeta, East Liverpool, Ohio; Lea Wagner, Clinton, Pa.; Thelma Vincent, East Liverpool, Ohio; Dorothy Thompson, Violet Huffman, Chester, W. Va.; George Wilcox, Wellsville, Ohio; Charles L. Dugan, Roy Buzzard, East Liverpool, Ohio; R. L. Stewart, Chester, W. Va.; William Bryan, East Liverpool, Ohio; Charles Barmer, Chester, W. Va.; Freda Phillips, Harry Shaw, East Liverpool, Ohio; Charles Mushgrove, Chester, W. Va.; Gerald Faulk, Harry Drane, East Liverpool, Ohio; John Pillo, Sr., Chester, W. Va.; Henry M. Vorndran, William Rinestine, East Liverpool, Ohio; Thelma Gregory, Richard Cerndiff, Lawrence Haun, Mary Helen Michaels, Margie McConnell, Phyllis McCullough, Ernest W. Judy, Richard K. Judy, Chester, W. Va.; Nina Moore, Georgetown, Pa.; Evelyn Dowling, Wellsville, Ohio; John C. Hayes, Chester, W. Va.; Evelyn Rinestine, East Liverpool, Ohio; Alma Marshall, Hazel Shroades, Gladys McConnell, Chester, W. Va.; Betty Heath, Newell, W. Va.; Ethel Robinson, Chester, W. Va.; Ray Gwin, Paul H. Adams, Wellsville, Ohio, William T. Grimm, East Liverpool, Ohio.

Alma Boston, Ellen Lomax, Lucille Cunningham, Leona Brown, Mae Studa, East Liverpool, Ohio; James Hubbard, Jo Ann Saraliza, Erla Beckman, Chester, W. Va.; Margaret Monroe, Marcella Bancroft, Florence Curran, East Liverpool, Ohio; Hazel Chaney, Marie Neff, Bessie Laudrille, Chester, W. Va.; Foster Crous, Helen Hancock, Agnes Cermak, East Liverpool, Ohio; Ryda Brown, Chester, W. Va.; Helen Morgan, Wellsville, Ohio; Elsie Darrah, Gertrude Rhodes, Chester, W. Va.; Mary Kennedy, East Liverpool, Ohio; Dean Golden, Wellsville, Ohio; Sophia Myers, Adeline Price, East Liverpool, Ohio; Ethel Carraher, Wellsville, Ohio; Clara Buxton, Blaine Allison, Chester, W. Va.; Lawrence E. Jones, James Massey, Leland McNutt, William K. Myers, Gladys Buzzard, Helen Brennen, Margaret Baker, Chiouris Wright, Lillie Franklin, Charles Clark, East Liverpool, Ohio; Edith Hart, Chester, W. Va.; Goldie Fowler, East Liverpool, Ohio; Martha Rice, Lucille Woods, Chester, W. Va.; Alice Scott, East Liverpool, Ohio; Clarence Angle, Vira Beebout, Chester, W. Va.; Lottie McCoy, East Liverpool, Ohio; Susie Haught, Betty Reed, Olive Martin, Chester, W. Va.; Lawrence E. Quartanow, Myrtle Boston, Floyd McKnight, Zelma Holman, East Liverpool, Ohio; Marie Shrvades, Chester, W. Va.

Pearl Cain, John Rice, Howard Robinson, East Liverpool, Ohio; Rufus Robuson, Chester, W. Va.; Betty Williams, Harold Quarterman, Earl Applegate, East Liverpool, Ohio; Paul Eugene Reed, Chester, W. Va.; Charles E. Howell, Samuel T. Wright, Eugene J. Mitchell, Ray Stull, East Liverpool, Ohio; Harold Sheely, East Palestine, Ohio; John J. Leach, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Martha Pugh, Julia Davis, Chester, W. Va.; William T. Ferguson, Jr., Don Stewart, Samuel G. Wright, Paul Dawson, East Liverpool, Ohio; Frank Simcox, Chester, W. Va.; Clyde Huff, Felix Kology, Charles R. Williams, Richard Hart, Chester, W. Va.; Elsie Shatkers, Hookstown, Pa.; Francis Davis, Richard Barker, East Liverpool, Ohio; Earl E. Miller, Newell, W. Va.; Howard Bunner, Chester, W. Va.; George Eddy, East Liverpool, Ohio; James O'Dell, Canton, Ohio; Preston Smith, East Liverpool, Ohio; Harry P. Rose, Wellsville, Ohio; Jim Geon, W. C. Henthorn, East Liverpool, Ohio; Audrey Bosworth, Harold Staggers, Opha Callum, Chester, W. Va.; Florence Hendricks, East Liverpool, Ohio; Daniel John, Chester, W. Va.; Richard Felton, East Liverpool, Ohio; Alta Smith, Ruth Jones, Eugene Cochman, Orla Bowers, Chester, W. Va.; Erwin E. Newlen, John Roberts, East Liverpool, Ohio; Cecelia Stalryla, Irene McMahon, Marie Ingram, Chester, W. Va.; Loula J. Allison, Hookstown, Pa.; Olive Smith, East Liverpool, Ohio; Irene Dawson, Chester, W. Va.

Jeannette Cundiff, Mabel E. De Long, Rachel Skeens, Grace Rogers, Willis Snow, Hazel Martin, Chester, W. Va.; Mary Geon, Gladys Blouir, Ronald L. Small, E. S. McFall, Lolance Welch, Robert Boley, East Liverpool, Ohio; John Strum, Chester, W. Va.; Mary Ferguson, Gaynell Hull, Margaret Costo, Edna Hoffman, East Liverpool, Ohio; Harold P. Stan, Chester, W. Va.; Edward Pam, East Liverpool, Ohio; August David, Chester, W. Va.; J. R. Van Duoen, Paden City; C. T. Cartwright, Wellsville, Ohio; Clifford Vaughn, Roy Tuttle, Gladys Lewis, Chester, W. Va.; Bernice Meekly, Ellen Prescott, East Liverpool, Ohio; James Forbeck, Wellsville, Ohio; Paul Logston, Chester, W. Va.; Jay Nuzum, East Liverpool, Ohio; Paul Baxter, Orris H. Cundiff, Chester, W. Va.; Paul Groubert, East Liverpool, Ohio; John M. Rose, Chester, W. Va.; Donald A. Williams, East Liverpool, Ohio; Howard W. Robinson, Newell, W. Va.; Albert Woodyard, Chester, W. Va.; Charles Fairs, Wellsville, Ohio; Robert Cross, Georgetown, Pa.; William, Logston, L. Callahan, Chester, W. Va.; James Noble, East Liverpool, Ohio; John M. Hart, Dana Logston, Abe Lyons, George Smith, George E. Davidson, Donald R. Patterson, C. G. Wilson, Chester, W. Va.; Frank Cairns, East Liverpool, Ohio; Harry Gallop, Chester W. Va.; Margaret Smith, East Liverpool, Ohio; O. W. Moore, Glenn L. Wilson, Chester W. Va.

Zada Lewis, East Liverpool, Ohio; Archie Gorly, East Palestine, Ohio; Homer Summers, Newell, W. Va.; Clarence Davis, Ray Puyle, East Liverpool, Ohio; Howard V. Clendenning, Hubert Paire, Harley Hill, Opal Angle, Hazel Sax, Chester, W. Va.; Helen Duke, East Liverpool, Ohio; Dorothy Buzzard, Claudia Delong, Lisbon, Ohio; Beatrice Bryan, Chester, W. Va.; Wilma Brown, Rebecca Cairns, East Liverpool, Ohio; Dorothy Bennett, Robert Pierce, Chester, W. Va.; Helen Enochs, Newell, W. Va.; Perry Lamy, Chester, W. Va.; Fred Bowlen, East Liverpool, Ohio; James Jacobs, Chester, W. Va.; B. D. Montgomery, Grafton, W. Va.; John Jones, East Liverpool, Ohio; Isaac Lyle, Chester, W. Va.; John D. Fulmer, Chas. Ervin, Gowers, Ohio; Alonzo D. Brown, Chester, W. Va.; Almeda Jones, East Liverpool, Ohio; Geneva Butcher, Georgetown, Pa.; Olive Ulbright, Daisy Markle, Frances Switzer, Chester, W. Va.; Anna Welch, Bess G. Parsons, Bonnie I. Mort, Mabel Waggle, East Liverpool, Ohio; Josephine Putnam, Toronto, Ohio; Alice Ferguson, Faye McGraw, Dorothy R. Smith, George R. Myles, Hazel Buchee, East Liverpool, Ohio; Archie West, Chester, W. Va.; Albert Harold, Dorman Winder, East Liverpool, Ohio; Wm. Walters, Chester, W. Va.; William Riedel, East Liverpool, Ohio; Floyd Weeks, East Palestine, Ohio; Elmer Nelson, Stovell Powers, Jr., East Liverpool, Ohio; Lillie Ma Woods, East Palestine, Ohio; Wanda M. Smith, East Liverpool, Ohio; Edgar Wagner, Clinton, Pa.

Edward P. Wright, John Gilhes, East Liverpool, Ohio; A. L. Rhodes, Thomas Calvin, Wellsville, Ohio; Paul Conkle, Jr., Russell G. Smith, Edward Haught, Chester, W. Va.; Tom Jarvis, Lester B. Thompson, East Liverpool, Ohio; Jeanne Pelley, Chester, W. Va.; Alma Jane Chambers, East Liverpool, Ohio; Robert Lee Powers, Chester, W. Va.; Charles Sayr, East Liverpool, Ohio; Joseph Judy, Homer Logston, Charles B. Rud, Chester, W. Va.; Paul E. Minnis, New Cumberland, W. Va.; W. L. Elliott, Chester, W. Va.; Wilbur Purinton, Jr., Mae Thompson, East Liverpool,

Ohio; Zara Garvin, Grace Wedgewood, Edith Logston, Jean Logston, Chester, W. Va.; Anna Williams, East Liverpool, Ohio; Edith Fetty, Chester, W. Va.; Margaret Thayer, New Cumberland, W. Va.; Mary Thiess, Dora Allison, Chester, W. Va.; Florence Groubert, East Liverpool, Ohio; James Woods, Glenn Rey, Chester, W. Va.; Dewitt Wilber, Donald B. Powell, East Liverpool, Ohio; Forest Buck, Charles E. Brown, Chester, W. Va.; Louise Fortman, East Liverpool, Ohio; Pauline Barrett, Newell, W. Va.; Bettie Reed, Polly Bowyer, East Liverpool, Ohio; Nellie Toiffoneff, Newell, W. Va.; Margaret Black, Eunice Clark, Bernice Mathus, East Liverpool, Ohio; Margaret Van Thyne, Emil M. Rice, William Withrow, Roy C. Haught, Chester, W. Va.; Mary Buckley, New Cumberland, W. Va.; Paul H. Van Devender, Chester, W. Va.; Lillie Davis, Salineville, Ohio; Nellie R. Brooks, Chester, W. Va.; Mildred Pots, New Cumberland, W. Va.; Kathryn Wiley, East Liverpool, Ohio.

Paul C. Rinestine, James R. Vodrey, East Liverpool, Ohio; James J. Daniels, Wellsville, Ohio; James A. Manis, Artie Balmenti, Chester, W. Va.; Mary Alice Rardin, Hookstown, Pa.; Ruby E. Wise, Isabelle Nolan, Louise Boretempt, East Liverpool, Ohio; Anna Cochran, Chester, W. Va.; Arthur Tranter, Juanita Russell, East Liverpool, Ohio; Harry McHenry, Chester, W. Va.; Clyde Mort, East Liverpool, Ohio; Curt Brown, Salineville, Ohio; Barry L. Ridgley, Marie Russell, Frances T. Doherty, East Liverpool, Ohio; Clarence Lintrin, Salineville, Ohio; Nell Garren, East Liverpool, Ohio; Lillian Brown, Salineville, Ohio; Flossie Diddle, Ruth Drane, Elizabeth Czech, East Liverpool, Ohio; Herbert T. Adams, Charles Michaels, Chester, W. Va.; Arch R. Smith, Iona Shroades, East Liverpool, Ohio; Leonard Bruner, Westfield, Ohio; Chas. Brown, William H. Shanton, Margaret Jackson, East Liverpool, Ohio; Therman Trowbridge, William L. Haney, Emma Bryan, Chester, W. Va.; Virginia Bowen, Newell, W. Va.; Florence Bratt, East Liverpool, Ohio; Virginia Shroads, Chester, W. Va.; Katherine Riyor, Hattie Grimes, East Liverpool, Ohio; Harold Engle, Chester, W. Va.; Arthur Lightfoot, East Liverpool, Ohio; Naomi Koenig, Newell, W. Va.; Mary Mickey, Chas. H. Purton, Jane Prince, Theodore Baxter, East Liverpool, Ohio; Mildred Dunham, B. Harrison Smith, Doris J. Davis, Clyde Barnhart, Chester, W. Va.; John Simballa, Chester Sayre, Emil Hasenstab, R. B. Smith, Mary M. Portchin, Leona Millward, E. J. Gaston, William E. Gaston, H. R. Frederick, East Liverpool, Ohio.

Our Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger on March 28, 1958:

OUR FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

While the plight of the elderly is deplorable in New Jersey, the problem is not one that is unique with this State. The old folks in many other sections of the country are no better off.

Representative PETER RODINO recognizes this in his call for a White House conference for the study of the aged. A conference of this sort, under the auspices of the President, would focus attention on a problem sorely in need of attention.

But dramatizing the plight of the aged is only part of the job. We must first recognize the job that has to be done. The next step is to get to work on it.

This is a fertile field for congressional action—so little has been done, and there is so much to do. But the most important thing now is to bring the problem into the national spotlight * * * and a White House conference would be a fine way to do that.

Help for the aged must come from many sources; some of them are local, but there is much that can be accomplished on a national scale. A White House conference, as RODINO points out, probably would lead to recommendations to Congress and legislative action.

RODINO's suggestion already has won the support of Representative JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee. We think it is an idea which should take hold in Congress, since it could make an important contribution toward the formulation of a program for the Nation's senior citizens.

They are badly in need of help. We hope they will not be forgotten by Congress.

Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the House will not be in session next week, I am taking this occasion to mention that on Wednesday next in the United States and in the Republic of the Philippines the peoples of these two great lands will be joined in observance of Bataan Day.

On April 9, 16 years ago, the tattered remnants of a joint Philippine-American force wearily surrendered to the overwhelming attack force of the Japanese Army. Bataan, April 9, 1942, was a dark moment for two countries. Men of both the Philippines and the United States had fought and fallen together; now they were to suffer defeat and captivity together. Whatever else Bataan may have cost our two nations, it is symbolic of this historic tie, this working together for the benefit of both.

Today this bond has become an important link in the chain of defense for the free world. The Pacific area is once again a focal point of the continuing international crisis, and still standing together are the Governments and the peoples of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines.

The nations of the southeast Asia area have realized, as have the member states of NATO before them, that collective security is the only defense against the armed might of forces that would destroy them. SEATO is the result. In this as in other joint defense moves the Philippines speak of mutual defense from the experience gained in World War II. The Philippines have also joined with the United States in bilateral agreements to supplement the defense of their own country, as well as our country and the rest of the free world.

While Moscow has raised the issue of colonialism in Asia and Africa, the Philippine Republic is the living answer to their propaganda. July 4 is Independence Day in the United States and in the Philippines. Their constitution is modeled on our own. The ideals of their people are the ideals of our people.

Bataan Day stands as a monument to the bonds that unite us, and on each anniversary of April 9, 1942, we renew our pledge that never, never shall those bonds be severed.

The Philippines are a beacon of hope for democracy in the troubled Pacific. On April 9 our thoughts will be with the brave and dedicated people of the islands and the many Americans of Filipino birth or descent who by industrious effort and good deeds among us have enriched our own lands. And we shall be remembering with gratitude and affection the service and the sacrifice of that band of Americans, now enshrined in immortal fame, that fought to the last inch of ground, as comrades with the Filipinos, and 16 years ago faced the blackness of the night and the tortures of captivity. To the survivors of that band and their Filipino comrades, and to the families of those that have gone on, we give the assurance that never will they be forgotten, never will the story of Bataan lose interest or fail to give inspiration to every generation of Americans as time marches into the centuries ahead.

The Legislator Looks at the Physician's Place in Public Affairs—Congressman Judd Speaks to Medical Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Courier issue of March 1958, the magazine of the George Washington University Medical Center, Washington, D. C.:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER H. JUDD, REPUBLICAN FROM THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE MEDICAL SCHOOL STUDENT BODY ON JANUARY 11, 1958—DR. JUDD IS A PHYSICIAN, A FORMER MEDICAL MISSIONARY IN CHINA, AND HAS BEEN IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS SINCE 1942

The day has come when it is not possible for the doctor to practice by himself, any more than it is for a businessman to work by himself. They have both got to work in terms of the whole picture.

Our profession is going through a transition, the same as various other professions, even politics to some extent. In the beginning the doctor treated symptoms. He didn't understand what caused them, but he was called in to relieve pain or difficulty. * * * He was skilful in relieving symptoms, much

more than we are today, in my opinion, because he concentrated his attention on these symptoms.

He knew how to write prescriptions that had such a bitter taste that it had at least some sort of psychological effect on the patient. He got better in order to be relieved of the necessity of taking more of the decoctions.

These men were not too bad in their field. In China I found the medical profession at this stage of development. They were experts at prognosis from their study of pulses. They have about 14 different kinds of pulses.

They will tell you how long the patient can live with these different kind of pulses. I learned not to stick out my neck and tell them I didn't see why the patient had to die because when it comes to predicting how long he was going to live, they were usually more accurate than I was because they concentrated on this one thing.

Now, there is a danger in this kind of medicine because when you treat the symptom, you don't get at the basic root of the disease. I learned that when I gave aspirin to malaria patients along with quinine, at about the time the fevor was about to break, anyway, they would break into a sweat and the fever would go down and the aches and pains and misery would be gone.

They would say, "That's wonderful," and they wouldn't take the bitter quinine; they just wanted the aspirin.

I would say, "But you'll be sick again in another few days if you don't take the quinine."

"Never mind," they'd say, "I'll come back and get another aspirin."

So, I had to quit giving aspirin in order to get them to take the quinine. Often I gave them medicine for the disease and hoped and prayed the symptoms wouldn't disappear too quickly, because then the patient wouldn't come back again * * *.

This was the stage of development in medicine a few years ago.

Then somebody discovered the tubercle bacillus, and someone else the diptheria bacillus. Someone began doing autopsies in numbers. It became clear that there were processes going on in organs that produced the symptoms. The doctor began to shift his attention from the results, the symptoms, to the causes of disease.

This was the period when I was trained in medicine, often called the period of therapeutic nihilism. We treated the disease, studied the disease, forgot about the patient. The ear was glued to the stethoscope, the eye to the microscope. It was a good period but it was not enough * * *.

Then we asked, "What can we do to prevent these processes?" The shift, the continuing metamorphosis was to preventive medicine. You had to be able to interpret the tuberculin patch, study sewage disposal, water and milk purity, pure food laws. The doctor had to use his immunizing needle as well as his stethoscope.

Then we went to a fourth stage, waking up to what the Chinese doctors had known all the time, the importance of the relationship of the emotions and the mind to the processes, and vice versa. We lost too many patients to those who treated people's emotions and created faith in them while we were just taking care of certain physiological processes.

There developed a good deal of attention to psychosomatic medicine.

The war came for us as it did for businessmen, and you went through medical school and were all ready to begin practice, but the Government said, "No, Uncle Sam has greetings." So you went out and tried to practice medicine around the world under conditions for which you were not prepared, and many a doctor woke up to the fact that it was not enough to be a skilled physician; he had to pay some attention to the political developments that had gotten us into all this dislocation * * *.

So, just to practice medicine, not to consider other things, we have got to pay more attention to public affairs than we have ever done in the past. We have to do it, really, for three reasons: first, we have to do it to insure the conditions which will enable us to practice good medicine with success and satisfaction for ourselves.

Second, we have to pay some attention to public affairs in order to influence and improve conditions which adversely affect our patients. This is part of our obligation; not just to make the diagnosis, "This man has hypertension," or "He has arthritis," because he's got something else wrong with him, too. He's got a business that's in trouble. Inflation is taking his life's savings. He doesn't see what is ahead; he is apprehensive about atomic weapons. What kind of a world is he going to live in?

These things bother him just as much as is ulcers or his insomnia or his gaseous indigestion. If you are really going to contribute to the man's needs, you have to understand the impact of his environment on him and be in a position to influence that environment to produce more favorable conditions.

There is a third reason, in addition to what you have to do, yourself, as a physician. That is to influence your future and that of your children as citizens, because before anyone is a doctor or a clergyman or a businessman, he is a citizen of this Republic. You are taxpayers and parents; you are trustees of a heritage, a way of life, a philosophy, that has made it possible for you to be here in this medical school.

That heritage is under attack: cold, calculating, determined, and increasingly successful attack, all around the world. If we are going to be good physicians for ourselves, our families and our patients, and our society as a whole, we must realize that nobody is needed more desperately than those with the kind of minds you have after the kind of training you have had in your medical school. Approach the political diseases just as you do physical and emotional diseases.

Doctors, almost to a man, are opposed to socialized medicine. By that I mean medical services supported and controlled by the Government.

The general public says, "You doctors are against socialized medicine because you have a union, a closed shop. You want to keep everybody out of it and you want to protect you own interests, jack up prices, and so on. You are against Government supported and controlled medicine because it will hurt you."

Now, this is not so. It isn't because it would hurt us that we are against it. The good doctor can always get ahead under any system. The poor doctor is better off under socialized medicine than he is under free competition. He does not have to worry. He gets out of medical school find the Government offers him six or seven thousand dollars a year right off the bat. He can continue with that the rest of his life and probably won't do much better than that. But, at least he is secure. Government will keep him on almost indefinitely.

The rank and file will be more secure under socialized medicine. Once in a while you find a doctor who is for it. The doctors as a group would not be worse off.

But, the patients would be worse off.

There are three essentials to good medical practice. First, the relationship between the physician and the patient must be wholly voluntary. If it isn't, something goes out of the interest and the confidence of the relationship. If the patient is just a number assigned to him by the Government, the doctor, in many cases, doesn't have the same interest he would if the patient chose him, in which case the doctor would want the patient to keep coming back to him.

Contrariwise, if the patient didn't choose the doctor, and was just assigned, that patient doesn't have quite the confidence in him and sits there, sort of on guard, holding back, not willing to come out and lay the whole story before him because he is not sure.

The combination of confidence and interest is necessary if there is to be good medical practice. Under Government it would not be voluntary on either side.

The second requirement for good medical practice is that there be no intermediary between the patient and the physician. Under socialized medicine there has to be an intermediary. Somebody has got to decide whether the doctor made the right diagnosis.

Who is that going to be? It is going to be the Government. Who is going to be in the Government? Doctors? Yes, at the top, but in general it is going to be the clerks who will go through the records to see if the doctor did all the things. Did he take all the X-rays, did he do all the routine tests? Furthermore, the clerk sits there and reads all the history.

Maybe men are willing to tell about all their escapades, but most women are not, and when she finds out that everything she tells the doctor is going to be checked on by some clerk, she isn't going to tell the doctor. She is deprived of the chance to have good medical treatment and the whole thing breaks down. It is a system that looks perfect on paper, but it doesn't give more and better care for less. It gives less and poorer medical care for more * * *.

The third essential for good medical practice is that you must have a system that gives maximum incentive for the doctor to improve himself, to study, to get ahead according to his ability.

What are the incentives? There are two. One is financial reward. There is in every profession the individual who has a "self-starter." No matter what the economic conditions, he will give everything he has. But the type is a minority in our profession as in every other. Most of us do better if we are going to get a reward, or think we are, in rough proportion to the effort and merit that we put into it.

The other incentive is professional recognition. Dollars are tangible and they are precious, but there is another thing which is more precious and that is recognition, professional advancement in accordance with your growth, your improvement and your merit.

I think the position you will come to covet more than any other is to be known as the doctor's doctor. I remember once while I was at the Mayo Clinic, a couple of boys from a certain eastern medical school came out to look around with their new medical knowledge and evaluate the various medical establishments there.

One of them, who knew me distantly, called me up and told me about the "temple of mediocrity," as he called the Mayo Clinic, with its mass-production methods.

Well, the Lord was with us on this particular occasion, because when we started next morning's clinic and the boys were up in the amphitheater to watch the temple of mediocrity, who was wheeled in as the first patient, but their own professor of surgery. He had come out to have his own gallbladder taken out at the Mayo Clinic.

You can fool the patients, but you can't fool the other doctors. * * *

Recognition is a tremendously rewarding thing, and if a society freezes you and you become like bureaus of the Government, something that's important, essential for good medical practice goes out. * * *

[We have to be aware of these things in public life] * * * not because we are doctors, but because of what we know as doctors

about the practice of medicine. We are concerned with the quality of the service. They [the reformers] concentrate on more equitable distribution of the services; they assume the quality, taking it for granted.

In getting more distribution they tend to cut the nerve of the thing that produced the good quality. Where you have socialized medicine, you have what you have in England; you have better distribution of a commodity that is increasingly unworthy of being distributed because of continued disintegration brought on by lack of interest, confidence, integrity, and incentive.

We need your type of mind, the kind of mind first trained at the autopsy table. Autopsy is seldom flattering. But you are trained not to recriminate and say, "Why did you make that mistake?" but to ask, "How did you make that mistake?"

You may have been perfectly sure the trouble was in the liver. You may have had expert consultants who all agreed it was in the liver. And you may have been able to convince all the relatives the trouble was in the liver. But when you opened him up the trouble was in the pancreas, and it was in the pancreas, period. It doesn't make any difference if the doctor is a Republican or a Democrat. It was in the pancreas.

The doctor is taught to study in terms of what is, not what he wishes.

Then he is taught the biopsy idea. He looks through a microscope and sees cells that have rejected the law-abiding processes of growth. He doesn't say, "It is cancer, all right, but it's only in the big toe."

As some said, "It's only what Hitler is doing to the Jews," or "It is only what the Chinese are doing in Manchuria. * * *"

"It's a long way off. Let's wait and see if it spreads."

It gets to the heart or the liver or the brain or the lungs. It is too late then.

The doctor is trained to say, "No, that's cancer. The thing that makes cancer bad is not what it is, but the way it grows. * * *"

Cattle Are Threatened by Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the farmer will not be fooled. He is becoming aware of the danger of opening the gates to a flood of cheap labor foreign agricultural products. Every times it sems that the farmer might make a little money, something happens. Now with cattle prices higher than they have been in a number of years, the livestock producer is threatened with a flood of cheap foreign cattle.

We lost our cotton markets, tobacco exports are on the decline, all because foreign countries using American dollars and American experts have been taught and equipped to grow cotton and tobacco at less cost. Probably the last remaining segments of our agricultural economy not under Government domination are the cattle, timber, and truck industries. Now these are being jeopardized by the importation of cattle and timber products.

Some farm organizations, without the support of their dues-paying membership, are advocating a continuation of the present buy abroad program falsely known and falsely labeled as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is no sip for the American farmer or the American labor in this administration program to import products we already have in surplus. We farmers should make our voices heard now—tomorrow may be too late. The following article should be a warning and I commend it to your attention:

[From the Lancaster Livestock Reporter of March 31, 1958]

IMPORTING NEW ZEALAND BEEF

According to the Western Livestock Journal, some sharp operators on the west coast are in the process of importing a lot of New Zealand cattle—big cattle, some of them grass fed—at a cost of around 9 cents a pound.

The story is that 1,700 head of these critters will arrive in California April 1, and plans are to bring in more as fast as boats can haul 'em.

Chances are this program will not draw enthusiastic cowboy yips of approval among cattle growers and feeders in California or anywhere else except New Zealand.

United States cattle prices are pretty good for a change. Consumers in metropolitan centers where unemployment has become something of a problem haven't been left ignorant of the fact that cattlemen are making a little money. But the beloved public wasn't impressed with the fact that for the last several years cowmen have been hard pressed to stay in business, while the price of beef over the retail counter was about as costly as ever in history.

Therefore, domestic ranchers' efforts to prevent importation of cattle into this country can be expected to run into some bitter opposition.

All that's sure is that this country's economy isn't strong enough to make the whole world rich.

United States cattlemen, while they have a pretty fair market right now, don't have any guarantee that it will remain that way. They aren't even sure of recouping bank-breaking losses they've sustained in recent years. Above all, their market is not good enough to absorb cattle shipments from all over the world.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Are We Moving to Nationalization of Grain Marketing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 20, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Are We Moving to Nationalization of Grain Marketing?" delivered by Robert C. Woodworth, director of the Feed and Grain Dealers National Association, before congressional guests of the Feed and Grain Dealers National Association, on March 18, 1958.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 3½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $270.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a very real honor to be asked to speak to you gentlemen today. Certainly no group could be found more illustrious or respected. One of my colleagues in Minneapolis, hearing that I was to address you, went so far as to exclaim, "My God. A captive audience of United States Congressmen." And he added, "If you have ever made yourself understood, make yourself understood now."

It is an honor to speak to you, but at the same time it is a difficult assignment, for most of you already are remarkably knowledgeable in the field of agriculture. Most of you represent States or districts that are largely agricultural; many of you have made the study of agriculture and its problems your main concern; some of you know the very industry for which I speak—the grain and feed industry—almost as well as we who are engaged in it daily.

I'm sure we can make you aware of some things you did not know before, so I think it will be worthwhile to describe our industry briefly, to elaborate on a few of its lesser-known aspects and to review some of the problems that beset us.

First of all, let me suggest the nationwide nature of our interests by telling you that the group for which I speak—the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association—has today a membership of 1,118 organizations from 42 States and is affiliated with 57 State and regional grain and feed associations. In all, its membership approximates 15,000 organizations engaged in similar or related business. And this number, as large as it is, is only part of the grand total of the industry itself.

TWO SEPARATE INDUSTRIES

As you know, our industry tends to divide itself into two more-or-less separate industries.

The grain trade is primarily concerned with the procurement of grain from the farmer, its movement, storage, conditioning, merchandising and eventual delivery to consumers and processors here and abroad.

The feed industry is chiefly a processing industry, concerned with research and development of high-nutrition animal feed formulas, the production of the feed itself and its sale and delivery to farmers and livestock raisers.

Last year the grain trade moved away from the farm and into consumption or storage some 4 billion bushels of grain of all kinds. It merchandised, during the same period, more than $5 billion worth of grain to provide the basis for roughly $20 to $25 billion worth of finished consumer products.

Last year the animal feed industry became the Nation's ninth largest industry in sales, with more than $3½ billion worth of product delivered to livestock raisers.

At the same time the United States Government, a "third force" of enormous dimension in the total grain and feed picture, owned some 1.6 million bushels of grain, including almost 1 full year's domestic production of wheat and 1½ times the quantity of corn that annually goes into domestic channels. This enormous holding made the Government—or, more particularly, the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture—by far the most important factor in the industry's operation, a factor infinitely more powerful than any possible combination of private groups.

For the moment, however, let us consider the industry itself, only keeping in mind that this third force exerts its influence constantly on each of the many segments I describe. As we proceed, as you become aware that the industry is an extremely heterogeneous thing, and that its many parts are themselves, made up of smaller parts, you will appreciate the extent to which Government seems to loom over any particular company or group engaged in our business.

THE COUNTRY ELEVATORS

Our industry's most visible and recognizable parts are, of courses, its many hundreds of country elevators, located in every town and village, beside every highway and railroad, throughout the grain producing areas of the Nation.

These are small facilities, with an average capacity of 50 to 100 thousand bushels of grain, and they are privately, and for the most part singly, owned. Thus they are small businesses, each competing vigorously in its territory for the farmer's grain, and each endeavoring always to offer the extra cent or half-cent per bushel that will bring grain to it rather than to its competitor.

To the extent of their capacity the country elevators store grain during the off seasons of the year, but their main function, during the harvest rush, is to receive the farmer's produce and relay it as quickly as possible to central markets or to giant terminal elevators.

The terminal system, with installations of 5 million, 10 million, and even 20 million bushels capacity, are located at the junctions of rail and highway networks, on inland waterways, and in export position at the seacoasts. They represent large business, but business which is no less competitive. Like the country elevators, many of the terminal elevators are singly owned, while others are bound together in corporate or cooperative networks. It is in the terminals that the bulk of United States grain finds storage, where major drying, cleaning, mixing, and other functions are performed, and from where merchandising into domestic and export channels is accomplished.

These elevators contain not only grain obtained on the free market, but also provide storage, on a rental basis, for the larger part of CCC's publicly owned stocks. Without them, and without the enormous privately financed expansion they have undergone in the last 10 years, the Government's actual ownership of storage facilities would have to be many times greater than it is today.

FUNCTIONS OF THE EXCHANGES

Independent grain exchanges, strategically located throughout the producing areas, provide merchants and potential customers—processors, millers, exporters, and others—with a common meeting place to conduct their business.

Probably no other business activity is so democratically governed or so subject to self-enforced rules and regulations to promote fair and ethical conduct. Men engaged in the grain business, as well as those who deal with them, have every possible assurance that they will receive efficient, just, and honest service.

The three largest grain exchanges are those of Chicago, Minneapolis, and Kansas City. Because of the volume of business done, the representative character of daily activity, and the intense degree of competition involved, transactions on these three exchanges are accepted as the basis of values in the buying and selling of grain everywhere in the United States.

The exchanges provide a market place for dealings both in cash grain—that is, grain in the hands of merchants and available for immediate sale and delivery—and in sales of futures contracts. In Minneapolis, the Nation's largest cash grain market, the emphasis is on the physical grain itself, with sales made on the basis of samples taken from each grain car entering the market area. A sample is displayed on the exchange floor, where it is subject to examination by all prospective buyers, and is finally sold to the buyer making the highest bid. The price is then posted and communicated to grain exchanges, producers, and the public throughout the country, and the value of grain from day to day and from minute to minute is this determined.

The operation of the grain business is not, however, limited to this day-to-day handling.

It was early recognized that the farmer who produces the grain should not be limited to the demand that exists on the particular day his grain arrives in the market, and the ultimate consumer should not have the price of his daily bread based upon fluctuating daily supplies. Because the supply of grain cannot be made to fit nicely the daily demand and the need for grain cannot be made to correspond to its seasonal production, there has grown up the so-called futures market, where grain is bought and sold for delivery many months ahead.

The operation of this market brings the future demand into the present and levels out the inequalities of supply and demand over the entire year. It operates to give the farmer the benefit of all foreseeable demand from one harvest to another and assures the consumer a price based upon the total supply of grain.

WHAT FUTURES MARKET DOES

Two major services are provided by the futures market:

First. Because grain is harvested in a comparatively short period, but is consumed

throughout the year, its true value can only be determined by estimating the total supply that may be available and the total demand that may arise. Both of these estimates are constantly changing, the one effected by reports of rainfall and drought, frost and disease, and—in these days—Government support prices, and the other by general business conditions, changes in consumer requirements and export potentials. To a large extent activity in the futures markets is due to these constantly changing estimates, and their result provides the most accurate barometer of grain values.

Second. Because of the impossibility of accurately determining grain supplies and demand, the risk of changes in the market is always substantial. Whoever holds grain, or sells grain in advance of obtaining a supply, necessarily assumes this risk. But the futures market—and within it the technique known as hedging—provides a form of price insurance that enables the commercial operator to divest himself of much of this risk and perform his services at prices that do not fully reflect the risk. The hedging technique, in its simplest form, is that of balancing every purchase or sale made in the present with an equal and opposite transaction in the future. If a country warehouseman, for example, buys a quantity of wheat from a farmer, he protects himself until that wheat is resold by immediately selling on the futures market a contract to deliver that much wheat at a future date. Let us assume that on the day he decides to sell the actual wheat the market price has declined to a point which reflects a loss of 5 cents a bushel on his original purchase. Similarly the futures price has declined 5 cents a bushel. He sells his cash wheat at a loss, buys back his futures contract at 5 cents profit. The two transactions thus offset each other and he remains even, or hedged.

It is natural that purchases by hedgers on any one day will not exactly equal sales made by other hedgers on that same day. During the harvest movement, in fact, the sales of futures contracts by cash wheat buyers will far outrun their purchases by cash wheat sellers, and during nonharvest periods the purchases of such contracts will outrun the sales. It is here that the grain speculator, or professional risk-taker, performs his essential function by buying or selling as the occasion demands and balancing the total market. Without the speculator, willing to assume the risk of grain ownership that is unabsorbed by cash grain hedgers, the entire process of procuring, handling, and delivering grain would be far more costly, to the farmer and to the consumer, than it is.

I have mentioned the country elevators, terminal elevators, and grain exchanges with their cash and futures markets. These, along with large fleets of ocean and lake vessels, river barges, trucks and even railroad equipment, are physical, observable aspects of the grain trade. There are, in addition, certain other aspects that might best be called skills, or talents, and that deserve mention at this time.

SERVICE IN SKILLS

The most important such skill is that shared by the fraternity of grain merchants themselves. These men are employed both in domestic and export trading, and are highly treasured by the grain firms with which they work. They have devoted their professional lives to understanding the intricacies and inner-relationships of the various markets, the vagaries of farm marketing and the patterns of movement by which grain finds its way most economically to the consumer. Many of them are the sons, and even the sons of sons, of grain merchants. They are artists in their calling and are so regarded within the industry.

Of similar skill, and of similar value, are the transportation specialists, also employed within the various grain companies. Their first rule is this: That any quantity of grain, when it moves so much as 50 miles from its point of origin, increases in cost to the extent of the transportation involved, and denied to possible markets that lie behind it. Their effort, then, in conjunction with the grain merchants, is always to move grain by the least expensive means possible, and to move it not 1 mile further than necessary to find a market for it.

These men are parts of our industry, just as the physical plants and financial resources of the various companies are parts. But like a human being, who is much more than simply a collection of arms and legs and organs, the parts of the grain industry working together make up an economic organism with a unique function, performing a valuable service, and performing it with great efficiency and extraordinary balance.

It is worthwhile noting that the cost of moving grain from producer to consumer is lower than for any other agricultural commodity. It is also forth remarking that the stability of the grain industry, the care it takes to protect its stocks and the efficiency of its marketing system are such that private banks and financial institutions demand from it less collateral for loans than in any other field of endeavor.

A PRODUCT OF 100 YEARS

Thus our industry is in many ways remarkable. But it is, after all, the product of more than 100 years of slow and tested development. It has evolved out of an infinite number of economic needs, and it has persisted and flourished because it has filled these needs more perfectly than any system that has challenged it.

Throughout its history the grain trade has been intensely competitive, and has thereby remained lean and spare, quick to adopt new methods and techniques, flexible in the face of new demands. If it is replaced, it will only be replaced by fiat, or by slow strangulation at the hands of uncontrolled power. I am convinced that it will never be replaced by a better means of doing the job.

The power we fear, of course, is that of Government itself, that "third force" I spoke of earlier. It is in protecting us from that power and in keeping in mind our historic role relative to that power, that we ask your aid and assistance.

We do not mean that we urge a return to the good old days, whatever they may have been, or a reinstitution of pure laissez-faire.

We recognize that under present agricultural-support laws, Government, and especially Commodity Credit Corporation, must necessarily be given effective powers, and we also recognize that there are many requirements under present law—among them the administration of crop loans, the physical takeover of grain in default under loans, the offering of export subsidies, the conduct of foreign relief and loan programs—which private interests cannot possibly undertake.

We also recognize that changes in Federal law and changes in administrative procedure, even in so good a cause as ours, must necessarily come about only after thorough consideration.

DEFENDS EFFICIENCY OF TRADE

We do urge, however, and most vigorously, that neither CCC nor any other Government agency be allowed to take over functions of the grain economy that are rightfully ours. For in our rightful area—the procurement, distribution, and merchandising of grain—no agency can approach us in efficiency and effectiveness. And we further urge that in those areas where Government has already encroached, and there are many such areas, every effort be made to hasten its withdrawal.

In this we are greatly encouraged by the attitudes and expressions of you gentlemen, and of the great majority of Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. We note that care has been taken to include in every piece of Federal legislation dealing with grain the admonition that the President and his agencies "make fullest possible use of the facilities of the private grain trade." We are convinced that you are as concerned as we about the usurpation of private functions by Government, and that you are as opposed as we to the development of a nationalized or socialistic system of grain handling.

Such a system can develop, however, and in fact does tend to develop, through the day-to-day administration of government program.

For my own part I do not attribute this to any grand socialistic design, or to any malice or deliberate destructiveness by public administrators. I attribute it, instead, to the very fact that these administrators are conscientious and hard-working, and that, when faced with the natural uncertainties and vicissitudes of the grain industry, they are impelled to extend their authority even further in order to make their plans and projections come out right.

In so doing, however, they introduce arbitrary, uneconomic and, therefore, completely unpredictable elements into the already complex workings of grain; they make worthless the foresight, based on economic factors, of free-trading merchants and exporters; they twist and alter the proven patterns of grain production, movement and consumption; they "tilt" the economic pool table, at the expense of the entire country and the world.

In its dealing with government, and especially with Commodity Credit Corporations, the grain trade has recognized that the unhappy results of too much planning are not necessarily deliberate or intentional. We have taken the approach that Commodity is well-intentioned, and willing to profit by constructive suggestions by ourselves. Therefore, we have made it our practice first to define the source of the trouble, then to reach some degree of unanimity among ourselves as to how it can be corrected, then to present our proposals in personal meetings with CCC officials. The results have left much to be desired, but in the main I believe we have chosen the wisest course. I would like to describe some situations in which our methods have seemed to work in the past, and show promise of working in the future.

THE SUBSIDY-IN-KIND

About a year and a half ago, after strong urging by the trade and by legislators sympathetic to the trade's goals, CCC instituted the present subsidy-in-kind program for wheat export.

This program provided that the larger part of foreign wheat purchases be filled by the trade from the free market. It also provided that the difference between high domestic wheat prices and the lower price of wheat on the world market be made up by a subsidy paid in wheat and drawn from Government stocks.

This plan, though certainly a long way from truly free handling of exports, did return much of the responsibility for export to the private trade, and with extremely beneficial results for all concerned. Prior to its institution, during the 1954–55 and the 1955–56 crop years, approximately 80 percent of United States wheat exports came directly from CCC stocks.

After the plan went into effect the percentage of export wheat from Government stocks fell to about 45 percent in the last 10 months of the 1956–57 crop year and to 35 percent in the whole of the 1957–58 year. At the same time the percentage of the national wheat crop taken over by CCC

through loans and purchase agreements fell from about 35 percent before the plan was used to about 14 percent in the subsequent 1956–57 season.

Since its introduction the wheat subsidy-in-kind program has clearly had the effect of broadening the total market, increasing the price of producer-owned wheat, passing directly to the farmer the benefits of export demand, promoting overall efficiency of the export program, greatly reducing the amount of wheat take-over by CCC and, consequently, easing CCC's inventory management problems with respect to wheat. All in all the program has been a splendid example of the ability of CCC and the trade to work together, and an example of CCC administration that we heartily applaud.

COMPLICATION IN COASTAL PRACTICE

You may be familiar, however, with a complication in this program that developed about a year ago.

It arose, we of the trade are convinced, out of Commodity's policy of maintaining three separate and variable subsidy levels for wheat, one on the east coast, one on the Pacific coast and another on the gulf.

At the time to which I refer, and for a period of roughly 2 months, there took place from the Pacific coast a tremendous movement of wheat into export, a movement far in excess of reasonable expectations from that area. Foreign demand for the particular wheat involved was admittedly strong, but as the demand was felt, and as domestic prices rose, the subsidy level also rose, keeping the wheat constantly competitive in the world market. As the volume of export continued, markets on our east coast began to fall, and there the subsidy followed them down and made the possibility of export increasingly less likely.

Obviously the private trade suffered in this situation, for many of its export stocks, situated according to normal export demands, proved to be out of position, and it was forced to make long and uneconomic movements of other stocks to fill the demand. Finally, however, CCC called a halt to the flood by excluding west coast wheat from foreign purchase agreements, and the industry undertook the task of readjusting the badly distorted trade routes.

The trade, as I have mentioned, was convinced that CCC's unpredictable handling of the multisubsidy system was at fault. Many trade members felt that the institution of a single subsidy, the same for all coasts and all classes of wheat, would be the best solution, for it would allow the domestic price of wheat plus the cost of transportation to control its flow into export, and would tend to maintain raditional patterns of movement. We agreed, however, that CCC had special inventory problems with certain types of wheat, so we ultimately proposed a modified single subsidy tailored to meet the agency's main objections.

This proposal was presented and thoroughly discussed in a series of meetings in Washington. It was never rejected by Commodity, and yet it was never formally accepted. But since that time, we are pleased to note, the various subsidies have been altered until as a whole they closely resemble the single subsidy we asked for. CCC is apparently satisfied with this arrangement and we are not displeased. So here again our efforts have made themselves felt.

PROBLEM OF SOFT WHEAT

Of more recent vintage, and still unresolved, is the trade's agitation over CCC policies on Public Law 480 purchase authorizations. It began when Commodity, in a recent authorization with Yugoslavia to provide financing for almost 20 million bushels of wheat, excluded entirely the soft red wheat variety raised throughout the eastern half of the Nation.

This exclusion—unannounced, unpredicted, and completely out of keeping with previous purchase authorizations—came at a time when unsold supplies of soft red wheat were still in the hands of eastern farmers; when the domestic price was low and the domestic demand virtually nonexistent; when the grain trade had considerable stocks in export position awaiting foreign buyers; when, in short, every economic sign would indicate that the wheat was still very much in surplus.

I will not burden you with great detail on this matter for, as I mentioned, the problem is still being discussed with CCC. It is our hope that some way will be found to resume export of soft red wheat under the Yugoslav agreement or future agreements, at least until surpluses of the wheat are actually disposed of. Study is also being given to devising some yardstick—preferably a yardstick of price—that may be used to indicate when a particular grain is or is not in surplus. Given such a price guide the trade could make use of its knowledge of markets and marketing to estimate the end of a particular surplus and therefore the time when a grain might be no longer exportable.

Certainly some means must be found to correct the present situation, under which CCC decisions—so often arrived at without trade consultation or knowledge—can so deeply disrupt and disturb the activities of private firms.

You will notice that in discussing the Yugoslav case I said that too little attention was paid to price as an indicator of the existence or nonexistence of an actual surplus. Similarly, when referring to the excess of wheat exports, from the west coast last year, I said subsidy policies did not allow the price factor to operate as an economic brake.

SHOULD NOT IGNORE PRICE FACTOR

I believe it is fair to say that the price factor is ignored in many of Commodity's decisions, and that this is one of the trade's main objections to overall policy. We are convinced that price, because it reflects the total supply and demand situation at any particular time, is the best possible guide to efficient and fair operation.

In the case of wheat export, a rise in price for a particular kind of wheat should immediately signal an approaching shortage of that wheat, and under a properly conducted subsidy program demand would automatically begin to shift to another kind, whose cheaper prices indicated an existing surplus. In the same way price could provide regulation of export purchase authorizations, either by providing an agreed-upon yardstick for CCC and the trade, or by encouraging foreign buyers to contract for bargain varieties.

In either case, and in cases past and yet to come, a greater reliance on price can bring about desired changes in the flow of grain in an orderly, foreseeable manner, just as would happen in a normal, uncontrolled economy.

CHANGING USE HABITS

I would like to refer once more to the Yugoslav purchase authorization problem, for it points up another danger inherent in CCC planning, namely that of changing the dietary preference of foreign buyers to such an extent that particular grains are denied forever their historic markets.

Yugoslavia, for example, has shown an historic preference for soft red wheat, yet CCC's order excluded the variety, not only when drawn from present "old" stocks but also when offered from new crop supplies soon to be harvested. It is not at all unreasonable to imagine that Yugoslavia, is becoming accustomed to some other wheat type, may refuse to make purchases of the soft red variety in the future, and may thus work real hardship on eastern producers.

Exactly that has already happened in the case of India, where milo has long been a dietary preference and was purchased in great quantity from United States stocks. When milo was unavailable to India for a period of time that country turned to wheat, and its preference has now shifted to that grain. Today, with a large surplus of milo existing in the United States, the Indian market is greatly needed. But the Indian market, unfortunately, no longer exists.

In this connection I would point out that the CCC charter specifically directs that "the President shall take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States." Certainly the altering of national preferences, if traceable to agency administration, is hardly consistent with this clear order.

You may be interested in hearing, today, of two further proposals by the trade to commodity, both of them aimed at lessening Government controls, returning trade responsibilities to the trade and increasing overall efficiency of grain handling.

We have asked, first of all, that sales of Government grain for domestic consumption be made competitively and for unrestricted use, at the marketing point nearest CCC's point of acquisition, and that such sales be made only through normal trade outlets and marketing methods. Grain that would be affected by this policy would be stocks in danger of going out of condition—of which large quantities are sold every year—and classes of grain that have climbed to the so-called formula price and so can be freely purchased from Government stocks.

The need for this policy has arisen from countless cases of CCC grain sales directly to processors, millers, and others who would ordinarily be trade customers. As you may know, CCC maintains active merchandising staffs in its nine regional offices across the country, and sales made by these staffs can and have directly competed with private merchandising. The trade feels that only a definite policy commitment by Commodity can adequately protect us against such merchandising in the future.

MOVEMENT BETWEEN STORAGE AREAS

Also involved in our request is the volume of grain movement by CCC from one storage area to another. Most of this movement is accomplished by rail or by lake boat, and a key to its size can be found in the fact that Commodity has now become the largest single shipper in the Great Lakes system and the main competitor with the private trade for grain-boat charters. We do not, of course, object to such movement when it is purely a matter of CCC inventory management. But we hope, through requiring Government sales at the point of acquisition, to halt movement of grain that is actually intended for sale rather than for storage. We strongly feel that if the grain is to be sold, if it is to enter the free market, it should reach and move through that market entirely in the hands of the grain trade.

By putting an end to so-called restricted sales—that is, sales that are tied to export or some other particular use—our proposal would insure the broadest possible market for Government grains and the highest possible return to the public pocketbook.

For it is self-evident that any restriction placed on marketing reduces the total possible market and at the same time reduces the market price. Our proposal would also assure that local merchants, who base their livelihood on the expectation of handling local grain, would not be bypassed, but would continue to perform their usual function.

SUGGESTS CASH SUBSIDY ALTERNATE

Our second recommendation to CCC is perhaps the more far-reaching. It would institute a subsidy-in-kind or a subsidy-in-

cash, whichever is best suited to their own requirements, in the export of all grains, not just wheat as at present. A cash subsidy is the simplest to administer and has the advantage of funneling 100 percent of export demand into domestic markets. This has the desirable effect of maximizing producer sales in the market place and minimizing producer dependence on Government loans. Thus the cash subsidy might be used for these reasons alone, or in those instances where Government stocks might be unusable as a subsidy due to insufficient quantity, unsuitable quality, or inconvenient position.

I have described the good results achieved by the subsidy-in-kind program for wheat. It is worth repeating that markets have been broadened, CCC takeovers have been reduced and more normal participation by the trade has been promoted. We are convinced that a similar program applied to the other grains, though it would vary with respect to each grain, will produce a similar and beneficial result.

At present the export demand for grains other than wheat is filled almost entirely from CCC stocks and the free market is almost completely bypassed. This means that farmers are being denied export markets for their current crops of corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums and rye; it means that the effect of this demand on free market prices is greatly delayed or blocked altogether; it means that CCC must inevitably take over and store a large portion of each year's crop that otherwise would move directly out of the country.

The result is lower market prices for these grains, excessive storage and transportation costs for CC and the taxpayer, an increasingly difficult inventory problem for the Government and restricted participation of the private trade in grain marketing. Certainly it must be obvious that CCC incurs nothing but trouble and expense by exporting a quantity of grain only to turn around and buy up the same quantity from the free market surplus.

We feel that a subsidy plan for all grains is especially desirable today in view of the poor keeping quality of the 1957 corn crop and—to some extent—of the 1957 sorghum crop.

CORN AND WEATHER

As you know, unusual weather conditions during the last crop year resulted in the failure of much of the corn crop to properly dry or mature. Much of this corn, to retain any value whatsoever, was artificially dried. Further, an unusually high percentage of moldy and damaged kernels and a high content of foreign material has been found in many areas. To store such corn for any considerable period will result in heavy losses. The only reasonable course is to channel it as quickly as possible toward consumption, and full advantage should be taken of export opportunities. This would leave CCC stocks made up largely of corn from earlier years, corn that is of higher quality and of better storeability than the present supply.

CCC has tended, in the past few months, to withhold its stocks of corn from the export market in order to encourage the flow of free stocks overseas at domestic price levels. Indeed, a limited quantity of corn has moved in this way. But it is apparent that the twin prospect of large amounts of United States new-crop corn being tied up under the loan program, and increased competition from the coming Argentine crop, will stop the flow of any large quantity of corn for export at domestic prices. A continuing subsidy program, however, would bridge the gap between domestic and world prices and would assure continuous availability of export corn on acompetitive basis.

PRICE CONTROLS VOLUME

The grain trade does not suggest that these present proposals, if adopted, will bring about major increases in total grain exports.

We recognize that the volume of export is determined mainly by the price at which grain is offered in the world market—a factor that CCC would control through the subsidies—and by the amount of credit or other financing offered by the United States to foreign governments.

We do hold, however, that a subsidy system for all grains would export every bit as much grain as the present system, and would export it more efficiently and in better keeping with the workings of a free economy.

It may be that I have erred in recounting so many of the problems, past and present, that exist between the grain trade and Government. In each case I have had to condense greatly both the problems themselves and the trades' justification of its position. To do otherwise—to explain fully the economic setting for each case and its full implications—would keep us here all day or all week.

I have tried to make clear that the free trade and its marketing methods are the most efficient ever devised for the handling of grain; that because of the excellence of this system it is of inestimable value to the entire national economy; that no Federal agency can hope to do the job at less cost or with better effect; that certainly, in the national interest, this intricate mechanism should be preserved and allowed to function.

In sketching some of our particular conflicts with CCC, I have hoped to make clear that each example arises out of too much Government regulation of an essentially self-regulating industry. Considered as a whole, they represent a constant pressure and a gradual trend toward the nationalization of the grain-marketing system. To be sure, we of the trade attempt to deal with each problem as it appears, in conference and discussion with CCC, and we do so with some success. But the nationalizing trend continues, and it gains ground day by day.

We must recognize that this trend arises ultimately out of farm and crop legislation. Despite congressional admonitions that the trade be fully used, such legislation has given so great a power and so much discretion to CCC that the trade can and has been bypassed. If more concern had been shown at the outset, if more attention had been given to possible misuse of the law, neither today's particular problems nor the long-range trend might ever have developed.

It is our hope that you, who are charged with our present lawmaking will exert every effort to halt and reverse this trend, and to forestall its development in the future. We urge that you incorporate the strongest possible strictures against nationalization in current legislation. We urge that you use your influence to prevent its growth through administrative agencies. We urge that you join us in furthering freedom for an industry America cannot afford to lose.

The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, April 3, marks the 40th anniversary of The American's Creed, written by the beloved William Tyler Page. On April 3, 1918, he was given a $1,000 award for his winning entry in a countrywide contest for the writing of a national creed.

Certainly, we would do well to consider that tenets of the creed today.

Tyler Page said of his concept of such a statement, "A creed it seemed to me, should contain those things to which its subscribers had believed all along, but which never had been brought together concretely." And this is what the American creed does.

How many could recite this creed? Do Americans have an understanding generally of the ideals and principles underlying American democracy? Americans should pause to reassess what being an American means. Those Americans going as tourists to foreign shores would do well to meditate on these principles, for as unofficial ambassadors they are expected to be knowledgeable, even articulate, about their country.

I urge Americans to take stock of what they believe in and to learn to explain it to others. I can think of no better starting point than the great statement, The American's Creed, conceived by William Tyler Page.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that The American's Creed, written by William Tyler Page, who died October 20, 1942, after serving 61 years in the Capitol Building of the United States, whose last post was as minority clerk of the House of Representatives, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the creed was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed, a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

WM. TYLER PAGE.

Scientific Education—Letter From President Flowers, of Southwest Texas State Teachers' College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from President J. G. Flowers, of the Southwest Texas State Teachers' College, at San

Marcos, Tex., in support of Senate bill 3187, a bill to provide for supplementary financial aid to students interested in science.

Dr. Flowers states that after careful examination of the bill he believes that, if enacted, it will lend much support to science and mathematics education in this country on both the secondary and collegiate levels, and that it will also give impetus to advance graduate study in the sciences and in mathematics, which is one of the great needs in the present crisis.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
San Marcos, Tex.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I appreciate your kindness in mailing me a copy of the proposed bill S. 3187, which provides for supplementary financial aid to students interested in science.

After a careful examination of the proposal, I have the following comments:

1. This bill, if enacted, will lend much support to science and mathematics education in this country on both the secondary and collegiate levels. Moreover, it will have competent effects on other areas of study.

2. It seems to me that it is entirely fair since the implementation and administration of it will be left to a large degree to local administration by our State agencies of education. It strikes me that this provides the local control that it needs.

3. Though the aid of $40 million a year would provide only 200,000 students aid over a 5-year period, it seems to me that this is at least a good beginning. The fact that the Government itself is interested in this problem may encourage private enterprise to match the funds, or at least provide something by way of encouragement.

4. Providing these grants will also give impetus to advance graduate study in the sciences and in mathematics which, after all, is one of the great needs in the present crisis. It is our feeling that something needs to be done to promote advanced study on the graduate level in these areas. The passage of this bill, I think, will give impetus in this area.

I wish you to know that we are strongly in favor of this proposal.

Sincerely yours,
J. G. FLOWERS, *President.*

Business Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial published in the St. Louis County Observer on Wednesday, March 26, 1958. It is a followup to the editorial I placed in the RECORD on March 24.

It points up the positive reaction and appreciation of many of the readers of this fine publication. They, too, have reaffirmed their disappointment in the local press for their gross portrayal of the gloom-and-doom thesis.

I would only reaffirm this editor's conclusion by repeating that this is indeed time for positive thinking.

BUSINESS, CIVIC LEADERS AGREE: BUSINESS IS GOOD

Last week's page 1 editorial about business conditions in the area served by this newspaper has evoked much favorable comment. Likewise there were two complaints that it 'taint so. These protests were from unemployed persons and we can sympathize with their plight. However, we do not back down from our original evaluation of the situation.

Conditions have been grossly exaggerated by the daily press to the detriment of business and constant repetition could have a disastrous effect on our economy. Which is why we urge the buying public to be realistic. In addition to many calls, we have received letters from business and civic leaders complimenting us for our constructive thinking. We say that the conditions in Observerland are good. The Freezall Food Service in Maplewood tells us they are doing twice the business they did a year ago and have added more help. The volume of the Glaser Drug Co. is running ahead of last year. Sales at the Brinson Appliance Co. are ahead of last year.

Jim O'Hara of O'Hara's Loop Market writes: "Your editorial on the slanted view being given on unemployment echoes my feelings. Congratulations on a fine article." Mr. W. E. Darr of 7222 Nottingham phoned to say: "My compliments to you on 'Let's be realistic.' We need sound thinking such as yours."

The executive director of the Sales Executives Associations of St. Louis in his complimentary letter says, "America needs more of this kind of reporting to act as a counterbalance to the gloom and doom prophets. The purchasing power of this country must be kept in motion. Keep up the good work." We appreciate these words from Jack R. Dauner and will print his letter in its entirety.

A letter from Irene Eberle Leibmann says, "just a word of thank you for the article printed in your latest copy of the County Observer, 'Let's Be Honest and Realistic' * * * I read in the Monitor where storeowners got busy and spread good news instead of gloom. This is being done in Texas. We can do the same."

And so as we have said and others seem to agree, we must have confidence in the future. The time to spend is now in order to keep our economy sound. This does not mean foolish spending but purchasing the things you need. Values were never better in Observerland.

We are sorry that space limits our mentioning all of the comments on last week's editorial and the sentiments expressed are really repetitious. To those who contacted us to express their thanks we are grateful and glad you agree. This is the time for positive thinking.

Reorganization of the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the message from the President on the reorganization of the Department of Defense, I have issued the following statement:

Of course, my subcommittee will give careful and thorough consideration to all of the proposals submitted by the President. The subcommittee will also give careful consideration to proposals not submitted by the President, including those contained in the Vinson-Arends-Kilday bills now pending in the House.

We will inquire with care into the proposed repeal of the existing provision of the National Security Act that the military departments shall be separately administered. The purpose of the repeal of this language is that in the future all funds for all military purposes will be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense instead of to the three service Secretaries as is now in the case. The appropriation of almost two-thirds of the total national budget to one official of Government will require the strongest possible justification to sustain it. It is probably greater economic power than should be possessed by one individual.

As revealed before the Senate and House committees, the principal difficulty in the Defense Department is the impossibility of securing prompt decisions. All witnesses agreed this is true because of the administrative jungle created by layers of secretaries, assistant secretaries, and deputy assistant secretaries. This plan does nothing to cure that situation.

Showdown on the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday morning, I had the priivlege of having the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, as my guest on the weekly radio program which is taped in Washington and sent to some 11 radio stations in the First Congressional District of West Virginia. This broadcast was made on the morning following President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill, and the Secretary was in very high spirits because of the victory for his farm policies.

It is my opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture is a man of firm and unfailing convictions, and in our Nation's Capital, this is a quality which is often lacking or sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. I informed the Secretary that as a Congressman and as a citizen of this country, I greatly appreciated his untiring devotion to duty and his unswerving allegiance to the goals and principles to which he is dedicated. In spite of the abuse to which Mr. Benson has been subjected by misguided or uninformed persons, he has come through the brimstone of political oratory unscathed and undaunted.

I enjoyed a most pleasant conversation with the Secretary, and feel certain that the people of West Virginia will profit greatly by listening to the Secretary's comments on my radio show which will be broadcast this weekend.

Along this same vein, I would like to call attention of the House to an outstanding editorial appearing on April 2, 1958, in the Wheeling Intelligencer, a leading newspaper in my district. This editorial salutes President Eisenhower for his moral courage in vetoing the farm bill, and suggests that this action might bring to the attention of Congress and the Nation the folly of continuing to follow a farm program which is both politically and morally wrong. The editorial follows:

[From the Wheeling Intelligencer of April 2, 1958]

SHOWDOWN ON THE FARM

The impending attempt to override President Eisenhower's veto of the farm freeze bill may serve the useful purpose of bringing the controversy over agricultural policy to a showdown.

Heretofore the issue has lacked the clear-cut lines of division now drawn. It is no longer a question of whether rigid or flexible farm supports are preferable as standard policy, but of whether we cut or strengthen supports right now, with all the arguments of recession necessity thrown in to add emphasis.

Secretary Benson had ordered a reduction in support prices for April 1 as permitted under existing law. A storm of protest went up from certain farm belt Senators and Congressmen of both parties who traditionally have backed high farm subsidies in spite of their cost to the taxpayers, the smothering surpluses they have piled up in Government warehouses and the obvious fact that they have not brought the desired stability and prosperity to the farm.

Demands were made on Benson to resign and then on the President to fire him. Both stood pat, so Congress passed a bill—by not too healthy margins in either branch—freezing both price supports and acreage allotments at their existing levels.

It is this bill Mr. Eisenhower has vetoed, and it is not only on the question of overriding the veto but on adoption of the President's counterproposals that the issue will be fought out. Mr. Eisenhower left no doubt in his veto message as to where he stands. Asserting that the farm economy needs a thaw instead of a freeze, he advanced a five-point program resting squarely on the theory that support prices should be lowered rather than raised. His plan would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cut the support level to 60 percent of parity as compared with the present 75 percent floor, and permit a 50 percent increase in acreage allotments.

The basis of the Benson-Eisenhower doctrine is that farmers should be encouraged to produce for the market rather than for Government storage and that the best way to accomplish this is to reduce artificial supports and gradually get the Government as completely out of the farm regulating business as the realities will permit.

That this, in reality, represents the view of a majority of ordinary farmers as opposed to the relatively few giant commercial operations which constitute the backbone of the high subsidy element, is suggested by the fact that the American Farm Bureau, numerically largest of all the farm organizations and the one representing most of the family farms of the Nation, backs the President and Secretary of Agriculture in their stand.

Maybe the congressional farm bloc will be revealed in its true light in the days ahead and what was represented as a political liability will turn into a Republican asset as well as a boon to the American people.

Program of People to People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD a very significant editorial which appeared in one of the world's great newspapers, La Prensa of Buenos Aires. The editors of La Prensa were moved to comment on the need for understanding between peoples of varying countries as a result of a thoughtful statement in Buenos Aires by a Washington attorney, Ralph E. Becker. Mr. Becker was in Buenos Aires attending the Inter-American Bar Conference and made a particular point of stressing the need for people-to-people contact.

From my participation in the Parliamentary Union, I have witnessed the great benefits to be gained from the people-to-people program. It is significant and encouraging to learn that distinguished private citizens such as Mr. Becker are making an effort to achieve the objectives of this commendable program. It is a tribute to Mr. Becker and to all thoughtful Americans who make similar contributions that this great newspaper should comment on the potential benefits to be derived from their work.

Materialistic aid will never replace the personal contact from which is achieved true understanding of the hearts and minds of peoples in other countries. I hope that all Americans abroad—Government officials and private citizens—will make an extra effort to encourage personal exchange of ideas among peoples.

The editorial follows:

[Translation of editorial in La Prensa, December 12, 1957, of the program of people to people]

The prominent North American Republican, Dr. Ralph E. Becker, in a dissertation given a few weeks ago at the Argentine chamber of commerce, outlined an idea which came from a meeting of President Eisenhower with a group of prominent citizens of his country, gathered together to consider ideas about the development of new avenues for international understanding. From this conversation developed the program of people to people, whose principal object consists of the wide support (guarantee) of communication between North Americans and people of other countries. "As an addition to the normal diplomatic relations from government to government, this program has summed up the advanced concept of a focus from people to people. Thus would be developed that nationals, in their private character as individuals, or as private organizations, would seek contact with their counterparts in other countries of the world," said the orator.

It seems to us that this idea is capable of giving good results. The aid which the United States would be able to lend to other countries, for the mutual benefit of the giver and the receiver, has concentrated up to this time in direct concessions from government to government. The Marshall plan completed its mission, but the world has shown some dissatisfaction with the aid as given in this manner, which presented evident limitations in the benefits derived from the aid. Why not offer the opportunity for North American industry in collaboration with private enterprise on the outside, to interest itself in projects which directly benefit the average citizen in his daily life?

This is the object of the program of people to people, to intensify mutual knowledge of the North American citizens and those of other countries, their commercial customs, their necessities and conveniences, their possibilities and the obstacles against the best development of the sources of wealth; in résumé, to know what to give some that the others need and if it is possible to pool the resources, ideas and the capital without intervention of the respective governments.

From this grew the idea of the association of enterprises of the two countries, which would be a new form of investment of capital and which would present the great advantage of dissipating the suspicions which an ill-understood nationalism offered for the importation of foreign capital in enterprises of primary national interest, rather than national capital associated with foreign which would be good security against so much fear and ill-defined imperialism.

It is understood that in this transfusion of capital, up to this time there would be needed the support of the governments, because of the ignorance of the private investors about the conditions in which their savings would be used and the securities offered. But if this ignorance is overcome by abundant information and in understanding between the citizens of various countries, the association of enterprises would be spontaneous for the mutual benefits which could be obtained. Such we believe is the feeling of the program of people to people and we consider it a subject worthy of study.

Initiative, on the other hand, is comprehended in a plan much more vast that has developed in the United States, inspiring in its elemental idea: to know by comprehending, to comprehend by understanding. We concerned ourselves with this in our edition of the 20th of August last and we gave information that in this country there has been formed through the initiative of President Eisenhower, 41 committees, constituted by professions or activities, from selected experts, industrialists, workers, sportsmen, hotelmen, collectors of stamps, etc., each one of which, in its sphere of action, sought opportunities and means to know other people and to learn about them in their natural daily life, their incentives and in their aspirations. Nothing more definite is offered than a plan to create a spirit of good will, in time to seek official support, they seek to avoid it, in order to give to the movement all the resulting spontaneity of the high propositions held in view.

In this same mentioned edition we published an invitation formulated for this paper by the President of one of these committees—the People to People Book Committee, Inc.—for divulging in our country the work of rapprochement which realizes the great value of the book as a vehicle. In effect, it has solicited from the people of the Argentine that they should furnish this committee with the names of our books which are considered most suitable to give us knowledge, and suggest the titles of North American works which are most appropriate for better informing us about the character, customs, aspirations, culture, etc., of that country.

Regarding this plan in the field of commercial and economic areas, there is no doubt that it would be able to produce the highest results.

Peculiarities of the Election of 1867

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Montana Parade section of the Great Falls Tribune of March 23, 1958, entitled "Many Peculiarities Marked 1867 Election," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY PECULIARITIES MARKED 1867 ELECTION
(By Herbert M. Peet)

Montana has had many interesting political campaigns in its 94 years of existence but the one held in August 1867, is best remembered for its peculiarities as well as for its bitterness.

That campaign, which was Montana's third, saw the territorial governor, Green Clay Smith, a Republican appointee of a Republican President, on the stump for the Democratic candidate for Congress.

It also saw for the first time in Montana's history the use of a campaigner from the outside in an effort to swing voters to the Republican side. The outsider was Col. Alexander Kelly McClure, Philadelphia newspaper publisher.

It also was the first and probably the only time that Col. Wilbur F. Sanders had as an opponent in his several unsuccessful races for Congress a man who was as adept in the use of billingsgate and sarcasm as Sanders himself.

Colonel Sanders' opponent in 1867 was James M. Cavanaugh, an Irishman who had lived in the territory scarcely a year. As Cavanaugh had wrested the Democratic nomination from the Missourians, the dominant element in the party, through a bitter and long contest in the territorial convention. Colonel Sanders and other Republicans thought the Irishman would be easy to defeat.

But this was only wishful thinking. It overlooked completely two realities in Montana politics of that day. The first was the implacable animosity a majority of Montana voters had for Colonel Sanders' persistent reference to Democrats as "rebels and traitors." They would vote for the devil himself rather than for Sanders. The other reality which the Republicans discounted too heavily was Cavanaugh's ability on the platform.

Cavanaugh, just turned 44 when the campaign opened, was 11 years older than Sanders and already had served a term in Congress from Minnesota (1858–59), after which he had migrated to Colorado. There, in a period of 6 years, he made his mark both as a criminal lawyer and as a politician before moving on to Montana in 1866. He had a keen sense of humor and a comprehensive understanding of the issues of his day.

On the platform he could be as funny as a clown 1 minute and rise to the heights of oratorical eloquence the next. But he also was a master of ridicule, satire, and derision and it was in these qualities that he met and matched Colonel Sanders in the 1867 campaign.

Sanders was seeking vindication for having induced Congress, in the spring of 1867, to nullify all the laws passed by the 2d and 3d Montana territorial legislatures, both of which had met in 1866. These two legislative sessions had been feuding with Chief Justice Hosmer and Associate Justice Munson of the territorial supreme court because the latter had declared certain legislation illegal. In retaliation, the legislators had materially reduced the judges' salaries and assigned them to newly created judicial districts in eastern Montana—the badlands—inhabited chiefly by Indians.

Never before and never since has Congress nullified the acts of a legislative assembly duly elected by the people. If such acts have needed correction it has been left to the courts to straighten out. But the unprecedented action of nullifying two Montana legislative sessions was taken by a Congress hellbent on punishing the Southern States for secession and the Civil War. The action against Montana was based on Colonel Sanders' report to congressional leaders that the men who made up the Montana Legislature were reeking with treason and were irresponsible, disloyal, ex-Confederate Democrats.

The Montana legislators, of course, were not the irresponsible traitors that Colonel Sanders said they were, and a majority of Montana people of that day knew it.

Green Clay Smith, a Republican, came to Montana to be its Governor in the fall of 1866 when the feud between the legislature and the supreme court of the Territory was at its height. Though it was a situation which called for no action on his part, he nevertheless had looked into it and decided that, while the Democratic legislators undoubtedly has acted intemperately, they had been driven to it by the bitter partisanship and arbitrary decisions of the judges.

By the time the campaign of 1867 opened, Governor Smith had decided to support Cavanaugh for Congress rather than Sanders. Smith had been a general of the Union Army in the Civil War and a friend and supporter of President Lincoln. In fact, in 1864, he had been considered for nomination as Lincoln's running mate instead of Andrew Johnson. But now, in 1867, Smith felt that President Johnson, who had succeeded the martyred President, was more nearly carrying out Lincoln's polices for reconstruction of the South than the radical Republican congressional leaders.

Montana Democrats seized this opportunity to induce Governor Smith to take the stump in their behalf and follow Colonel McClure throughout the territory. McClure had been drafted by the Republicans to campaign in Sanders' behalf. Like Smith, McClure had been one of President Lincoln's friends but he did not agree with Smith that President Johnson's reconstruction policies were those that Lincoln would have pursued if he had lived.

It was apparent from the start that Sanders and Cavanaugh would engage in a verbal slugging match such as Montana never before had witnessed. While this would be an enjoyable sport for many, managers on both sides felt that Governor Smith and Colonel McClure should and would give the campaign a tone of dignified and dispassionate discussion of issues.

Unfortunately, when Governor Smith reached Helena from Virginia City, he was entertained a little too generously by Cavanaugh's friends and was visibly drunk by the time he started his speech. This naturally disgusted many Republicans. While it may have embarrassed some Democrats, it had no ill effects on the election's outcome. It was the only time the governor slipped during the campaign. When he left Montana a couple of years later he became a Baptist minister and in 1876 was the Prohibition party's candidate for president of the United States.

Through it is doubtful whether Colonel McClure won many votes for Sanders, he made an excellent campaign. He delivered a speech a day for 2 weeks (Sunday excepted) and had to travel 40 to 60 miles between speaking engagements in a platform wagon over roads that were seldom more than a couple of ruts.

He soon discovered that the majority of his audience at each point was made up of Democrats and that he had to speak with reasonable prudence. In 1 town, where a crowd of 40 had assembled to hear him, only 1 of the number was a Republican. A Democrat was asked to call the meeting to order so this Republican could introduce the colonel.

Writing about his experiences for the New York Tribune, McClure said: "If any ambitious eastern orator supposes that it is an easy task to declaim to the people of the mountains, and that any sort of speechmaking will be accepted as a treat, he would do well not to attempt to carry the theory into practice.

"I have never been before audiences in the East where political questions were better understood than by the people who compose public meetings in Montana, and I can conceive of no worse place for pretentious stumpers than just here. They not only detect the want of fitness for the task of enlightening them, but they are merciless in exposing it on the spot."

Colonel McClure found it was no breach of propriety in Montana for a Democrat to get up at a Republican meeting, after the regular speakers were through, and reply to the speeches. This was done at one of McClure's meetings and he said he "never listen to a more chaste, eloquent, and logical speech than was this reply by the Democrat."

Their difference of opinion over President Johnson's reconstruction policies did not keep Colonel McClure and Governor Smith from becoming good friends during the 6 months McClure was in the territory. He found the Governor to be a typical Kentucky gentleman, courteous, kind, and tolerant.

In one of the towns where they campaigned, a terrier belonging to the colonel, a pet of which he was particularly fond, was stolen. When the governor heard about it on his arrival the following day, after McClure had gone on, he made a search for it, found it and delivered it later.

In the fall of 1867, before Colonel McClure returned to their home in Pennsylvania, he and Mrs. McClure derived much pleasure in attending the weekly receptions—or levees as they were called—which the governor and his lady gave in Virginia City, the territorial capital.

Montana voters left no doubt that year as to how they stood on Congress' nullification of their laws. Sanders was defeated by a substantial margin. At the same time the voters elected a new legislature, one of whose first acts was the passage of a joint resolution demanding the resignation of Chief Justice Hosmer and Associate Justice Munson so that competent and able judges could be appointed in their places. Munson resigned, but Hosmer held on until his term expired. He was not reappointed.

To Build Peace: Ask Khrushchev to Talks in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

TO BUILD PEACE: ASK KHRUSHCHEV TO TALKS IN UNITED STATES

For direct, positive results on behalf of world peace and security, this newspaper respectfully urges upon President Eisenhower a direct, positive step: an invitation to Premier Khrushchev to face-to-face talks with the President in Washington on the crucial problems facing mankind today.

Such a meeting between the heads of state of the world's most powerful nations could conceivably accomplish what no amount of long-distance notes could ever hope to achieve.

Just the fact of an invitation to Khrushchev would have immediate and much-needed effect in reversing the propaganda current set in motion by the latest Soviet Union effort to label itself as the champion of peace and disarmament: the deceptive offer to suspend nuclear weapon tests.

But countering Soviet propaganda would be a minor factor in the promotion of an Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting. What is important is the possible results in a concrete approach to peace and understanding in a world now fearful and divided.

In identical notes handed the Soviet Government on Monday by the United States, Britain and France, it was stated that the present international situation requires that a serious attempt be made to reach agreement on the main problems affecting attainment of peace and stability in the world.

What more serious attempt along these lines could be made at this time than a bid by the President of the United States for a personal conference with the headman of the Soviet state?

What the three nations were proposing yesterday, even as the Russians' nuclear suspension announcement was making its dynamic impression upon the world, was a summit meeting so hedged in by redtape preliminaries and conditions that no one could tell when or whether it could be held.

A direct get-together with Khrushchev as soon as feasible would get to the heart of the summit proposition, without delays and confusion. Khrushchev is now the unquestioned and undisputed head of the Soviet Government; now is the logical time for him to speak for Russia to the President of the United States.

What is most needed now is initiative, decisiveness, imagination, in pushing for world peace. An invitation to Khrushchev would possess all these elements.

Speech of Hon. John E. Fogarty at the Annual Dinner of the Society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the annual dinner of the Society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Westerly, R. I., on March 16, 1958:

St. Patrick's Day is a day for remembrances. It is a day on which we recall again the great names of Ireland, the names of the countries and the towns and the villages, of the hills and the valleys, of the lakes and rivers and bays of Ireland. A day on which we recall again the names of her saints and her scholars, to recite and list again the names of her great patriots and leaders, of her singers and of her poets. Even though many of us have never seen the places, just as we have not seen or known the saints of Ireland, both the persons and the places come alive again in our minds and in our hearts. We recall the names of Donegal and Tyrone and Armagh in the north, of Kildare and Meath, Wicklow and Dublin in the east, of Waterford and Cork and Kerry in the south, of Limerick, Clare, Galway and Sligo in the west. The names of Niall, Cormack, Brian, Murray, O'Connor, Parnell, O'Connell, Plunkett, Emmett and Hyde; the names of Patrick, Bridget and Columkille, and Brendan and Malachy and all the rest of the saints, and the great leaders and the scholars, and the bards and genealogists and the poets of Ireland.

It is difficult for those who are not Irish to understand the character of the Irish. There is a strong undercurrent of sadness in any joyous Irish celebration. And, on the other hand, even in Irish mourning there is an element of the joyful. The Irish wake is not an accident. This seeming division characterizes the history of the Irish people as it does characterize the Irish personality. The line between the consideration of Ireland as a gray-haired old lady mourning in the shadows for the loss of her sons and waiting in vain for help from across the waves, and the consideration of Ireland as vigorous and fertile, producing sons and daughters and sending them forth triumphantly to the ends of the earth, the lines between the things of time and those of eternity, between the times of peace and the time of trouble have been finely drawn. It is common in the characterization of nations to picture them in an hour of triumph, and of strength and victory, rather than in a time of defeat and suffering. This is not the case with Ireland and the Irish people. The Irish character has not been formed and proved in one short test, or in one shining hour. It has been slow tested and proved in a long and bitter history, in defeat and oppression and suffering. It has been proved not only as to heroic virtues, but also as to unheroic ones; not only as to courage and fortitude and greatness of mind, but as to patience and tolerance and long suffering; the little and unheroic virtues, without which neither a nation nor a man can claim perfection.

It seems as a result of this long slow testing, the Irish have developed a sensitivity which permits them to hear the last note of the harp, or the song of freedom, after other ears have become deaf to it. It permits them to see the last spark of freedom in what was once a great fire after other eyes no longer see that light, and to feel the warmth of freedom, and of hope, in what to others may appear to be a cold lump of peat. The Irish character as a result of this testing and trial has been marked by a great longing and aspiration for freedom. That longing and aspiration have been expressed in the five great loves of the Irish people.

First is their great love for country, for the soil of Ireland, for its towns and its people. So great is this love and longing, that the greatest punishment set for Columkille, the saint, was that he could no longer set foot on Irish soil. And so we have, all of us, in a sense remained exiles whenever we have been away from Ireland. Like Columkille we can say: "There is a gray eye which ever turns to Erin. What joy to fly upon the white-crested sea, and to sight the waves breaking upon the Irish shore. To return to Ireland where the song of the birds is so sweet and the clerks sing as well, where the young are so gentle and the old are so wise, where great men are noble and the women so fair."

The second great love of the Irish is their love of religion, for the things of the spirits. At the time of the coming of christianity the Irish spirit was willing and ready. St. Patrick came and was received without martyrdem. The same cannot be said of the other lands, not of Rome, not of Gaul, nor of the East, nor even of the new continents found across the sea. Ireland gained the title of Isle of Saints and became the source of missionaries to all corners of the world.

The third great love of the Irish is their love of learning. It was this great love that kept alive the flame of knowledge and the pursuit of truth during the dark period of the 5th, 6th and 7th centuries.

The fourth great love is that of political freedom—a love which sustained the Irish in standing against the Danes and the Normans, the Tudor armies, the hosts of Cromwell, and all the soldiers of the King of England.

It is this love of freedom which inspires the Irish people and their friends all over the world to create conditions in which the immoral and absurd partitioning of their homeland can be brought to an end—not only in order to right a wrong and to secure another triumph for freedom and democracy but so that the undesirable social and economic consequences of this national dismemberment may be ended also—and may I add that those who help to speed the coming of the day of the inevitable and peaceful reunion of Ireland are securing the foundations for a splendid future for the Irish homeland.

The fifth great love is that of poetry and song. A love so strong and deep and so consequential that as late as the 15th and 16th centuries English rulers were moved to impose special penalties on bards, minstrels, rhymers, and geneologists who sustained the lords and gentlemen in their love of rebellion and other crimes and which moved the soldiers of Cromwell to break the harps still found on the walls of the cottages of the Irish at the time of the invasion. The ancient Gaelic law recognized this in forbidding the seizure by justice in any house of any Gael whatsoever, one of his books, his sword, or his harp. For his book was the symbol of his intellectual and of his spiritual freedom. The sword was the symbol of his political freedom, and the harp was the symbol of all the things that the human heart aspires to.

The world needs the revival of the five great loves of the Irish today as it has always needed them. It needs love leading to positive action. In a time when the traditions of the past are rejected and frowned upon, when learning and truth must compete in the marketplace with falsehood and error and the only test is that of which is most useful, there is a great need for the return of the love of truth and the love of learning. When love of country and love of political freedom in many areas of the world have been destroyed, there is a great need for the revival of the Irish love of country. When the faith has grown cold and has been rejected by many, the love of the faith, too, must be revivified. When love of poetry is looked upon by some as unmanly, when it has little or no place in the deliberations of man, there is a great need for a revival of this Irish love of song and poetry. This, then, is the pattern and the way.

The responsibility of the sons of St. Patrick is clear. Let us hope that all may so meet and fulfill their responsibility that each and every one say that he has been the good servant of learning and of song and poetry, but in all things God's good servant first. And then we can hope that the good St. Patrick in his right may judge us all with gentleness.

Please, God, let our souls be forever free. Let us be men of our time and have the courage to stand fast by the cause of justice and righteousness and, by our steadfastness, win all mankind to an appreciation

of the merit of the cause which we plead—so that, in some distant day, it may be said of some of us that there was one sanctified spot dearer than all others—where the dew glistened on the softest green, the spirit of Ireland hovered, and shook the stillness of the Irish dawn on its journey to the stars.

Hon. Frank Ikard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the March 30, 1958, issue of the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., appeared a splendid article written by the able correspondent of that newspaper, Mr. Robert Baskin, about our friend and colleague, Hon. FRANK IKARD, of Texas.

Mr. Baskin's excellent story demonstrates why FRANK IKARD is held in such high esteem not only by those of us who work with him daily but also by his constituents of the 13th Congressional District of Texas. No one can come to know FRANK IKARD without recognizing him as a man of character and stature.

Here is the article by Mr. Baskin:

FRANK IKARD: POLITICAL COMER
(By Robert E. Baskin)

A strapping 6-foot 4-inch Congressman from Wichita Falls last week was well on his way toward becoming one of the most important men on Capitol Hill.

The tide of events this winter has rapidly brought Representative FRANK IKARD into the forefront of major congressional developments. He has met this challenge with an ever-increasing amount of hard work and perseverance.

A modest, soft-spoken man of 43, IKARD would never lay claim to any particular accolades for the service he is rendering.

But as Texas' representative on the House Ways and Means Committee, he occupies a position of power that is both legislative and political.

Since Congress reopened in January the House committee has been laboriously preparing tax legislation for this session. From every segment of the Nation's economy has come advice on what tax policies should be pursued. Soon a tax bill will emerge.

On top of that, the committee has been considering extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Here IKARD has been most active, leading the fight for workable controls on foreign oil imports, which have had a devastating effect on Texas' economy.

A relative newcomer to Congress, Ikard enjoys the confidence of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, whose blessings are necessary for any Democrat to ascend to the Ways and Means Committee. There is political power in this committee because its Democratic members are also members of the committee on committees, which determines other Democratic committee assignments.

"The most important thing that can happen to a fellow in Congress in his committee assignment," IKARD says, recalling that his first-term assignment was to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which had little relation to his inland district.

IKARD comes of old Texas stock. His grandfather, W. W. Ikard, settled in the north Texas open range country in 1867, making his headquarters in Clay County. The family has been prominent in that area ever since.

The future Congressman was born at Henrietta, attended the public schools there and went on to the University of Texas, where he received a law degree in 1937. He then entered one of Wichita Falls' leading law firms.

In 1942 IKARD went into the Army, and his next 3 years were years of great hardship; not only for himself but also for his wife, the former Jean Hunter, of Wichita Falls, whom he married in 1940.

IKARD became a frontline rifleman in Company K, 110th Infantry, 28th Division. He fought in Normandy, northern France, Aachen, the Siegfried Line, and the Hurtgen Forest. He was wounded twice.

Then one day in November 1944, his company found itself surrounded at a road junction near a river in Luxembourg. It was out of food, ammunition and medical supplies. Casualties had been heavy. Company K was captured by the Germans.

For nearly 6 months the War Department listed IKARD as missing in action.

During this time, he was a prisoner living in a shack in the railroad yards at Halle, Germany, on the Elbe River. Allied bombings were frequent, and food was scarce.

Liberation did not come until spring, and by then IKARD's 225-pound frame had been reduced to 135 pounds by malnutrition.

In captivity, IKARD had time to think of the future.

"I had never had any intention of getting in politics in any way," he says, "but in prison I just got sold on the idea that more people ought to take part in government. I came out with the decision that that was what I wanted to do, although I had no particular goal in mind."

He returned to his Wichita Falls law firm, and his first political office came in 1948 when Gov. Beauford Jester named him judge of the 30th district court.

In 1951, Congressman Ed Gossett resigned to accept a business position in Dallas, and IKARD announced for Congress. He beat seven opponents in a special election. In three elections since then he has had no opposition.

Recently's IKARD's name has appeared in speculation on possible candidates for the Senate race this summer.

"The only interest I have at the moment," he says, "is doing as good a job in the House for the 13th District as I can."

Legislatively, he is interested mainly in agriculture and oil and gas, the basis of his district's economy.

IKARD can be roughly classified as a middle-of-the-road Democrat, with certain strong conservative leanings.

Of his tax philosophy, he says: "I feel very strongly that our tax laws should be for revenue only instead of for social reforms, which should be dealt with directly."

Currently, IKARD believes that small businesses need tax relief, and he is pressing for such action at this session.

When Congress is in session, the Ikards and their town sons, Frank, Jr., 16, and Bill, 12, live in nearby Chevy Chase, Md. The Congressman is at work early and stays late, and he says he misses the dove hunting and book collecting that he once had time to enjoy in Texas.

Russell Lee—Camera Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Russell Lee, of Austin, Tex., is an artist who paints with a camera in place of a brush. As a matter of fact, he does very good work with a brush, too, but his finest artistry has been achieved in pictures he has taken of real life.

His wonderful works mirror life as it really was or is. The magic eye of his camera has trained on happiness and sorrow, love and hate, confidence and fear, hunger and plenty, war and peace, all the ingredients of this thing called life. To me, Russ Lee's wonderful protraits not only depict life, but give a clear insight of the artist himself. Obviously the artist must understand his subject before he can effectively reproduce it for the people. Mr. Lee's work could only be accomplished by a man whose heart and conscience and character matched his photographic genius.

Mr. President, in the Austin American Statesman of Sunday, March 23, published an excellent feature story written by Nell Fenner, the woman's editor of the newspaper, concerning Russell Lee's work. I ask unanimous consent to have the story, headed "Camera Artistry," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMERA ARTISTRY
(By Nell Fenner)

[Pictures referred to in article not printed in RECORD]

The pictures on this page tell their own stories—a smile, a wait, a handclasp, a plot, and a little girl's mystic concern with the present and future.

And that of the deep inner eye of the artist who photographed them—Austin's own Russell Lee.

That familiar and generous smile at the bottom of the page is, of course, on the face of the most authentic Texan of them all, J. Frank Dobie. Russ caught this shot of Pancho's photogenic mug during a writer's outdoor gathering at Joe Small's Lake Travis cottage.

The youngsters waiting and watching at upper left are truly children of darkness. These are a coal miner's children as Russ saw them back in the 1930's at a window of their shack wondering when, or if, their father would come home from down in the mines. Darkness is inside this home and smudged over on the faces of the children.

Holding hands (lower left) is an expression of love at any age but it's seldom done any more by sophisticated folks in public. This tender gesture here unites an elderly east Texas couple who openly believe that the old ways are the best—and dress that way to prove it.

At upper right is what looks like a friendly political plot between these two Democratic women. Russ' lens captured this enthused discussion at a recess during a July political rally in Belton in 1956. All the flavor is here, hot dog stand in background and cokes in paper cups. You can almost hear the woman at left saying: "Now, honey, you go back to your precinct and get out the vote, and let's get our boy elected." Answer: "Now you know you can count on me."

The center photo is a 1949 scene in Corpus Christi where this child was sitting on the front steps of her home with a calm, resigned dignity that belies the living conditions around her. Russ took this for a research project for the University of Texas sociology department on living conditions of Spanish-speaking people in Texas. This photo really needs no words to explain it.

These pictures tell the story of life as it is experienced day by day by people anywhere and everywhere.

And that is what Russ Lee does with a camera.

"Photography," he says, "means the responsibility to express accurately and honestly those things that are a part of life."

This sounds like an artist's viewpoint, and it is. Russ is an artist. Now he uses a camera, but once he used a brush and paints. Here's what he will tell you about himself in his picture-filled home at 3110 West Avenue.

"I took up painting a few years after college, after having been a chemical engineer 4 years. Painting was a creative challenge, but soon I began to feel that there was a fleeting image I couldn't capture. It would be gone so quickly I couldn't get it down. That's when I learned about the camera."

So Russ took up photography "just to help my painting." But soon he learned that photography was his medium.

That was in 1935, and in a year's time he was launched on a photographic career that has taken him all over the world and placed his name among those of the top photographers of the world.

In 1936 he went to work as a staff photographer with the United States Government's Resettlement Administration, which later became the Farm Security Administration, and in 1942, the Office of War Information.

During those 7 years he photographed conditions on farms and of migratory labor throughout States west of the Mississippi River. The some 35,000 pictures he took are now in the Library of Congress. Many of them were used overseas during World War II to show other countries what rural America was like. Many of them illustrate the American Guide Series of books published by the WPA for various States.

During the war years of 1943 to 1945, Russ served in the Air Transport Command of the United States Air Force. He photographed check points from the air for ATC's air routes all over the world.

After the war he became staff photographer for the Coal Mines Administration, under the Department of Interior, doing a survey of housing, medical care and living conditions in coal mining areas. This work was later published in a book called A Medical Survey of the Bituminous-Coal Industry."

It was after this, in 1957, that Russ and his wife, Jean, moved to Austin. They had been on fishing trips earlier at Buchanan Lake and decided Austin was the place for them. (Although Russ is a native of Illinois, Jean was born and raised in Texas.)

Russ' work now is mostly industrial photography, which still takes him all over the world. In addition, he handles special assignments for many national magazines—Fortune, the New York Times magazine, Look, Ladies Home Journal, to name a few. He covered the 1952 and 1954 Texas gubernatorial campaigns for the New York Times Magazine.

Closer to home, he has illustrated magazine stories by such Austin writers as Hart Stillwell and Joe Small. He has photographed the University of Texas relays for Sports Illustrated.

In his industrial work, mostly for oil companies, one trip took him to Saudi Arabia, England, Denmark, Holland, West Germany, France, Italy, Turkey, Libya, Venezuela, Colombia, Cuba and Canada.

Although Russ' work is almost entirely outside of Austin, he nevertheless contributes his talents to the community. Right now he is taking pictures at his own expense at the Austin State School and the Pre-School for Mentally Retarded to illustrate a report being compiled on their work.

A project he is particularly interested in is a photographic workshop at the University of Missouri. Now in its 10th year, he has been chairman of it for 9 years, and will attend the 10th session in May. A nontechnical workshop, he calls it an experiment in photographic expression. The object is to teach photographers to start thinking in terms of good pictures.

Two of Russell Lee's pictures were included in the highly acclaimed Family of Man exhibit that opened in the New York Museum of Modern Art, toured many parts of the world and was published in book form.

Russ is no gadget loving photographer. He'd rather talk about people, and the way he sees them—and captures them on film. He has found those fleeting images with his inner eye.

Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Imaginative Proposal for Helping India," from the Providence Journal of March 31, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IMAGINATIVE PROPOSAL FOR HELPING INDIA

The India aid program submitted jointly by Senators KENNEDY (Democrat, of Massachusetts) and COOPER (Republican, of Kentucky) is perhaps the most positive, imaginative, and potentially stimulating proposal of its kind to have been presented to Congress and the American people since President Eisenhower outlined his atoms-for-peace plan 4 years ago.

And, if the United States and its Western allies haven't lost their capacity to crusade—to find their own welfare in the greater good of all mankind—the Kennedy-Cooper program could provide just the inspiration needed to restore to the West its flagging confidence and renew its sense of direction.

First, the two Senators have focused attention on the crucial nature of India's drive to create a healthy industrial state within the framework of democracy. India is the point on which balances the fate of a free and representative society in teeming, emergent Asia and Africa.

If India's experiment continues to offer hope, Asian nations not caught up in the Communist net will be encouraged to follow in a movement that could be democracy's vindication and victory. If, on the other hand, India fails—and its second 5-year plan is sagging badly as a result of a poor year for crops and global inflation—Red China and the Soviet Union will appear to offer the only hope for peoples as desperately depressed as they are in Asia.

This message has been said before, of course, but rarely as persuasively as Mr. KENNEDY presented it to the Senate, or as abundantly supported both by facts and, since Senator COOPER is former Ambassador to India, by personal confirmation.

But more importantly, they have outlined a specific plan of action commensurate in scope to the size of the challenge posed by India, a plan that could make the difference between freedom and totalitarianism for India, Asia, and ultimately the Western World.

The proposal would, in effect, make India the target of an economic campaign comparable to the Marshall plan which in the last decade has changed the face of Europe. But instead of making it an all-American operation, Senators KENNEDY and COOPER propose to enlist the nations assisted to economic health by the Marshall plan in a vast coordinated effort to bring India the capital, agricultural knowledge, and industrial skills it needs to achieve its second 5-year plan.

Senators KENNEDY and COOPER recognize that two stimulants are needed. The United States, as the leader and the wealthiest member of the Atlantic community, must lead the way by coming forward with an economic aid offer that will enable India to get off the treadmill.

But India, too, must reciprocate, as the nations of Europe did through the OEEC, by dropping its shroud of pride and presenting the lending nations with a candid appraisal of its economic condition and needs so that a realistic development program can be worked out among India, the United States and any other contributing nations.

This requisite is one India could and should honor. If it is a string or a condition, it is one attached only in the interests of getting India on its feet as fast and efficiently as possible.

If there is one fault with the Kennedy-Cooper plan, it is that it limits itself to India, leaving for later consideration those nations from Pakistan to Malaya which rim the Indian Ocean and which, with India, create an economic unit.

The two Senators have endeavored to raise America's sights high, but perhaps they should try to raise the goal just a bit higher by proposing an economic aid program that would embrace all those nations which would join in a central Asian counterpart to the Organization of European Economic Cooperation.

Although creation of such a regional planning unit would require the cooperation of feuding states such as Pakistan and India, that cooperation should not be too much to ask in return for an aid program of the scope envisioned by Senators KENNEDY and COOPER. But the first move is up to the United States in the interest of regaining the initiative in world affairs in the service of freedom.

Freedom Is Still the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I should like to include an article written and published by a citizen of my home town, the Honorable Robert C. Stovall, of Okolona, Miss.

Mr. Stovall is a man of prominence and tremendous ability. Educated at the University of Mississippi and Harvard Law School, he established himself early in life as an attorney of eminence. Presently he is serving as president of the Columbus & Greenville Railway Co., a short-line railroad which traverses the State of Mississippi. In the midst of his busy life he has also established himself as a successful dirt farmer.

From a reading of the article one will promptly conclude, and correctly so, that Mr. Stovall is a courageous man and a

profound believer in the principles which made our country great. The article is respectfully commended to the reading of everyone. It follows:

FREEDOM IS STILL THE ANSWER

(By Robert C. Stovall)

Again our self-styled political economists are looking for that elusive pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. This time, Malthus and old Dr. Ben Franklin and scores of other wise men to the contrary, we are to achieve an abundant life in the future by doing what comes naturally. A few years hence, they say, there will be 200 million Americans, and these 200 million citizens, some of them as yet unborn, will stimulate trade no end by creating a limitless demand for consumer goods. So we will reproduce ourselves into prosperity. And as to what those 200 million customers will use for wampum, the economists do not say.

Many of us, I believe, are wary of economic theories and fed up with social experiments in defiance of natural law. Have we not weakened our economic structure and lost precious rights regulating and subsidizing ourselves into prosperity? And have we not come to the verge of bankruptcy spending ourselves into prosperity? Here again historical facts do indeed confound the theorists.

For centuries the stock reply of the Chinese to suggested change was: "We tried that experiment and it didn't work; so we abandoned it." We know that 400,000,000 customers failed to make China prosperous. In an atmosphere of filial piety, a Chinese considered numerous progeny his best bet for social security, and he worked the theory to the limit. The result? Well, not a rags to riches story in China, or in India. Rather a grim struggle against starvation. Now the governments are seeking a remedy through birth control.

History teaches that, barring national calamities and international upheavals, a productive people will be a prosperous people; and that the greatest incentive to production—whether a harvesting machine or a drama—an electronic brain or a Parthenon—is freedom—a freedom that comes only with knowledge, responsibility, and self-discipline.

A few weeks back, sputnik soared into outer space, and American confidence plummeted. Certainly it was unfortunate that America should lag behind the Soviet Union in the missile race, due to the betrayal of our secrets by disloyal citizens; to the genius of German scientists, whom our Government permitted the Russians to kidnap and exploit after World War II; to interservice rivalries with our military men; and to an all-out effort in Russia.

But it seemed to me that our reaction to sputnik was singularly deficient in courage and commonsense. You will remember that Mary Ellen Chase emphasized the oldfashioned American virtues of grit and gumption that still prevailed in the fishing village of her childhood. She told of a man who had lost his lobster traps in a northeast gale and loudly lamented his misfortune without exciting too much sympathy. "Why don't he shut his mouth and pick up his feet?" his neighbors said. "You can't sail straight by taking time to bawl about bad luck."

The talk of vulnerability that assailed our ears from sources high and low evidenced, I think, two potentially fatal defects outside the missile program—a lack of self-reliance and a lack of responsibility for our country. How could any American sell freedom and faith short, even in the face of the direst military threat?

The Crusade for Freedom no doubt is doing a thoroughly worthwhile work. But we have informal envoys who are trying to win friends and influence people by boasting of the number of sweptwing cars, deep freezes, washing machines, garbage disposal units, et cetera we have in this country, not realizing that men under oppression, with sore needs of the spirit, are deaf to the lure of material gadgets and luxuries. Some of our citizens are the only people who seem to have been taken by this overemphasis on material possessions.

We think of the Greek who said to the Persian: "You do not know what freedom is. If you did, you would fight for it with bare hands if you had no weapon." That is language a modern Pole, or Serb, or Hungarian would understand. Nor was it propaganda for foreign consumption. To the Athenian his freedom was his most prized possession in the days when Athens created drama and built the Parthenon and defeated the military might of Persia.

You may have read Dr. Edith Hamilton's very arresting book, The Echo of Greece. In it, she tells of a Greek army far from home and surrounded by a much superior force of the enemy, with just the slimmest chance for a successful breakthrough. The general made his men this speech, short, pointed, and sustained by fact: "You live in the only free city in the world. In Athens alone, the state does not interfere with a man's daily life." Naturally, soldiers would make a superhuman effort to get back to a place like that. Wouldn't we all?

In the Golden Age of Greece, Pericles said, "The individual can be trusted. Let him alone." And the founders of our country, notably Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, had the same idea. Then toward the end of the fifth century B. C. and into the next, the Athenians lost their self-reliance, responsibility, and self-control, and soon their freedom, and world leadership. Dr. Hamilton says they went to the theater and laughed at the comedies of Aristophanes that mirrored their ineptitude, corruption, and license. "They were getting in one way or another comfortable assistance from the government. What real difference did it make if officials grew rich and foreign affairs went badly?"

As you remember, after the first stunned silence as sputnik circled outer space, a mighty clamor arose. Billions for defense, for foreign aid, for education, for conservation, and for what have you. Tax and spend, put enough money into the hands of enough agencies, and bureaus, and commissions, and services, and departments, and the country might be saved.

You probably read that testimony before a congressional committee recently disclosed that a certain document from Russia was received by seven different governmental agencies, translated into English, stamped secret, and filed by each one of them. Not one communicated with any other or attempted to put the paper in the hands of our scientists, where it conceivably might have value, before it was pigeonholed. To heighten the absurdity, it was not secret at all but had been published and distributed in Russia. Then the amazing fact came out that often scientific articles were published in the United States, translated into Russian and printed in Russian newspapers, sent to Washington by our representatives over there, retranslated into English, and filed away. Would another billion dollars for an eighth agency cure a performance like that?

We think, too, of the officers at Harmon Air Force Base in Newfoundland, who, to save a bookkeeping headache, buried spare parts that had cost the American taxpayers over $33,000. You will recall that, exhumed on congressional instigation, parts worth $18,502 survived the burial and were still usable. According to the warrant officer, the captain had said to him, "We got a hole; we might as well use it." The Army unit to which these bright young men were attached has a million dollars worth of spare parts instead of the $75,000 worth it is supposed to have. Billions for defense, but what good will they do unless we first fill up the holes?

"A dismal failure," Senator ELLENDER says of our foreign-aid program. Allowing for possible political bias on the Senator's part, has there ever been a report of real achievement in the way of friendship and cooperation from these squandered billions from any source other than the agency itself? Will more billions tossed about in the same fashion change that picture or merely lead us nearer bankruptcy and overwhelming debt?

It seems we were not much disturbed by the unfavorable comparison of our schools and colleges with those of European countries until sputnik soared. Had we forgotten that Thomas Jefferson said that no nation can be ignorant and free?

The Russian satellite pointed up the importance of mathematics and science in a school curriculum and made courses in co-ed cooking, love and marriage, and life adjustment sound somewhat inadequate for the age in which we live. Let us have more money for schools but let us ask if it is to be invested in scholarship or wasted on educational fads and theories.

Certainly booklearning is important for the development of the whole man and for the progress, culture, and safety of the state. I think we should be more concerned with both the quality and quantity of instruction our young people have. But scholarship of a sound and basic character will not save our Nation without a concept of freedom as a possession of great price to be had only on terms of responsibility and self-control.

Dr. Hamilton tells us that, when an Athenian youth was 18, he went to a temple with his family and friends, and in a solemn ceremony, took this oath: "I will not bring dishonor upon my weapons nor desert the comrade by my side. I will strive to hand on my fatherland greater and better than I found it. I will not consent to anyone's disobeying or destroying the constitution but will prevent him, whether I am with others, or alone. I will honor the temples and the religion my forefathers established." I should like to see that engraved on the walls of our schools and on the hearts of our youth. I think it would be a splendid oath for Congressmen to take—and cabinet members—and judges. In that way, we might avoid another insult to freedom in a future Little Rock.

Our existence as a free nation and as the last best hope of earth may well depend on education—in and out of school—not for life adjustment but for life mastery through the Christian faith of our fathers.

Starvation in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written as to cause of the so-called recession. In my opinion, the causes of the recession have been increased a hundredfold by the fact that the gloom peddlers and crepehangers are always talking the public into a genuine fear. Recessions generally are caused by the public refusing to buy. As long as this fear of the buying public exists, recession recovery will be slowed.

The editorial clearly portrays the attitude of many Democrat Members,

They seem to have forgotten some of their own attitude back in 1949–53. The American public generally sees through this Democrat attitude just cheap political maneuvering.

The editorial from the Joplin Globe follows:

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of March 29, 1958]

STARVATION IN MISSOURI?

Much has been heard recently about the political hysteria in Washington over the current slump, and all sorts of wild-eyed spending schemes for relief. But we had no idea our illustrious Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS had gone loco on the subject until his Report From Washington came in the other day.

We were shocked to learn from Senator HENNINGS, in Washington, that people all over Missouri are starving, including people in Joplin. He links us with Valley Forge, which connotes privation and suffering, in discussing a chins-up speech made there recently by former President Herbert Hoover, in this paragraph:

"If the unemployment situation in Valley Forge is anywhere near as bad as it is in the Bootheel, St. Louis, Kansas City, Joplin, and a lot of other parts of Missouri (where large numbers of people are going hungry for the first time in a generation), I am sure that this speech must have appalled many of the listeners."

Perhaps Senator HENNINGS needs to shake the Washington fog from his brain and come on back to Missouri, breathe some clear, wholesome air, and observe first-hand that our supermarkets still are crowded, we still are troubled with car traffic jams more than we are with hunger, that people are well fed, well clothed and well housed, and that very few if any are, except by choice, going in rags, or barefoot or living in tents. He undoubtedly would be abashed to observe that most of them have bank accounts and TV sets and can even go out for dinner occasionally. Oddly enough, all but a relatively small percentage have jobs.

Of course, if Congress becomes so silly as to appropriate all of the billions recommended by Senator HENNINGS in a full typewritten page of welfare gimmicks, few in Joplin or anywhere else in Missouri will even have shirts in another year or so.

Maybe the Senator has forgotten that it is his colleague, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, and not himself, who is running for reelection this year.

The most amazing thing of all is that by expounding such political gibberish, Senator HENNINGS insults the intelligence of his own constituency.

A Presidential Retirement Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

A PRESIDENTIAL RETIREMENT AID BILL

While the Congress is considering the question of Presidential disability, it might at the same time return to a long-pending bill to grant former Presidents retirement aid in the form of a pension, staff, and other facilities consonant with their services in the world's greatest office.

Under present law a former President receives no pension or remuneration of any kind, nor does his widow, with the pitiable exception of free postage.

In 1957 the Senate passed a bill providing $25,000 annual compensation and other facilities to former Presidents and their widows, but up to now the House has not acted.

The bill, in addition to financial aid, would provide secretarial and clerical assistance on a basis comparable to the staff of a Senator from the least populous State of the Union, suitable office space in a Federal building, free transportation within the United States and its Territories and compensation of $10,000 to widows of former Presidents.

Some Presidents, like Mr. Hoover, have been wealthy men and have had no need for assistance from the Government. President Hoover has indicated that he would not avail himself of the act if it were passed. He drew no salary during his term as President.

Some Chief Executives like President Grant have died in virtual poverty. The picture of General Grant laboriously striving to finish his memoirs to pay his bills while he was slowly dying of cancer at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., is a picture which should haunt the Nation forever.

Other Presidents, like Mr. Truman, have finished their term of office in modest circumstances and have had to write or even indorse advertising to provide for themselves and their families.

Former President Truman, in his broadcast of February 2, said:

"I have the biggest individual mail in the State of Missouri, and maybe bigger than any in a lot of other States * * * It takes three clerks to answer my mail. My postage bill is something tremendous * * * I see an immense number of people * * * and I have to have some place where I can talk to them. I can't talk to them in a cubbyhole or a back room. If I hadn't inherited some property that finally paid things through, I'd be on relief right now."

This is just not right. It reflects not so much on our former Presidents as the Nation which provides for them in so niggardly a manner.

Congress should make one of its urgent items of business a proper provision for former Presidents and their widows.

Political Science Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to an organization and a program with which, no doubt, many Members of this House are already familiar. I refer to the American Political Science Association and its congressional fellowship program.

Each year, for the past 5 years, the association has selected a small number of promising young political scientists and journalists to spend a year working in Congress. During the past year, 9 political scientists and 6 journalists were selected by a distinguished panel, including William White of the New York Times, Warren Unna of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Senators Mundt and Sparkman, and Representatives Yates and Curtis.

The purpose of the fellowship is simple: to provide a familiarity with congressional politics that cannot be acquired through books, alone. Rather than simply observe and interview Congressmen, these fellows work in the offices of Members of their own choosing. Having just completed some 3½ months working on the House side, they are now beginning their apprenticeships in Senate offices, where they will remain for the rest of the session. Upon completion of their stay in Congress, they will return to the campuses and newspapers across the country, better prepared to teach and write.

Having had a fellow, Mr. William Mitchell, of Harvard, in my office, I can personally testify as to their diligence, loyalty, and intelligence. They make signal contributions both to offices and to the Congress. I am pleased to see Mr. Mitchell and his friends have the opportunity of working in the Senate, but I am sad at the loss of a valuable worker, and pleasant companion. Apparently, some of my colleagues feel as I do about the congressional fellows, for I have noticed that they make use of them year after year. Is there a better indication of the high esteem in which they are held?

I hope that as new groups of these fine young men and women come to Washington, those of you who have not had the pleasure of working with them will choose to do so. They need our cooperation, and we need their knowledge and skills. That knowledge and skill is at our disposal and without cost either to us or the taxpayers. I can think of no better investment.

Who Pays for Federal Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Frank Tripp entitled "Voter Pays Plenty for Free Projects." This column was published in the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sunday Press, March 9, 1958.

Mr. Tripp resides in Elmira, N. Y., in my congressional district and in addition to being a national syndicated columnist, is also chairman of the board of the Gannett Newspapers, Inc. His approach to subjects can probably best be described as nonpolitical but completely human.

The article follows:

VOTER PAYS PLENTY FOR FREE PROJECTS

(By Frank Tripp)

It was inevitable that two recent columns would bring reaction, pro and con, agreement and abuse. The ones about "Mr. Fall

Guy" and about our self-reliant forebears and their genuine freedom.

It is becoming more noticeable every day that this generation is unwilling to listen to or admit the diabolical evolution that took the mastery of their lives away from them and made them pawns of a mass system controlled by the extravagance, waste and something-for-nothing promises of power-seeking politicians, labor czars and do-gooders.

To get the cards out on the table, in my book, 7 out of 10 of the sacrificing public souls who give their lives to fellow man start out as guys looking for a job and end up promising Utopia to keep it. That goes from the White House down.

It is the simplest thing in the world to do great deeds, make great reputations, and happy the people if you can do it on the people's money and fool them into liking it.

That has happened in this great land by and through the most colossal humbug in history; that there ever was or ever can be man-given something for nothing. For example:

Every time a community builds a schoolhouse into a university, a highway, an airport or a costly what-not, it calms the taxpayers by seeking State aid. The State in turn goes all out to pass it on to Federal aid.

The sap voter falls for it 'cause "it ain't going to cost nobody nothing." The trap was deliberately set for him.

Just who or what are State aid and Federal aid? Why, mister they are you.

You'll find them, and those of a hundred others, in every tax you pay, in every car you drive, in every loaf of bread you eat—plus the salaries and waste of the system that every party fights to control.

It was more honest back when politicians paid dollars to buy floaters to vote for them. At least it was not the taxpayers' money that is now spent in billions to buy votes through increasingly extravagant pet schemes that make the populace more and more dependent upon the state, and less and less the rulers of their own lives; softies, taxdrained suckers.

There was a time when there was a difference in political parties; when principles were involved and voters affiliated because of basic differences. Today the voters' choice is which can most fool them that it will see them from the cradle to the grave—in ease and luxury—on their own money, they forget.

Each upon taking over, be it State or Nation, accentuates the hokum of the other and adds a few more giveaways and more patronage to win the next election.

They have not only lavished every cent they dare tax from people, but have built a debt that the youngest babe and his great grandchildren will never see paid. Why not? It is the people's debt, not the party's.

The few among them who resist this pillage bat their heads against party loyalty, die, or retire, discouraged. The system grows vaster, stronger; the people more helpless, more mendicant.

So, you "fall guys" who called me names, here's a round-robin picture of the mess you've plunked yourselves into.

As long as you think that the Government, or any group that owns you, body, soul, and pocketbook, can give you something for nothing, you'll vote yourself and your children deeper into the mire—someday maybe into a communism of your own making.

If it wasn't for the kids I've brought into the world, I wouldn't give a —— how you vote. The only sound thing that some of you harp on is that there isn't much choice.

And there won't be, until people take over at their hometown level—and stop selling their vote for some selfish pet project.

The Nation's Railroads Are Entitled to Immediate Relief by this Congress

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1958, an article appeared in many of the Nation's newspapers under the caption, "Two Month Deficit of Eastern Rails Is $43 Million." The article said in part:

> Twenty major eastern railroads showed combined losses of $43.5 million in the first 2 months of 1958. * * * This compared with the net loss $6,011,250 in the 1957 period. * * * This January–February deficit was 6 times larger than the net loss of $7,218,417 in the same 2-month period in 1932 when one-third of the Nation's railroads were in bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever any doubt that the once mighty railroad industry is tilted toward financial disaster, the results for the first 2 months of 1958 supply a conclusive answer, and at the same time demand prompt remedial action from this Congress.

It is true that at this moment hearings are under way by the Smathers committee in the Senate. Based on available information about the best that can be expected in the way of legislation is relief for the Nation's railroads by repeal of the wartime excise tax on the transportation of persons and property and curbing the power of the public utilities commission of the several States in regulating certain phases of the railroad industry. If the wartime excise tax is repealed and the power of the public utilities commission is curbed such action is woefully inadequate in solving the overall problem.

In addition should the Senate enact any legislation based on the recommendations of the Smathers committee, it will be at least May or June before it could be received by the House where hearings would also be necessary. With Congress adjourning in July or August, let us face the fact that the chances of this type of legislation being approved by the House before adjournment are highly doubtful.

Mr. Speaker, lengthy hearings involving thousands of pages of testimony have already been held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as the result of recommendations presented for the consideration of President Eisenhower by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization. This Committee also spent many months studying the transportation industry so that Congress has ample evidence of the need of an efficient transportation system which includes the railroads of the Nation.

In addition to the hearings that were held, several bills are pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but no action has been taken on them. These bills while not containing the complete answer to the railroad problem are a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1958, on the floor of the House, I quoted Mr. David C. Bevan, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., when he said on March 19, 1958, at Cleveland, Ohio:

> The railroad industry has working capital sufficient to meet payrolls for only 1 week. * * * We need immediate action, not studies. * * * The industry is facing a dire emergency.

In addition to Mr. Bevan's statement on March 27, 1958, Eugene V. Attreed, vice president and director of the Railroad Division, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, said in part:

> We are hearing and reading a great deal these days about the Nation's railroads. The plight is real, and unless our National Government takes immediate and extensive remedial action the damage to our country will be grave.

Confronted with these dire warnings, I have introduced this date a House resolution providing for the creation of a select committee of 9 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 5 from the majority party and 4 from the minority party 1 of whom he will designate as chairman.

The select committee would be authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study and investigation of the present financial condition of the Nation's railroads, which has resulted in widespread unemployment in the industry.

The select committee would also be authorized to formulate an emergency legislative program designed to aid the railroads in such a manner as to relieve unemployment in the industry and assure the continued maintenance of a railroad system adequate to meet the needs of the United States in time of war or other emergency.

The select committee would be required to report to the House as soon as practicable but not later than June 30, 1958, with its recommendations, including recommendations for legislation.

This resolution if approved immediately would give the select committee or its subcommittee nearly 2 months to complete its assignment. Meanwhile it would have the necessary authority to subpena witnesses and the production of such papers and documents as it deems necessary. In other words, the select committee would have all the necessary power to go to work and report back to the House by June 30, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly some may wonder why this subject should not be handled by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. My answer is that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has enough to do with its full agenda between now and the adjournment of this Congress. In addition, this is emergency legislation to meet an acute situation that affects not only the transportation industry but our national defense, as well as unemployment and the health and welfare of the American people as a whole. Therefore, time is of the essence

and a select committee is the only feasible answer.

I can go one step further in warning Congress that unless drastic action is taken immediately, railroad bankruptcies will not only magnify and prolong the business recession but could lead this Nation into a complete economic upheaval.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution creating a special select committee is designed to get action by this Congress at the earliest possible moment on extending relief to the Nation's railroad industry, and I am hopeful that the resolution will receive immediate approval so that this select committee can begin to function at the earliest practicable date.

Recreational Facilities in Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Mr. Melvin O. Steen, director of the Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission, concerning the recreational facilities in the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVOIR AREA MANAGEMENT FOR RECREATION

(By Melvin O. Steen, director, Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission)

In calendar year 1945, a new and awesome era for this Nation and for all nations began with a blinding, searing flash over Hiroshima. This was year 1 of the atomic age.

In that same year, in the breadbasket of America, 9,000 miles from the rubble that was once a Japanese city, another era began that was destined to have great impact also on our Nation. This was the Missouri River Basin development program, fathered by the Pick-Sloan plan, and devised to terminate the destructive force of floods, while at the same time providing power, irrigation, and recreational opportunities for a dynamic and progressive people.

The basin, including parts or all of 10 States, comprises 20 percent of the Nation's entire land area. Geographically and ecologically, the basin includes a vast and varied region, ranging from deciduous forests and bottomlands in the southeast, across a wide expanse of ever-changing prairies, to pine forests and towering mountains in the northwest.

In this vast region we find the industrialist, the businessman, the truck gardener, the corn farmer, the wheat grower, the rancher, the lumberjack, the miner, and a host of other Americans with callings as diversified as the land on which they live. It is said that variety is the spice of life; certainly variety sparks the economic life of the Missouri River Basin.

The self-evident contribution of flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power to our economic life is not the subject of this paper. I am concerned here with the social and economic values of outdoor recreation, a so-called secondary benefit of this development program.

Recreation means different things to different people. To some it is as uncomplicated and inexpensive as a game of bridge with the couple next door, to others a fancy night club is essential. To most Americans, however, hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, picknicking, boating, swimming, or some other outdoor sport is the preferred and principal recreation. More Americans seek relaxation and enjoyment in outdoor recreation than in all other forms combined.

In the early days of basin history, outdoor recreation was no problem; at least it was not the problem that it is today. To the trapper, the trader, the cowhand, and the settler, outdoor activity was a way of life rather than a form of recreation. Even when this pioneer life was supplanted by modern agriculture and industry, outdoor recreation was quite easy to find. It is in recent years that the shorter workweek, higher family income, improved roads and transportation facilities, more people, and more private property have brought a new problem—the problem of places to go for outdoor recreation and enough space in which to enjoy it.

We are concerned about this today, but our real problems lie in the future—many of them just around the corner, I may add. The events and problems of the next quarter-century can best be described in the Ozark adage which proclaims "you ain't seen nothin' yet."

It is my considered opinion, that the American people are currently in a phase of population dynamics that we biologists call an irruption, a phenomenon which, for present purposes, I briefly describe as an explosive expansion into favorable environment by an animal population.

Consider, if you will, that while today's babies grow to 25-year-old adults, the population of the United States will increase from 170 million to 250 million, 70 percent of which will be urban residents. Developments that now seem fantastic will become commonplace. Science will make major breakthroughs on many fronts. Standards of living will rise substantially; time for travel and recreation will be bountiful. Distance will be no barrier, because no part of this world will be more than a day's travel away. We can eat breakfast in Nebraska and dinner in New Zealand. The need for resources will increase greatly. We will join the have-not nations, competing in world markets for raw materials. This will bring great changes to the resource-rich Missouri Basin. Great changes will come to this breadbasket of the Nation, if for no other reason than population increase alone. I remind you that, 25 years hence, 80 million new Americans will seek food, shelter and recreation in this land of ours.

To bring the current rate of population increase close to home, let me illustrate by telling you that one city the size of McCook is added to our population each and every day; two States like Nebraska are added each and every year. Moreover, the rate of increase accelerates from time to time, to the amazement of many population specialists who have been forced to revise their forecasts upward repeatedly in recent years. Can it be that they do not recognize an irruption when they see one, or that they believe man is not subject to the same natural laws and population dynamics as other animals?

Whatever our individual and specific conclusions may be, some facts we all accept. We agree that this Nation is growing at an unprecedented and ever-increasing rate, and we know that the atomic age can bring more human progress in a year than mankind achieved in a century before. I fear, however, that most Americans do not grasp the significance of these truths. They do not really understand that this Nation is already well along in a new and swiftly moving era—an era with potential that staggers the imagination—wherein events will dwarf, in both speed and scope, all past human history into relative insignificance.

In this new and exciting era, adequate recreational outlets for our people will be imperative, because we must maintain a high level of social health to meet the impact of the atomic age. Healthy recreation is essential to a healthy society, and there is no better recreational medicine for the mental and physical health of man than that which he finds out-of-doors. The course we should pursue is well defined, for it is very clear that the American people can better afford to build and maintain playgrounds than penitentiaries.

The Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission is charged by law with major responsibility for the preservation, development, and maintenance of outdoor recreation in this State. In view of this, and of the age in which we live, only our legal and financial latitude to meet this responsibility limits our performance. Financing is the basic problem; all our performance is, of course, governed by this primary factor.

Within these limitations, we will make every effort to develop and maintain the recreational potentials of the Missouri Basin program in our State. One such current effort is based on a memorandum of understanding between the Bureau of Reclamation and our agency, which agreement enables us to develop and maintain recreational facilities and natural resources on certain reservoirs within the Republican River Valley. The favorable terms of this agreement, and the generous cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation, have enabled us to do far more than would otherwise have been possible.

Since 1952, when the agreement was completed, we have moved forward as fast as orderly progress and available funds would permit. We have stocked these reservoirs with more than 2,500,000 game fish, ranging from catfish to rainbow trout. We have recreational areas, boat-launching sites, tree plantings, and the roads originally developed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Through cooperative effort we have constructed terraces and grassed waterways, reseeded and retired marginal acreage, and developed and maintained wildlife plantings. Through better land use we have implemented erosion control, improved the soil, and enhanced wildlife environment. We have also made major reductions in wheat and corn acreages, substituting alfalfa, sorghums, and other crops which are not surplus in the national sense.

We have encouraged private and group developments to the extent permissible, and there are now 48 cabin leases outstanding, and 2 organized camps and 2 concessions in place on the reservoir lands. In addition, the We-So-Braska Girl Scout Council is currently constructing their permanent summer home at Swanson Lake. This new organized camp will include a beautiful, modern lodge and grounds and a primative camping area. It will serve the Girl Scouts of 17 southwestern Nebraska counties.

At Swanson Lake, too, an attractive and practical shelter house has been constructed and put in public use. This development was a joint project of the Trenton Chamber of Commerce and local communities in this region, and is an outstanding example of community interest and enterprise, as well as a welcome addition to public service facilities.

Since 1952, more than 1,500,000 people have used the recreational facilities of these reservoirs, and public use increases annually. In 1957 alone, over 350,000 people found

recreational outlets on these impoundments. If we disregard all future problems and needs, if we consider only the present, we can still easily justify recreational developments in the Republican River Valley.

As I have indicated throughout, our work on these reservoirs has been made possible through the help provided by the people of the Republican River Valley, and because of the outstanding cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation. Our cash expenditures to date have totaled $117,927, but we have realized a total income from these reservoirs of $103,931.

This favorable ratio of income to expenditures on public-use areas is a matter that calls for some discussion, for I am certain that other departments in the basin have the same problems we face in Nebraska. Briefly, our current income, and our potential income, is such that we must make each new public-use area as nearly self-supporting as possible.

Most of our annual income must be used to meet the basic costs of wildlife management, and even so, this management falls short of desired levels. After we meet this fixed and inescapable overhead, we have a limited balance that we reserve for capital expenditures—primarily the acquisition and development of public-use areas and facilities.

When we develop such an area (or if we take over the management of an area developed by some other agency) maintenance becomes our responsibility. I choose to describe this maintenance cost as a mortgage on our future income—a mortgage that has no maturity date and never can be paid off. To make matters worse, the annual payments we must make go up and up through the years, as operating costs increase and the public requires more service.

Since our capital investment fund is our only reserve, an increase in fixed overhead means a reduction in capital improvements. If we keep mortgaging our future, we eventually reach a point where all income must go into fixed overhead—when little or nothing can be done to keep pace with growing needs for public-use facilities. If I may be pardoned this personal reference, I have seen many administrators in my field mousetrap themselves and their agency into virtual stagnation in this way. They didn't or wouldn't tell the citizen hat no administrator and no governmental agency can give the people something for nothing.

However, when we face the problems of the future with realism and vision, we find that it is no great trick to maintain sound financing and healthy growth—we need only have the fortitude to tell the people the truth, and to resist deviation from a sound approach to our problems. Good public-use areas can be made self-supporting, or largely so. In the case at hand, most of the income stems from agriculture. We are told, from time to time, that the state should not engage in farming. We are not really farming, of course; we are landlords, the farming is done by tenants. Actually, our other income these past few years was such that we had a choice of being in the farming business or out of the recreation business on the Republican Valley reservoirs. In any event, what is wrong with making sound and profitable use of the people's land, especially when it results in better social health and in the added profit of very substantial trade income for this region.

In summary, if this paper makes any contribution whatever to the work of the interagency committee, I hope it will be along the lines I have pursued throughout. I trust that I have given you a better understanding of the part recreation should play in the Missouri Basin development program, and of the problems we face in developing the potentials of that program.

Finally, I hope our little sightseeing trip into the next quarter century has given you new concepts and increased determination to drive forward with the full basin program. If you think I may have described some sights that are not there, I can only say that my associates around the Nation tell me I have a pioneering mind, yet when I look back on my 30-odd years of experience in our field, I realize that my greatest administrative weakness is my inability to think big enough and far enough ahead.

I believe that we face a greater challenge, here in the breadbasket of this great Nation, than we realize. I believe we should take a new look at things, and resolve to do our best, individually and collectively, to meet this challenge.

Gentlemen, we are already in the early stages of an era wherein an avalanche of world-shaking developments will descend on us in swift and bewildering array—we face the challenge of the atomic age, we must make ready to meet it.

The Importance of Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, under the new housing legislation which has just been signed by the President, we may expect a boom in home construction throughout the land.

There are, of course, a great many phases of America's housing needs. One particular phase which has always been of special interest to me is the matter of housing for America's elderly citizens.

As my colleagues are now aware, the number of men and women over the age of 65 is now well above the 14 million mark. Four hundred thousand Americans pass that milestone each year. What is more, thanks to the extension of life span, our elderly citizens are the second fastest growing age group in the Nation.

By 1975, there will be no fewer than 20 million Americans 65 years of age and over. These Americans need good homes. They need homes especially adapted to the needs of elderly folk—homes easy to maintain, homes economical to construct and to pay the mortgage on, homes with built-in features which are of special use to the elderly, particularly the handicapped.

We need housing for the elderly in our cities; we need it in our countryside, and, yes, we can use it in vacation areas as well.

As I have previously indicated in public comments, it would be a wonderful thing if hundreds of thousands more Americans could enjoy, in their retirement years, small cottages located in healthful surroundings as in the many lake areas of my State.

Recently, I sent to Commissioner Norman P. Mason, of the Federal Housing Administration, a message from one of my constituents, a good friend of mine, Mr. Stuart M. Stebbings, of De Pere, Wis., on the subject of homes for the elderly, especially in resort areas. I send Mr. Mason's reply to Mr. Stebbings to the desk.

By way of further background on this overall subject of housing for the elderly, I append two articles which, I believe, will be of interest to my colleagues. One is from the January 19, 1958, Milwaukee Journal entitled "Housing for Elderly Has Modern Design." The second is an article on a different approach to this problem, utilizing former hotels for continued residence by the retired. It is entitled "New Concept in Low-Cost Housing" and was published in the Life Begins at Forty column of the New York Journal-American, on March 24.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1958.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I appreciate the opportunity this gives me of discussing with you some of the operations of FHA.

Mr. Stebbings' proposal for summer cottages for elderly people or retirement homes in vacation areas, has much appeal. FHA will insure mortgages on seasonal homes or homes located in resort areas that may be used only part of the year or, in some cases, all of the year. These homes, of course, must meet FHA requirements as to construction and location and generally must be in areas where there is some possibility of year-round living. FHA has insured a considerable number of such properties.

However, FHA would not insure a mortgage on a cabin or vacation house, or part-time homes located in a remote area where it might not have any stable resale value or in those cases where the property did not meet FHA minimum construction standards. The National Housing Act provides mortgage insurance to enable families to acquire good housing on reasonable terms.

FHA is experimenting with a new program designed to make its services more readily available in small communities and localities distant from metropolitan centers where FHA insuring offices are located. This is entitled the Certified Agency Program, and under it, local banks and other lending institutions in small communities of not over 15,000 population, are certified as agents of the FHA. These local lending institutions then may process the loan, have the appraisal of the property made and make the commitment for FHA insurance of the mortgage. This is very close to what Mr. Stebbings suggests in the postscript of his letter. This program is on an experimental basis in selected areas of the country and as experience is gained, we are actively considering its further expansion.

I would suggest that Mr. Stebbings discuss with the Milwaukee FHA insuring office, the types of construction and locations he has in mind.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner.

HOUSING FOR ELDERLY HAS MODERN DESIGN

LOS ANGELES.—Churches are borrowing new architectural designs from postwar resort and garden apartments to provide up-to-date living accommodations for aged citizens. It is no longer a question of supplying them with creaking rocking chairs on the porches of old folks homes.

In this area, the southern California Presbyterians have chalked up an outstanding success with White Sands, a beachfront development at La Jolla. Until very recently it was a luxury hotel.

Nearly 200 older men and women now live at White Sands in comfort and dignity. A second home in the Pasadena area is on the drawing boards—a sleek structure of concrete, glass, and steel.

The key to these unique middle-income housing trends for seniors is their financing. Lacking huge endowment funds, the religious groups are appealing to members with savings who, through substantial downpayments, can bear the cost of construction.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS A MONTH

At White Sands, entry fees beginning at $7,500 guarantee a single resident life occupancy of a room. Choice meals, resort recreational facilities, maintenance and medical-nursing service come to another $175 a month.

At Presbyterian village, on the outskirts of Detroit, 75 oldsters have completed 2 years' residence in cottage-dormitory type accommodations. Included on the 32-acre site are apartments, a community residence hall, and an infirmary. Eventually, the Detroit presbytery hopes to have 75 buildings.

Unlike luxury setups on the west coast, the village rents its apartments at $75 to $90 a month, with dormitory room, board, and nursing service for $150 a month. Guests who cannot afford the fees are helped to apply for old-age assistance, with the presbytery of Detroit making up the difference through assessments on each church.

ASSESS MEMBERS

Original financing of the village was arranged through large individual gifts and an assessment of $1 for each church member in the presbytery. When finally completed—and all mortgages are retired—Presbyterian village will cost between $6 million and $7 million.

At Spokane, on the other hand, the synod of the Washington Presbyterian Church will turn to cooperative financing to pay for building and operating a manor type residence.

Rooms and apartments with private bath (some with kitchenettes), and wall to wall carpeting, will start at $5,500 for a living room-bath combination and will go up to nearly $21,000 for a fully equipped two bedroom apartment.

Monthly maintenance at Spokane's Hawthorne Manor will be lower than in California—about $100. A 25 percent reduction of both the founder's fee and the monthly bill is available for retired ministers.

NEW CONCEPT IN LOW-COST HOUSING

(By Robert Peterson)

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.—Charles Lavin, 61, will probably go down in geriatric history as the David who slew the Goliath of heavy housing costs for older people. And his weapon was as simple as a slingshot.

He turned the trick by simply taking over fine old hotels and letting people come to live in them on an annual basis performing most of the hotel services themselves. He found that with minimum services and with high, year round occupancy based on two persons per room he could offer comfortable living complete with 3 meals a day for as little as $65 a month—and still make a reasonable profit.

I talked with Mr. Lavin at his Miami Beach headquarters. He's bronzed and well-built, with gray-black hair and a strong, serene face.

"With building costs what they are today," he said, "you just can't go out and build housing which will rent for anywhere near what most older people can afford. I've found that the solution is to take over hotels which are no longer paying their way. By turning them into retirement hotels, keeping them full the year round, and letting guests perform most of the services, you can offer people an amazing bargain in good living."

Mr. Lavin already has 15 retirement hotels in half a dozen States. They are nonsectarian and are open to respectable, congenial people who can care for themselves. They are all hotels of fine reputation. One of his recent acquisitions is the famed MiraMar Hotel in Sarasota. I stayed there just 2 seasons ago and paid $20 a day.

At his hotels, and at retirement hotels operated by others who have latched on to his idea, the chef is the principal employee on the staff. Many of the services, such as carrying trays, running elevators, and having charge of the linens, are performed by guests. Guests who volunteer to work 2 hours or so daily are placed on the petty payroll and receive a token salary of $10 a month.

"I'm convinced that a lot of illness among older people is brought on by boredom and insecurity," said Mr. Lavin. "I have many people in their seventies and eighties who have been in my hotels for years and have never been seriously sick.

"With interesting contacts, things to do, and a sense of security stemming from their very modest living costs, they tend to stay emotionally healthy and this helps keep them physically healthy."

What Part Will I Play As a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to take this opportunity to express my warmest congratulations to Miss Cynthia Shoemaker, daughter of Rev. and Mrs. Stanley J. Shoemaker, Shelby, Ohio, who has recently been selected as 1 of the 12 winners in the Ohio State essay contest conducted by the American Legion. Miss Shoemaker's essay, "What Part Will I Play As a Citizen?" is absolutely one of the finest it has ever been my privilege to read. In my opinion, her essay richly deserves the acclaim which it has so justly received, and, Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to me, in these days when so-called juvenile delinquency receives so much publicity, to know that the future of our great Nation will be entrusted to such outstanding young people as Miss Shoemaker. Her work is a credit to her parents, and to her school, and I am extremely proud to number her among the young people of my congressional district.

As a reward for her achievement, Miss Shoemaker will soon be coming to Washington for a 10-day visit, and during that time she will be one of the guests of honor at a luncheon given by the Ohio congressional delegation. I am looking forward to this opportunity to meet and talk with this outstanding young lady. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit her essay for publication in the RECORD:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

(By Cynthia Shoemaker)

Good citizenship begins in the home. I want to make my home a center of love, friendship, cooperation, and harmony. If I can cooperate with the members of my family for the welfare of the home, I will be able to cooperate with the other American citizens for the welfare of the whole country.

My next step toward being a good citizen will be to assume my responsibility in the community. Before I can be a good citizen in the community, I must learn how my local government functions. After I have investigated the importance and the duties of each office, I can then use my power to vote for the candidates who meet the requirements. Choosing the persons best qualified for the various offices will make the government function honestly and smoothly. Besides being active in the political phase of community life, I will also try to set an example to others of community respect and pride. I intend to support any project for the welfare of the community and its citizens. The community is only what its individual citizens make it. I will try to do my part.

It naturally follows that my good citizenship in the home and in the community should develop into good citizenship in my country. I feel a deep love for America with all its ideals, standards, and opportunities. Rather than to take for granted all the rights and privileges of our land, I wish to show as much appreciation for our rights as did those of the past who fought and died to create freedom and democracy. Recognizing the value of freedom of religion, of speech, and of press—some of the benefits of a great democracy like ours—I will try to be worthy of living in such a land of opportunity and freedom as our United States.

The previously stated qualities of knowledge of the local government, of the use of the voting power, of community respect and pride, and of interest in community projects can again be applied to the National Government. With my voting power I will put the "X" on my ballot for the candidate who will lead our country honestly, wisely, and unselfishly. I will respect the law and cooperate with the law enforcement bodies. I plan to contribute as much of my time and money as possible to the agencies which work for the public welfare: The various charities, mental institutions, research programs, foreign welfare agencies, hospitals, and countless other organizations. I will support those projects which enrich the American youth: Better schools, planned recreational programs, vocational guidance, and religious organizations. All these I will uphold because today's youths are tomorrow's leaders.

There are many other aspects of citizenship than those which I have mentioned. No matter where the road of good citizenship may lead me, I will endeavor to be a responsible and helpful traveler on that road. I feel that God has put us all on this earth for a purpose, and I am grateful that I can fulfill my purpose in the best land of all, the United States of America.

Why We Need Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask per-

mission to insert a small but forceful item which one of my constituents from Trail, Minn., found in the March issue of the REA paper Volts and Jolts.

The article follows:

During a 70-year lifetime, an average American consumes 6,000 loaves of bread, 3 oxen, 4 calves, 4 sheep, 300 chickens, 12,000 pounds of vegetables, 9,000 pounds of potatoes, 14,000 pounds of fruit, 6,000 quarts of milk, 5,000 eggs, 8,000 pounds of sugar, 2,000 pounds of cheese, all of which came from America's 4,782,393 farms. And then some people have the nerve to say the farmer isn't an important segment of our population.

You Have Much at Stake in Freer-Flowing Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to call to the attention of the House a very fine editorial on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of a day or two ago. It discusses the issues raised on the act with great clarity.

A very poignant paragraph therein strikes me as being worthy of emphasis. It states that "it cannot be said that complete free trade is to the best interests of all sections, but certainly they will be best served by freer trade on a reciprocal basis—which is the end result of extending the reciprocal trade agreements program."

I heartily commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues. It follows:

YOU HAVE MUCH AT STAKE IN FREER-FLOWING TRADE

If you are a housewife, a repairman or a clerk, perhaps it is difficult to think of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without some degree of detachment.

You might well ask, "So what if it does expire this summer. How does it affect me and my pocketbook?"

Well, President Eisenhower said Thursday night that world trade makes jobs for at least 4,500,000 American workers, a sizable segment toward making the national economy strong. Much of American prosperity is wrapped up in foreign trade. If you are a businessman or a farmer with things to sell here and abroad, foreign trade affects you directly.

Why all the argument about it? In brief, this is the way it works:

Suppose you make toys, or work for a company that makes toys. A company in Japan also makes toys, ships them here and sells for a lower price. You appeal to the Government for help, to set up a "protecting" tariff so foreign toys will have a higher price and your business can go on. But once we erect a barrier, other countries also erect barriers and pretty soon a great many businesses in America have goods to sell but no market.

Much has been said, and will continue to be said, about the rise of the protectionist feelings in the South and Southeast where the cotton textile industry is located. Textile people say they can't meet some foreign competition. And, indeed to assert that some of these industrial plants will not be affected is to overlook the truth.

It cannot be said that complete free trade is to the best interests of all sections, but certainly they will be best served by freer trade on a reciprocal basis—which is the end result of extending the reciprocal trade agreements program.

At the present time the South's total foreign trade is somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 billion a year. In 1938–39 this average total was $1,085 million. The South's share in the whole foreign trade of the Nation has increased from less than 20 percent in 1938–39 to 26 percent in 1954–55.

The influx of the cotton textile industry has been only one of the many factors which has made for a general improvement in the region's economy. More and more the South is growing new crops, more and more it is becoming industrialized with plants that range from automobile assembly and parts to manufacture of synthetic fabrics.

The region expects to grow more diversified in coming years and this will put the South in a greater position for an expanded share of foreign trade, of having a more stable economy, and of putting more dollars in its pockets. It would be shortsighted indeed to restrict the 2-way flow of trade between this region and the world before we have even reached a third of our industrial potential.

In the years before World War II, the South shipped out more than it shipped in but in more recent years it has moved toward a closer balance of exports and imports. And it has been during this period of achieving a closer trade balance that the South has made the most progress.

At our doors lie Latin America and Africa—great potential customers of goods. We would be less than farsighted not to capitalize upon these markets, to sell them products in exchange for minerals, oils, or coffee. In doing so, we not only help our own region, we help these nations support themselves.

At this critical juncture of the cold war, economic trade is the greatest, single weapon we have to employ against the Soviet Union. If we retreat from our policy of a freer-flowing trade, we will weaken our alliances, further destroy confidence in our leadership in the world and push nations that need trade into the hands of the Communists. And, as Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson so succinctly put it, "in the long run, impoverish this Nation."

What does foreign trade mean to you? It means helping to win a war. It means helping to assure our continued prosperity. It means dollars and cents.

Proposed Resolution in Honor of the 800th Anniversary of the City of Munich, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1958

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposed resolution in honor of the 800th anniversary of the city of Munich, Germany:

Whereas the city of Munich, Germany, throughout the history of civilized man has always been regarded as a key center of learning, culture and science, and

Whereas the people of Munich for centuries have been taken this great heritage to all corners of the world, and

Whereas the people of Munich and their compatriots in Germany have contributed much to the enrichment of the American way of life, and

Whereas the United States of America has prospered under the contributions made by the people whose ancestors first came forth from that great center of Central Europe in all aspects of art, music, science, education, medicine, and other constructive contributions for the advancement of mankind, and

Whereas the city of Munich, founded in the year 1158, is joyously entering a period of celebration during the summer of 1958, marking the 800th anniversary of its founding, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives, proudly and with pleasure salute and hail this great city in recognition of its 800th anniversary and pray that the world will continue to benefit from its expanding heritage.

A Wisconsin Speech Correction Leader Points the Way to a Fuller Life for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, among the greatest assets in the lives of all of us are the teachers who give to us their wisdom, their sympathy, and their encouragement.

In last Sunday's Milwaukee Journal, I was pleased to read a heart-warming article which describes the forthcoming 80th birthday of a teacher who is one of the outstanding leaders in a field in which we can use far more experts than we now have. A refer to Miss Rhoda Zucker, supervisor of the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee speech correction clinic.

Miss Zucker is the founder and director of the clinic. Last week, she and her colleagues attended the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Speech Correction Association, where she was awarded an honorary life membership.

Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly both this fine woman and all the unnamed men and women who have helped open to our children doors which otherwise might have remained locked.

It was teachers of this sort who opened doors for the great Helen Keller (who is now, incidentally, 77 years young, herself). We need inspired teachers of this caliber for the hundreds of thousands of youngsters in our land who otherwise might not achieve at least part of their birthright to speak and to hear. Yes, we need more technicians, more speech and hearing therapists. We need more understanding of this human brain and its speech and hearing centers as well as understanding of the ear, mouth and throat.

Communication is one of man's most essential needs. Every child, normal or retarded, 100 percent healthy or brain-injured, must be given an opportunity to communicate. There must not be an iron curtain over speech and hearing.

The little boy or girl who stutters or lisps must not be denied the help to which he or she is entitled.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the article which was published in the Milwaukee Journal. However, since I also wish to stress the point that the Congress likewise has responsibilities in this field, I also send to the desk excerpts from testimony and a report of the House Appropriations Committee. The latter House of Representatives Report No. 865, which was submitted by Representative JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, who has industriously contributed a very great deal, not only to this field, but also to many other related fields. The testimony which I have sent to the desk was taken at the hearings which Representative FOGARTY and his deeply interested colleagues conducted.

In this connection, Mr. President, I stress the fact that the University of Wisconsin, the Cove Schools in Racine, Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, as well as many other leading educational and medical institutions in the United States, are helping to conduct research which will shed more light on speech and hearing problems. I hope all this work will move full speed ahead.

Speech and hearing research is still, amazingly enough, almost in its infancy, compared to other types of research. I am sure that, as it gets increasingly underway, much of it under the capable guidance of the National Institutes of Health, it will pay for itself a thousandfold, both from an economic standpoint and from a humanitarian standpoint.

Dr. Pearce Bailey and his able colleagues at the Institute who are conscientiously dedicated to this objective, can feel a well-deserved sense of satisfaction in the knowledge of the new frontiers they are opening up toward a better life for children and adults alike.

Dr. Bailey and his associates are, of course, confronted by a vast number of possible outlets for a limited amount of Federal research funds. The House Committee which is sympathetic with that problem of so many financial needs urges, however, intensified use of funds for this speech and hearing phase.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the excerpts from the hearings and report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND TRY AT RETIREMENT WORKS

(By Marilyn Gardner)

Miss Anna Carr's retirement 11 years ago proved to be something of a failure. So, 5 years ago, she tried again. And, this time, it seems to be working.

"My friends don't say retired, though," she said. "They say 'retread.'"

Miss Carr's first retirement was from Milwaukee State Teachers College—now the University of Wisconsin—in Milwaukee, where she had founded and served as director of the school's speech-correction clinic.

Shortly after she had retired from the college, she went to Ann Arbor, Mich., to visit a friend teaching at the University of Michigan.

"What?" said the friend upon hearing that Miss Carr had retired. "Nonsense. We need you here." So, Miss Carr went back to work, this time as the senior clinician at the university's speech-correction clinic.

Miss Carr, a tiny, lively woman whose curly, white hair was accented by her brillian red dress, stopped off in Milwaukee recently to visit old friends and colleagues at the university.

She had come from Madison where she attended the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Speech Correction Association and where she had been awarded an honorary life membership in the group.

HOW DOES SO FEEL?

Miss Carr herself seems a bit surprised that she will be 80 years old next month. "I don't feel like 80," she said, "but then, I don' know how you should feel. I always remember the story about an elderly woman whose niece asked her how it felt to be 80 years old. 'Why, I don't know,' the woman answered. 'I've never asked one of them.'"

One of the best known authorities in the field, Miss Carr traces her career in speech correction back to the early 1920's when, as a tutor for veterans of World War I who were students at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

"Some of them needed help with their speech," she remembered, "and that's when I became interested in it."

Miss Carr described herself as a second-grade pioneer in the field of speech correction for, while such work was being done when she began her studies, the field wasn't nearly as broad or comprehensive as it is now.

She is 1 of 3 coauthors whose book, Rehabilitation of Speech, has become a standard text for students of speech correction. The book was published in 1937, and subsequent editions came out in 1947 and 1957.

"I believe it is the first text published which covered the whole field," Miss Carr commented. Then she added with a smile, "I've heard that some people in speech correction call it their bible."

STUDIED LATIN FIRST

A native of Galatia, a small town in southern Illinois, Miss Carr was graduated from Cornell University, majoring in Latin. After graduation, she began teaching school "here, there, and everywhere," she said. "If I told you all of the places, it would take much too long."

When she became interested in speech correction, she went to the University of Iowa in Iowa City for graduate work, getting her master's degree there.

"One of my teachers there was from Latvia, and I think it was he who put the idea in my head to go to London to study."

She was able to manage a year's work in phonetics at University College there, but then returned to this country "while there were still some coppers left in my purse." She came to the University of Wisconsin for additional graduate work.

When she finished her work at the university, Miss Carr took a position as director of the speech-correction department of the Wausau elementary schools. "I was the director and the department, too," she continued. "And, was I busy."

BUSY IN CITY, TOO

In 1930, she came to Milwaukee to teach at the college here. "We ran a three-ring circus," she remembered. "I was teaching, directing the elementary-school clinic, and working with college students who needed speech correction to become teachers."

Today, Miss Carr said, more emphasis is being put on the problems of the deaf and hard of hearing in connection with speech defects.

"After all," she explained, "we don't learn to speak without our hearing. If a child is born deaf, he won't learn to talk. But if he has been deafened after he has learned to talk, he won't have any trouble speaking."

The "team approach" is another relatively new development, she continued. Since many speech defects involve other problems, the speech correctionist must work with other people in solving the problem or know to whom the child should be referred.

"Many defects are physical in nature," she said, "but others are psychological. And still others may have, if not their origin in, at least no help from the home situation."

IMITATES SOUNDS

Since one learns to speak by hearing speech, a child is apt to "imitate whatever he hears in the home," Miss Carr added, "whether it's the Spanish language or a Southern drawl. If there's a lisp in the family, the child may speak with a lisp, although it could be caused by other things, too."

A baby's first attempt at speech, known as "baby talk," is part of this imitation process, she said, and is a perfectly normal phase of a child's speech development. "That is, of course, provided it doesn't go on beyond the age when he knows better."

A baby, she explained, "hears all this talk going around him, so he begins to try it, too. He bubbles and babbles, making all kinds of strange sounds, just enjoying his ability to make noise."

"Then one day he accidentally makes a sound like 'mah,'" Miss Carr continued. "It's an easy sound to make, so he does it again—mah-mah. 'Oh, he's beginning to talk,' says the flattered mother. 'Say mama, honey.' So he says it again, imitating her, and he learns to talk."

"A young child, however, can't make a wide variety of sounds," she said. "First he tries those that he can see being formed by a parent's lips or tip of tongue. These are sounds like 'puh,' 'buh,' 'mmm,' 'th' and so forth."

BABY TALK BEGINS

"Gradually he begins to try sounds he can't see made," she said, "sounds like 'err' or 'sss.'" And here is where so-called baby talk often begins.

"No one knows just why a youngster has trouble with these sounds," Miss Carr said. "It's probably caused by several things.

"Take the 'sss' sound, for instance. You need teeth to make that sound," a commodity most babies don't have. So instead of the "sss" sound the baby substitutes the "th" sound, one he can make easily. That's why you hear things like "thither Thuthie."

"Probably," Miss Carr concluded, "it's that a baby imitates what he hears, but substitutes sounds he can make or sounds that he thinks are the same. Many of our sounds are much the same you know.

"You stand in the next room and I'll say 'sss' and then 'th' and see if you can tell the difference. It may sound the same to a baby."

EXCERPT FROM CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY'S REPORT URGING INTENSIFIED WORK BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

"Finally, the committee is not entirely satisfied with the status of research, on sensory disorders, including sight and hearing, and expects greater effort to be expended in these areas, both in the laboratories of the institute and in the laboratories of grantees, during the coming fiscal year."

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS ON DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959 FISCAL YEAR—TESTIMONY OF DR. PEARCE BAILEY

HEARING AND SPEECH DEFECTS

Mr. FOGARTY. We asked you last year in our report to get started on a research program in the neglected field of hearing and

speech defects. What have you done about it?

Dr. BAILEY. We have done considerable, Mr. Chairman, to stimulate research in this field. There has been a considerable increase in the number of grants. In 1958, 35 research grants totaling $514,405, and 4 field investigations totaling $119,013, were awarded.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is this on speech and hearing defects?

Dr. BAILEY. Yes, sir. In addition to that we have started a training program in otolaryngology.

Mr. FOGARTY. Give us a breakdown of these projects, please.

Dr. BAILEY. Yes.

(The information referred to follows:)

National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness—Hearing and speech disorders, 1958

RESEARCH GRANTS

Institution:	Amount
University of Oregon School of Medicine, Portland, Oreg.	$26,504 10,166
Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo.	5,855 20,757
University of Chicago School of Medicine, Chicago, Ill.	20,470 13,225 17,999
University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pa.	3,680
Creighton University School of Medicine, Omaha, Nebr.	5,988
North Western University, Evanston, Ill.	4,047 32,200 19,550
University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, Kans.	8,872
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.	9,583
Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo.	17,154 16,488
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.	4,995
Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Mich.	2,750 1,725
Manhattan Eye, Ear, and Throat Hospital, New York, N. Y.	29,763
Lempert Institute of Otology, New York, N. Y.	15,000
Los Angeles Otological Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif.	19,482
Children's Hospital Society of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.	17,250 15,525 21,275
New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York, N. Y.	34,080
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.	5,203
Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, Mass.	14,834 5,750 40,250
Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, Cleveland, Ohio	5,442
Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio	8,824
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.	33,629
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md.	2,300
Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, N. H.	16,790
Total, research grants (35)	518,405

FIELD INVESTIGATION GRANTS

Institution:	
John Tracey Clinic, Los Angeles, Calif.	15,621
Vanderbilt University, School of Medicine, Nashville, Tenn.	20,355
American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, Rochester, Minn.	62,200
St. Christopher's Hospital for Children, Philadelphia, Pa.	20,837
Total, field investigations grants (4)	119,013

TRAINING GRANTS

Institution:	
State University of Iowa School of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa	27,852
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	9,936
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md.	15,000
Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Mich.	4,104
Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, Mass.	23,058
New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York, N. Y.	17,388
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.	22,026
State University of New York, Brooklyn, N. Y.	18,854
Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, N. C.	13,392
Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.	16,200
Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Tex.	17,820
University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md.	19,120
Total, training grants (12)	204,750

Mr. FOGARTY. We have not had much chance for progress in this field.

Dr. BAILEY. It is just beginning. It was an untouched field.

COMMENTS OF CONGRESSMAN WINFIELD DENTON AND DR. BAILEY

SPEECH DEFECTS

Mr. DENTON. Did you tell us all you were doing on speech defects?

Dr. BAILEY. I did not go into detail, Mr. DENTON. We have a large experimental and basic program at Bethesda that we have developed and there has been a considerable increase in the amount of research and training support given on the outside. The program is so young it is hard to say——

Mr. DENTON. We started it a year ago; did we not?

Dr. BAILEY. That is right.

Mr. DENTON. There is nothing reported yet in the way of new discoveries?

Dr. BAILEY. No; except basic ones. We found new methods of conducting sound in the brain and things of that sort, but nothing which might be applied to the problem directly.

Texas Newspaper Supports Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of Texas' best known big-city daily newspapers is the Houston Press. Under the leadership of its capable editor, George Carmack, a combat veteran of World War II who now uses his pen to fight for what he believes in, as he once used his sword in combat in the South Pacific, the Houston Press has been in the very forefront of the battle to uncover corruption and governmental chicanery in Texas and to improve our State government.

Mr. President, on March 31, 1958, an editorial entitled "Open the Frontier" appeared in the Houston Press. In the editorial, the Press points out that by granting statehood to the great empire of Alaska the Congress could provide a psychological and economic lift to the American economy.

It is fitting that a Texas newspaper should editorialize in favor of statehood for Alaska. A nationally prominent University of Texas historian, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, who was recently elected president of the American Historical Association, in his book The Great Frontier, proves the historical validity of the views expressed in the Press' editorial. Dr. Webb and the Houston Press both pointed out that the existence of an open frontier, ripe with opportunity, begging for human hands and human brains to explore and utilize its resources thoroughly and wisely, provides not only a challenge but a real opportunity for a frontier-conscious people to better themselves materially and in every other way.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Open the Frontier," from the March 31 issue of the Houston Press, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues for its articulate reasoning in support of immediate statehood for Alaska.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN THE FRONTIER

Congress argues heatedly over remedies for the recession but still delays action on a measure that could easily provide the psychological and economic lift needed to bolster the people's confidence.

That is statehood for Alaska.

Creation of this 49th State would demonstrate that America has not stopped growing, that it still is willing to recognize its pioneers who settled a frontier Territory and civilized it. Most of our States, after all, once were Territories just as Alaska is.

Statehood would open up the vast area and resources of Alaska for development, which can occur only at a snail's pace under the rigid restrictions of Federal control.

This development would mean jobs of many kinds—in the timberlands which have hardly been touched, in oil and mineral exploration which barely has begun, in the tourist industry in one of the world's most attractive areas, and in the increased transportation, trade, and services that would be needed.

Many of our displaced farmers could earn a good livelihood by growing food, most of which is imported into Alaska at high cost now and much more of which would be needed by a growing population—and the land would be there for the taking, as it was in the old West.

Tens of thousands of Americans have migrated to Alaska in recent years even without the extra opportunities statehood would bring. Many more willing hands, and capital as well, would follow promptly if this great frontier were thrown open as it should be.

By granting statehood to Alaska, Congress would do justice to the Americans who are there now and provide opportunity for millions more. And this is the time to do it.

Voluntary Plywood Quotas Do No Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] and myself, last Thursday on the House floor, debated the issue of Japanese plywood imports and their effect on Pacific Northwest prosperity and employment. The gentleman from Oregon claimed the Japanese have imposed voluntary limits on the amount of plywood Japan will allow her plywood industry to ship into the United States.

It is true Japan, last year, placed a voluntary quota on the quantity of plywood that she would ship into the United States. But once Japan imposed that voluntary plywood quota she forgot about it and paid no attention to that so-called voluntary quota.

In 1957 Japan announced she had placed a voluntary quota on plywood shipments to the United States of 435

million square feet. Instead of observing her voluntarily imposed quota limit, Japan shipped into the United States in that year 679 million square feet or almost 250 million square feet more than her voluntarily imposed quota.

Voluntary quotas that are not observed are no better than no quota at all.

The voluntary plywood quota Japan said she was imposing upon herself by quarters for 1957 and the actual amount of plywood by quarters she shipped into the country were as follows:

	Quarters of 1957	
	Voluntary plywood quota of Japan	Actual imports of Japanese plywood
January-March	89, 993, 000	161, 000, 000
April-June	91, 800, 000	177, 000, 000
July-September	98, 970, 000	173, 000, 000
October-December	155, 000, 000	168, 000, 000
Total	435, 763, 000	679, 000, 000

In every single quarter of 1957, Japan exceeded the voluntary quota she said she was going to observe.

If American plywood workers are to be saved from unemployment and loss of income, quotas must be imposed by the United States Congress on plywood imports. Experience has demonstrated that voluntary quotas do no good.

Return of Enemy Property and Payment of War Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1958, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter of the same date which I received from Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Department of State, outlining on behalf of the administration a program for limited return of enemy property and the payment of war damage claims of American nationals against Germany arising out of World War II.

On March 31, I acknowledged receipt of Mr. Macomber's letter and requested that a draft bill be prepared, which I would then introduce, designed to carry out the administration's program.

My letter to Mr. Macomber reads as follows:

MARCH 31, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ASSISTANT SECRETARY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 28, 1958, submitting the administration's proposal for a limited return of vested German assets and for the payment of war damage claims of American nationals against Germany, arising out of World War II.

I am in complete agreement with your statement that action should be taken promptly if the beneficiaries of this legislation are to derive any benefits from this program during their lifetimes.

In order to bring the administration's program before the committee in the proper form, may I request that you prepare for introduction a draft bill designed to carry out the administration's program.

I trust that the spade work on such a bill has already been completed by the several agencies which will be responsible for carrying out the administration's program, and I hope that the submission of the draft bill will not be delayed too long so that the committee will be in a position to schedule hearings on this important legislation at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS, *Chairman.*

We Need Real Tax Reform: Not Just a Shot in the Arm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it gives me great pleasure to include the very fine editorial that appeared in the April 5 edition of the Saturday Evening Post which has a circulation of approximately 5½ million weekly. The editorial deals primarily with the merits of the Sadlak-Herlong tax-reduction proposal, H. R. 6452, and I believe it contains some very interesting and enlightening statements.

The editorial follows:

WE NEED REAL TAX REFORM: NOT JUST A SHOT IN THE ARM

In view of the disturbing rise in unemployment and considerable grinding of gears throughout the whole economy, it was inevitable that some relief from the heavy tax burden should be explored as a means of getting things started again. High taxes are only one of many factors that have caused the economy to shrink. But to many, including Vice President NIXON, tax reduction, as opposed to an artificially inseminated public works program, seems the quickest way to do something about it.

Anyway, a spate of bills and proposals has hit Congress, the bulk of them based on the idea that tax reduction would increase the ability of individuals to purchase the products of industry and thus halt the business recession. Few of the bills provide that Government economies should accompany reduction in taxes.

However, neither among responsible leaders in Congress nor in the Treasury Department is there much support for tax reduction as an important means of adding to purchasing power. For example, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, commenting on the proposal to increase the $600 exemption to $700, said that this would give the taxpayer in the lowest brackets an extra soda pop per day, but would cost the Government $3 billion.

This sums up the difficulty in the way of tax reduction as a "pump priming operation." If you cut taxes without reducing expenditures, the national debt soars still higher, causing inflation and a further decline in the value of the dollar. If you reduce Government expenditures, at least some of the supposed benefit from a tax cut is canceled out, because the economics would remove from the spending stream as much purchasing power as tax reduction could put into it.

The truth is that the country is now paying the penalty for failing to revise its tax system when the going was good. As has been pointed out frequently by Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, entirely too much reliance is placed on the income tax as a producer of revenue. Under the present tax system, the Government's income is linked too closely with the incomes of the taxpayers. During a recession, the demand for more Government spending to relieve distress runs into loss of revenue as incomes and profits shrink. The resultant strain could be critical. At the present time we are cruising in the stratosphere of taxation as far as the big income groups are concerned, while at the same time it would be politically impossible—and also unfair—to add to the burdens of the lower brackets—where the bulk of income-tax revenue comes from.

The question arises what to do, as far as tax reduction is concerned, to stem the recession. One group, headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, favors cutting income and excise taxes by as much as $4,600,000,000 immediately, apparently relying on the stimulating effect of such action to give the economy the needed shot in the arm.

A more gradual approach which has wide support takes the form of a bill introduced by Representative ANTONI SADLAK, of Connecticut, and Representative A. S. HERLONG, Jr., of Florida. This bill would cut income taxes at once and would continue to reduce the rates over a 5-year period, at the end of which the rate for the lowest income brackets would be 15 percent, and for the highest, 42 percent. Mr. SADLAK would permit the President to postpone the implementation of the bill if the Government found itself in a financial jam as a result of reduction of the rates. But both sponsors of the bill regard tax reduction, particularly for the middle-income groups, as a stimulant to investment in industry and to the creation of new jobs and business opportunities.

Even more generous cuts in the individual and corporate income tax would be possible in Congress could be persuaded to look into the manufacturers' excise tax which has been successfully tried in Canada. The virtues of this tax were recently described by Mr. Magill, in a bulletin of the Tax Foundation, as follows: "Such a tax is collectible from relatively few taxpayers; it produces revenues in bad times as well as in good. If it were inserted into our Federal system, it would doubtless replace many of the present special excise taxes levied at various rates on selected transactions." This tax, as opposed to hit-or-miss levies like the tax on telephone calls, should cause little hardship.

It could be, of course, that appearance of a real intention to go to work on the fundamentals of the tax problem would have something of the stimulating effect which some people expect from an immediate income-tax cut. Representative SADLAK, for example, believes that his plan to cut income-tax rates on the larger incomes would encounter less popular resistance today than it would have done a few years ago. For one thing, it is generally recognized that the confiscatory rate on the top incomes produces a very small proportion of the Federal revenue, but does effectively discourage investment. In short, the Trumanesque antipathy to what used to be called the trickle-down theory has been at least partially dissipated by belated understanding of the fact that freedom of capital to be employed in productive industry, as opposed to seeking shelter in tax-exempt bonds, does trickle down to the benefit of the rest of us.

Consequently, if the leaders in Congress really hope to use relief from taxation to stimulate economic activity, they will start to work to reshape the tax system so that it can produce what the Government actually needs without harassing individuals and discouraging investment, as our present income-tax system undoubtedly does.

The Soviets' Unilateral Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an article by David Lawrence entitled "The Soviets' Unilateral Drive," which appeared in the April 1 issue of the Washington Evening Star:

THE SOVIETS' UNILATERAL DRIVE—FREEING OF SATELLITE NATIONS SUGGESTED AS OPPORTUNITY FOR A GOOD DEED

(By David Lawrence)

Some people hereabouts are always urging our own Government to take the propaganda initiative away from the Soviets. This correspondent has been cogitating about it for some time now and, with all due humility, offers a plan that may at least achieve a high point in dramatic technique.

First, inasmuch as the Kremlin wants a show or a spectacular demonstration of some kind, let the summit conference be a show and let it be held in Madison Square Garden, New York, where it can be witnessed by millions of persons day in and day out.

Second, let an admission fee be charged and the TV rights sold for a big sum. Then let all the proceeds be distributed to the families of the thousands of Hungarian patriots who were killed or maimed in the recent attempt of the Hungarian people to regain their freedom.

Third, if the foregoing—which requires international agreement—cannot be achieved, let there be some unilateral decisions made. This means that, without any agreement with the other party, one side takes it upon itself to stop doing certain things that are harmful to people in another country.

Thus, the Soviet Government could stop oppressing the people of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. This is far more important than to stop testing nuclear bombs. For it is asserted by the scientists that the amount of radioactivity from nuclear tests isn't any more harmful than medical X-rays of the luminous rays of a wristwatch. As for the police measures taken by the Kremlin to deprive millions of persons in Eastern Europe of their liberties, this is much more damaging to mankind. Indeed, many people would prefer death to any enslaved life under Communist tyranny.

Another unilateral decision Moscow could make would be to open up her radio and her television to ambassadors from foreign countries, just as America does.

Still another bit of unilateral righteousness which the Communists could exhibit would be to let law-abiding citizens of other countries travel where they like inside the Soviet Union.

The Soviets might also make a unilateral resolution to admit not just a handful of correspondents to reside in Moscow but as many as wish to do so. This is what a free press really means. What are the Communists afraid of? Why do they maintain censorship on all outgoing news and radio broadcasts made by correspondents resident in Moscow?

There is another unilateral adventure on which Moscow might embark. It could return the territory of East Germany to the people of Germany. This is a step which would do much more to hasten the peace of Europe than any phony gestures about stopping the testing of nuclear weapons.

"Unilateral" is a big word nowadays in the propaganda of the Communists. It implies self-denial and a wish to go ahead with good deeds, irrespective of whether an adversary does the same. But, strictly speaking, the latest proposal of the Soviets isn't onesided at all. While agreeing to give up the testing of nuclear bombs for a while, the threat is also made to resume testing later on if the United States doesn't also agree to stop testing. So it's really a maneuver that merely publicizes a fake desire for an international arrangement to stop testing. The United States has all along advocated the same objectives but has insisted on a system of safeguards to prevent concealment or cheating.

There is a place where this kind of agreement can be negotiated. It's in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. But the Soviets have not been willing thus far to go again to that body for further talks. It's really a boycott of the United Nations. The Communists seem to prefer the theatrical stuff which, they believe, will deceive the world, including many gullible persons in America.

So maybe the Madison Square Garden idea is the answer, after all. Of course, nothing would be agreed to there, but this would also be true of any other type of conference.

For there will be no peace until menacing dictatorships are overthrown and the world has been made "safe for democracy." This was a World War I slogan, but it is even more pertinent today when some of the large empires of the past which nourished freedom are being broken into fragments due to alleged nationalistic feeling, only to have these smaller countries gathered one by one under the yoke of Soviet imperialism. Meanwhile, the remainder of the free world, threatened by aggression, staggers under the heavy cost of armament.

It would be relatively inexpensive to carry the true story to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain so that they will know that the appeasers in our midst are not the spokesmen of the West. It is important that the oppressed peoples should never feel they have been forsaken but that, instead, they can rely on the moral support of the whole world whenever they start breaking the chains of their bondage.

Recovery Through Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of a letter from Mr. Arthur A. Hagman, publisher of Inside Michigan as well as the advance text of an article that will appear in the April issue of that magazine. The article, entitled "Recovery Through Production," offers a suggestion as to how the foreign-aid program could be used to stimulate economic prosperity here at home:

EAST LANSING, MICH., *March 27, 1958.*
Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Thank you for your considerate acknowledgment of my letter of March 11, with which was enclosed manuscript for an article to appear in the April issue of Inside Michigan. Enclosed are page proofs.

We are pursuing our studies of the automotive impact upon the national economy and are coming up with some significant facts, figures, and charts.

For example, the stimulated purchase of some 150,000 motor vehicles per month would require the reemployment of hundreds of thousands of jobless workers in the automotive and allied industries. The cost of such purchases would be in the neighborhood of $780 million for a period of 3 months.

Through such production of value, Government has a chance to recover a substantial part of investment from income and corporation profits taxes. Then, too, such industrial prosperity multiplies its effects throughout the national economy, bringing some 2 million additional jobless people into an income-tax bracket.

The alternative is an extension of unemployment compensation benefits which do not spark new job opportunities and which do not provide a return of Government investment. Actually, the cost of an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for 2 million people at $30 weekly would cost Government $780 million—without tax return or stimulating influence.

Production of value seems like an immediate remedy to the current recession. I would be happy to prepare to testify before the Foreign Affairs Committee to this effect.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR A. HAGMAN,
Publisher, Inside Michigan Magazine.

RECOVERY THROUGH PRODUCTION

The American public is generally aware that foreign-aid programs of the past and present have been designed to bolster our national economy, while assisting backward nations of the world to achieve higher standards of living.

The principle in itself may be commendable, but unless the shot-in-the-arm formula can stimulate the flow of a healthy life-blood through the arteries of our Nation's economy, the mutual-security program falls short of the cure. Industrial production in given classifications, spreads its benefits throughout the Nation, with taxable returns to government.

During President Roosevelt's first 8 years in office, no effort was made to stimulate industrial recovery. All emphasis was placed on relief plans, WPA, CCC, and other made-work programs which had no bearing on economic development. As a consequence, unemployment remained at over 17.5 percent during Roosevelt's first two terms of office, continuing until World War II.

War production immediately after Pearl Harbor started the wheels of industry rolling. The emergency curtailed civilian production while directing the entire national labor force into war work. Prime contractors spread industrial work to subcontractors, who in turn spread their requirements among all conceivable suppliers of raw materials. Thus, prime contracts to major industries filtered through to the very grassroots of our national economy.

Only a national war emergency saved our country from a continuation of high unemployment, WPA, CCC, and outright relief.

If a peacetime emergency is in the offing it cannot be solved by handouts, or nonpro-

ductive work. We must provide a program for production of value, with the end products of manufacture being used to develop the backward countries of the world.

An analysis of present foreign aid spending is revealed in a booklet titled "The Mutual Security Program at a Glance," prepared for the February 25 Conference on Foreign Aid Aspects of United States National Security, headed by Eric Johnson.

This booklet reports that total mutual security shipments during the period of April 1948 through June 1957, amounted to $11,539 million. This is somewhat over $1 billion per year.

The unfortunate conclusion is reached that the entire program contributes very little to the creation of new job opportunities or improved business conditions in our country. Of the 11 principal commodities shipped by mutual security, 5 are classified as surplus farm products equal to one-half of the total expenditure, or $5,573 million for the period.

Other semiraw materials, which create a limited number of new job opportunities are listed as coal, chemicals, and petroleum, in an amount of $1,287 million. Automobiles, trucks, tractors, buses, and other motor vehicles accounted for only $351 million.

It must be obvious to everyone that the mere shipment of surplus farm products can provide but a slight stimulant to an ailing economy. Certainly the expenditure of some $504 million for tobacco to backward nations of the world is of little aid or comfort to them and cannot conceivably be a curent to our current recession. Shipments of other surplus products of agriculture may be of some comfort to indigent peoples of the world, but can hardly improve their economic self-sufficiency.

By comparison, mutual security shipments of motor vehicles of all kinds amounted to only $351 million for the same 10-year period—or about two-thirds of the amount expended for tobacco.

If the foreign aid program is a prescription designed to remedy the economic problems of our Nation and the world, and to develop mutual security, more consideration should be given to providing the useful items of industrial production.

The influences of industrial production requirements are felt throughout every segment of the national economy. Industry draws upon every natural resource of the land and upon every conceivable form of business. Industrial workers and others involved, represent a large segment of consumers of that which might otherwise be surplus farm products.

To make matters worse, the Defense Department is buying motor vehicles from Japan, contributing further to hardships imposed upon American taxpayers.

According to reports released from the Pentagon, the Defense Department last year contracted for over $100 million worth of motor vehicles from Japan, to be delivered over a period of 5 years.

By stimulating American production through purchases of manufactured products—useful to international development and mutual security—will our Nation balance the higher costs involved by savings in unemployment compensation payments.

Motor vehicle manufacturing represents the classic example of impact through the production of value. The automotive industry directly employs 1,250,000 people. Another 10 million Americans are employed full time or in part, by tens of thousands of parts manufacturers and service businesses associated directly or indirectly with automotive production.

The current slump in automotive purchases, equal to about 130,000 motor vehicles worth $260 million per month, could well be remedied by mutual security and Defense Department purchases equal to that now being expended for tobacco and other nonwork producing commodities, together with that of motor vehicles purchased in Japan.

Speech of Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad Interim of Lithuania, at the Commemoration Ceremonies of the 40th Anniversary of Declaration of Lithuania's Independence

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have participated as a guest speaker at the commemoration ceremonies on the 40th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence on March 23, 1958, in Newark, N. J.

Addressing the audience also on that occasion was Mr. Joseph Kajeckas. Although I was unable to understand his address, which was delivered in his native tongue, I could feel its moving and stirring eloquence. Now that I have been able to read this translation, I can readily understand the feeling and inspiration which he invoked.

It is a fitting tribute to great people. I know that all who cherish freedom and liberty—all Lithuanian-Americans and others of Lithuanian origin join in the expression of sentiment contained in Mr. Kajeckas' address.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include Mr. Kajeckas' address:

TRANSLATION OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AD INTERIM OF LITHUANIA, ON MARCH 23, 1958, AT ST. GEORGE'S LITHUANIAN HALL, NEWARK, N. J., AT A COMMEMORATION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

This anniversary of Lithuania's independence is out of the ordinary. It is the first such anniversary in many years without the late Minister Povilas Zadeikis among us. You had the privilege of hearing him speak in this city in the past. We grieve at his death, but we realize that although the man himself has passed on, the aspirations of the country he served remain unchanged, because their source—Lithuania's glorious past, undying rights, and national tradition—remains likewise unchanged. Let us open the curtain somewhat on the glorious past.

According to Prof. Clarence Manning of Columbia University, "the Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tators. They furnished a power and a government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization."

We know, however, how the greed of powerful neighbors overwhelmed the progressive, humanistic state of Lithuania, the darkness of a seemingly endless night descending on Lithuania and remaining for 120 years. This curtain of darkness was not lifted until the momentous February 16 that we commemorate today.

Four decades have passed since that day when a group of Lithuanian patriots in Vilnius proclaimed Lithuania a free and independent state, thus fulfilling the prayers and aspirations of many years. Let us recall the path of suffering that was traversed: Unsuccessful insurrections to restore Lithuania's honor; the period of the suppression of the press, accompanied by the smuggling of books into Lithuania; the school of suffering, when mothers secretly taught their children while at the spinning wheel; the exile of persons to Siberia for the use of prayerbooks and texts in the Lithuanian language; the persecution of Muravyov; Krazial; impressment into the occupying force's military service; Russification; economic subjugation; and even the erasing of Lithuania's name from the map. Such was the fate of Lithuanian sons and daughters, deprived of their ancient state. Such was the sad tale of Lithuania's subjugation. "Let Lithuania be darkened and silent," the oppressor had said.

The act of February 16 broke the chains of slavery. Lithuania's breast sighed its relief as the weary nation took on its new life, as Lazarus come from the grave. With the act of February 16, she turned the imposed shameless page of her history, the story of her suffering, and dedicated herself to the work of reconstruction. Fortunate were those who lived to see that day, but how many were those who closed their eyes on life with the sight of their nation's plight still before them.

One of those who died such an untimely death is the man whose 100th anniversary we celebrate this year, Vincas Kudirka. During the years of freedom, I was fortunate enough to have been able to visit his tomb on the banks of the Sesupe, and during this jubilee year, I remember that visit with pride. That man, besides his numerous writings and the composition of the national anthem, left for his countrymen the advice, "My Lithuania, when your enemies sink their teeth into you, you will survive only if, as a hydra, you grow several heads when one is severed." Today more than ever, the systematic extermination of the Lithuanian nation goes on. Thus, it is appropriate for us to keep Kudirka's warning in mind. At the time when Lithuanian heads in the homeland are being cut off by the enemy's cruel slaughtering, it is at least possible for Lithuanians abroad to help save the situation. Their heads and hearts can be saved for the Lithuanian cause; they not only can, but should be saved, since Lithuania's cause is also the cause of the whole free world. If the light of liberty is extinguished anywhere in the world, the prospect of peace and freedom for all nations is made just that much darker. John Donne rightly said, "Ask not for whom the bell tolls: it tolls for thee."

"As many as the dying leaves of autumn," fell Lithuania's sons in defense of her freedom. Let us especially remember on this occasion the brave men who were the signers of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. Most of them have either passed away or were killed, and to honor their memory and in general to honor all those brave men who gave their lives for Lithuania, I now propose a minute of silent prayer.

I will not enumerate the blessings of Lithuania's freedom. There are too many among you who have been witnesses to those blessings, and you know them full well. Neither

will I detail the darkness and cruelty of Lithuania's present enslavement. Between Lithuania's past freedom and present enslavement, the contrast is enough to sadden the hearts of all men who cherish human dignity and the beautiful and good acts of a brave nation.

On February 16, though, we remember past celebrations, when people, having decked their homes with the tricolored symbols of their country, rejoiced in the proud displays and songs of the Lithuanian Army on parade. In villages and towns, men, women, and children of all ages joined their hearts in happy song, while organizations came in bands to the house of prayer to thank their God for the blessings of His peace and the fruits of liberty under the independence won through so many centuries at such a price; they came in throngs to the tomb of the unknown soldier to honor his heroism and of all those who fell in loyalty to his own cause; they went to the public halls to enumerate their achievements, to feasts, toasting a nation reborn in freedom. The invalids of the wars of independence were proud of their sacrifices for the fatherland; the volunteers of the wars of liberation were proud of their services. That day was always the greatest of occasions for a Lithuanian: The day of his rejoicing and the day of his honor.

So it was in the days of freedom. And now? Now, the conquered banner of our country has been furled; either it is cruelly mangled by the invader's boot, or reverently hidden by men who still keep its faith. Going to church together in organized groups is prohibited. The Lithuanian anthem, during the jubilee year of its composer, is silenced. Lithuania's military uniform is no longer seen, and the soldiers' happy song has died. Silence holds its dominion over the unknown soldier's sarcophagus; a cruel and alien hand has scattered and desecrated its honored stones. The enemy's sacrilegious power has left no room for the crosses which once stood by that holy shrine, and has irreverently plucked out the symbols of a brave nation's suffering. The bugle's tribute to the colors at this tomb is no longer heard at sunset; the liberty bell, like America's own, that Lithuanian-Americans had given their country, no longer tolls its angelus in accompaniment to the soldiers' prayers as our nation's flag begins its descent. That pregnant moment at the sunset when Lithuania's amber, green, and red gave over its domination of our country's rolling fields and peaceful plains to the stillness of night is gone now, and lives only in the memories of men whose burning faith in a once-strong, grand, and proud national heritage can never leave their hearts.

The ugliest side of present-day imperialistic communism consists in the fact that they justify the murder and extermination of innocent people, innocent Lithuanians, as being virtuous. If the annihilation of a person or of a nation serves communism, then, in their jargon, that is good and to be praised. If the trampling on of solemn treaties serves communism, in their dictionary, that is good and meritorious. If lying serves communism, then one can lie as much as possible—the more you lie, the better Communist you are. To serve their purposes, the notions of freedom, independence, coexistence, democracy, peace, nonintervention in other countries' internal affairs, colonialism, etc., are distorted beyond recognition.

Let us glance briefly at the record of imperialistic communism's lies, violence, and treachery. With Lithuania, the Kremlin had numerous, well-written, and valid treaties, among them the treaty of nonaggression; but it trampled on these treaties with the clearest of consciences. Stalin isn't blamed for this by his successors; the undertakers of Lithuania's freedom, Molotov and Dekanozov, did not suffer because of the violation of those treaties; they were punished for something else; for the cruel deportation of innocent Lithuanians and Baltic people in general to Siberia. Servo also was not punished. He remains even now firmly entrenched in the Kremlin's upper echelons.

The Soviets speak of the creation of a neutral zone in Eastern Europe. Long ago, such a zone existed in the Baltic States without the helping hand of the Kremlin. The Baltic States freely declared themselves neutral on the eve of the last World War. What better conditions for peaceful coexistence could one dream of? However, such conditions were not suitable to the carnivorousness of the Kremlin, and it swept away that zone.

When, for security reasons, the free world establishes, by mutual agreement with interested nations, various military bases far from Russian soil, the Soviets are extremely sensitive. Yet, the Communists were the first to impose such bases in the Baltic States for aggressive purposes. They still keep those bases there, and have even extended them throughout the whole territory of the Baltic States.

The Communists are also sensitive in regard to the alleged intervention of other countries in the affairs of the Middle East. They even denounced the recent statement of the United States Secretary of State, made on the occasion of Lithuania's Independence Day, as intervention in Soviet internal affairs, as if Lithuania were their estate and the Lithuanians their serfs without any rights.

The heart of every free and enslaved Lithuanian rejoices at the action that the Soviets call intervention. It was because of the intervention of President Wilson at the time that a whole series of peoples once enslaved by czarist Russia, Lithuania included, became free and independent after World War I. We remember also that, in spite of the Soviet cries of interference, the Philippines are free today and the Central American Republics can exist peacefully and securely alongside the powerful United States.

The record of imperialistic communism in this respect, on the other hand, is an open book. No one else but the Kremlin continues to occupy Lithanian people against their will. And it was not by the doves of peace that the Soviets came into control of the Baltic States, but, by their own admission, through the use of bayonets, tanks, and planes.

Such, then, are the policies of the Kremlin—policies foreign and disgusting to any free country. But without any justification, the Soviets point an accusing finger at other nations. According to the Russian proverb, it is the thief's own hat that is on fire. The only way the Soviets can raise the sunken national honor is by withdrawing from Lithuania and the other nations that they have enslaved.

There is being distributed in the United States a Soviet propaganda magazine in which Moscow praises itself for a new discovery in economics. They supposedly have done away with unemployment in Lithuania, and for this they seek credit. We give them that credit, but it cries to heaven for vengeance. After having killed Lithuanians, after having deported hundreds of thousands of them, after having sent countless others as "volunteers" to labor in their virgin lands, after having frightened away tens of thousands of Lithuanians as refugees to the Western World, they praise themselves for having gotten rid of unemployment. But brains aren't necessary for such a discovery; all one needs is a guiltless thirst for blood, and the discovery produced is called barbarism. The Soviet version of their discovery is understandable, however, when we remember that lies and deceit were and are now the Soviet's sputniks, fellow travelers.

Gen. Mark Clark, who negotiated with the Communists for about 10 years, was right when he stated: "There is no decency in the Communists. They'll cheat, they will lie, they will murder, they will do anything to attain their end of world domination, and they will sign a solemn pledge today, fully intending to abrogate that pledge the next day."

Albert Camus, the 1957 Nobel prize winner, said that "The Hungarian revolution blew to bits the biggest lie of the century: a lie that tried to pass off a regime of police tyranny as a proletarian revolution. * * *"

But let us return to our commemoration. Let us, on this solemn occasion, give thanks to those who so much deserve it. First, let us give thanks to the suffering Lithuanian nation. She, by her perseverance, safeguards the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, which aspirations created the basis for the act of February 16. We are grateful to President Wilson for his proclaimed principle of the right of self-determination of nations at the time, and, as a result, for the favorable international climate which enabled the Lithuanian people's will to manifest itself effectively. We are grateful to the signatories of the act of February 16; we especially wish that the three living signers of that act may live to see it renewed in a new birth of freedom. We give thanks to the Lithuanian Army, thanks to which we enjoyed 22 years of independence. We are grateful to the provisional government of Lithuania and its underground heroes for their determination to restore Lithuania's honor.

We are grateful to the Government of this country, especially President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and their predecessors for their nonrecognition of Lithuania's occupation by force, and for their numerous meaningful statements in that regard, together with the statement that Mr. Dulles made on this particular commemoration this year.

We thank the governors of the several States and mayors of cities of this country, including the Honorable Governor Meyner of the State of New Jersey and Mayor Carlin of the city of Newark, for their highly esteemed proclamations throughout the years; also we thank numerous Senators and Congressmen, including the Honorable Congressman Rodino of the State of New Jersey, for their many stirring speeches supporting the aspirations of the Lithuanian nation and sympathizing with her plight. In general, we thank all friends of Lithuania and the great-hearted American people for the various ways in which they have supported Lithuania's cause.

Finally, we thank all our own countrymen and Lithuanian-Americans; those who organize in liberation efforts; federations; alliances and organizations; sponsors of Lithuanian-language radio programs, including Mr. Stukas; the reverend clergy; writers and journalists; teachers, especially the sisters in our Lithuanian schools, and all those individual persons who in one way or another have rendered their aid toward Lithuania's liberation, the easing of her plight, and the raising of Lithuania's good name above her great sorrow.

The Lithuanian nation will remain eternally grateful for such wholehearted and noble efforts. She has a long memory as regards her benefactors in the hour of misfortune.

Today Lithuania is stepping into the fifth decade of proclaimed independence, but is also finishing the 18th long year of slavery. She has not yet reached the crest of her Golgotha. One can still not see the end of her way of the cross. But, in her suffering and anxiety, she is greater than the so-called man of the year for 1957, just as Nero's persecuted Christians were greater than the emperor who was powerful enough to hold the lives of men in his balance. In the first road of suffering to Golgotha, the long arm of the

Roman law was required to force a bystander, Simon of Cyrene, to help carry Christ's cross.

Lithuanians need no police power to help carry the cross of their suffering nation: a Lithuanian heart is sufficient. Thus, especially in this jubilee year, which is also the jubilee year of our country's patron, St. Casimir, let us be determined to bring down the cloud over Lithuania's horizon, to light the fire of freedom once more in her sky, to ease the suffering of Lithuania, to help it keep and persevere in the hope of freedom until the Easter morn and the resurrection of that oppressed nation. For rise it must; it cannot have suffered so much in vain. God bless our common efforts to this end.

The Town That Cares and Shares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an article from the December 1957, issue of Coronet magazine entitled "The Town That Cares and Shares." The article concerns Frankenmuth, Mich., a town in my congressional district and which, as I have had occasion to state in the past is unique for the spirit of self-reliant community service which its people have developed and maintained during the more than 100 years of its history.

THE TOWN THAT CARES AND SHARES

Official Washington was astounded in 1952 when the villagers of Frankenmuth, Mich., spurned Federal funds and built their own flood-control dike, without going into debt.

But Frankenmuth was merely staying in character. For this unique community has neither asked nor accepted favors since the 1840's when its founders, fewer than a score, put their axes to the cork pine woods to make a clearing for a town.

Frankenmuth began in a unique experiment and has continued unique to this day. To spread the gospel to the American Indian, a Lutheran missionary society in Bavaria, Germany, decided to send not just a missionary but an entire congregation. The pagan Indians then would have not only the words of a preacher but the example of practicing Christians to bring them into the faith.

The preacher, Pastor August Craemer, and the 15 men and women who volunteered for the venture, called themselves "The courage of the Franconians"—Frankenmuth—coming as they did from the region along the Main River where the inhabitants were called Franken.

The first chore on arriving at the Cass River in Michigan, at a spot approximately 80 miles north of Detroit, was to build a log church and living quarters for the pastor. Their first pledge was that their individual and collective lives would always be the personification of the injunction contained in Galatians VI: 7 and 10. The promise was kept.

The results have made Frankenmuth, population 1,620, a place apart. It has no crime. (Its jail has been turned into a warehouse.) Its one policeman devotes himself mostly to traffic matters. Everyone pays his taxes in full and on time.

In 1952, when Frankenmuth decided to dike the rampaging Cass River, most of the funds came from the village and township treasuries. Folks along the river were assessed for the balance. There were a few complaints—by those who felt that others were benefited more than themselves. A Frankenmuth businessman, believing that all property owners profited from the improvement, agreed to pay the bills of those who thought the assessment inequitable. It all worked out satisfactorily.

Frankenmuth has no poor people. Few businesses have ever failed, no one ever has been on public relief. Even during the depression it had no unemployment.

Service to others is the keynote of this remarkable town's philosophy. If a man has always done his share of service to the town, the town is ready to aid him when he needs aid. "In Frankenmuth," its people say, "we care for each other, we do not grow weary in well doing."

Some years before the dike was built, the river flooded through the town and crumpled Albert Hetzner's new garage. Everyone suffered heavily, but Hetzner lost everything.

On the basis of the biblical injunction "let us do good to all men," the business district began a collection. (The first contributor was Hetzner's keenest competitor.)

In just 4 days the collection totaled $3,100, and work on a new garage was begun immediately.

Frankenmuth's extensive public improvements have always been on a pay-as-you-go basis. It is debt free.

For its youngsters the town has provided excellent schools, a $125,000 recreational hall with 12 bowling alleys, an ice-skating rink, a new park and swimming pool, lighted baseball and softball diamonds. The way the town feels about its youngsters is summed up by former Mayor Otto Trinklein: "Our sons hunt and fish with us and our daughters and wives are friends. These are reasons why we never have any serious juvenile problems."

Frankenmuth's code of conduct began with the town's founding, when each adult gave 1 day a week to work for the village. This idea of service has continued right up to today, though progress and scientific development have cut down the amount of such work. But the spirit survives. Frankenmuth never lacks volunteers for any project.

And because its citizens invest in each other, practically all of Frankenmuth's considerable industry is not only locally but family owned, and operated by third- and fourth-generation descendants. Nearly everybody owns a piece of the town's biggest industry, Universal Engineering Co., the two mutual fire and automobile insurance companies, the flour and woolen mills.

Frankenmuth stubbornly maintains its Bavarian traditions (even today German is spoken in almost all of its households) but its Americanism ranks high. Nor has it forgotten its religious origin. St. Lorenz Lutheran Church is a center for activities. Founded in 1845, it has given the denomination 68 ministers and 71 lay teachers. For a long time it was almost obligatory that every family have at least one member dedicated to religion. Although the village is 95 percent Lutheran, "we look to the day when the spires of all faiths will tower above our trees."

Frankenmuth retains the gemütlichkeit which first made it famous through a broad section of Michigan and the Middle West. Ask a villager what gemütlichkeit means and he will struggle with comfortableness. He will finally agree it is a way of life that tastes the full flavor of good food, good home, good businesses—all earned through honest labor and pride of craftsmanship.

This gemutlichkeit has made it the Nation's only town to give its name to an entire meal. Boston named baked beans, Frankenmuth chicken dinner. For 50 years Frankenmuth chicken dinners have been famous. Now 10,000 persons weekly—5,000 to 7,000 on the average Sunday—descend on the town's three major restaurants for their all-you-can-eat chicken dinners.

More than half a million chicken dinners a year come under the head of big business in a community this size. Yet the town hasn't a single professional chef. The cooks are from the surrounding homes and farms, as are the several thousand other people employed in this chicken-dinner business.

William Zehnder, restaurant proprietor, puts it this way: "These folks love life and find joy in giving their best to each meal. Their neighborliness and natural service help explain why 100-mile journeys for a Frankenmuth chicken dinner are not uncommon."

Change has been slow, if any, in the ownership of the town's businesses and industries. The names of many of its founders are still conspicuous in its business district.

Frankenmuth's oldest continuous business is Hubinger's grocery, begun when the town was only 2 years old and operated today by Miss Hattie Hubinger, granddaughter of the first owner, George Hubinger. He and his bride honeymooned on the ship which brought the town's founders to America.

Frankenmuth's lumberyard, offshoot of the sawmill built to clear the townsite was, until recently, operated by four great-grandchildren of the mill's first owner. Most of the district's prosperous farms are in the hands of the same families that cleared them from the virgin forests.

Many rural communities complain about the profits taken by middlemen on farm products. Frankenmuth processes its own, and keeps the profits. Its grain is ground in its own 87-year-old mill with the poetic name, Star of the West. Its wool becomes blankets or batting for stuffing comforters on the ancient looms installed 75 years back primarily to weave heavy fabrics for clothing, and horse blankets for the men and teams working in Michigan's pine forests. Local pigs and cattle end up in dozens of types of sausages produced by the three sausage plants.

A seeming alien note in Frankenmuth's industrial picture is the multi-million-dollar Universal Engineering Co., which turns out precision parts for Michigan's busy auto plants and employs nearly 500 persons. It was started in 1925 by a Detroit industrialist who had heard of the town and the high caliber of its workers.

Clinton Grainger, copublisher of the town's weekly newspaper, explains why the firm, today the world's largest producer of drill bushings, was welcomed by the community: "It was just another phase of our program to assure employment for our young folks and encourage them to stay home, just as building our $125,000 recreation center was part of that plan. As a result, our youngsters stay here and we've got more jobs in our town than we have citizens."

Hospitality and friendliness are a part of the Frankenmuth heritage. One feels at home the instant he sets foot in the town.

Richard Rummel, the village photographer, and over the past 20 years president or secretary or board member of the chamber of commerce, says, "Outsiders are very welcome here. We want them as businessmen, or residents, or both. We welcome anyone who will bring in a type of business or industry not competitive with one already established here. It's natural that we want to protect our own business people. We give every encouragement to those who want to raise their children in a community where juvenile delinquency is nil."

Further evidence of the warm welcome awaiting outlanders comes from the fact that it is not necessary to be a native or Bayerisch (German for Bavarian) or a Lu-

theran to be a town official. Mayor Jim Wickson, for example, misses out on two counts; he is Canadian born, his forebears were Swedish and English.

H. J. Schluckebier, auto dealer, great grandson of one of the town's founders, will tell you that Frankenmuth is what it is because "Our businessmen do the things most chambers of commerce, commercial clubs, and service organizations just talk of doing. We believe in each other, seek to be fair to each other, believe in hard work."

But the actual secret lies in Galatians VI, verse 7, which long ago became the village's code of conduct: "* * * for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

Personalized Rehabilitation Services of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual record of unselfish service for handicapped war veterans, and their dependents, has recently come to my attention. It concerns the personalized rehabilitation service activities of the Disabled American Veterans. When it was formed in 1920, the organization was composed exclusively of America's war wounded and disabled veterans. It was granted a special charter by the Congress in 1932.

Starting out as an organization of handicapped veterans of World War I, its congressional charter was amended in 1942 to extend eligibility to any American citizen, who has been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. The DAV is therefore composed exclusively of America's disabled defenders.

Although all of the some 2 million war veterans who are receiving disability compensation from the United States Veterans' Administration have substantially benefited by reason of its legislative and rehabilitation activities, less than 10 percent of them are dues paying DAV members—all of whom receive the Disabled American Veterans' Monthly which keeps them informed as to all developments which may affect their future.

Detailed facts are set forth in DAV annual reports to the Congress, printed as House documents by the United States Government Printing Office.

At its national convention in Louisville, Ky., in June 1941, the DAV formally decided that its contribution to the Nation's national emergency defense effort would be to see to it that all ex-servicemen and women should have the benefit of expert advice and assistance of trained national service officers, in the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their respective claims, with the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies, for service connection of their disabilities, disability compensation, hospitalization, medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, and finally selective placement into self-sustaining suitable jobs, utilizing their remaining abilities.

Far too many World War I disabled veterans, who failed in time to get the benefit of such expert advice, had suffered the disillusionment of being unable technically to prove their legal entitlement to such benefits to which they considered themselves equitably entitled—because of their inability to procure detailed, specific, factgiving affidavit evidence to substantiate their claims.

That the DAV has been faithful to its self-assumed policy, of extending such much needed services to disabled veterans following World War II and the Korean conflict, is indicated by a résumé of some of the many services extended by its nationwide staff of full-time national service officers during the last 10 years, as follows:

Claim folders reviewed	3,453,604.00
Rating board appearances	1,382,863.00
Favorable awards obtained	537,367.00
Service connections obtained	99,054.00
Increased compensation obtained	225,493.00
Monetary benefits obtained	$179,083,769.66

Infinitely more could have been accomplished if the DAV had been enabled financially to maintain an even larger number of trained national service officers, gradually reduced from more than 400 in 1948 to about 150 at the present time. Nevertheless, during the last 10 years, the DAV has expended the aggregate sum of about $12,197,600 in the maintenance of such special advocates. This sum does not include administrative expenses at its national headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, nor the cost of its national publication.

To estimate the DAV's cost of extending needed service to individual distressed disabled veterans involves differing circumstances proving entitlement to service connection, an increased disability rating, medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, and so forth. Advising and assisting individual claimants requires time, ranging from a few minutes up to many hours. Most claimants have no conception of the time that their attorneys-in-fact must expend in carefully studying the evidence in official claims folders, in preparing briefs, in making presentation to claims and rating boards, and so forth.

Thousands of claimants have been given pertinent, helpful advice, not measurable or recorded in the monthly reports required to be submitted by each national service officer to the national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, located at the DAV national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during the last 10 years, one would find that the DAV has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed on behalf of a claimant, or, measured another way, about $8.80 for each appearance before a rating agency, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, or about $14.10 for direct monetary benefits obtained for claimants for each rehabilitation service dollar expended by the DAV, not counting the fact that such benefits will generally continue for many years.

These statistics fail to reveal the humanitarian dividends thereby obtained for the scores of thousands of distressed disabled veterans, and their dependents, who have been directly benefited for the rest of their lives.

Most of these serviced disabled veterans have probably assumed that the DAV has been getting some kind of financial help from the Federal Government. No money has ever been appropriated to the DAV by Congress.

It is true that, because the Veterans' Administration has realized the value of such personalized services, it has, throughout the years, been furnishing office space for all DAV national service officers, in its regional, district, and central offices.

DAV income has been procured from membership dues, but, more importantly, since 1942, from its Idento-Tag project, by which most automobile owners throughout the country receive miniature automobile license tags. Incidentally, attachment of such Idento-Tag to keyrings has enabled the DAV to return about 643,000 sets of lost keys to their owners during the last 7 years—without regard to whether they had previously submitted any donation. Fortunately, Idento-Tag recipients who do respond with donations have long enabled the DAV to maintain a larger staff of full-time national service officers than maintained by any veteran organization.

If, however, twice as many Idento-Tag recipients were each year to donate only $1 in response to receipt of their miniature automobile license tags, then the DAV would be enabled to expand its rehabilitation service setup into all of the some 175 hospitals of the United States Veterans' Administration, where they could then extend much needed rehabilitation service to so many additional scores of thousands of discouraged disabled veterans.

Incidentally, the Idento-Tag project is owned and operated by the DAV itself at its national headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. Most employees consist of disabled veterans, their wives, their widows, and other handicapped persons—a rehabilitation project in itself—under the direction of the DAV national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly.

Because the income from the Idento-Tag project has not been sufficiently adequate to provide for its staff of full-time national service officers, resignations have reduced their number from about 400 in 1948 to about 150, notwithstanding appropriations aggregating $3,240,000 during the last 9 years from its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Its reserve funds therefore again need to be built up, by greatly increased volume of donations by disabled veterans—

all of whom have so much benefited by reason of the DAV service program—and by other social-minded Americans. Much needed are many more bequests in wills, designations as beneficiary in insurance policies, assignments of stocks and bonds, and benefactors of perpetual rehabilitation funds, in some multiple of $100—a grassroots idea spontaneously started by a group of concerned disabled veterans in Montana.

After the end of each fiscal year, an updated memorial honor roll of the benefactors, who have established such perpetual rehabilitation funds with the DAV service foundation (presently ranging from $100 to $1,000) will be included in each DAV annual report to the Congress.

Only the interest earnings will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining service officers in the respective States from which each perpetual rehabilitation fund originated. This unique idea, if supported by a sufficient number of social-minded Americans—as well as individual disabled veterans and their DAV departments and chapters—holds hope for eventually building up sufficient reserve funds, so that the earnings therefrom can enable the DAV to maintain much needed rehabilitation service for disabled veterans in each State throughout future years.

The experience as to World War I veterans, for whom service connections were procured as much as 35 years after active service, indicates that such expert service officers will be needed for many decades into the future.

Fellow Americans who think about it will realize that security for America's war disabled, and their dependents, is inevitably linked up to future security for America. Americans who help the DAV directly, or through its incorporated trustee, the DAV service foundation, will thereby be helping many more of America's disabled defenders, and their dependents, and their communities, and will also thereby help to fortify America's future security.

Union Strike Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of a letter written to me by one of my constituents who, although a union worker, has some justified complaints regarding the dues which he has been forced to contribute to the strike fund:

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Despite the fact that I am a good union member of the CIO, local 599 I find, or am getting to more or less get the opinion that the unions of today, who represent so many millions of factory workers, are getting to the point of dictatorship, whereas the working man must comply to every desire that certain radical unionist demands.

I firmly believe as many of my shopmates do, that the unions are being operated by a select few men who are interested in only personal glory and just for the money that they can squeeze out of the working man.

My main issue is this; in 1955 they took from our paychecks each month was $7.50. As you probably know that was the year of a new contract to be negotiated for the CIO for the Big Three corps. The union stated that the extra $5 per month was for the strike fund. Now a certain man desires a like sum to be deducted every month for the same purpose. I would sincerely like to know what happened to the huge fund that was built up in 1955 and why they want to try the same stunt 3 years later.

I do believe that the demand by some of these certain corrupt union radicalist are the very roots of this country's recession, which my family is experiencing right now as I expect to get laid off shortly, as I have only 4 years of seniority.

In closing, I only wish that I could express my opinions which my shopmates also share, to the people that could be most benefited by it.

If ever I can be of any service in any way I would be more than willing to donate my time in anything that I could help with, as I am quite well schooled in several subjects.

Yours truly.

——— ———.

Water Storage Needs and Wilderness in the Columbia River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1958, the executive committee of the Wilderness Society, one of this Nation's great conservation organizations, adopted a statement on water storage needs and wilderness in the Columbia River Basin.

The press release on that statement follows:

WILDERNESS SOCIETY SUPPORTS CERTAIN COLUMBIA BASIN DAMS

In a statement on dam projects in the Columbia River Basin, released today, the Wilderness Society has supported Paradise, Libby, and High Hells Canyon, as alternatives to projects that would seriously encroach on scenic, wildlife, and other wilderness assets.

The Wilderness Society, a national conservation educational organization with headquarters at 2144 P Street NW., in Washington, D. C., describes its purpose as the development of knowledge and appreciation of wilderness and protection of areas where it is preserved. The society cooperates with many other conservation and civic groups.

Other proposed dams that might be favorably considered, according to the society, include Pleasant Valley or a combination of Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep.

"We realize," said Executive Secretary Howard Zahniser in releasing the statement, "that in order to preserve wilderness and other natural values in some places we shall have to meet the needs for water storage in other places. We believe also" he said, "that those who are concerned primarily with water programs should likewise realize that a sound overall program must include the preservation of outdoor resources."

Dams that the society opposed in its statement include Glacier View, Penny Cliffs, Crevice, Spruce Park, Long Meadows, Ninemile Prairie, Bruces Eddy, Nez Perce, Lower Canyon, Freedom, Wenaba, and Narrows. These dams, according to the evidence now available, the society said, "would seriously encroach upon areas having unique scenic, wilderness, and wildlife assets."

The society's statement, adopted by its executive committee on February 13, 1958, was entitled "Water Storage Needs and Wilderness in the Columbia River Basin."

You will note that the dams which the Wilderness Society opposes include Bruces Eddy on the North Fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho, for which Congress authorized planning money with adoption of the conference report on S. 497.

Consistent with their policy of insisting on a thorough study prior to authorizing such projects, the Wilderness Society and the other conservation organizations did not oppose this provision of this bill. However, there will continue to be strong opposition to construction of Bruces Eddy, at least until we know what is going to happen to the recreation and wildlife resources involved.

The complete policy statement follows:

WATER-STORAGE NEEDS AND WILDERNESS IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The executive committee of the Wilderness Society, having reviewed water-storage needs and various proposals for dams in the Columbia River system, adopted the following policy on February 13, 1958:

Projects for construction have been considered in relationship to their impact upon areas of wilderness and other undeveloped country on several of the Columbia River tributaries. It is recognized that, in striving for the preservation of these wild areas, it will be necessary to meet the needs for water storage at other sites which do not encroach upon lands that have been dedicated to wilderness uses or upon other areas of high scenic or recreational value. A sound overall program for developing the water resources of this region should be consistent with and include the preservation of these outdoor resources.

Following a thorough consideration of all the values involved, a sound appraisal from an overall point of view should be made of any project proposed for construction within the Columbia River system. The society will contribute, within the limitations of its resources, to the study and appraisal of each of the proposed dams to determine its effects upon the fish, wildlife, and other wilderness resources of the Northwest. Such appraisals should be designed to facilitate the selection of alternatives to harmful upriver impoundments without jeopardizing the irreplaceable recreational resources of this region. Surveys and studies should be made by all the appropriate Government agencies involved and made available for public consideration.

The society will actively oppose not only any dams in dedicated areas of wilderness but also any proposals for authorization of dams at sites where complete studies of the impact of these projects upon wilderness, wildlife, and other recreational resources have not been completed by all appropriate agencies or where recommendations resulting from these studies have not been made available for full consideration by the public.

Evidence now available indicates that several of the dams currently proposed for construction within the Columbia drainage would seriously encroach upon areas having unique scenic, wilderness, and wildlife assets.

Such dams include Glacier View, which would flood western portions of Glacier National Park; the Penny Cliffs project, which

would back water for 6 miles into the Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area; the Crevice impoundment, which would inundate wild sections of the Salmon River Gorge within both the Selway-Bitterroot and Idaho Primitive Areas; and the following proposed dams at valuable wildland sites not included in specially designated areas of wilderness: Spruce Park on the Middle Fork of the Flathead River in Montana; Long Meadows on the Yaak River in Montana; Ninemile Prairie on the Blackfoot River in Montana; Bruces Eddy on the North Fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho; Nez Perce on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon; Lower Canyon and Freedom on the Salmon River in Idaho; Wenaha on the Grande River in Oregon; and Narrows on the upper Snake River in Wyoming.

In order to satisfy current requirements for water storage, there are other projects, which do not necessitate sacrifices of irreplaceable outdoor values, such as those in wild and other undeveloped areas. From information available at this time, some of the dams currently proposed for construction appear to involve only minor losses to outdoor recreational resources. Because of their locations at downstream sites, Paradise on the Clark Fork River in Montana, Libby on the Kootenai River in Montana, and High Hells Canyon on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon afford maximum flood-control and hydroelectric-power potentials without serious encroachment upon areas of outstanding recreational value. Other proposed dams that might be considered include Pleasant Valley, or a combination of Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon.

The staff of the Wilderness Society is instructed to cooperate with other conservation groups in studying the various projects which have been and may be proposed for construction in the Columbia Basin, and, in counsel with the executive committee of the Wilderness Society, to formulate statements on the position to be taken by the society on each of these dams as they may relate, either directly or indirectly, to the protection of recreational values. The society will also endeavor to work in fullest cooperation with other conservation groups to obtain general agreement on the positions that may be taken on these various proposals in the light of recreational, hydroelectric power, water storage, and general long-range economic needs of the region.

Higher Education and the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY G. HASKELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, the United States Commissioner of Education, is, in my opinion, a very able man. On several occasions in the past he has addressed himself to some of the many problems that face this Nation today in the field of education. On March 5, 1958, Dr. Derthick spoke before the final general session of the 13th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, which was held in Chicago.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his speech, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(By Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is a privilege to have this opportunity to spend a few minutes with you who represent every aspect of American higher education—all subject fields; all types of public and private institutions; teaching, research, and administration.

I wish to discuss one of the most critically important aspects of education in the national interest today—the development of effective teamwork at the policy level between institutions of higher education and the Federal Government "to insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

It is my strong conviction that we have reached an era in the development of American education when new and concrete advances must be made. We are a juncture in the history of our country when education in its relationship to security and national well-being is every bit as critical as when the ordinances in 1785 and 1787 were enacted to establish the concept of Federal participation in eduction. The steps we need to take now may well be as fundamental as those taken in 1862 and subsequently to establish and support the land-grant colleges of the Nation.

Today we need a new perspective. The very security of the Nation depends on the education and technical training of our manpower. We simply cannot maintain or advance our position of leadership in the free world without more and better education.

Higher education in the United States is provided by more than 1,900 institutions of various types—universities, liberal-arts colleges, junior colleges, institutes of technology, and professional schools. The educational administrators and the faculties in the colleges have made valiant efforts to meet the needs of the country for higher education. The deficiencies in meeting these needs are attributable only in small part to lack of energy or vision on the part of those connected with the colleges. The great deficiency lies in the fact that society has not yet provided the financial resources necessary to establish and maintain the kind and extent of higher education required, and to make it possible for all our youth who are capable of doing so to enter upon and complete a program of education at the higher level.

These shortcomings are principally reflected in the large gap between the total numbers now being educated beyond the secondary school and the numbers who have ability to benefit from college attendance. Of particular significance is the failure to extend higher education to the gifted young who have potentialities for the greatest contribution to the future of our country.

Our concern is deepened by the fact that the requirements of our expanding population in the years to come must be fulfilled by a pool of very restricted manpower. Let me cite only one example to dramatize the situation. Today we have some 2.3 million 18-year-olds in our total population of 170 million. Twenty-three years from now in 1980 it is estimated that our population will number about 250 million. Yet there will be fewer than 2.3 million persons 40 years of age—an age at which it can be expected that many in this age group wil have begun to assume leadership positions. This means an almost inconceivable scarcity in the leadership age groups 20 to 25 years hence.

With only about 6 percent of the world's 2.6 billion people and yet consuming half of all the goods and services produced in the world, the United States occupies a unique and increasingly difficult position today. We must have the trained leaders in every field to provide us with the skills necessary to meet all our domestic problems and, in addition, to show the free world the kind of inspired leadership so essential in these times. The responsibility for developing this leadership rests squarely upon our system of free education for all, and upon the citizens who sustain this system.

The American public has, I believe, become fairly well informed about the strengths and shortcomings of our elementary and secondary schools. Public alarm at the crises in these schools has produced an eagerness to do something about it, and has started us moving on the right road. Our colleges and universities fortunately still have a little additional lead time in getting ready for similar crises in higher education. Realizing this, the President, at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, appointed in the spring of 1956, a Committee on Education Beyond the High School to study the needs of higher education and to make recommendations on how they could best be met.

The major recommendations of the President's Committee called for doubling faculty salaries within the next 5 or 10 years, and for taking other appropriate measures to strengthen the human and physical resources required for the effective operation of the Nation's colleges. To follow up the work of the President's Committee, Secretary Marion B. Folsom established a special departmental task force last August to consider what the Federal Government should do to help with the impending crisis in higher education. As the chairman of this task force, I can assure you that during the fall and winter we explored a great many possibilities for assistance.

Our present approach was formulated only after long and serious consultation with representatives of our own and other Government agencies, including the National Science Foundation. We drew upon the findings of the President's Committee and other studies in the field. We relied upon the counsel of many of you in this room.

The finished product represents what we believe to be a sound and realistic approach of Federal assistance to help improve American education at critical points. We realize that our new program is by no means the final answer to the complex problems involved, but we do think it makes a constructive step forward. It has been painstakingly prepared in each detail and remains faithful to the historical tradition of education in this country.

Since many of you are already familiar with the nature of our proposals, I will deal only briefly with the three main sections which relate most directly to higher education.

THE CONSERVATION OF TALENT THROUGH PROGRAMS OF TESTING AND COUNSELING, AND BY PROVIDING FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thousands of America's best young minds—potential scientists, teachers, and leaders in many fields—are foreclosed from college training each year. A number of studies have shown that many students in the top of their classes drop out of high school before graduation, or do not go on to college after graduation.

It is clear, I believe, that the identification of able students who can profit from further education is an essential first step in developing the Nation's manpower resources,

Lack of understanding of potentialities, lack of motivation to continue education beyond high school, and financial reasons account for the loss of most of the superior students who drop out of school before completing their education.

Considerable financial aid to college students is available from private, State, and Federal sources, and from colleges and universities. But most of the scholarships are not large enough to pay even the major costs of going to college. Three-fourths of the scholarships awarded by colleges and universities in 1955–56 were less than $375. Under the proposed administration bill, the Federal Government would provide funds for scholarships of up to $1,000 a year for four years to the most capable students unable to pay for a college education. The scholarships would be awarded and administered by State scholarship commissions or boards.

The number of scholarships proposed will, we believe, make a significant contribution to the national interest by providing higher education for the development of talent that would not normally be available because of financial handicaps. On the other hand, we believe the program is not so large as to discourage further scholarship assistance by institutions, State, and private donors. Nor do we believe that it will constitute an excuse for any withdrawal or diminution of existing scholarship programs.

We do not expect this small but important scholarship program to meet the needs of all students who will require financial assistance. The States, private donors, higher institutions themselves, and all others responsible must continue such efforts unabated.

Not only must adequate provision be made for faculties and facilities needed by expanding higher education, but every effort must be made to keep the cost to the student at the lowest possible level. It will be of no avail to raise large sums for scholarships and other types of financial assistance to students if these aids are wiped out by rising tuition charges. It is in the national interest, I am convinced, that higher education should be available to all who can profit from it, regardless of economic status. Increases in tuition and fees beyond the normal rise in the cost of living, especially in our publicly controlled colleges and universities, seriously imperil our national tradition of equality of educational opportunity and handicap the fullest utilization of our most precious resource: talented youth.

THE EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION AT ALL LEVELS OF EDUCATION

The United States has with good reason been called the most backward major Nation in the world when it comes to speaking to the people of other nations in their own tongues. We were made painfully aware of this during the Second World War and again in Korea; we still have not learned our lesson in this field. Even today, only 1 new Foreign Service Officer out of 4 has a proficiency in any foreign language, according to the State Department. Language deficiencies still seriously handicap our efforts to build a durable peace, and leave us dangerously vulnerable in our competition with world communism.

The basic overall objective of our proposed foreign language development program is to strengthen language training resources for education, business, industry, the professions, and Government. This would be done through an expansion of foreign language institutes and centers in selected institutions of higher education, and through increased research and studies in the field of language instruction.

THE EXPANSION AND STRENGTHENING OF GRADUATE EDUCATION AND THE PROVISION OF FEDERAL FELLOWSHIPS FOR POTENTIAL COLLEGE TEACHERS

As you are only too acutely aware, the growing shortage of adequately trained teachers for institutions of higher education is one of the most serious single problems confronting all of American education today. It is to the graduate schools that we must look for the bulk of new college teachers, and yet of the 9,000 students awarded the Ph.D. or equivalent doctors' degrees in the graduate schools every year, no more than 3,500 are available as new college teachers.

Financial support of graduate students is generally accepted as necessary in order to develop the trained manpower required by our society. However, such assistance is not available in sufficient amount to enable the graduate schools to resist the inroads upon potential graduate students by nonteaching professions and occupations.

The present proposal, which provides for grants to institutions and for a limited number of fellowships to graduate students, is, I believe, one way to turn the tide which is running against higher education. Perhaps it will not enable the colleges to offer larger salaries to attract teachers—other ways must be found to do that—but it will materially increase the basic supply from which teachers can be drawn. Surely, if we do not increase this supply, no amount of money for salaries will bring enough qualified teachers into the colleges.

We would emphasize that the terms of this legislation leave to the universities the responsibility for developing sound programs of graduate education. In administering aid to graduate education, it would be our intention to ask the university one major question: How can we help you produce more and better college teachers? All we ask is that the institutions provide sound programs clearly related to this objective.

In this section as in the four other major sections of the proposed legislation we have taken great care to preserve the principle of institutional and local responsibility for education by placing upon the institutions and the States the responsibility for designing and administering plans which will help us achieve national objectives essential to our security and survival as a free Nation.

I believe that the Office of Education can and should provide those services, implicit in a leadership role at the Federal level, which are appropriate to the requirements of 1958 in the national interest and that are consonant with the American tradition of institutional and local control of education. I like to put it that we should exercise leadership without domination; assistance without interference.

The challenge of the national interest to higher education today demands a creative and productive partnership between the Federal Government and the vast resources of our colleges and universities.

Almost daily as I read testimony before congressional committees and listen to and talk with key leaders speaking from unusual vantage points, I am deeply stirred and excited by a mounting conviction that education is indeed the crucial weapon in the cold war as well as the instrumentality that alone can bring lasting peace and a better way of life to the world's hungry and deprived multimillions of people. Failure to attain the full potential of our educational power throughout each successive stage of our American school system could cost us the blessings of democracy purchased by our forebears at great sacrifice.

We have not a moment to lose and much of the responsibility for mobilizing educational power is in your hands. This mobilization needs to reach every institution in this country and stir teachers, parents, and citizens at every school level. Each of us who teaches ought to approach youth daily under the conviction that every single classroom is more important than any missile launching site and that from the minds and characters therein nourished will come the answer to survival.

Dr. Edward Teller, in a televised interview only 3 nights ago, reaffirmed what many wise men have recently emphasized when he predicted in effect that by 1970, unless we have a dynamic acceleration in mobilizing our educational power, we may well lose our way of life even without a war. He believes we are running that far behind in the tempo of educational effort.

It is not enough for those of us who teach or who are head teachers to serve our profession as inspired warriors. There must be an electrifying awakening on the part of our people to the facts of life in this crucial contest. We have the resources—human and material—and we have them in abundance. But I would like to see us take just one page from the Russian book, and I refer to the kind and degree of determined effort and support they are investing in their educational system. It would be well for us not to forget a pointed remark made to the American education delegation at Geneva by a high Soviet education official: "We challenge you Americans to a competition in the classrooms."

When our people generally awaken to the full significance of this challenge, every schoolhouse at the crossroads and every college campus will be tooled and geared to generate the quality and quantity of brainpower needed for a space age.

It is a shame upon us, for example, that while professional and scientific authorities tell us that we have an estimated 300,000 persons in each year-group who have the capabilities to achieve the Ph. D. level, only about 9,000 Ph. D.'s are actually awarded each year. If we could multiply our output of trained manpower at the Ph. D. level by 33 times, just consider what tremendous additional brainpower we would have for creative endeavor, for scientific achievement, for research, and for all of our scientific and professional fields in which amazing advances are in store.

This big job is bigger than any one institution or any association of institutions. It requires increased teamwork at every level, in every State, and with the Federal Government itself an active partner—all within the tradition of State and local and institutional control of education.

Naturally, we at the Federal level feel that we would be guilty of the worst kind of default in responsibility if we did not seek to play our now obviously necessary role in this enterprise. We ask that you, the representatives of American higher education, clarify your wishes so that the Office of Education may cooperate with an effective national policy that will be representative of the 1,900 institutions of higher education. I think that you can appreciate the difficulty that we have had during the past few years in securing a reasonably clear mandate for action from American higher education.

We need and we shall value your personal participation, your united counsel, and your thoughtful support so that we of the Office of Education may fulfill our responsibilities and obligations in the national interest.

Contributions of the Irish to the Early Foundation and Freedom of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the story of the contributions of the Irish to the early foundation and freedom of America and their participation in the formation of many of our historic events is indeed a memorable chronicle. It is one which is frequently recalled and outlined at this time of year when the descendants of those valiant immigrants pay homage to the Patron Saint of Ireland who sustained their forebears through the adversity and hardship which confronted them in this great land of opportunity.

But certainly it has not been more forcefully or eloquently recalled than by the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals, the Honorable Robert Emmett Quinn, on the occasion of the 58th annual dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of Providence, R. I., on Monday evening, March 17, 1958.

A former legislator, Governor, and jurist of my native State of Rhode Island, Chief Justice Quinn received a warm welcome and response from the large number of members of the society who were privileged to hear his remarks. Because of his eminent qualification as an officer in the United States Navy during World Wars I and II, as well as a devoted scholar of American history, Judge Quinn's address was particularly impressive. Due to its inherent historic value, Mr. Speaker, I submit the speech of Chief Justice Quinn for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, your excellency the most reverend bishop, Your Excellency Governor Roberts, distinguished members of the judiciary, both Federal and State, your honor the mayor, distinguished State officers, members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and their guests, first, I would like to thank the toastmaster for the generous introduction and to advise the assembled gathering that I am really only a pinchhitter tonight. Senator KENNEDY was scheduled to respond to the toast, "the United States," but was unfortunately detained. Senator KENNEDY, of course, is a distinguished Member of the United States Senate, an author of note, a philosopher, and has been permanently mentioned as a candidate for President of the United States. But with all due deference to Senator KENNEDY, there are other young men in the Congress of the United States who are equally able and highly thought of by their associates and I think I would really be remiss if I did not say to you that one of the most valuable, most illustrious and best liked Members of the Congress of the United States is your own beloved and distinguished toastmaster, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY.

The toast assigned to me is the United States. This is a monumental subject. Histories about it have been written. I might talk about the Supreme Court or the Congress of the United States or of the United States Navy, which has very many distinguished representatives including two admirals here tonight; but this is St. Patrick's night and I think I should confine myself to the Irish in the United States. However, I think I should say this: There are really only two first-class powers in the world today. With all due regard to England, France, Italy, Germany, and so forth, there are only two great powers—the United States of America and the Soviet Republic and there is a fundamental difference between them. The philosophy of the Soviet Republic is based upon godlessness, treachery, deceit, doubledealing, and complete ruthlessness. The philosophy of the United States is based upon honesty, integrity, honor, and the fear and love of God. The announced policy of the Soviet Union is to destroy the United States and so we must keep our country strong and keep our weapons clean.

Among the sentiments which operate most powerfully upon the human heart, and most honorably upon the human character, are those of veneration for our forefathers, and of love for our posterity. They are the connecting links, between the future, and the past. By the fundamental principles of Christianity, the happiness of every human being is interwoven by countless, but imperceptible ties with that of his contemporaries.

By the power of filial reverence and parental affection, individual existence is extended beyond the bounds of a single life and the happiness of every age is chained, in mutual dependence, to that of every other.

Admiration for his ancestors excites, in the breast of every man, interest in their history and pride in their accomplishments. Love for his posterity spurs him to labor for their support, stimulates him to virtue for their example and creates in him the tenderest solicitude for their welfare. So, man was not made for himself alone. He was made for his country, by the obligations of his citizenship; he was made for his species by the Christian duty of universal charity; he was made for all the ages past, by the sentiment of reverence for his forefathers, and for all future times, by the impulse of affection for his progeny; and under the influences of these principles, "Existence sees him spurn her bounded reign." These influences redeem him from subjection to time and space; he is the glory of creation, bounded in this world only by the boundaries of the universe, and destined to life and immortality in the world to come when the fabric, of nature itself, shall dissolve and perish.

And so, St. Patrick's night brings back the fondest recollections of the passing years; it stirs the depths of our emotions; it is a day of gladness and of sorrow, as we look back upon the vista of other times, and other men, and live anew, the triumphs and the failures of our fathers, in their age-old fight, for freedom and nationhood.

A distinguished Icelandic anthropologist, Prof. Jon Steffensen, has come to the conclusion that a considerable proportion of the blood-thirsty Viking pirates of the ninth century and onward probably were restless Irishmen out on the loose.

If this assumption, based on the measurement of some hundreds of skulls, including those of two saints, is true, it means that men with Celtic blood ravaged much of northwestern Europe during the Dark Ages and almost certainly set foot on the American Continent 300 years or so before Columbus.

The evidence in favor of these highly consequential emigrations has been published in the current Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute here by Professor Steffensen, a member of the Department of Anatomy and Physiology at the University of Iceland, Reykjavik.

The evidence shows that, on the basis of their still determinable biological characteristics, the Vikings (a term derived from the Old Norse or Icelandic word "Vikingr," meaning "sea rover" or "pirate") can be divided into two groups, eastern and western.

Irishmen may have been the first to set foot on the Western Hemisphere. There is indisputable proof that thousands of Irishmen were on ship to America in the 1500's. In 1656, the whole eastern shore of Maryland settled with Irish. There was a great influx of immigration up the Delaware to Pennsylvania in 1729.

In the South, Mitchell laid out the city of Atlanta; O'Brien founded the city of Augusta; McCormick named the city of Dublin, Ga.

Governor Dongan of New York long before the Revolution called first assembly of the representatives of the American people. The first governor of New York was an Irishman, son of an immigrant from County Longford. The first mayor of the later great metropolis was the son of a man from Galway.

James Hoban, Architect of White House and Superintendent, 1792.

Thousands in New England—John Sullivan from Limerick, schoolmaster at Dover and Berwick, over 50 years. John Sullivan was:

1. Father of a governor of New Hampshire.
2. Father of a governor of Massachusetts.
3. Father of an attorney general of New Hampshire.
4. Father of attorney general of Massachusetts.
5. Father of New Hampshire's only major general in the War of the Revolution.
6. Father of first judge appointed by Washington, in New Hampshire.
7. Father of four sons who were officers in the Continental Army.
8. Grandfather of an attorney general of Massachusetts.
9. Grandfather of a Governor of Maine.
10. Grandfather of a United States Senator from New Hampshire.
11. Grandfather of an attorney general of New Hampshire.
12. Great great-grandfather of a distinguished Union officer in Civil War.

The first white child born in Western Reserve, what is now Ohio, was an Irish boy named "Cummins."

The first house built in the western district was built by an Irishman.

Irish immigration at rate of 20,000 per year in 1770. But many had to change their names.

Embargo on Irish trade made Irish anxious to fight for the Colonies.

The Boston Tea Party met in an inn kept by John Dugan. The tea was thrown into the harbor Griffin's Wharf.

Patrick Carr was one of men killed in Boston massacre.

Benjamin Franklin went to Ireland in 1771 to visit the Friends of America.

Eleven of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irish. Among them were:

John Hart, of New Jersey; James Smith, of Pennsylvania; George Taylor, of Pennsylvania; George Reed, of Delaware; Thomas McKean, of Delaware; Charles Carroll, of Maryland; Edward Rutledge, of South Carolina; Robert E. Paine, son of Robert O'Neil.

Chancellor Livingston of New York swore George Washington in as President of the United States. He also began the negotiations which led to the purchase of Louisiana Territory.

William Collins was teaching school in Hartford, Conn., in 1660.

The first telegraph line was built by an Irishman; telegraph line was invented by an Irishman.

An Irishman invented the submarine, reaper, mowing machine, steamboat, and an Irishman built the Erie Canal.

Irishmen built the railroads, dug the canals, explored the mines, made the mills and factories run.

Irish blood was shed on every battlefield of the Seven Years' War.

The first strong voice "Give me liberty or give we death" was the Irish voice of Patrick Henry.

First general officer killed in Revolution was Maj. Gen. Richard Montgomery, born in Donegal.

Forty-eight Irishmen were in George Washington's regiment in Virginia in 1754.

General Sullivan's men manned the guns on Dorchester Heights on March 17, 1776, when the British under Lord Howe evacuated Boston.

"St. Patrick" was the countersign of Washington's Army that night. Five full regiments of Irish troops came over with the French.

One hundred and thirty-eight Irish names among the Minute Men at Lexington.

Colonel Custis wrote: "Then honored be the good and old services of the sons of Erin in the War of Independence. Let the shamrock be entwined with the laurel of the Revolution and truth and justice guiding the pen of American history inscribe on the tablets of American remembrance, 'Eternal gratitude to Irishmen.'"

Thomas Johnson in the Colonial Congress nominated George Washington as Commander in Chief of American Army. He and six sons fought with him. Johnson was offered Chief Justiceship of the United States Supreme Court.

John Hancock and Thomas McKean, presidents of the Continental Congress, were Irishmen.

Joseph Reed, secretary to Washington, was Irish. Offered $50,000 to desert, he replied, "I am not worth purchasing, but such as I am, the King of England is not rich enough to do it."

Generals: Morgan and Hand, leaders of rifles; Knox, head of artillery; Moylan, head of cavalry; Montgomery, in command of Northern Army; John Dunlap, Andrew Lewis, John Fitzgerald, Ephraim Blaine, William Irvin, Richard Butler, Dan Morgan, Walter Steward, William Thompson, Anthony Wayne, and John Stark were all generals in the Continental Army.

Of the famous Board of Conference of 5 members, 2 were Irish, Dominick Lynch and Joseph Reed.

Captain Parker commanded at Lexington; Captain Barret commanded at Concord, and Captains Smith, Davis, and Walsh fought there.

Royal Governor Hutchinson wrote to his King, "Without the Irish rebels in Massachusetts, the Province could not have been wrested from the crown."

At Bunker Hill, Major McClary was second in command and Col. Mike Jackson was there with his five sons.

Governor Clinton was the man who stopped the British from sweeping up the Hudson to reach New York.

Colonels Shee and Hand and Montgomery commanded the Pennsylvania troops; Colonel Haslett commanded the Delaware troops.

Crossing the Delaware was the most dramatic episode of the war, followed by the battles of Princeton and Trenton. Knox, Sullivan, and Ewing commanded there—and there Colonel Haslett, Heale, and Fleming gave up their lives. At Brandywine and Germantown, Sullivan, Nash, Irvine, and Wayne commanded; and Nash and Irvine laid down their lives.

There John Barry commanded a land force. Colonels Gibson, Fullerton, and Potter were with him.

And so at Fort Mifflin, Chestnut Hill, Quaker Hill, Cherry Valley—Sullivan, Maxwell, and Clinton.

Then Valley Forge, Monmouth, Tappan, Green Springs, Saratoga, Cowpens and down to Yorktown, when Moyland led to victory and the colors were handed to Robert Wilson.

Galloway, Ramsay, Plowden, and Froude admit one-half of the American Army was Irish.

AMERICAN NAVY

John Barry first commissioned officer:

There are gallant hearts whose glory
Columbia loves to name;
Whose deeds will live in story
and everlasting fame.
But never yet one braver,
Our starry banner bore,
Than saucy old Jack Barry,
The Irish commodore.

He won his first battle with British ship *Edwards*. Won last with *Sybil* in 1783. He commanded *Alliance*, finest ship in American Navy. He was offered $100,000 to desert, and replied, "I have devoted myself to the service of my country and not the value of the command of the whole British Navy could seduce me from it."

The father of Andrew Jackson, seventh President of the United States, and one of the great figures in our history was born in Ireland.

President Polk was a nephew of Col. Thomas Polk, born in Ireland. Colonel Polk called the convention in May 1775 which passed the Mecklenburg resolutions declaring independence of the colonies a year before the Declaration of Independence.

President Buchanan was the son of an Irish immigrant.

President Arthur was the son of an Irishman, as were McKinley, Wilson, and Truman.

Dolly Madison was the granddaughter of William Coles, born in County Wexford.

The mother of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry was also born in Ireland.

Gen. Phil Kearny was the hero of four wars.

Maj. Gen. James Shields of County Tyrone, is the only man in the history of the United States to represent three different States in the United States Senate—Illinois, Minnesota, and Missouri.

Gen. Patrick Cleburn of County Cork was the most dashing general of the Confederate Army.

Col. Charles G. Halpine wrote the famous war song, We Have Drunk From the Same Canteen.

Ireland never accepted the sovereignty of England. She fought the invaders for 800 years.

In 1541 the Irish Parliament convened by Henry VIII declared Ireland to be a kingdom and chose Henry VIII, King of Ireland.

In 1782 the English Parliament declared no power on earth but the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland competent to make laws for Ireland.

The Act of Union of 1800 was based on a petition signed by only 1,000 people, while 700,000 petitioned against it, and 5 million Catholics were disenfranchised. It was carried out by 135,000 armed soldiers and a parliament in which all but 7 members were bribed.

But this, my friends, is neither the time nor the place to ask you to listen to a detailed account of the story of the Irish people; to tales of valor unsurpassed; to courage without fear; to honor without stain; to prisons made holy, to scaffolds made altars; to suffer under laws described by the philosopher Montesquieu "as contrived by the devil"; all this you will hear St. Patrick's night from tongues more eloquent than mine. So we'll lay aside the history of Ireland, and the story of the Irish people. But we can't lay aside two magnificent attributes of the Irish race—courage, and devotion to the ideal of nationhood. That spirit of nationhood, of liberty, and independence for the Emerald Isle, has persisted through the centuries, and its fires will never die.

If it be brave to live and struggle without surrender, as our fathers did under laws with "cruelty writ in every line" and still smile, surely the Irish were brave. If it be greatness to live and struggle without surrender in a land "where liberty hung crucified for centuries, dying perpetually, yet never dead, wasting forever, yet enduring still," and after all this, to win recognition to freedom in the end, surely the Irish had greatness.

Listen to the magic words of Robert L. Taylor. If I were a sculptor, I would chisel from the marble, my ideal of a hero. I would make it the figure of any Irishman, sacrificing his hopes and his life, on the altar of his country, and I would carve on its pedestal, the name of Robert Emmet.

If I were a painter, I would make the canvas eloquent with the deeds of the bravest people who ever lived; whose proud spirit, no power can ever conquer, and whose loyalty and devotion, to the hopes of free government, no tyrant can ever crush. And I would write under the picture Ireland.

If I were a poet, I would melt the world to tears with the pathos of my song. I would touch the heart of humanity with the mournful threnody of Ireland's wrongs and Erin's woes. I would weave the shamrock and the rose into garlands of glory for the Emerald Island, the land of martyrs and memories; the cradle of heroes; the nursery of liberty.

Tortured in dungeons, and murdered on scaffolds, robbed of the fruits of their sweat and toil, scourged by famine, and plundered by the avarice of heartless power, driven like the leaves of autumn before the keen winter winds, this sturdy race of Erin's sons and daughters, have been scattered over the face of the earth; homeless only in the land of their nativity but princes and lords, in every other land, where merit is the measure of greatness.

How strange it is, that this land that sent her sons as soldiers to the defense of every stricken nation should receive so little outside help in her struggle for independence and statehood. France, Spain, Austria, Canada, and the United States felt the rallying force of the Irish volunteer in every fight for freedom; and, more, Washington felt not only the power of Irish manhood in the Continental Army, but the might of a contribution of half a million dollars when it was needed most, given by 29 Irishmen of the city of Philadelphia, all members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

And this same intrepid, dauntless devotion to the ideal of nationhood lived through the centuries, until on July 11, 1921, Ireland became a nation. Alone, unaided, an unarmed people, against the might of an empire, won for itself recognition and independence. Army without banners, is the description given by the poet, to the little band that won that age-old fight. Army without banners indeed—army without adequate arms equipment—army poor in everything material with which wars are won. But army rich in courage, rich in the justice of its cause, rich in the spirit of its patriots, transmitted to them by their heroic fathers; rich in the consciousness of nationhood; rich with the determination to live like heroes, and die like men; rich in the armor of justice and Christianity; rich in the teachings and prayers of St. Patrick; and rich in the graces of Almighty God.

This is our legacy. May no man among us ever surrender that heritage. May no one of us ever betray that trust. May no member of this organization ever haul that banner down, no matter what it costs to keep it streaming from the masthead. In eternal testimony to the love and devotion of every good Irish American for this great Republic—to the dignity and worth of every human creature made in the image and likeness of God—to freedom and independence and moral courage—to the Star Spangled Banner—to the United States of America.

AFL-CIO Opposes Enactment of the Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451 and H. R. 7026

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following testimony of George D. Riley, AFL–CIO legislative representative, which he presented to the House Banking and Currency Committee on February 7, 1958:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE D. RILEY, AFL–CIO LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, RELATIVE TO THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS BILL

My name is George D. Riley. I am a legislative representative of the AFL–CIO. I am accompanied by Nathaniel Goldfinger, who is an economist in the AFL–CIO research department.

We are grateful to Chairman SPENCE and the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear before you and to present our views on a few aspects of the bill, entitled Financial Institutions Act.

The AFL–CIO is a trade union federation, not a banking institution. We are not experts on the intricate details of our complex banking system. However, the Nation's banking system, which is involved in this proposed legislation, is of obvious interest to the 13½ million members of AFL–CIO unions and their families. This bill is of interest to every American, since it deals with a basic aspect of our economic system and social structure.

The bill is a long one—some 250 pages long It recodifies our various banking laws and contains a great many changes in those laws. We are attempting to consider, therefore, a very long, complicated, and technical bill that affects our entire banking system and the general welfare of the public.

This bill, as we understand it, emanates from the recommendations of a 27-man advisory committee, appointed by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. These 27 men are, in all likelihood, honorable men of stature. Most of them, however, are bankers—including 5 former presidents of the American Bankers Association. Since bankers are human beings, subject to the operations of self-interest, it would not seem too strange if items of self-interest are to be found in the intricate details of the many pages of this bill.

I think that all members of this committee will admit the possibility, at least, that the public interest and the interest of the banking community, may not always be identical. This factor concerning the origin of the bill should be enough to warrant extreme caution in examining it, before recommending its adoption as the unified banking law of the land.

Many Members of the Congress would be outraged if a 27-man advisory committee, including 20 members of the AFL–CIO executive council, were to advise and recommend to the Congress on the detailed writing of a technical labor law. Most Members of the Congress would probably want to study such a bill—as they should—and hear the views of various groups. The financial institutions bill, now being considered, deserves at least as much caution and detailed study, since the Nation's banking system is more complex and less familiar to most people than are labor-management relations.

The following are our views on a few specific sections of the bill.

THE FEDERAL USURY LAW (TITLE I, SECTION 35)

The bill now being considered, would eliminate the Federal usury law—the 7 percent maximum interest rate—from conditional sale transactions (such as installment purchase contracts), which include most consumer and many small-business loans.

Under the existing law, the Federal Government, in effect, tells the States to name a maximum interest rate. If any State fails to do so, the Federal Government's limit of 7 percent applies.

The States do have maximum interest rates on some types of transactions—in which case, the State maximums prevail. The Federal maximum interest rate prevails, however, in transactions where the States have not set their own maximum interest rates.

Section 35 of the bill states that "the purchase of obligations or evidences of indebtedness from the actual owner thereof shall not, for the purposes of this section, be deemed a loan or discount." In other words, as we read this proposal, the Federal maximum interest rate would not apply to most consumer and many small-business loan transactions, since those transactions would not be considered loans, under the meaning of the law.

Any limit on the interest rates paid on most consumer goods and many small-business loans, therefore, would depend on the State laws. The vast majority of State usury laws, as we understand it, are antiquated and do not apply a maximum interest rate limit on conditional sales transactions that include most consumer goods and many small-business loans.

In the absence of effective State usury limits, passage of this bill would eliminate any maximum interest rate limitation on most consumer goods and many small-business loans. In effect, therefore, the bill proposes to permit the raising of interest rates paid by consumers and small businesses, under the usual type of consumer or small-business loans. The limited protection given to the consumer and small-business man, under existing law, would be eliminated, except in those few States that have modernized and fairly effective usury laws.

In our opinion, adoption of this proposal would be a sad case of special legislation that would bring actual or potential harm to a majority of American families and that would be for the benefit of a tiny minority.

What is needed is not the elimination of the limited Federal usury law for most consumer and many small-business loans, but a strong and modernized usury law that would protect the public.

Under existing circumstances, for example, a consumer or small-business man is usually told that his interest payments on the purchase of an automobile, television set, truck or equipment, is 5 percent or 6 percent. The loan, however, is also usually subject to charges and is amortized over a period of time. Instead of a 5 percent or 6 percent interest rate, the borrower, under those conditions, probably pays an effective interest payment of about 10 percent or more. The effective interest payment is usually about twice the nominal interest rate that is stated in the terms of the loan. Unfortunately, most people are not aware of this situation.

A modernized usury law would name a maximum effective interest rate, rather than a maximum nominal interest rate. At a minimum, a modernized usury law would require the open and clear statement of the effective interest rate and charges on the papers signed by the borrower.

The existing Federal usury law is in need of changes—it is in need of strengthening, not weakening. It is the consuming public and small business that need Government protection against high interest charges—not the bankers who are the beneficiaries from those charges.

STATE EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS PROHIBITED (TITLE I, SECTION 51)

This provision prohibits any State or any State agency or officer, under State or local law, from examining a national bank or requiring it to pay a license fee, any other kind of fee or penalty to the State. This prohibition proposes a further weakening of the protection of the public interest.

The Senate committee report on this bill states: "Various States have enacted legislation requiring national banks to acquire a State license in order to qualify as a licensed lender. The general purpose of licensing laws of this type is to protect the public in the field of small loans and installment purchase contracts * * * such (State) laws usually require examination of all licensed lenders by State authorities."

The consuming public would be placed in a rather helpless position if this provision, section 51, is adopted, along with the proposal to eliminate the Federal usury law from most consumer and many small business loans. As we understand it, adoption of the two proposals would result in the following:

Section 35 says that there is no Federal maximum interest rate on conditional sales transactions (such as installment purchase contracts), except if they come under the usury laws of the State in which the bank is located. In other words, if there is a State maximum interest rate, it would apply.

Section 51, however, tells the States that they cannot effectively enforce their maximum interest rates, if they have any. This is done by prohibiting the States from licensing or examining national banks which do the overwhelming bulk of banking business.

The combined effect of sections 35 and 51, it seems to us, would be to give the consuming public a run-around. The consumer would get no protection from the Federal Government and would be told to look to his State for assistance. Most State laws, however, are antiquated and inadequate. Furthermore, the States would be told that they cannot effectively enforce their usury laws, in any case.

Section 51 deserves a careful analysis from the viewpoint of public interest. The prohibition against State examination or licensing of national banks, as we see it, should not be adopted. There could be some reasonable argument for its adoption, only if the Federal Government were to provide a strong and modernized national usury law and adequate protection of the consuming public and small business, as well as effective national enforcement of such strong and modernized Federal usury provisions.

SECRECY OF EXAMINATION REPORTS (TITLE I, SECTION 50)

This provision would classify as confidential—and as privileged against disclosure—examination reports made by national bank examiners, related correspondence, papers and other information obtained by the Comptroller, without the consent of the Comptroller. Such documents, under this provision, would be secret—not subject to subpena by the courts, for example, without the Comptroller's consent.

This secrecy proposal seems like a strange one to us. Isn't it peculiar, to say the least, to grant confidentiality to bank examination reports, particularly at a time when legislation is being urged on the Congress for full public disclosure of trade union finances?

THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT (TITLE II)

The Federal Reserve System is one of the most important economic arms of the Government. Its powers are very great. Its activities have a significant effect on the welfare of the American people and American institutions, including State and local governments. The Federal Reserve's operations affect the money supply, interest rates and the growth of the national economy.

The Federal Reserve System is much too important and much too powerful to be dominated by one tiny segment of American economic life. Title II deserves most careful study, analysis and revision.

The main body of the Federal Reserve System is the seven-member Board of Governors, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Some idea of the extremely great powers of the Board of Governors over the economic life of the Nation can be seen from the following description in a Federal Reserve Board publication:

"It is the Board's duty to supervise the workings of the Federal Reserve System * * * the Board appoints 3 of the 9 directors of each Federal Reserve bank, including the chairman, who is also the Federal Reserve agent and the deputy chairman. Appointments of the president and first vice president of each Federal Reserve bank are subject to the Board's approval. The Board also issues regulations that interpret the provisions of law relating to Reserve bank operations. It directs the System's activities in bank examinations and in economic research and publications.

"Of the principal monetary actions of the Federal Reserve, the Board has full authority over changes in reserve requirements and margin requirements. It also has authority to establish the maximum rates of interest that member banks may pay on time deposits. It 'reviews and determines' discount rates established by the Reserve banks. While the terms of consumer credit were being regulated, the Board had sole responsibility for their determination and enforcement. In general, the Board of Governors is responsible for formulating national credit policies and for supervising their execution. The members of the Board are also members of the Federal Open Market Committee.

"This (Federal Open Market) Committee, comprising the 7 members of the Board of Governors and 5 representatives elected by the Federal Reserve banks, has the responsibility of deciding when and how much to buy or sell in the open market and under what conditions."

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should be a public body. If it is to be a public body in composition and viewpoint, section 38 of title II should be amended.

Section 38 states: "In selecting the members of the Board, not more than one of whom shall be selected from any one Federal Reserve district, the President shall have due regard for a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial and commercial interests, and geographical divisions of the country."

This language in section 38 should be amended. There should be specific mention in this section for fair representation of labor, consumer and small business interests on the Board of Governors. Without such fair representation of the largest economic groups in the country on this powerful Board, it is hard to conceive of it as representative of the American public.

Labor, consumer and small business interests should be fairly represented on the Board of Governors. In addition, the number of members of the Board, who come from any one economic segment of our society should be specifically and strictly limited. Only in this way will it be possible to hope that the direction of the Federal Reserve System will reflect the viewpoint of the American people, rather than the viewpoint of a tiny minority.

Section 17 of title II should likewise be amended to provide for labor, consumer and small business interests to be represented on the 9 member boards of directors of the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks. In addition, the number of members of these boards of directors, who come from any one economic segment of our society should be specifically and strictly limited. The American people should be protected against the possibility that either the Board of Governors or the boards of directors of any of the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks will become dominated by a tiny economic segment of American life.

The Federal Open Market Committee is, perhaps, the most powerful economic arm of the Government. This Committee, as now constituted, is composed of the 7 members of the Board of Governors, plus 5 representatives elected by the Federal Reserve banks. It is our understanding that these five are usually from banks and financial institutions. In effect, therefore, the Federal Open Market Committee, with its great powers over the economic affairs of the Nation, is strongly influenced, if not dominated, by bankers.

This condition must be corrected to protect the public interest. Title II of the bill should be amended to strictly limit the number of members of the Federal Open Market Committee, who come from any one economic segment of American life. This powerful Committee should be a public body, fairly representative of the American people—not a bankers' committee or bankers' and big business committee.

Section 8 of title II provides for a Federal Advisory Council of 12 members. A publication of the Federal Reserve Board states: "The Federal Reserve Act provides for a Federal Advisory Council of 12 members, 1 from each Federal Reserve district, selected annually by the Federal Reserve bank through its board of directors. Council members are usually selected from among representative bankers in each district. * * * It confers with the Board of Governors on business conditions and makes advisory recommendations regarding the affairs of the Federal Reserve System."

This important Advisory Council is, in effect, a bankers' council. This condition should be changed by amending section 8. There should be specific language, requiring fair representation on this council of labor, consumer, small business and farmer interests. There should likewise be specific language to strictly limit the number of members of this council who come from any one economic group in our society.

The Federal Advisory Council, as well as the Board of Governors, the boards of directors of Federal Reserve banks and the Federal Open Market Committee should all be opened up to fair representation of the large and important economic groups of the country. These Government agencies and committees should not be representative of the big banks and blue chip corporations alone.

If organized labor strongly enforced or dominated the National Labor Relations Board, there would be outcries throughout the land. The Federal Reserve System, with its tremendous powers over the economic life of the Nation, should not be considered the private domain of the banks and the blue chip corporations. The entire Federal Reserve System should be carefully examined and opened up so that it may become, in fact, a public system, representative of American economic life.

Section 10 of title II, as well as other sections of this title, provide for a change in the voting procedures of the Board of Governors. The proposed revision in section 10 sounds perfectly innocent, when it suggests that an affirmative vote of a majority of the Board of Governors in office should be sufficient for taking important actions—instead of the affirmative vote of not less than five members, as provided in the present law.

This proposal, it seems to us, is not as innocent as it sounds. It suggests the possibility that the President may permit membership on the Board of Governors to fall from 7 to 6, 5, or 4—by not making appointments when vacancies occur. It suggests, furthermore, the possibility that a 9- or 10-member Federal Open Market Committee—the members of the Board of Governors, plus five others, who are usually bankers—can be completely dominated by the banking group.

This proposal for a change in the voting procedures in the Board of Governors should be most carefully examined for its implications and rejected, if there is anything in it that may be harmful to the public interest.

Every provision of title II—whether or not it involves changes in the present law—should be thoroughly studied and examined.

It is a sad commentary to think of the present influence of the banking group on the Government agency that determines interest rates and the money supply. It would be as if the Department of Labor set American wage rates—with high officials of the Department, and an advisory council of that Department, composed of former and present members of the AFL–CIO Executive Council.

The Federal Reserve System can and should be a public system that is representative of all important economic groups in the country. If this Federal Reserve System, with its tremendous powers over our economic life, is to be preserved as a vital part of a free economy, its entire composition and complexion must be changed. The opportunity to make the Federal Reserve System a thoroughly public system is in the hands of this committee and of the Congress.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT (TITLE VII)

The constant growth in numbers of credit unions is clear indication of the interest in and participation in the affairs of such voluntary and cooperative financial organizations in recent years.

Briefly, credit unions are groups of persons in the same locality, of like purposes, who may wish to lend to or borrow from each other for sound everyday purposes to maintain and advance the cause of sound American standards of living.

A great many of our members also are members of credit unions typically operated at their places of employment. It may be that some persons in credit unions may never exercise the opportunity to borrow or are fortunate in not having to borrow; nevertheless, they themselves may be the lenders whose money is productive of a fair rate on their investments.

On the other hand, many loans are on an emergency basis or for a specific occasion and are approved to meet the contingency without undue delay.

It might be stated that trade unions and credit unions have much in common and accomplish a great deal through organized action. And while each serves a definite need, their functions dovetail to a great extent by providing security and independence. Loans to members of credit unions result in helping them out of debt, not embedding them deeper.

Credit unions are an important part of the American scene, both in industry and in Government employment.

Specifically referring to S. 1451 now before your committee, it is our hope that there will be no action taken by the Congress which in any way would make the task of credit unions in serving their membership difficult or the interests of such members disadvantageous.

I have examined the statement of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., pre-

sented to your committee recently and can say that we indorse the general purposes of that statement. CUNA is the organization best informed on the activities and operations of individual credit unions, and we hold its views in proper regard. For this reason, we feel justified in indorsing CUNA's remarks and adding any of our own which are indicated.

Some of the definitions in S. 1451 provide needed clarification; namely, that of "Federal credit unions." Better definition of a Federal credit union could hardly be asked.

We find no fault with the language in section 3 of title VII providing a modernized version of the creating act for the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. Other sections designed to eliminate obscurity and provide modernization also appear to be proper in the bill as passed by the Senate, including increase in signature loan limit, declaration of dividends, elimination of unnecessary phrases, and regulation of Bureau employees.

Section 25 regarding "Space in Federal Buildings" would extend to certain persons employed by the American Legion and Red Cross the rights to credit union membership maintained for Federal employees as well as continuing the memberships of retired Federal employees. This liberalization is to be commended.

Section 26 extending the provisions of the act to include all States, the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Panama Canal Zone are desirable and are indorsed.

I fully realize that the subject of taxation basically, as mentioned in section 23, does come to your committee but that S. 1451 is reaffirming existing law on this subject. Representation on this point has been made before the Ways and Means Committee, which fact takes care of the subject quite well. Credit unions have been included under this tax arrangement for more than 20 years. We hope to see the same plan continued without interruption or modification.

There are certain other changes proposed in the legislation, notably in section 7 and elsewhere, to which opposition has been voiced. Our suggestion in such cases is as contained at the outset of this statement in line with the position set forth on the bill in general by CUNA, which is that we are following the lead of CUNA in its stand on title VII overall.

We do, however, have reference to section 7 (b) dealing with audits of credit union affairs as set forth on page 231 of the bill as passed in the Senate and reads as follows:

"(b) The Director shall encourage every Federal credit union to make an adequate internal audit of its affairs at least once each year. In any case in which the Director deems it is necessary, either because of the absence or inadequacy of any such internal audit or for any other reason arising in the course of the supervision of any Federal credit union, he may require at such times as he deems necessary that such Federal credit union have an audit by an independent individual or firm approved by the Director or in the alternative require that it be audited by the Bureau. The expense of any such audit by the Bureau shall be considered part of the examination fees authorized in subsection (a) of this section."

There would appear to be the danger that small credit unions could be audited out of existence through financial costs of several audits a year. Certainly we do not oppose audits but there should be a limit, however, to the number of audits required in a given year.

This long, complicated, and technical bill affects various aspects of our economic and social life. We have offered some comments, questions, and suggestions on a small number of issues in this bill. We believe that there are many points in this bill that deserve most careful scrutiny.

We urge this committee to give careful consideration to every provision in the bill, in an attempt to protect and advance the public interest.

The Inquiring Fotographer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting newspaper columns I see is that published as a regular feature in the New York Daily News under the title "The Inquiring Fotographer." The question asked and the answers received in this morning's edition of that paper are timely and should have special interest for us in Congress. I am sorry I cannot include in the RECORD the photographs of the individuals whose answers are given in the column:

THE INQUIRING FOTOGRAPHER

(By Jimmy Jemail)

The question: Are you worried that the Government will do too little to curb the recession or too much?

Where asked: Various spots.

The answers: Ed Doonan, Ardsley-on-the-Hudson, paper manufacturer: "Too much. The consumer is the key to the recession, not Government spending. If he won't buy, no amount of Government spending will help. The thing for the Government and other agencies to do is to instill confidence in the consumer."

Robert Rosenthal, 250 East 176th Street, ticket broker: "Too much. This is a normal period, a shakedown from the crazy times we have gone through. Abnormalities are being corrected. Too much Government spending will get us back to abnormality, where too many guys were getting a free ride. Let us get back to a merit basis."

Herbert J. Simmonds, Rye, manufacturer: "Its very difficult for the Government to know whether it is doing too much or too little. Too much spending will result in uncontrolled inflation. It is better to let the laws of economics take their natural course. Fewer people will be hurt."

Tom Ferrara, East 45th Street, restaurateur: "I am frankly worried about too much Government spending. We are in a vicious cycle. If the Government spends more money, taxes must go up. Then the unions will demand more money and prices will follow wages. So we will find ourselves back where we came from with even more inflation."

I. Neil Thompson, Huntington, district manager: I am afraid the Government will spend too much and do too little in other ways. That is because the recession is now psychological. The people should forget their fears and spend a little money. That is a lot better for them than more inflation."

Raymond Hoffman, First Avenue, plumbing and heating contractor: "Too much. In my opinion, the politicians in Washington do not give a damn for the country. All they tre interested in is getting reelected. Various blocs will make deals with each other for more spending. They will spend my last dime and yours."

Israel's 10th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we in America are proud of the wonderful spirit and remarkable progress our friend and neighbor, Israel, has made in her first 10 years.

We salute the courageous people of Israel and wish you well as you enter your second decade of achievement:

[From Near East Report of April 1, 1948]

ISRAEL'S 10TH YEAR

Israel will celebrate its 10th anniversary on April 24. The accompanying statistics are convincing evidence of unique achievement. The figures leap upward. They can be understood only against the background of history.

The generation of Jews which is now building Israel survived the Hitler holocaust which took the lives of 6 million men, women, and children. The survivors of the concentration camps who reached Israel are moved by the urgent compulsion to make up for the lost years and to win security for the future.

The Jews of the Western Hemisphere who lived through the Hitler tragedy were shocked by the incapacity of the democratic world to stop Hitlerism. In the last decade they have helped Israel to become a sanctuary in which Jews could lead a normal, free, and secure existence.

HAVEN OF REFUGE

The extraordinary immigration brought Jews out of the displaced persons camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy immediately after World War II; lifted Jews on a flying carpet from medieval Yemen; transferred the oldest Jewish community in the world out of ancient Babylon; ended second-class citizenship in the squalid mellahs of north Africa; reenacted the exodus from Egypt, and provided a haven for Jews from behind the Iron Curtain.

Prior to Israel's establishment, between 1919 and 1948, Jewish immigration to Palestine was preponderantly from Europe (79.6 percent) while the Middle East produced only 8.7 percent. Since Israel's establishment, 43.3 percent came from Europe, 31.5 percent came from Asia, 24.4 percent from Africa, .08 percent from North and South America. In the last 2 years, the immigrants came primarily from strife-torn north Africa, from Hungary and from other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Immigration cannot possibly continue at the past rate because the sources are drying up. Very few of the 5 million Jews of the United States have any intention of emigrating to Israel; there are not many Jews left in the Arab countries or in the satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. And the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union are held virtual prisoners. Their opportunities for escape are faint. Thus, on March 25, the leading Soviet cultural newspaper, Sovetskaya Kultura, in a long statement attacking Israel, warned Soviet Jews against migration to Israel, charging that Israel was established as a result of the deception of millions of persons urged to leave their native countries.

Israel itself, like most of its newcomers was poverty-stricken, and the resettlement was a costly undertaking. If Israel had been called upon merely to develop its economy for the 800,000 Jews and Arabs who lived there in 1948, it might have needed very

little outside assistance. But to achieve the staggering task of receiving, rehabilitating and resettling more than 900,000 immigrants, Israel, like other countries which have been host to large-scale immigration, had to spend far more than it could produce. The new nation had to raise approximately $2 billion. This has come from reparations from West Germany which agreed to pay $822 million over a 12-year period; from the free gifts of the Jewish communities of the United States of America, such as the unprecedented UJA; from the sale of Israel bonds; and from the generosity of the United States Government and its people.

The total of American aid now exceeds $540 million in loans and grants. This large investment has brought concrete results. The Israelis have raced to integrate themselves and to become economically independent. Economists have found much to criticize in their economy (the Israeli's are their own sternest critics), yet observers have testified to Israel's progress.

DEVELOPMENT

In its current MSA presentation, the Administration points out that 20 new independent nations have come into being since World War II. Half have a per capita income of less than $100, while 7 have a per capita of less than $200. Israel is at the top of the list with a per capita income of more than $500, while Malaya is next with $310 and Lebanon with $258.

Another appraisal of Israel's progress was given in Washington on January 31, at the annual conference of the Middle East Institute by Professor A. J. Meyer, the associate director of the Center of Middle Eastern Studies at Harvard University. Referring to the Israel Government's development program, Dr. Meyer declared that the country has pushed ahead at an extraordinary rate. He said:

"Israel's real gross national product per capita rose by 25 percent (an average of 6 percent yearly) from 1950 to 1954 despite massive immigration and a large-scale inflation. Through this same period the country invested at 20–30 percent of gross national product and increased productivity at per worker approximately twice as fast as per capita product—at about 12 percent per year."

Thus, there has been a determined effort to irrigate Israel's barren and eroded soils. The land under cultivation in this period of the state's development has increased from 400,000 acres to 950,000 acres. Israel is now producing about 70 percent of its own food.

BARRIERS TO PROGRESS

Israel's economic problems have been complicated by the refusal of her neighbors to make peace. Israel has been compelled to maintain a highly trained and well-equipped army—a severe drain on her resources. (While the United States has given Israel large-scale economic aid, it has never given Israel military assistance such as it has extended to her Arab neighbors, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia.) In addition, the Arab economic boycott has affected Israel's economy. If the Arabs had been willing to make peace with Israel from the beginning, there would have been a normal interdependence. Israel would have purchased agricultural commodities from her next-door neighbors in a complementary exchange for the products of her factories. But the boycott and blockade have raised Israel's costs since she has had to buy and sell in expensively distant markets.

These obstacles have had the effect of spurring Israel to greater effort and within the last year or two, Israel has been expanding trade relations with countries like Japan, Ghana, Burma, and other newly established nations in Asia and Africa. The Israelis, who have begun to acquire some technical proficiency from American teaching and example, have been exporting their skills to other lands.

A major factor in widening Israel's horizon of friendship and trade was the ending of the Egyptian blockade of the Straits of Tiran and the firm stand of the United States and other great maritime powers in asserting the international character of that waterway.

Summary of American aid to Israel

[In millions of dollars]

	MSA grant	MSA technical aid	MSA loan	Surplus foods	Export-Import Bank loan	Total
1948						
1949					[1] 135.0	135.0
1950						
1951		0.084	[2]			.084
1952	63.5	.9				64.4
1953	70.2	2.6				72.8
1954	52.5	1.5				54.0
1955	20.0	1.5	20.0	13.0		54.5
1956	12.5	1.5	12.5	27.9		54.4
1957	15.0	1.6	10.0	10.7		37.3
1958	7.5	1.5	(2)	35.0	24.2	[2] 68.2
Total	241.2	11.184	[2] 42.5	86.6	[1] 159.2	540.684

[1] Israel has repaid $33.5 million in principal and $28.6 million in interest on this loan.
[2] Israel is negotiating for $15 million from Development Loan Fund.

HOPE FOR PEACE

The two major questions which confront Israel are economic development and military security. Reparations from Germany are scheduled to end by 1964, and by 1961 the Israelis will have to begin to redeem bonds which were first marketed in 1951. Israel leaders are now giving sober consideration to the problems which will arise as these obligations come due and sources of income are curtailed.

The economic issue is linked closely with peace. All free-world diplomats would like to see an Arab-Israel peace settlement, but there is widespread skepticism over the prospects of any change in the situation as long as the Soviet Union continues its penetration of Asia, the Near East, and Africa, and lavishes political support on the Arab cause.

Accordingly, unless there is some revolutionary change in the Near East which will enable one or the other of the contending Arab factions to recognize that Israel is a permanent part of the landscape and that it is in their best interests to reach cooperation and understanding with Israel for economic development and mutual defense, an early peace is unlikely.

Israel's economic problems have an intimate relationship with the political question because Arab leaders who have relied on the boycott and blockade as weapons to harass and weaken Israel in the past, will persist in that campaign until they are compelled to acknowledge that Israel will be able to surmount its economic difficulties.

The Arabs watch eagerly for any sign of a decline of America's support, whether it be in the sale of Israel bonds, in contributions to UJA, or in the American-aid program. (This year, the administration increased the Israel aid program in acknowledgment of the needs and opportunities in Israel, and in disregard of the Arab boycott.)

The record of Israel's achievements and the promise of Israel's future show quite clearly that the friendship of the American people has been the most indispensable and the most significant source of Israel's strength. Nothing is more important than American friendship in any consideration of the prospects of Israel's survival and ultimate peace.

Israel's progress in 10 years

[Dollars in millions]

THE PEOPLE

	How many came	Imports	Exports	Exports a percent imports
1948	101,828			
1949	239,576	$253	$29	11.7
1950	170,249	301	37	12.3
1951	175,095	380	46	12.0
1952	24,369	309	45	14.6
1953	11,326	281	59	21.2
1954	18,370	286	88	30.4
1955	37,478	325	90	27.0
1956	56,234	364	107	29.5
1957	[1] 71,000	404	135	33.2
Total	905,525			

[1] Estimated.

Israel's progress in 10 years—Continued

THE GROWTH

Year	Agriculture (1,000 acres)		Electric consumption (million kilowatt-hours)	Industrial production (at current prices in millions of Israel pounds)
	Irrigated	Cultivated		
1948-49	75	412	329	133
1950	94	620	464	200
1951	117	837	558	290
1952	135	869	668	470
1953	162	887	759	640
1954	190	890	895	900
1955	225	900	1,047	1,100
1956	245	920	1,142	1,300
1957	275	930	1,170	
1958	350	957		

DECADE IN ISRAEL

	1948	1958
School enrollment:		
Kindergartens		77,000.
Elementary public schools	86,587	283,833.
Secondary schools, paid tuition	11,582	23,000.
Teachers colleges	1,470	4,100.
Technical and agricultural schools	3,304	17,003.
Arab schools	10,092	25,812.
Yeshivot		6,300.
Christian missionary schools		9,000.
Universities		9,200.
Evening and other schools		20,413.
Teachers	5,962	26,797.
Population	800,000	2,000,000.
Cultivated area	412,500 acres	957,000 acres.
Irrigated area	75,000 acres	350,000 acres.
Water consumption	250,000,000 cubic meters	1,200,000,000 cubic meters.
Gross national product	$818,000,000 (1951)	$1,101,000,000 (1956).
National income (per capita)	$294 (1950)	$550 (1956).
Shipping	10 ships—14,000 tons	35 ships—250,000 tons (600,000 tons by 1960).
Hospitals	63 (4,626 beds, or 5.33 per 1,000 population).	106 (12,254 beds, or 6.85 per 1,000 population—1956).
Infant mortality	51.7 per 1,000 population	32.3 per 1,000 population.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, on March 19, 1958, spoke to the Boys' Club of New York alumni on a very important subject, Juvenile Delinquency. Congressman SANTANGELO, while a State senator in New York, was selected as a member of the Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency. This commission made a thorough study of the problem throughout the State of New York, and as a result, Congressman SANTANGELO has become intimately familiar with many aspects of this troublesome problem. His speech furnishes a keen analysis of the causes, prevention, and control of juvenile delinquency, and will, I know, prove interesting and stimulating reading:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rolnitzky, Mr. Capra, members of the Boys' Club Alumni of New York, I am very pleased to speak to you on a subject which demands the most serious attention of all people in our community. At the outset, I want to compliment this organization for providing the opportunities for personal development for the youth of our city and permitting children to develop themselves culturally and physically. You demonstrate the essence of a successful life, a sound mind in a sound body. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to men like Peter Capra, your director, a dedicated citizen who is giving his time, attention, and energy toward your programs. I salute your membership and alumni who are providing the scholarships to all children regardless of race or religious background in secondary education and in colleges. If we had more men like your members, our city would be a better place in which to live.

I desire to speak to you about the broad subject of juvenile delinquency. I wish to talk about the nature, the extent of the problem, its causes, prevention, and control. More claptrap, hogwash, and balderdash has been uttered about juvenile delinquency, that as a result there exists a mass of confusion and loose bricks lying all around without any construction.

NATURE OF PROBLEM

The problem of juvenile delinquency forms a daily part of our newspaper reading. It is a common source of anxiety among parents, adults, and scary females. It is a frequent subject of discussion in the pulpit, in the lecture hall, the classroom, the clinics, and in meetings where the most wonderful asset of our life, our children, are seriously considered.

Each group tends to view the problem in terms of its own particular area of concern, whether it be law, religion and morality, social organization or personality development. In talking of juvenile delinquency, I am talking about persons under the age of 21 years whose conduct includes all unlawful or persistently antisocial behavior.

Certainly the problem is a legal problem. It involves provisions of law, statutes for their punishment and for their treatment. Certainly it is a moral and religious problem also, involving values by which men order their lives and their conduct. Certainly also it is a social problem, involving a threat to a stable society by children who are maladjusted and antisocial. Finally it is a problem of personal development that affects not only the individual delinquent himself, but also the church, the home, the school, the health services, the character-development agencies, and other community groups. Adding it all together, it is a challenge.

That challenge we accept.

EXTENT OF PROBLEM

To read the newspapers, one would think the youth of our country is in revolution, that they have run riot, and that rebels without causes have taken over the Government. Newspapers for their own personal gain have glorified and dramatized the problem to such an extent that the public and even the world believes that our country is basically morally rotten and that our rottenness has permeated our children. The facts belie such impressions. Statistics show that 1 out of 161 children comes to the attention of the courts. Six and two-tenths out of 1,000 are involved in acts of juvenile delinquency. This amounts to six-tenths of 1 percent. Other statistics increase the amount to tremendous proportions of 2 percent of our youth. At any rate, 98 percent of our children walk through the corridor of life called adolescence without running into trouble or beating their heads against the walls. We are not concerning ourselves here with the 98 percent, but with those 2 percent.

On a nationwide basis, delinquency increased from 1940 to 1954 at a rate of 102 percent. The high level of juvenile delinquency was reached during the war years and declined through 1948. The increase between 1948 and 1954 was 58 percent. While our child population increased by 13 percent from 1948 to 1954, juvenile delinquency in that same period increased by 58 percent, or approximately 4 times the growth of the rate of increase of our youth. In the State of New York, the total increase of juvenile delinquency from 1940 to 1954 was 37 percent, as compared to a national average of 102 percent. Obviously the city of New York is not the den of iniquity that certain people portray it. My experience on the Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency disclosed that juvenile delinquency was relatively higher in urban centers than in rural centers or communities. The nature of the acts of delinquency also differed in these communities.

While there has been a relatively small proportion of young people involved in acts of delinquency and the rate of increase has not been of mountainous proportions, the instruments of evil and destruction which the children have in their possession and which they use in the perpetration of their horrible deeds have frightened and terrorized our community. While the numbers are small, nonetheless we must give serious consideration to and examine thoroughly our legal practices and our social measures.

THE CAUSES

There is no one cause for juvenile delinquency. There are many and varied causes. My conclusion has been that the major causes are as follows:

1. A breakdown in respect for authority, both for the State and for the family.

2. There is a breakdown in the family, because of increasing divorces, the absence of parents from the home and its corollary, a lack of love and affection. Of course, we also find in certain instances, a smother love of the overly protective parent which brings about juvenile delinquency.

3. Thirdly, and most important, the youth of our country have a feeling of frustration, of not being wanted. This feeling gives rise to a rebellion within them, so that they are truly rebels without causes. They experience a feeling of not being wanted in the home, in the school group or in the community.

They struggle for recognition and desire to be recognized in some form or another.

As a resident of this town, New York, I have looked about and seen a breakdown in respect for authority. The young boy is a mimic and just as we see God in our own image—just as the Negro sees God as a Negro and the mouse visualizes God as a bat, so do the young men adore the apparently prosperous and influential people around him. When a young boy sees a racketeer sporting around in a flashy car, with a quick buck for spending in a local bar or bistro, he is overwhelmed with admiration and perhaps seeks to emulate that character. The bookmaker on the corner or the policy runner who is always ready with a roll has his influence on the kid playing ball in the street. The young boy who sees the cop get his payoff from the bookmaker or policy runner thinks that all cops are crooked and dishonest and that if he should get into trouble he too could pay and get off unscathed. He is in for a rude awakening when he finds that except for the practices connected with gambling, cops are inherently honest and will arrest and prosecute crimes of violence, larceny and homicide. The young man who is fortunate enough to live on the same block as does a baseball or other athletic star is living in the proper climate. He seeks to emulate or imitate that athlete. If fortunately the boy lives on the same street as a Perry Como or Jerry Lewis or similar great entertainer, he aspires to be one of them. Our economic ghettos and our trend toward communities where only the poor live and where there is not a variety of people, tends to eliminate the opportunity for helpful idolatry and hero worship. Few children admire lawyers because on the street lawyers may be considered shysters and not great men. We as lawyers must look inward to see whether or not we are carrying out our part of our destiny, that is, to be an inspiration to the young man on the street corner and on the street.

In my own opinion, I believe that our mass mediums are instrumental, more instrumental than I care to admit, in the provocation and spread of juvenile delinquency. A young man's mind is inflamed by newspaper stories of shootings, killings, and gang wars. If he does not get the idea from the street corner, he picks it up from the newspapers and television. Recently on television was publicized the making of "zip" guns, together with the method of making them. I, for one, never knew how to make a "zip" gun and learned the technique on TV. I am sure that thousands of boys also saw the same display. Newspapers inveigh against the horror magazines, but I believe that the yellow journalists and the tabloids have created more harm than they realize as a result of their publicity, they unwittingly glorify the young hoodlum.

Our Constitution guarantees freedom of the but the press has failed to regulate its own publications. The press contributes in more ways than one toward the climate of juvenile delinquency and in many instances by its publicity destroys the residue of good within a boy and by its quixotic attacks at windmills prevent public officials at times from doing what is right for fear of being pilloried and destroyed.

PREVENTION

The problem today is, what are we going go to to prevent juvenile delinquency? My solution is to restore respect for authority and to instill in the youth of our country a feeling of belonging, with a desire to do good.

We must restore the responsibility to the persons and the places where it can do the most good and where by nature and circumstances the most can be accomplished. We must restore responsibility to the parents. This is a primary responsibility. You are all aware that where the parents pay attention to their children and where they are at home sharing in common pleasures, there is less apt to be outbreaks of delinquency. Because of broken homes, children are thrown into the streets, torn between conflicting interests.

As a result of the hearings held by the New York State Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency, I introduced a bill which became the law of the State of New York and which unfortunately our social minded judges are not inclined to enforce. This bill provided that when a young man got into trouble, a judge of the domestic relations court could call the parents in and impose conditions upon the parents, which were reasonably calculated to prevent the recurrance of juvenile delinquency. Where the parents willfully disobeyed the conditions imposed by the court, the court could impose a fine or sentence on the parent. Forewarned is being forearmed and while a parent may have an excuse because he did not know where his children were, once he has been apprised he must assume that duty of controlling that which his own acts created.

That solution, of course, is not a cure-all. We also must restore teacher responsibility. The teaching profession has been struggling for decent wages and for better educational plants. Our public schools are overcrowded. Teachers fear the disciplining of children because they fear they will lose their jobs, which means their bread and butter. I for one would strengthen the hands of the teachers by permitting them to exercise discipline, to use the rod where the occasion permitted it and to grant immunity to the teachers for their disciplinary action. Boys who know that teachers may utilize the rod are less likely to challenge their authority. Parents are to blame because they fail to support a teacher who stands in loco parentis when the teacher and child come into conflict. I would require parents to give permission to teachers to practice discipline in accordance with their judgment. Where the parent refuses to give such consent, I would authorize the teachers to expell the children or call the parents to book because of the child's lack of respect, intransigence or belligerence. Some people may say that schools are overcrowded and that teachers cannot cope with overcrowded classes. That is a lame excuse. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the parochial schools. They too are overcrowded but in the main there is no disciplinary problem in these schools. Children in parochial schools are encouraged to participate in school plays, choral groups, games and speeches. The parents are also called upon, ad nauseum, to share the children's activities and to view the results of their children's histrionic talents. The enforced attendance by parents at these functions creates both interest and a common endeavor which promotes understanding, affection, love and respect one for the other. The public schools can well profit from this example. However, people are afraid to talk about parochial schools and their methods because of the fear that one is recommending a union of church and state.

A young man's leisure hours are a source of temptation and a climate in which he can get into trouble. They are supplementary to the home and to the school. Keep a boy busy in sports and activities and you will normally keep him out of trouble. He should be encouraged to participate in school and also out of school in baseball, basketball, chess, and other activities. I cannot pay too much tribute to organizations such as the Boys Club, who fill in the hours for young men to provide stimulation and joint activity, who give the young men a feeling of belonging and recognize an achievement regardless of its importance. The Big Brother movement is a tremendous life in our area. The Boy Scouts of America do a yeoman job and give the boys an opportunity to participate and also to receive vacations in the country, away from the sultry heat of the city streets.

Our parks give needed recreational facilities but for the poor boy they are too far away and not accessible. The playgrounds in the housing communities afford better opportunity and better avenues of release of energies. We have very few tennis courts and our playgrounds in the county of New York are not easily accessible to the teenager. In the rural sections, I have seen with pleasure the efficacy of the 4–H clubs which provide for a development of skills and ready outlets for the young man's energy. The Police Athletic League renders a great deal of service and affords various outlets to the young boys. Of course all these activities cater to the great bulk of our youth, the 98 percent. Our job is to take care of the other one-half of 1 to 2 percent of the boys who are juvenile delinquents. The police department can be of great assistance and can make or break a young man with its understanding. Wholesale arrests and roundups by scary police officers, who lock up groups of boys who are overly active but not criminals do not help the situation. Police officers, before coming into the force, should receive courses on psychology. More foot patrolmen would be of great assistance because the greatest deterrent either to crime or juvenile delinquency is the presence of a bluecoat walking up and down the street making himself part of the community life.

The courts can be of great assistance. I think everything should be done to prevent that first arrest and judges, many of them who have understanding, will dismiss cases so that there shall be no arrest but only a scolding. Lawyers can also prevent crime by talking to these juvenile delinquents as "dutch uncles." While they think their job is to "beat the rap," I think we as lawyers have a duty to ourselves and to the children to moralize with them and to encourage them to stay out of future mischief.

Government can provide an expanded housing program, for low-income people which provides decent accommodations. While a poor home is not a certain source of juvenile delinquency, decent housing accommodations do not embitter children of their surroundings and we can at least provide these with modern utilities and decent sanitary conditions.

The Federal Government, the State and the city can also assist. The Federal Government can give grants-in-aid to support programs which are designed to encourage the development and growth of children. The Division of Juvenile delinquency in the Federal Government is understaffed and undermanned and while it performs a valuable function, it can be expanded. The State of New York, as a result of a bill which I introduced, has created a permanent State Youth Commission, under the chairmanship of Mark McClosky. It is the function of the State Youth Commission to coordinate State governmental programs, to work with the local communities in promoting and expanding recreational centers, programs, and to provide the funds for local groups which are working in this common struggle to prevent and eliminate juvenile delinquency. The city of New York, by opening the school playgrounds after school, has been doing a great job not only through its educational system but also through its police department. There are many other methods of preventing it, but each one of us has the responsibility to set an example by being models of virtue and still comport ourselves as human beings.

REHABILITATION

We talk a great deal about rehabilitating the juvenile delinquent and the youthful offender, but we do very little about it actually. The famous Glueck's made a survey and found out that within 5 years 85 percent of the children who were guilty of delinquency repeated and transgressed once again. This is a horrible indictment of our

system. We little realize that when a boy gets into trouble he is actually condemned to menial employment and to second-rate citizenship. Every agency of government interposes its strength to keep this child from becoming a useful citizen and losing himself in the anonymity of every day life. A boy, after making a mistake, receives the blessing of our youthful offender law, gets a break and, being released, resolves to walk the straight and narrow path. He applies for a job—civil service closes its doors to him. He cannot become a police officer because the police department under the leadership of its police commissioner not only refuses appointments to boys who have made one mistake but also extends the principle of refusing appointment to a boy whose father has been a convict. The boy cannot even get a job cleaning the streets because civil service will not approve or certify him as qualified. He cannot get a liquor license because the ABC and the State liquor board will refuse him a license. He cannot even become a barber because that requires a license. If his crime has been a serious one, the docks and waterfront are closed to him. The State civil service also closes its doors. He can't get a Government clerical job—the Post Office Department will not even let him carry letters. The electricians and plumbers deny him, as a license is required. If he wants to drive a truck, he needs a driver's license and perhaps he cannot even get a driver's license. Even if he wants to be a grocer, he finds himself handicapped, because he might need a beer license and can't get it. Where is he to turn? He can only hold jobs which are menial and which pay little. The road back is difficult. Not only are obstacles put in front of him by the State and Federal Governments, but now the New York City Housing Authority has adopted a program to evict the families of boys who have gotten into trouble. One hundred and seventy families have been evicted and many others are threatened with eviction.

During my senatorial career in the New York State Senate I made a recommendation and introduced a bill which redefined the term "arrest." A person who has been adjudicated a juvenile delinquent or youthful offender should not be considered as a person having been arrested. In this way, a boy would be able to say truthfully, as on a civil service questionnaire, that he has never been arrested. We public officials will not take the responsibility to give a juvenile delinquent or youthful offender a chance to gain public employment. We act this way because we know that if the boy transgresses once again a newspaper will call for the removal of this public official. It requires courage for a public official to give such a boy an opportunity in public employment and there are very few with such courage. Despite these obstacles some boys rehabilitate themselves. I salute them.

Members of the boys club, it has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to talk with you and if I have been too long please believe that I feel like Mark Twain who was called upon to speak, and after making a long speech, said: "Please forgive the length of my speech, I didn't have time a prepare a short one."

Trial by Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, to the Louisiana State Bar Association meeting at Alexandria, La., in November 1957, on the subject of Trial by Jury. Representative WILLIS is a member of the Judiciary Committee and one of the most able and learned lawyers in the House of Representatives. His address deals with a subject that is fundamental, and the subject and the address should be of concern to every Member of the Congress, as well as to the people of the country generally.

I concur wholeheartedly with the views so ably expressed by Representative WILLIS. The jury trial is one of our most cherished and privileged possessions, and it is imperative that it be held sacred. I regret to have to say that there are a number of organizations in the country which have little or no regard for the principles of liberty upon which this country is based. I agree with Mr. WILLIS that in all criminal prosecutions a man has an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to be confronted with his accusers and witnesses, to call for evidence in his behalf, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of his vicinage, without whose unanimous consent he cannot be found guilty.

The address of Mr. WILLIS is as follows:

(By Edwin Willis)

The origin of trial by jury is disputed by historians. It is evident, however, that the principle of trial by jury emanated from the sense of justice and fair play of our ancestors. This is clear when one studies the forms of trials that existed among all nations in primitive times.

As far back as the ancient days of the Greek and Roman emperors we can discern modes for the settlement of disputes which resemble our concept of modern juries. The Roman tribunal was somewhat similar to the modern jury but they employed men possessed of legal knowledge in place of a formal judge. The Romans also had a procedure comparable to our present system for challenging jurors.

The old custom of the Roman emperor in summoning before him persons who lived in the neighborhood to declare under oath their knowledge with respect to facts of public interest was indeed the germ of the modern trial by jury.

RIGHT OF EXAMINATION

In the early Middle Ages this Roman procedure was employed on ecclesiastical questions by Frankish bishops and by Charlemaine and the other Frankish kings in connection with civil issues. Some centuries later we find virtually the same custom in the inquisition processes employed by the Norman dukes.

I digress to point out another right which not only implements the jury system, but without which jury trial would be completely ineffective. I refer to the right of an accused to confront and cross-examine his accusers. We have it on highest authority that this particular right was derived directly from the Romans. Except for it, one of the most courageous and profound of all the early Christians would have been doomed to die on the cross, as did the Master before him.

At the second trial of St. Paul before Festus, the so-called witnesses did not testify. Instead Tertullus, the orator, made this argument:

"We have found this man to be a pest, a promoter of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sedition of the Nazarene sect."

Paul said, "I am standing at the tribunal of Caesar; there I ought to be tried. To the Jews I have done no wrong, as thou thyself very well knowest. For if I have done any wrong or committed a crime deserving of death, I do not refuse to die. But if there is no ground to their charges against me, no one can give me up to them; I appeal to Caesar."

Then Festus, the Roman governor, made this ruling:

"Thou hast appealed to Caesar; to Caesar thou shalt go * * * Romans are not accustomed to give any man up before the accused has met his accusers face to face and has been given a chance to defend himself against the charges."

But, regardless of the true origin of trial by jury, there is no dispute that the system, as we know it today in America, was derived from England.

During the reign of Alfred the Great, from 871 to 901 A. D., we can find semblance of settlement of disputes by juries. But the common-law system of trial by jury developed from the 10th to the 16th centuries. William the Conqueror employed the jury system, as it existed in 1085, in compiling the Doomsday Book.

In the early days trial by jury was not a matter of right, but merely a privilege, to be granted or withheld as a favor of the King. Henry II did encourage jury trials during his reign in the latter half of the 12th century. He also employed a jury for indicting those individuals who had violated the King's peace by the commission of serious crime.

During this period of development the function of the jury was not to render a verdict but to supply evidence on oath as witnesses do today. The ancient jury was very similar to our modern concept of the grand jury, to the extent that the evidence amounted to an indictment.

Until the 13th century, however, this indictment by the jury was followed by a trial by ordeal, battle or comporgation. It was dissatisfaction with such modes of trial, and the opposition of the church, which finally led to the acceptance of the opinion of a second jury, a deciding one. Here we see a resemblance of our petit jury.

MODERN SYSTEM

The abuses of King John resulted in changing the privilege of a trial by jury to a right. This ended the practice of selling and buying writs, which had flourished under him. The Magna Carta, granted at Runnymede in 1215, provided that no free man should be impoverished, dispossessed or in anyway detained, except by the fair judgment of his peers and according to the law of the land. Here was the true beginning of our system of trial by jury, as a fundamental right.

The history of trial by jury during the Middle Ages is replete with incidents of abuse of, and hostility for, this system by kings and their ministers. They converted the process of attaint, which was originally devised to provide extra protection for the accused and to be a royal weapon against the corruption of justice, into an attack on the jury itself. Thus, if they considered a verdict by a jury unjust, they preferred charges against its members and tried them before the star-chamber court, which functioned without a jury. That court over the years became an instrument for religious and political persecution. That institution, with its denial of a jury trial, was one of the main causes for the downfall of Charles I and his ultimate beheading.

In 1641, when Parliament obtained the upper hand, one of its first acts was to abolish the star-chamber court and to assert the right of every Englishman to a fair and open judgment by his peers. It also abolished the right to punish jurors for verdicts considered to be unjust, and substituted therefor the remedy of a new trial. Actions of attaint were prohibited in 1670 in the famous Bushell case when a judge at-

tempted to imprison a whole jury for a verdict with which he disagreed.

There were other instances of intimidation of juries during these years. The actions of bloody Judge Jeffries were notorious. However, public acceptance and confidence in the verdicts of juries overcame all such attacks. Able and courageous leaders of the English bar, such as Erskine, Coke, Bacon, Burke, and Fox led the fight to preserve the sanctity of jury verdicts.

During and after the French Revolution, fear of revolutionary elements led to repressive censorship and limitations of civil liberties in England. In 1793 habeas corpus in certain cases was suspended. Fox led the movement which resulted in repealing the suspension.

POWERS EXTENDED

In 1792, Fox had also been responsible for a new libel law which extended the power of juries to decide the whole case, both as to the law and the fact. Here, indeed, was a victory for democracy and trial by jury. And since the beginning of the 19th century, there has been very little threat to the right of trial by jury in criminal cases in England.

The old adage that distance lends enchantment did not apply among the American colonists in their relationship with the English Crown. Although the same conditions on the whole prevailed in colonial America as in 18th century England, with respect to the administration of justice and trial by jury, the attitude of the colonists was from the beginning different. Being in no position to fear feudal exactions of exploitations, the colonists looked upon the king not as their protector but rather as the potential aggressor upon their rights. In this spirit they protested every effort to curtail trial by jury as an act of tyranny.

Thus the English Parliament passed the famous Navigation Acts and in 1696 reorganized the admiralty courts so as to better cope with flagrant smuggling in and out of the Colonies. These admiralty courts, however, were not part of the traditional common law system and did not provide for a trial by jury. As a result, English or English-appointed judges frequently sentenced American seamen and merchants arbitrarily. The more effective these courts became, the more the colonists resented them, and the more they came to insist upon trial by jury as a fundamental right.

The Stamp Act of 1764, offensive enough in its imposition of taxation without representation, added insult to injury by providing that all violators were to be tried in the admiralty courts where trial by jury is not provided. The Americans did not accept the British view that Parliament was completely sovereign, and could constitutionally pass any measure it chose. In their eyes, the Stamp Act was, among other things, a clear effort to bypass and thus to deprive them of the right to trial by jury. The reaction against it was so strong that it prompted the Colonies to pass acts of nullification. The Virginia resolution, introduced by Patrick Henry, the Stamp Act Congress, and, above all, the boycott of all English merchandise, forced the repeal of the Stamp Act.

This effort on the part of the English Parliament to bypass jury trial was to be repeated by the American Congress almost 200 years later in connection with so-called civil rights legislation, except that equity instead of admiralty courts were to be the instrument.

The final British effort to tamper with the traditional trial by jury in the colonies came with the misnamed act for the impartial administration of justice. This was one of the intolerable acts passed in 1744 as a realiatory measure for the Boston Tea Party. This act provided that certain offenders were to be transported to England for trial there. This repudiation of the colonists' own right to judge their fellow citizens was one of the last acts which made reconciliation with England impossible, and thus provoked the war for American independence.

RIGHT PRESERVED

It was in the light of this background that the Founding Fathers were determined to preserve and perpetuate the jury system when our Constitution was adopted.

It is illuminating to note, however, that there was no real controversy in respect to trial by jury in criminal cases. In fact, jury trial in criminal cases was provided for in section 2 of article 3 of the original Constitution. The seventh provision of the Bill of Rights refers to trial by jury in civil cases. Here the colonists were erecting a barrier against extension of any power, even in civil cases, comparable to that which had been vested in and exercised by the admiralty courts during the domination of England.

Jefferson was in Paris at the time of the adoption of the original Constitution. During the time of the great debates on the proposition to ratify the original instrument in the conventions of the several States, Jefferson wrote from Paris to a friend:

"There are instruments for administering the government so clearly trustworthy that we should never leave the legislature at liberty to change them. The new Constitution has secured these in the executive and legislative departments, but not in the judiciary. It should have established trials by the people themselves, that is to say, by jury."

Accordingly, our forefathers imbedded jury trials even in civil cases as part of the Bill of Rights. And the constitutional guarantee of the right to jury trial has withstood the most severe stresses and strains in our turbulent history.

Thus, the fear of the panic created by the French Revolution hit America with such force that it prompted the passage of the Alien and Sedition laws dealing with treason, and curtailing the right to criticize our Government. But devotion to the principle of trial by jury was so deeply imbedded in the minds of our ancestors that no one had the temerity to suggest the elimination of trial by jury under these laws.

SYSTEM NEVER SUSPENDED

In fact, in our entire history, when the greatest of threats have been leveled at the very existence of our Government itself, trial by jury has never been suspended; not even in wartime. It was preserved during the trying days of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the War Between the States, and through two world wars.

It is this deep-rooted belief in trial by jury that is responsible for the law and jurisprudence to the effect that citizens cannot be tried by the military courts in this country.

There is one exception, however, to this history of trial by jury in America, and that is during the reconstruction era. It was the most flagrant example in our history of a peacetime suspension of the right of trial by jury. It was accomplished by the establishment of military governments in areas where fighting had ended. But the excesses of the military governors and of the carpetbaggers and scalawags who surrounded them aroused public hostility. This deliberate repudiation of all the philosophy upon which the Constitution was conceived caused the reconstruction acts to be condemned by all men of good will.

EROSION OF RIGHTS

Despite the provisions of the Bill of Rights, however, trial by jury has been gradually eliminated in civil proceedings before so-called administrative bodies and tribunals. The Honorable David F. Maxwell, former president of the American Bar Association, had this to say on the subject:

"For some time I have been deeply concerned by the insidious process which has been gradually eroding our right to trial by jury in civil cases. The right of trial by jury is firmly imbedded in the American system of jurisprudence and is as old as the country itself. Reference to it is found in the Declaration of Independence, which deplores the abuses and usurpation by George III 'depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury.' Article VII of the Bill of Rights guarantees trial by jury 'in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars.'

"Yet, during the past half century, bit by bit, there has been a whittling away of jury jurisdiction. Arbitration has replaced the jury trial in many areas, notably in the motion picture, building trades and textile industries, and generally in the field of labor law.

"Various administrative bodies and tribunals, both on a Federal and State level, are determining the rights of citizens in a manner affecting their everyday lives, without the benefit of juries. In Saskatchewan, Canada, such a board is vested with authority to award damages in automobile accident cases on the basis of liability without fault, and there are many authorities in this country advocating the adoption of a similar system here. The Compulsory Arbitration Act in Pennsylvania, adopted in 1952, provides that the trial court may, by appropriate rule, substitute arbitration for trial by jury when the amount in controversy is $1,000 or less, and the constitutionality of the act has been upheld by the supreme court of that State."

As one of those who firmly believes in trial by jury, I, too, was concerned about recent attempts to limit and circumscribe this constitutional right of our people.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION

Thus, we heard and learned a great deal about the precious right of trial by jury during the debates on so-called civil-rights legislation in the Congress last year. A discussion of civil rights is, of course, beyond the scope of this assignment, but I mention our experience because it provided a new meaning to jury trials as a fundamental right.

The question was not whether, after trial of an injunction suit on its merits, a person charged with contempt of court for violating the injunction decree is entitled to be tried by jury. And no amout of specious argument by the proponents of the bill could make it so. The proposition was whether we should substitute an initial civil remedy for a present criminal prosecution as was accomplished through the admiralty courts during colonial days.

Thus, for the last 70 years or more a person charged with depriving another of any conceivable civil right, including his right to vote, can be prosecuted and tried, but only before a jury of his peers. Forsaking principle for expediency, Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General of the United States, took the position, however, that the jury system is no longer to be trusted in so-called civil rights cases.

NEW REMEDY CREATED

Accordingly, a new remedy was created. But, mind you, the new cause of action is not granted to the persons aggrieved. It is to be exercised exclusively by the Attorney General. The class injunction suit is to be filed in the name of the United States against the people of a whole community and the action can be brought without the consent and even over the protest of the real parties at interest, a reprehensible practice for which a lawyer could be disbarred.

Stated differently, the real issue was whether Congress could, as a matter of good constitutional law, or should, as a matter of

cynical congressional policy, pervert equity courts as criminal tribunals.

We did succeed in providing a jury trial in certain criminal contempt proceedings which can result in imprisonment. From my point of view, the jury trial provision is far from satisfactory, but it was the best we could imbed in the so-called civil rights bill. In any event, if this limited provision can serve as a challenge to succeeding Congresses and to the members of the bar to continue the fight against further erosion of jury trial as a fundamental right, I think our efforts will not have been in vain.

Reports on Bills To Authorize the Enforcement of State Statutes Prescribing Criminal Penalties for Subversive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, several bills have been introduced to correct the so-called wrong of the Supreme Court in connection with the case of Pennsylvania against Nelson. Much of the criticism against the Supreme Court is motivated by dissatisfaction with the Supreme Court's decision and its liberal viewpoint. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, after an exhaustive study, opposed H. R. 977 and S. 654, which seeks to correct the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Pennsylvania against Nelson. For those who seek an unbiased, unprejudiced viewpoint regarding the decision, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the bar of the city of New York, which opposes the enactment of the proposed legislation in H. R. 977 and S. 654.

REPORTS ON BILLS TO AUTHORIZE THE ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

In *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U. S. 497 (1956)), the United States Supreme Court held that the Pennsylvania sedition statute was superseded in view of the scheme of Federal antisubversive legislation by which, the Court concluded, the Federal Government had occupied the field and precluded State intervention with respect to the same offenses. This holding had the effect of rendering unenforceable similar statutory provisions in other States. After the Nelson decision, the Committee on the Judiciary of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, during the 84th Congress, 2d session, recommended the passage of bills which would permit the enforcement of any State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for sedition against the United States or any State, unless Congress specifically prohibits their enforcement.

Three bills to the same effect have been introduced in the present Congress. Of these, the bills presently under consideration are H. R. 977 and S. 654, which are companion bills corresponding to the bill approved in the last Congress by the House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary. Their text is set forth as an appendix.

In the Nelson case, the defendant, an acknowledged member of the Communist Party, was convicted in a Pennsylvania State court of a violation of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act. Nelson was also convicted in a Federal court of violating the Smith Act (18 U. S. C., sec. 2385) and the Federal general conspiracy statute (18 U. S. C., sec. 371). The supreme court of Pennsylvania reversed the conviction under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act on the ground that the Federal Smith Act superseded the enforceability of the State sedition statute which proscribes the same conduct. The Court emphasized that the evidence against Nelson related solely to alleged sedition against the United States, and in no respect was directed against the government of Pennsylvania as such. The United States Supreme Court upheld the ruling of Pennsylvania's highest court in the decision *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U. S. 497 (1956)) which the bills under discussion seek to reverse.

The Supreme Court's decision was rested on three principal grounds, which may be summarized as follows: (1) The Congress determined in 1940 that it was necessary for it to reenter the field of antisubversive legislation from which it had largely abstained since the end of World War I. Thereupon and in succeeding years, Congress enacted a series of statutes which includes, among others: the Smith Act, proscribing advocacy of the overthrow of any government—Federal, State or local—and membership in a group which so advocates; the Internal Security Act of 1950, requiring registration of Communist action organizations and Communist-front organizations, and registration of the members of the former; and the Communist Control Act of 1954, imposing further penalties on the Communist Party and the members thereof, and upon Communist-infiltrated organizations. This scheme of Federal legislation creates a pervasive totality of Federal regulation, which makes inescapable the conclusion that Congress has intended to occupy the field of sedition * * * and no room has been left for the States to supplement it. Therefore, a State sedition statute is superseded regardless of whether it purports to supplement the Federal law. (2) The Federal statutes touch a field in which the Federal interest is so dominant that the Federal system must be assumed to preclude enforcement of State laws on the same subject, in accordance with the principles enunciated in such decisions as *Rice* v. *Santa Fe Elevator Corp.*, (331 U. S. 218 (1947)) and *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* (312 U. S. 52 (1941)). (3) Enforcement of State sedition acts presetns a serious danger of conflict with the administration of the Federal program.

The Court's decision appears sound on the basis of the stated reasoning. The precedents relied upon foreshadowed the result, which was predicted and has been favorably viewed by legal commentators. However, the question now presented is not whether the Supreme Court correctly read the intent of Congress at the time of the enactment of the various antisubversive statutes, but rather whether it is wise national policy for Congress at this time to revitalize the State sedition statutes, and whether this result should be sought by the enactment of the proposed legislation. The committee believes that both of these questions must be answered in the negative.

1. The bill under discussion would single out criminal statutes relating to subversion and advocacy thereof for extraordinary and indiscriminate treatment in determining the interrelationship of all Federal and State statutes concerned with these subjects. The usual method of determining the enforceability of State legislation in relation to Federal enactments has been judicial determination on a case-by-case basis, so that evaluation may be made of the impact of Federal and State acts on one another in terms of practical operation and the national or local problems presented. The bills would displace this usual method of Federal-State accommodation by a blanket declaration that, "except to the extent specifically provided by any statute hereafter enacted by the Congress," no State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for sedition against or overthrow of Federal or State Government shall be unenforcible by reason of existing Federal legislation, or any future Federal legislation.

Some 42 State statutory provisions would immediately be revitalized, all of them primarily directed against overthrow of the United States Government, bearing such diverse titles as antisedition laws, criminal anarchy laws and criminal syndicalist laws. Even more diverse are the substantive and procedural provisions of the various statutes, some having provisions plainly at variance with the Federal legislation; others being vague and lacking even in basic procedural safeguards. Some, like the Pennsylvania statute, would punish utterances which encourage any person "to commit any overt act with a view to bringing the Government of this State or of the United States into hatred or contempt," provisions which raise sharp constitutional questions as the Supreme Court specifically indicated. Yet the bill would at one swoop reanimate all these measures, without distinction or particularization.

Even if Congress were willing to take such blanket action with respect to all existing State statutes without detailed study of their diverse provisions, should it also be required to accept the burden of exercising continuing surveillance over all future State enactments which might adversely change or add to existing State legislation to the detriment of the Federal scheme? If Congress does not promptly enact Federal legislation to supersede such undesired new State acts, the courts will be utterly powerless to give relief if the bills under discussion are adopted. Moreover, continuing alertness by Congress to the mere provisions of all present and future State legislation would not alone suffice, for it is in the operation and specific applications of statutes that problems of inconsistency in interference become apparent. In the harmonizing of the statutes of our Federal and State governments, it has been pointed out that: "Proper accommodation is dependent on an empiric process, on case-to-case determinations. Abstract propositions and unquestioned generalities do not furnish the answer."

The pressures under which Congress operates in this dynamic era obviously do not render feasible its now undertaking to perform this painstaking empiric process presently carried on by the courts.

2. It is to be borne in mind that the conduct and advocacy for which Nelson was convicted under the Pennsylvania statute were directed toward the attempted overthrow of the United States Government. The same appears to be true with respect to prosecutions under virtually all the State statutes. This consideration adds support and emphasis to the determinations of both the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of the United States, that this legislation which seeks preservation of the Federal Government and the Republic touches a field in which the Federal interest is dominant. Decisions of the Supreme Court which have upheld enforceability of State legislation concurrently with comparable Federal legislation have usually stressed the existence of a predominantly local interest. But, as the Pennsylvania Supreme Court asserted in ruling against the State statute in Nelson: "Sedition against the United States is not a local offense. It is a crime against the Nation." The State court

also emphasized that so far as relates to the State's police needs: "There are many valid laws on Pennsylvania's statute books adequate for coping effectively with actual or threatened civil disturbances." Consequently, there is no basis for a contention that the present State sedition statute, and the comparable State acts, are necessary to the exercise of the State's police responsibilities.

It is clear that the problem of subversion against the Government of the United States is a national rather than a local problem. In this respect and others it bears a relationship to the crime of treason against the United States, punishment of which is confided under the Constitution to the Federal Government, and may not be subject to State prosecution. The present Federal antisubversive legislation further expressly indicates that considerations of international politics and foreign policy may also be involved. All these are factors which emphasize the need for a uniform national standard and an integrated centralized program, rather than suggesting a need for localized diversity of standards and decentralization of control, factors traditionally advanced in opposition to uniform Federal legislation. For more than a century, ever since *Cooley* v. *Board of Wardens of Port of Philadelphia* (12 How. (53 U. S.) 299 (1851)), such considerations have been recognized as highly significant by the courts in cases under the commerce clause. Where the subject matter has indicated the desirability of a uniform national system of regulation, rather than local diversity, the tendency has been to hold that the States are precluded from acting at all.

Consideration of the national character of the offense also brings into focus some practical problems of enforcement. As the Pennsylvania Supreme Court noted, a group advocating overthrow of the United States Government might well be but part of a larger group spread over a number of States. In prosecuting such an interstate group, the most successful results are likely to be achieved through a unified plan under centralized control, with careful determination as to the sequence and timing of the prosecution of the various participants. From the viewpoint of the overall Federal plan of attack, a State prosecution might well result in premature warning or harmful advance disclosure of evidence, as the State court suggested. Local prosecutors, whether motivated by personal ambitions, political opportunism, or merely by uninformed and misguided zeal, might thus hamper and frustrate effective Federal police and prosecutive activity with respect to important phases of the Federal legislative scheme. Even if this has not yet occurred, as the minority urges on the basis of the Department of Justice's brief in *Nelson*, it would represent a continuing threat as new personalities and new local political campaigns are injected into some or all of the 42 States whose sedition statutes are to be reanimated by the bill under discussion.

The mere fact that jurisdiction in the field is reserved to the Federal courts will surely not prevent the cooperation, when requested, of local law enforcement agencies with the Federal authorities. However, the Federal authorities should at all times exercise an overriding jurisdiction in this sensitive field, an impossibility if the local authorities are enforcing local rather than Federal statutes. It is submitted, therefore, that the proposed bills would hinder rather than augment the protection of our Nation from subversive activity.

3. Most important, problems of individual rights and traditional values are not to be ignored in the effort to guard our Nation against those who ignore or seek to trample on them. We have been wisely admonished that if this indifference to traditional values should spread to us, it would be the greatest threat to our own liberties.

A traditional value of paramount importance which would be adversely affected if the various State sedition acts are reanimated relates to the preservation of freedom of expression guaranteed by the first amendment. The State court was mindful of this problem in pointing out that State and Federal laws should be so administered as not to threaten the right of the individual to speak freely and without fear, even in criticism of the Government, it found this an additional factor weighing in favor of Federal supersession. The Federal legislation here involved has also been recognized as involving sensitive problems in the area of first amendment freedoms; indeed, in the first prosecution of Communist officials under the Smith act, the Supreme Court, while upholding the convictions, pointed out through Chief Justice Vinson that since "teaching and advocacy of the overthrow of the Government * * * contains an element of speech * * * we must pay special heed to the demands of the first amendment marking out the boundaries of speech."

We cannot ignore that impingements upon freedom of expression result from the existing Federal antisubversive legislation, and that they extend well beyond the confines of the courtroom alone. They necessarily include, in addition, FBI investigations, grand jury investigations, and investigations by committees of both Houses of Congress with all their glare of harsh publicity for the witness. It cannot be doubted that in the aggregate these measures create pressures causing some individuals to refuse to participate in virtually any organization, no matter how innocuous or worthy its avowed purposes, and to refrain in other ways from engaging, as stated by Justice Frankfurter, in the interchange of ideas particularly with respect to controversial subjects, where such interchange is most needed in solving the problems of a democratic society.

Yet the restrictions and pressures upon freedom of expression resulting from the Federal program have, nevertheless, been generally accepted in the interest of assuring the national security. But by reviving the State sedition statutes en masse, all these pressures and restrictions will be intensified and duplicated at the State level, in the State courts, the State investigative agencies and the State legislative committee.

We submit that our objective should be an efficient and integrated system designed to achieve our Nation's security with a minimum, not the maximum, of restrictions on fundamental rights. This is in harmony with the salutary judicial principal that when measures affect the freedoms that are basic to liberty, such measures must be narrowly drawn to meet the supposed evil, closely tailored to impose only so much restraint as is essential for the purpose. Those who would now impose additional retraints and penalties upon the citizenry must bear the burden of demonstrating their need in terms of the national interest and security. That demonstration has not been made, and cannot be made, with respect to the proposed legislation here discussed.

4. An especially troublesome facet of the problems resulting from the proposed duplication of antisubversion legislation at the State level is presented by the possibility of double or multiple prosecutions and punishment. The Supreme Court in Nelson expressly pointed out that it did not reach the question whether double or multiple punishment for the same overt acts directed against the United States has constitutional sanction. Even if it be assumed that the constitutional problem may be hurdled, the basic policy question will nevertheless remain. Where the same act has been held to constitute both a Federal and State offense, it is generally because the same physical act may offend a State policy and a different policy of the United States. Thus, in the classic case of *Fox* v. *Ohio* (46 U. S. (5 How.) 410 (1847), in sustaining a State conviction for the forging of counterfeit checks, the court reasoned that the Federal Government proscribed counterfeiting in order to protect the currency, while the State was punishing a private cheat upon its citizens. Here, however, the selfsame policy underlies both the Federal and the State legislation, and both would punish the very same conduct. In these circumstances, there seem peculiarly apposite the words of Mr. Justice Washington, writing in 1820: "To subject them (the defendants) to the operation of two laws upon the same subject dictated by distinct wills particularly in a case inflicting pains and penalties is to my apprehension something very much like oppression if not worse."

Under the Federal and State statutes here involved, the pains and penalties are both severe and disparate. Thus, the Federal Smith Act provides for a maximum imprisonment of 10 years and a fine of $10,000, and the Pennsylvania sedition statute for a term of 20 years and the same fine. In this very case, Nelson was convicted under the Smith Act, and was also convicted and sentenced under the State act to a prison term of 20 years, supplemented by a $10,000 fine and $13,000 as the costs of the State prosecution. Consequently, while Congress, with primary responsibility for the national security determined on a maximum 10-year sentence for this offense, this defendant would serve 30 years. Moreover, the Federal judge called upon to fix a fair sentence under the Federal Act cannot know whether the defendant will be subjected to additional and serious punishment for the same acts in consequence of one or more State prosecutions. This will necessarily impede fair and intelligent sentencing under the Federal legislation.

Prosecutions in the State courts would present still another troublesome consideration. Under the doctrine that the 14th amendment does not incorporate all of the guaranties of the Bill of Rights, State court prosecutions do not afford a defendant many of the important protections guaranteed in the Federal courts. Thus, for example, the fifth amendment's privilege against self-incrimination need not be observed in State court prosecutions, and evidence obtained by wiretapping and illegal searches and seizures may be received in evidence. Where a defendant is charged with acts of subversion against the Government of the United States, it seems anomalous and paradoxical that he should be subjected to prosecution in State courts which deprive him of very important protections guaranteed and required in the courts of the United States.

5. The thrust of the minority report is that in a nation of dual sovereignties, the States should not be deprived of all power in regard to sedition. Initially, this argument reflects a somewhat exaggerated view of the effect of the Nelson decision, for there is no inference that all State power will be eliminated in regard to detecting or preventing aspects of sedition which have local significance. Indeed, the Supreme Court has already upheld in unequivocal terms State laws requiring State employees to take an oath with respect to advocacy of overthrow of the State or Federal Government and to reveal Communist affiliation, and requiring teachers to meet similar standards.

The Nelson decision merely rules in favor of Federal supersession with respect to a crime of national importance, as to which the national interest is dominant, and on the basis of well-established principles, con-

sistent with past decisions on the interaction of State and Federal authority. The minority report acknowledges that in such earlier decisions as Gitlow, Whitney, Gilbert and Fox, upholding State sedition statutes, the question of Federal supersession held determinative in Nelson was not in issue. In those cases, either there was no Federal sedition legislation in force at the time or the point was not raised.

Nor can we attribute validity to the minority report's justification of the bills on the ground that the criteria confessedly being the intent of Congress, Congress is the logical body to declare such intent. This would constitute a mischievous oversimplification of the established, tried, and tested principles governing Federal-State accommodation which, as has previously been pointed out, entail an empiric process of judicial determination on a case-to-case basis. The draftsmen of the proposed legislation, as well as the minority here, implicitly acknowledge the soundness of this established procedure by leaving it untouched in all fields of legislation other than that relating to subversion. This highly sensitive field is alone singled out for blunderbuss congressional treatment, sealed off from normal judicial examination and accommodation.

The minority report's assertion that there are no sound reasons for Federal preemption in the field of sedition is sufficiently answered, we believe, by our preceding discussion pointing out the important national, individual, and civil liberties interests in support of a single and uniform Federal system of control. This in no way precludes, of course, the closest possible coordination between Federal and State officials in securing evidence concerning seditious activities for the purpose of insuring prompt and effective prosecutions under the various Federal statutes. For the reasons heretofore discussed, it is quite conceivable that this cooperation will be even closer and more effective than if there is a rivalry on each side to initiate its own prosecution, with all the attendant publicity and other advantages for the ambitious prosecutor.

Finally, the minority report argues that the States should be given power to prosecute subversion against the Federal Government in order to guard against the possibility of Communist penetration in positions capable of avoiding or preventing Federal punitive action. It is difficult to believe this melancholy conjecture is advanced seriously. If there is any inadequacy in the present loyalty and security measures relating to Federal personnel—as to which no showing whatever has been made—the logical remedy is to perfect those Federal security measures, rather than to shift vital national security responsibilities to the States. It is clearly illusory to assume that the national security would be enhanced by such dispersion of centralized responsibility, any more than national security would be enhanced if each State were placed in possession of all our defense secrets and nuclear weapons and its own army and navy, as a like precaution against subversion in high Federal posts.

We believe there is, as there must be, full confidence that the powerful investigative and prosecutory forces at the disposal of the Federal Government can be relied upon to continue, with complete loyalty, their vigorous enforcement of the comprehensive Federal antisubversion legislation heretofore enacted by the Congress.

We, therefore, propose the following resolution for adoption by the association:

Resolved, That the Association of the Bar of the City of New York opposes the enactment of the proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 977 and S. 654, 85th Congress, 1st session.

New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the World Almanac of 1958 lists many fine things about New Jersey.

One wishes that the Almanac had mentioned that the congressional delegation from New Jersey ranks among the first.

For the present, we shall have to be contented with the population, the motto, the bird, and the flower of New Jersey, its mountains, industry, waterways, crops, highways, and institutions, as follows:

NEW JERSEY: GARDEN STATE

Capital, Trenton; area, 7,836 square miles, rank, 45th; population (census of 1950), 4,835,329; rank, 8th; motto, Liberty and Prosperity; flower, Bogbice Violet; bird, Eastern Goldfinch; tree, red oak; third of the Original Thirteen States.

New Jersey, one of the Middle Atlantic States, is bounded north by New York, east by New York, the Hudson River and the Atlantic Ocean; south by the Atlantic and Delaware Bay; west by Delaware Bay, Delaware and Pennsylvania. One of the earliest lands to be settled by the Dutch early in the 17th century, it was the scene of much action in the American Revolution, developed iron furnaces and grist mills, and became a great industrial State.

There are low mountains in the northwest, and rolling hills leading down to a coastal area with many waterways and inlets. The Delaware River runs along its west line. Its shipping facilities make it a large freight terminal. It divides authority over tunnels and bridges with the Port of New York Authority and the State of Pennsylvania. Newark, Jersey City, Hoboken, Perth Amboy, and Camden handle shipping for foreign ports. New Jersey contributes a huge figure to the total tons of New York Harbor.

Highest point in High Point, Sussex County, 1803 feet, Delaware Water Gap, in the Kittatiny Mountains, is 900 feet wide between mountain sides, 1,600 feet high.

Represented in 90 percent of all industries, its more than 12,000 factories employ 323 classifications of labor. The State ranks first in the United States in dollar value of chemical products and has many laboratories for physical and chemical research. Important are electrical machinery, food products, textile products, apparel, transportation equipment, primary metal industries; petroleum and coal products, fabricated metal products.

Chief crops are corn, peppers, asparagus, beets, eggplant, lima beans, and potatoes. The principal fruits are apples, blueberries, cranberries, cherries, grapes, peaches, raspberries, and strawberries. New Jersey holds high rank in the poultry industry, dairying and the processing of vegetables, especially tomatoes. The first dairy cattle artificial insemination project in America was launched in Hunterdon County; also the common-carrier shipment of day-old baby chicks, now a multi-million-dollar business nationally.

Among New Jersey's institutions of higher learning are: 4 universities, including Princeton and Rutgers, the State university; the Institute for Advanced Study; 26 colleges; 8 professional and technological colleges.

Atlantic City, Ocean City, Cape May, Asbury Park, Ocean Grove, Wildwood, attract hundreds of thousands each year. There are 23 State parks with almost 27,000 acres, 11 State forests with more than 150,000 acres.

New Jersey's many points of historic and scenic interest include the Palisades, massive vertical wall of rock rising more than 500 feet above the Hudson River; Morristown National Historical Park, General Washington's winter camp site.

The State's network of modern highways has the highest ratio of multilane mileage in the Nation. Included are the 118-mile New Jersey Turnpike, Garden State Parkway (165 miles, Paramus to Cape May), Newark had the first great air terminal in the United States.

Chief railways: Pennsylvania, Lackawanna, Jersey Central, Erie, Lehigh, West Shore, B. & O., Reading.

New Technique for Water Supply Meets Strict Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, an article in the magazine The Plant entitled "New Technique for Water Supply Meets Strict Requirements" has come to my attention.

The problem of water supplies has been given much attention in recent years due to seasonal local shortages and regional droughts. These conditions, together with increasing calls for more water, point up the fact that water is not in unlimited supply.

In light of these conditions, it is most encouraging to note any well-planned effort on the part of a regional group, a community, or an industry to make more intelligent use of water supplies.

This article tells clearly how the Flick-Reedy Corp. is building just west of Chicago a plant which will provide its own water supplies from the rain that falls on its land. This firm's thoughtful solution to the water problem should be brought to the attention of all industrial firms which are planning new plants or replacement programs in the period ahead.

The article follows:

NEW TECHNIQUE FOR WATER SUPPLY MEETS STRICT REQUIREMENTS

All water needed for air conditioning and other industrial purposes at the new $2,300,000 metal-fabricating plant nearing completion at Bensenville, Ill., for the Flick-Reedy Corp., well-known manufacturer of industrial air and hydraulic cylinders, will be drawn from manmade lagoons. This completely internal system for supplying process water is unique in that it is independent of any outside source of supply and will rely upon nature and an effective means of collection to keep sufficient water in the storage reservoirs. The system provides up to 18,000 gallons of water per hour for the plant's designed level of operation. Esti-

mated cost of water is only one-half cent per thousand gallons.

As finally evolved, the system is comprised of two supply lagoons, which overflow into a sanitary lagoon. Excavated from the heavy soil of the plant site, each supply reservoir is 75 feet wide, 600 feet long, and has an average depth of 5 feet. Maximum capacity is 1,800,000 gallons per lagoon.

The lagoons are supplied by rainwater collected from the 5-acre roof area of the 220,000-square-foot plant and from 5 acres of paved parking areas. Each inch of rainfall (annual rainfall in Illinois is approximately 37 inches) results in a potential 10-inch rise in the storage ponds * * * or 280,000 gallons of water. Since rainwater is soft, no treatment is needed before use in the plant's processes.

Water for clean operations, such as cooling and heat treating, will, be returned directly to the lagoons after it has served its purpose. However, water for such operations as ferric oxide plating will not be returned immediately but first passed through several phases of treatment.

Upon discharge from the plant, the contaminated water will be transferred to a halding tank, retailed for a short period while sediment and heavy wastes fall to the bottom, and chemically neutralized. Next it will move to a small aerator-type sewerage unit and after treatment flow to the sanitary lagoon.

Water for drinking and other personal use is drawn from a deep well on the plant site; thus no dependence is placed on municipal supplies.

Smashing through the water barrier by means of an internal water system meant much to DuPage County as well as to the company. The Flick-Reedy plant is the first manufacturing facility to go up in 20 years in an area expected to accommodate much of Chicago's future industrial growth (Bensenville is about 15 miles northwest of Chicago's Loop). In seeking an orderly industrial development and thereby avoiding the staggering difficulties encountered in some communities which have grown without proper planning, county officials have adopted a strict water-conservation program which gives consideration to water tables, drainage and flood control, and to demands on water-producing and sewerage facilities.

Mr. Sweeney's Rare Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis Times:

MR. SWEENEY'S RARE IDEA

We don't know Mr. James C. Sweeney, 7701 West Chester Pike, Upper Darby, Pa. Know nothing about him, either.

But Mr. Sweeney has sent us a novel idea—an idea practically no one has mentioned in years and years. In the whipped-up recession excitement of current Washington, it is, indeed, unmentionable.

All Mr. Sweeney has in mind is this: Each year when the Federal budget is made up, put a little something in the pot to pay on the debt. Amortization is the word—a common practice in business, and even among State and local governments. But in Washington it sounds as strange as a cussword in Polynesian.

Mr. Sweeney has figured out that if we were to amortize the debt by A. D. 2000 it would take around $11.4 billion a year for interest and payment on the principal. Which means it could cost us nearly $500 billion to get rid of it.

If we should take another 50 years, the annual interest and principal payments would run about $8.8 billion—and the total cost by A. D. 2050 would exceed $826 billion.

Stretching it out until A. D. 2100 would cost a little less per year—$8.4 billion, roughly—but the ultimate cost would be $1.2 trillion.

All this, of course, Mr. Sweeney figures on the theory that we start paring down the debt from its present height of $275 billion—instead of heaven knows what it will be in a few more years—and that we keep up the payments year after year, the same as any one (except Uncle Sam) deals with a fixed charge.

The alternative, and present course, is to go on paying interest of about $8 billion a year forever—until 2000, 2050, 2100, 2601, always. And for that what do we get? Debt never paid off.

What we are paying out in interest each year, as Mr. Sweeney points out, would soon pay off the debt if these sums were applied to the principal. But interest paid on a debt which never is reduced, as he gently puts it, "is virtually money wasted."

Taxpayer money.

Postmaster North, 67, Retires With Plaudits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have always admired Mr. Roy M. North who retired last Tuesday as our National Capital City's postmaster after a distinguished career in the postal service which saw him begin as a railway mail clerk in his native Georgia and later become an Assistant Postmaster General.

Well do I recall the presentations of Mr. North when he appeared before our House subcommittee handling Treasury Department and Post Office Department funds. This was back in the 80th Congress and I was then the subcommittee's chairman. Mr. North greatly impressed me by his obvious sincerity and his knowledge of postal operations. Serving as Washington's postmaster in recent years, he has turned in an outstanding performance and I was pleased to read the story appearing in Tuesday's issue of the Washington Evening Star, captioned "Postmaster North, 67, Retires With Plaudits."

The Star article follows:

POSTMASTER NORTH, 67, RETIRES WITH PLAUDITS

Roy M. North, 67, Washington's postmaster since 1949, retired today with plaudits from two Federal officials for his 48 years of postal service.

His own boss, Postmaster General Summerfield, and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, commended him for his work. Since 1953, it has dealt in part with experiments that may revolutionize the Nation's mail delivery.

The biggest single need in the postal service, he declared, is a perfected machine to sort the mail within the post office.

"There is a need to eliminate a lot of manual labor," the husky, gentle voiced postmaster said. "And the way the post offices are expanding, I'm sure it wouldn't cause anybody to lose his job."

WILL BE ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. North isn't retiring from active work.

"I wouldn't be satisfied doing nothing," he said.

Instead, he will become the legislative representative for the National Association of Postmasters, and will spend much of his time lobbying on Capitol Hill.

The Georgia-born postmaster started his career as a railway mail clerk, and was commissioned as a postal inspector in 1915. He drew national acclaim in the early twenties for helping to solve a $2 million train robbery at Wittenburg, Mo.

He was appointed Deputy Third Assistant Postmaster of the United States in 1933 by President Roosevelt, who became a close friend. President Truman named Mr. North, a Democrat, to his past position.

HASN'T TAKEN ALL OF LEAVE

"I think I've given the Government its money's worth," he said. "I've taken only about one third of my annual leave, worked about 50 hours a week and have 2,100 hours of sick leave unused. A lot of my time has been spent in working with experimental machines and techniques being tested in the Washington Post Office."

Mr. North says he will now have more time to spend with his wife at home, 2501 Calvert Street, NW. But, he admits, he will have to be mightly careful about it.

"Women don't generally want you under their feet," he asserted. "And there's always a chance they'll catch you with an unmailed letter in your pocket."

The Place of the Church-Related Colleges in America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 5, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in RECORD, I include the following address given last fall by Dr. Kevin McCann, president of the Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio. President McCann is perhaps better known as the author of the official biography of President Eisenhower, having served on the general's staff in Europe during the war, and on the President's staff in the White House.

With all the current discussion and reappraisal of our educational institutions and standards, it is important to read this analysis of what our country needs and can receive from the church-related college—and what the church-related college needs and ought to receive in understanding and support from our country.

WHY THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE TODAY?

(Address by Kevin McCann, president of the Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio, at Hartwick College, Oneonta, N. Y., on Founder's Day, October 3, 1957)

If at the outset I may be permitted a personal profession of commitment, I would

say that I am president of a church-related college because in no other human enterprise can I see a like opportunity for stewardship:

Stewardship that is an acknowledgment and partial payment, at least, of the debt each of us owes the Republic and the men and women, our forebears in blood and in spirit, who built it.

Stewardship that is an active effort to help one's own generation to preserve, expand and pass on a glorious heritage, a little strengthened, a little magnified because we have lived.

Stewardship that is a recognition that none of us can hope to win salvation if concerned only with the treasures of earth and the service of self.

More pointedly, in this age when all the peoples of the world hunger for a creative peace and a decent fellowship among men, I most firmly believe the colleges of religious faith—Jewish and Catholic and Protestant—have a stirring and effective answer to the paramount question before us:

How can this Nation, under God, as successfully wage the peace as it has waged war?

Here is a question to excite, to inflame, to inspire all of us; a question imbrued with the blood of those many thousands who died far from home that we, their fellow Americans—so comfortable, so prosperous, so sure of ourselves—might have the freedom and the will and the enduring courage to wage the peace they did not live to enjoy.

To answer it is so fraught with blessing that none of us can excuse his silence by claiming that to speak out would be an effrontery or an immodesty.

In that light I shall attempt, as a church-related college president, to sketch for you my own version of the answer. But first we of these colleges must face the fact that, though our friends may be legion, our mission as institutions of learning and education is seldom fully understood—sometimes not by ourselves.

Science is now preponderant in its influence on the affairs of men and nations. The liberal arts are often reduced to reading courses and discussion groups. Financial resources measure the repute of a school. Religion in many places is a search for the lowest common denominator of natural reason unaided by revelation. In such circumstances, we of the church-related college—before all else, certainly before we propose answers to questions of great moment—must justify our existence to others and to ourselves.

We cannot justify it because our graduates through many decades were builders of the Republic and missionaries around the earth. For every evidence of greatness we adduce, a comparable instance of narrowness and selfishness can be raised up from the past. And the balance sheet might be a standoff of good and not-so-good.

We do not contribute to the Nation and to the world solely because the religious spirit of our students is fostered and religious activities are a college concern. Many State universities would put to shame many church-related colleges were it possible accurately to compare, one beside the other, the intensity of religious spirit and the integrity of religious activities on their several campuses.

Nor can we demonstrate a unique capacity to shape the future merely by the statement that, compared to other schools, our facilities are as good, our faculties as wise and knowledgeable, our student bodies as alert and—because we are, almost all of us, very small—the immediate interplay of minds and personalities produces better educated men and women. Our smallness, like our comparative poverty, is a quality most of us wish we were rid of. In any case the largest college or university is just as small and the teacher-student relationship just as close as a single classroom on the campus. Moreover great teaching does not diminish in quality because those who share it increase in number.

We can justify our existence only when we recognize that we, as colleges, were born out of faith in God, the Creator of men and of things, the source of human worth and dignity, revealed to us in only one book, and that we were given by those who founded us the mission of speaking the faith and of interpreting by its light all that pertains to the conduct of life, from a crisis in one soul to a crisis in world politics.

Secular skills and knowledge and wisdom are within our domain as centers of learning. We seek for our students command and eminence in them. We reject naught of the world that may be of profit and worth to those who must live in the world. But we are colleges of the book and the revealed word. And therefore we—the Christian colleges—must view all things and all men in the shadow of Christ crucified, in the glory of Christ arisen. Therein lies our uniqueness. There is the badge that distinguishes us.

Today we honor the founder of such a college tradition. To him the war for independence was a current event. The Republic was an experiment; the Constitution untried; the continent a wilderness beyond the Alleghenies. On this occasion then a review of the Nation's history since his day might seem a proper theme for a speaker. Certainly the story of America should be an inexhaustible mine of inspiration to those who doubt the present or fear the future.

Today however those who doubt and fear can instantly retort: "Things are not now what they have been before; history has lost its pointedness of example and precedent; the old saws and adages, proverbs, principles, purposes are null and void; man at long last possesses the power to destroy mankind."

Such retort is for us, both of the Jewish synagogues and of the Christian churches, the latest damnation of our faith as foolishness. Not God, as we have believed, but men—insanely arrogant or stupid or criminal men—can write finis to what we have called His creation and His children made in His image. What merit, what value or refuge in a creator who cannot sustain his creation against the wilfulness of created men?

That question, if not blasphemy, is nonsense. We know our world will not perish utterly in a nuclear holocaust nor humanity be blotted out by blast and radiation because a tiny few might seem to have that power within their control. Although common sense may be silent, faith will cry out that God will not permit such an end to the world.

Nevertheless we read with apparent avidity the most dire prophesies of doom. We immerse ourselves in a frantic whirl of getting and spending that indicates we live only for today because subconsciously we expect tomorrow to be the blank after the blast. We realize that this is an age of explosiveness in the physical areas of human living, in the manifold patterns of human thinking and feeling. But in our country at this moment we seem to rest in a trough of inertia about personal responsibility, about free cooperative action, about the challenges that confront us as individuals and churches and church-related colleges.

In this year of 1957, to every problem that extends beyond immediate personal advantage or hurt, the almost universal reaction seems to be: That is the Government's job.

Such a reaction should be just as much nonsense to one who believes as the nonsense that the destiny of mankind, no longer within the providence of God, is now at the whim and sufferance of a few men. For us of this Republic, Government is the servant of the Nation's high purposes, not a trash can for abandoned privileges and responsibilities and duties.

Government, for instance, waged the Second World War most successfully only because Government was the focusing agent of a united people's will to win. Whatever the cost might be to all of them or to any of them. Government cannot as successfully wage the peace today because once-united people have straggled and dispersed and even fled the field.

That is a blanket indictment, to be sure; and not completely true. Battalions and regiments still labor in the battle for men's loyalties and friendship. And one man, at least, who 2 years ago at Geneva melted the glacial ice of the cold war, still works tirelessly for peace. Such genius and wisdom and faith as his cannot go unrewarded. But first the American people must rejoin the campaign as a united people, moved by a passionate conviction that here is a job to be done, far more important than the pursuit of new comfort and ostentatious show.

Government can only marshall money and talents and machines. Propaganda cannot arouse the will to sacrifice and to persevere. Propaganda can only inflame the emotions when the will is already committed.

The promise of rewards in more trade, in more money, in more leisure cannot ignite an unquenchable zeal and a hard determination in the minds of the people. Such a promise may move some, but the many know firmly and deeply that the history of secular promise is a history of delusion and vain hopes.

Only conviction—a conviction that is explosive in times of immediate crisis, a conviction that endures through the distractions and cares of daily life, a conviction that is ever dynamic and creative—can arouse a people to unity of action and sustain them in it. To such conviction, a church-related college can contribute mightily.

Is that part of the college mission? For that matter—and after all this talk—what is the mission of the church-related college?

Certainly, and not in least part, its mission is denominational—to preserve the traditions of its constituency, to support with reason and with knowledge the faith of its churches, to fortify and expand and inspire its denominational fellowship. Such a purpose is worthy and valid.

In all the anxious searching for a more visible unity among those who accept the gospel of Christ, let us always remember that the present separations and differences among us were rather born in agonized searching of soul and conscience, rather maintained in the courage of martyrs and the constancy of self-effacing witnesses, than begotten of greed for power or nourished in command of power.

To forget that fact is to erase noble areas from our heritage and to guarantee new anguish in their restoration—for restored they will be, or we shall end up with churches whose boast will be that they are nonsectarian as a supermarket.

But the mission of the church-related college extends beyond the cares of its denomination into a mission that is universal: the teaching and the study and the propagation of truths that for us of the Christian faith are keys to the Kingdom; that for all men give significance and meaning to life.

These truths—enunciated by the prophets of Israel, enriched and clarified along the Sea of Galilee, in the villages of Judeau and in the holy places of Jerusalem, preached thereafter to all men and all nations—are not a monopoly of the church-related college. At the heart of Western civilization and integral of the American heritage, they are shared by men and women and children of all the continents. They are the possession of the scholarly and the illiterate, the poor and the prosperous, the prudent and

steady, the volatile and erratic. And through the ages they have been a mightier force for peace on earth, for justice and mercy among men, than all the arms and money and treaties of empires.

To a church-related college, the profession and practice of these truths is of first importance because only in their light and in their full acceptance can the arts and sciences be applied for the whole good of the whole man—divine in his origin, divine in his aspirations, divine in his destiny. And in their application to the affairs of the day lies the answer to the question: "How can this Nation, under God, as successfully wage the peace as it has waged war?"

What are these truths?

For all of us they are much the same in number. But for each of us certain among them stand forth in special aptness to a momentous question or a tangled problem. I hope you will allow me to pick out six truths that seem to me essential to the answering of this one question about the waging of the peace. Fundamental to all, I would say, is:

The frailty of man in his works and ways. The just man falls many times a day. The just nation is a bewildering confusion of idealism preached and crimes against idealism practiced. But in all men and in all peoples there is an eternal compulsion to do justice and to do good. That compulsion, not rooted in the policies of government or in the painfully contrived philosophies of men, is an insistent force within the human conscience, distinguishing man from the beast, arming the individual man with a strength that overrides all temporal power. And consequently the second of these truths concerns:

The supremacy of conscience. No human authority, external to individual man, can impose upon him a serfdom of will or mind, if the authority hopes long to endure. In all the history of mankind that we can read clearly, no earthly power has won final victory over a dedicated conscience. Supreme in its authority, conscience is supreme too in its efficacy when the contest is between good and evil, between justice for men and the debasement of men, between peace and fruitless strife. Inseparable therefore from the frailty of men and the supremacy of conscience is a third truth.

The purposefulness of living. Men's frailties and the world's tyrannies between them may sometimes make of human living an apparently hopeless pattern of goodness forever compromised and evil often triumphant. But recognizing that we do not live for today or this year or this decade alone, hearing all about us the ceaseless call of many consciences and witnessing the ceaseless response to those calls, we can see the guiding hand of a provident God in the history of men and of nations. Of course what we believe good and holy may be banished from this place or that, for a few years or for many. But in dungeon or hiding place, on the field of battle or on the mountain tops of public view, there will be those, careless of self and even of life, who will not permit such banishment to last. And on this fact hinges a fourth truth:

The inescapability of sacrifice. The vanity of a generation, the insanity of its self-delusion, is measured by its confidence that ways have been devised to make the course of life a journey of ease, free from pain and sorrow and danger. We may extend the expectancy of life for that fictitious being the average man. We may gild and upholster and plate with chrome the surroundings of that hapless creature the common man. But even as the ancient Greeks, we must not envy any man while he lives nor call any man happy until he dies; for all their days all men without exception walk in the valley of the shadow of death and their constant companion is imminent misfortune. As we all walk in the same valley, we all live within a common kinship, for another of these truths is:

The brotherhood of man under God. Not just a humanistic sentiment or a theological deduction, this is a physical fact, intensified and elevated for us by all the teachings of our faith from the stern words written by a prophet of God—"whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God created He man"—to those warm words spoken by the Son of God—"Judge not that ye be not judged * * * By this sign shall men know that ye are my disciples that ye love one another." In our frailties we may come to abhor or to condemn individuals, even to attempt their destruction. But unless we ever seek a sympathetic understanding of all peoples, our faith is a lie and our practices as individuals, our policies as a nation, are futile.

Finally, we who strive to follow the Christ are of all men the most senseless unless this is for us the highest of all truths:

The end of man is God. In all the wisdom of the philosophers, in all the works of the scientists, in all the prizes of secular and temporal achievement, there is still no answer to: "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world * * *?"

These 6 are not worn out platitudes, although my wording of them may be tired and worn. They are not tedious and solemn cautions, although my presentation may be without lustre and fire. They are keys to a reward beyond the ravages of rust and moth and thief.

In their practice man can win a glimpse of glory before death and enjoy a foretaste of a greater happiness; rising above his own frailty even as he forgives a like frailty in his fellow man; sharpening and heeding his conscience that he may be powerful for good; strengthened amidst reverses and disasters by his trust in the providence of a Heavenly Father; courageous in sacrifice as he was redeemed by sacrifice and born in sacrifice; unaffrighted by the armies of evil since he is joined in a vaster and mightier brotherhood; adventuresome and persevering to win a goal not limited like the finite world nor expressed in its transitory rewards.

Here is the answer to that paramount question: How can this Nation, under God, as successfully wage the peace as it has waged war?

A nation without patience and forbearance and pity toward frailty will bog down in frustration and cynicism. A nation without a higher respect for the commands of conscience than for the demands of expediency will be trapped in opportunism. A nation without dedication to the pursuit of the ideal will degenerate into compromise with whatever chance and circumstance make possible. A nation without decent regard for the dignity of all men—beginning with the least of its own citizens—will win no more than sullen fear or grudging silence. A nation without faith that man is divine in his destiny will find its own destiny, when challenged mortally, is defeat, ruin, extinction.

A nation accepting religious truths as its political guideposts, committed to them and observing them out of conviction, may seem a hopeless dream. But this Republic through generations has been for hundreds of millions a hopeless dream realized. We won a high place in the hearts and minds of men everywhere, unique in history, not because this Nation was a mighty hurler of mass death or a headlong dispenser of subsidy and bribe or a tireless merchant of golden promise and attractive word, but because—imperfectly, of course, yet steadily and often in high dedication—it sought the realization of divine truths as a way of life.

We have not changed. We still so seek. To much of the world however we seem to have become engaged with an adversary on fields of his choosing: In a race of arms, in a contest of spending, in a war of propaganda. Thus preoccupied we seem to forget that our greatness as a nation has been our way of life, our approach to the problems of human life, our faith in God and in the efficacy of His eternal truths.

Armed we must be and better armed than any enemy. Sound spenders we must be if our friends are to rise strong and healthy out of weakness. Heralds of fact we must be or our cause will be lost in a ceaseless smother of lies. And government must have our wholehearted support in those rules that can be effectively discharged only by government.

But our way of life, our approach to the problems of human life, our faith in God and in the efficacy of His eternal truths—in these we as individuals and as groups of individuals are the doers and the witnesses and the missionaries.

The practice of all these I find more perfectly exemplified on the campuses of religious faith than anywhere else in all this land. I find in a college such as this a great voice and a treasury of zeal that can recall the Nation to a purposeful unity under God for the better achievement of His truths.

I suggest no new organization for the defense or the practice or the propagation of the word. But had I a voice that could penetrate into every college born of faith in God, I would cry out: "Let us every day and every moment of every day remember that we have a higher mission than secular concern."

In these days of godless conspiracy to enslave and deprave, that mission requires of us fullness of service to God as ever and, more sharply than ever, a fullness of citizenship.

America is no Caesar. America is ourselves. American strength and wealth and position are in our spirit, in our minds, in our conscience. Not a secular concern, American citizenship in its fullness is the practice of religious truth and its fullest possible practice is a religious duty.

Few in this world of rampant secularism and materialism will agree to that statement, you may retort. But we do; certainly we should. And we are not few.

As colleges we are numbered in the hundreds; we are rich and strong in the experience of years, in the intellect and genius of our facilities, in the fire and enthusiasm of our students—rich and strong and potent and creative because we have an inspiration and a commitment that is eternal and universal.

And behind us, supporting us, asking of us only leadership, are the tens of millions of men and women of the synagogues and churches of America. Whatever their differences, they are one in their faith in God the Father who created man in his image that he might do justice and love mercy and walk humbly and thereby enjoy in peace the good things of this world.

We who have met so many challenges and wrought so many triumphs out of misfortune and disaster will not fail in leadership now. We do have the answer how this nation, under God, will as successfully wage the peace as it has waged war. We cannot stand silent or we betray our faith and our mission. And that, I am firmly convinced, will not come to pass. We will speak out and this land, this world, will be the better for our witness.

The Seventh United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, last November, in the course of an inspection trip on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I had the opportunity to visit and see firsthand, the fine work being done by the Seventh United States Army in Germany. It was my pleasure to meet the commanding officer, Lt. Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, at his headquarters, and to observe some of the work being done by the Seventh Army. It is important for the American people to know about the high type of leadership that is being given to Amercan soldiers abroad who today form the frontline of defense of the human freedoms we Americans so cherish. All too frequently the impression is given that the life of the American soldier abroad is an easy one and that our military commanders are not always conscious of the need for economy together with maximum preparation for any eventualities. I found the situation in the Seventh Army adverse to any such impression. From the commanding officer on down to his staff, I found a healthy spirit reflecting the need for economy and maximum efficiency, together with a well-planned program to maintain good relations with the German people during these difficult days when it is necessary for the military of the United States not only to defend our own interests, but to provide a shield of protection for other free people.

General Clark has prepared a summary of activities of the Seventh Army for the calendar year of 1957 which reflects great credit on him and on the officers and men under his command. I believe this report will be of real interest to the American people. Under leave obtained, I insert it in the RECORD:

SEVENTH UNITED STATES ARMY—SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES, 1957

(By Bruce C. Clarke, lieutenant general, U. S. Army, commanding)

As we of the Seventh Army witness the close of another eventful year and as we continue to carry out our important tasks in many areas of Western Germany, I will review briefly the major accomplishments that have marked the progress of the command during these past 12 months.

Nearly every member of the Seventh Army was associated in some manner, either directly or indirectly, in the vast program of modernization undertaken during 1957. The Seventh United States Army set the pace for the United States Army in the evolution from a World War II organizational structure into the streamlined and highly mobile combat force we now possess. All major fighting elements of this command completed the conversion to the Pentomic or other new concepts in record time and during the process suffered no significant loss of combat effectiveness. I extend my congratulations and appreciation to all of you whose efforts have contributed to the success of this history-making operation.

In addition to reorganizing, Seventh Army continued to receive and release many units under Operation Gyroscope. At the present time 70 percent of the Seventh Army is participating in this program. In connection with Gyroscope operations, we have completed recently a restationing program, initiated to balance properly our tactical units along the critical east-west border. This 3-way switch of units involved the 2d and 4th Armored Divisions and the 8th Infantry Division.

Our training facilities and training emphasis have continued to keep pace with our increased responsibilities. Training areas have been improved greatly with the addition of realistic combat courses and firing ranges designed to coordinate further the tank-infantry-artillery fighting teams. Army training tests have been revised to insure a uniform standard of proficiency for the reorganized tactical units. Although training requirements have been increased and proficiency goals raised, 88 percent of all units tested during 1957 attained ratings of superior or excellent. During 1957, no battalion or battle-group-sized unit has failed an Army training test. During the past year, 18,418 Seventh Army soldiers were graduated from USAREUR and Seventh Army school courses; and, with its 8th year of operation completed, the Seventh Army Noncommissioned Officers Academy has graduated 33,665 highly trained noncommissioned officers. The value of this fine school is evidenced by the adoption this year of its salient features by the Department of the Army as the basis for training all noncommissioned officers. The 5 division academies have added significantly to this output of fine noncommissioned officers.

Ranger and night training has been stepped up. A program for infantrymen to qualify for the coveted expert infantry badge has been stressed.

The vital marksmanship program has made great strides during these past months. A total of 1,620 soldiers competed in small arms matches at Seventh Army and higher level, with 523 awards being presented to participants. In our program to qualify every rifleman as a sharpshooter or better, we have been about 75 percent successful. In addition, an energized automatic rifle marksmanship program was instituted to increase the combat effectiveness of rifle squads and to raise the proficiency of Seventh Army Le Clerc Teams. In the family of larger weapons, several thousand tank crew members fired during the annual tank-gunnery program. An outstanding 87 percent qualified as expert gunners in this training during 1957 as compared to 74.6 percent in the preceding year. In the artillery and missile fields, significant progress has been made in gunnery. Averages are well above the previous year.

A continuing program is underway to insure that maximum time is allotted our combat leaders, particularly at company level, for the actual field training and combat development of their units. One means of effecting this has been to reduce to a minimum the cumbersome administrative loads formerly carried by the smaller tactical organization. The establishment of a unit administrative center and the consolidation of supply records at battle group, battalion and equivalent level has not only improved the quality of administrative actions, but has permitted the company and battery commanders to get away from their desks and lead their units. Consolidation of unit fund activities at battalion or battle group level has been very successful.

In the field of supply and logistics we have made substantial progress and plans are now nearly perfected to coordinate further these activities in the Army rear areas through a Seventh United States Army support command.

Every practical assistance has been given to the growing German Army. A great many personnel from other NATO nations and from other MAP nations have visited and observed our units in training and in field exercises.

Our status of combat readiness has remained at a very high level.

The many accomplishments realized during the past year are particularly noteworthy when viewed in the light of imposed budgetary limitations. Implementation of a quarterly review and analysis of Seventh Army's programed objectives has been most helpful in stimulating prior planning, objective thinking and an analytical review of activities. These studies have contributed greatly to our policy of receiving maximum returns for each dollar spent. I am sure that I need to say no more about the "belt-tightening" which each tactical and technical service has experienced during the recent months. We have accomplished the requirements placed on us by a high order of economy and improved management.

I would like to discuss now some of the outstanding achievements which can be attributed directly to the cumulative and combined efforts of all personnel. Good advances are continuing in the field of German-American relationships. We would not be enjoying this valuable association if it were not for the sincere friendliness and helpfulness extended to the German people by each of you. While furthering this worthy cause, all members of Seventh Army can view with pride the results of their disciplined safety habits. Army motor vehicle accidents decreased by 9 percent and fatalities from such accidents were 30 percent lower than last year. In addition, there were 15 percent fewer military injuries which means 1,200 fewer disabled soldiers. Total property loss, including fire damage, decreased by 10 percent over 1956 for a monetary savings of $250,000. While the members of this command were contributing $366,370 to the 4 major charity campaigns conducted in 1957, more than $6 million were being placed in soldiers' deposits. In November, the number participating in a formal savings program reached 56 percent, for an alltime high.

During 1957, 15,000 members of Seventh Army participated successfully in the educational program at all levels of schooling. These individuals have made not only a valuable contribution to their personal future, but have increased their worth to the service. In many instances, this increased individual proficiency was rewarded with advancements in grade. Since the end of 1956, Seventh Army received and reallocated 43,785 enlisted promotion spaces.

The increasingly careful observations conducted by inspector general teams throughout the command have disclosed marked improvements in our many fields of activity. In those instances where deficiencies have been noted, the constructive guidance presented by the inspectors has been utilized most effectively by commanders at all levels. By this prompt action, many potential pitfalls and actions detrimental to efficiency have been eliminated. In this regard, an accomplishment of major importance was the decrease in serious crimes among Seventh Army personnel. While the worldwide incidence of crime increased, the crime rate in the Seventh Army decreased from an average monthly rate of 1.13 per thousand in 1956 to a rate of 0.83 per thousand, this past year.

I point out, also, that the fine results realized from improved preventive maintenance procedures are reflected clearly in the reports I receive from our command maintenance inspection and spot check teams. The highly serviceable condition of our equipment is especially gratifying when you consider that many of the items of equipment continue to receive hard field usage, and, of course, in many cases the items have seen long service.

The Seventh Army athletic program for 1957 included participation by 101,500 individuals in the 14 separate sports activities which were viewed by approximately 2,534,000 spectators. Emphasis on carrying on sports at lower unit levels insofar as practicable have produced beneficial results. This field of endeavor also played an important role in the enhancement of community relations, in that 843 contests were participated in jointly by German and Seventh Army personnel. An estimated 342,000 spectators, mostly German, were attracted to these events.

I am very pleased to note that the overall health of the command continued to improve during 1957. With the exception of our minor bout with Asiatic influenza, a marked decrease was registered in the occurrence of other types of diseases. Let us all hope this happy situation continues.

Finally, I wish to point out that changes have been made in Seventh Army Headquarters to enable it to handle expeditiously a modern field army geared to the atomic age. Some reductions have been made. Staff and command procedures have been streamlined to eliminate command and staff inertia.

Again, my congratulations are offered to each of you for the outstanding advances you have made in your many areas of great responsibility. The Seventh Army has achieved a high order of professionalism in all areas of endeavor. I urge you to face with confidence and faith the new problems which will confront the United States Seventh Army during 1958. My confidence in you to meet and solve these is unbounded.

I wish you and the members of your command a healthy and a peaceful new year.

Retired Officers Endorse H. R. 689

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of responsibility and grave concern that I again call attention to the sound principle of equalization of rights and benefits for personnel of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces as compared with those of the Regular components. As the Members are aware, I have spoken out in support of this principle many times in the past.

Since I am convinced that the long-established intent of Congress is to grant equal treatment to Regulars and Reserves, I have introduced clarifying legislation, H. R. 689, which is a companion measure to S. 1085, introduced by Senators SPARKMAN and JACKSON. The purpose of this legislation is not to enact a new law or extend the provisions of the present law but merely to affirm and effectuate the congressional intent to equalize the treatment accorded Regulars and Reserves under similar circumstances.

Numerous organizations having World War I officers in their ranks have endorsed this legislation. Endorsement has come at the local, States, regional, and national level. As representative of the hundreds of endorsements for this meritorious legislation, and under leave heretofore granted, I am pleased to insert a resolution adopted by the Heart of America Chapter of the Retired Officers Association of Kansas City, Mo., on February 1, 1958:

Whereas the Heart of America Chapter of the Retired Officers Association of Kansas City, Mo., has always supported the principle of equalization of rights and benefits, including retirement rights, for personnel of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces as compared with Regular personnel of these services, and as between the Services themselves; and

Whereas such equalization is not only in the interest of justice and fair play, but by force of example encourages participation of younger personnel in the National Defense, maintains the active and favorable interest of older Reservists, and promotes a high moral among those engaged in the national defense; and

Whereas it has long been the declared intent of Congress to grant equal treatment to Regulars and Reserves, as evidenced by legislation through the years, including the original Selective Service Act, such equalization being also one of the major declared purposes of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong.) and of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.): Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Heart of America Chapter of the Retired Officers Association of Kansas City, Mo., in a called meeting assembled in Kansas City, Mo., February 1, 1958. That the Congress pass clarifying legislation as proposed in Senate bill 1085 and House bill 689 so that Regular and Reserve officers will be accorded equal treatment with particular reference to retirement benefits and that we urge our United States Senators and the Representatives from this area to support the above mentioned bills, S. 1085 and H. R. 689.

KENNETH MARTIN,
Secretary.

Russian Betrayal of Polish Underground Is Recalled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post, Wednesday, April 2, 1958, written by Stefan Korbonski, who was chief of civilian resistance in the Polish wartime underground, and which recalls a tragic series of events which transpired in Poland in the spring of 1945:

I REMEMBER EASTER—RUSSIAN BETRAYAL OF POLISH UNDERGROUND IS RECALLED

(Fourth of a series)

(Stefan Korbonski was chief of civilian resistance in the Polish wartime underground. He also directed, with his wife Zofia as his chief cipher officer, the secret radio communication with the Polish government-in-exile in London. In April 1945, he was appointed chief of the Polish underground. He was arrested by the Russian NKVD, later released and then fled with his wife to Sweden. He is vice chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and the author of Fighting Warsaw. His wife is with Voice of America.)

(By Stefan Korbonski)

All through the grim years of the German occupation of Poland and our work with the underground, my wife Zofia and I had looked forward to the first Easter we would celebrate with our friends when our country was liberated. It became a symbol of hope to us.

But as events turned out, that first postwar Easter in 1945 proved to be the most tragic time of my life.

A few days earlier, on March 28, I had stayed behind while other leaders of the Polish underground drove to a deserted villa at Proszkow, near Warsaw, for secret talks with a certain General Ivanov. He had been identified only as a personal representative of Russian Marshal Zhukov.

The Polish delegation was headed by Jan Jankowski, the underground vice premier. It included Kazimierz Puzak, president of the Polish underground Parliament, and Gen. Leopold Okulicki, commander-in-chief of the Polish underground army.

The Russians had invited our underground leaders to a conference on two major points: One, the situation arising from the continued occupation of Poland by the Red army and Soviet authorities more than 6 months after the first Russian military units had entered the country; two, the indisputable fact that the Polish underground government still remained underground.

There had been reason enough for the caution of the underground leaders. As the Russians moved across Poland, our guerrillas reported the Russians first put on a display of friendliness, but then ordered the partisan officers to dissolve their units and become integrated into Communist units. When they refused, they and underground officers were disarmed and arrested.

The Russians had guaranteed complete safety and immunity to the Polish underground delegates to the Pruszkow conference. But Vice Premier Jankowski asked me to stay behind. Since I was secretary of the interior in the underground government, and chief of radio communication with the Polish government in exile in London, Jankowski thought it was essential for me to keep London informed of the proceedings of this parley, which the Russians insisted must be held in secret.

Several days passed.

Then our intelligence reported that mysterious cars had left the villa. Although I suspected strongly now that the invitation had been a trap, I hesitated in alarming London, for fear of endangering both the delegates and the talks. We assumed the talks might last several days and I decided to wait until Easter Sunday before taking definite action.

Meanwhile, I followed Jankowski's warning to go deeper into hiding with my wife. We waited out the approaching Easter holiday with anxiety and fear in an isolated hut in the country. Easter has always been a very important holiday for us in Poland and if the delegates failed to return home by then, it would mean they had been arrested. We waited in vain.

Early on Easter Sunday, I notified London by secret code of the Russians' treachery.

Then, desperate to forget for a few hours our feeling of impending tragedy, we accepted an invitation to Easter lunch with a trusted friend.

The table was set with the traditional miniature paschal lamb made of sugar and butter. There were brightly painted Easter eggs, a roast suckling pig and other Polish holiday specialties. As we wished each other "Wesolego alleluia," two Russian officers barged noisily into the house.

We were stricken with fear. They had traced us, we thought. We, too, would share the fate of the delegates to the conference. A second glance at the intruders calmed us—

they were both very drunk and their sole interest was the table.

Uninvited, they immediately fell to eating and drinking with a will. Shortly afterward, one of them fell sound asleep with his head on the table. The other officer tried to rouse him. Failing, he apologized for their intrusion and for his comrade's behavior. As he left, he whispered confidentially to our host: "As for that Stalin, he's a thorough scoundrel."

The British Broadcasting Corporation told the world the story of the treacherous arrest of the Polish underground government. The Polish government in exile immediately nominated me to succeed Vice Premier Jankowski.

In June of 1945, a show trial of the Polish delegates was held in Moscow. They were charged with conspiracy against the Soviet Army by staying underground after the Russian occupation began. They received long jail sentences and Jankowski and General Okulicki died in prison.

Later, we learned the true identity of "General Ivanov." He was none other than Gen. Ivan Serov, present chief of the Russian secret police.

Recession From What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have not given the writings of Dorothy Thompson the careful attention they deserve, since in her recent article entitled "Is a Perpetual Boom Desirable?" I find so much that makes sense, probably because it coincides with my own thinking.

For instance Miss Thompson asks, "What is full employment? That everybody who has a job must keep it and all who are seeking one must find it? And find it in exactly the place they want and at wages unrelated to their productivity?" And then she adds, "But thousands of mothers are also in the labor force, often very much to the detriment of their children and their home life, and dubiously, even, to its real financial advantage."

A little farther along in her article she makes this statement which, in my opinion, sums up all that spells economic insecurity among too many of those who make up our labor force:

The 40-hour week has been established, but an enormous number of families have not based their expenditures on such earnings but on the anticipation of an overtime and an annual raise, and have been spending in advance of income, as the per capita indebtedness reveals.

And then Miss Thompson touches on my pet peeve when, in discussing salesmanship as it applies to automobiles, she sets forth this view:

Too much salesmanship can create sales resistance. And many people—

Myself included—

detest the new-model cars and are discovering, also, that a car, if well cared for, will perform for many years longer than the dealer wants the buyer to think.

In my opinion this mature and able columnist has given forth with a veritable lung-full and to all of her comments which I have quoted I want to lend my endorsement with a fervent "amen."

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I would like to include an article written by C. Wilson Harder, entitled "Washington and Small Business," which I think is very timely:

As of this writing, it appears almost certain, with sufficient support from the people, that there will be some type of tax reduction.

The month of February 1958 may well go down as a climactic month in the Nation's history.

For this was the month when it came out in clear focus the damage that had been wreaked on the domestic economy by the long concentration of foreign giveaway programs, and other grandiose schemes.

Since long before the last election, the Nation's small-business men, voting through the National Federation of Independent Business, have called attention to the serious economic disturbances in the making due to unrealistic tax policies which prevent the expansion and healthy maintenance of independent business.

In early January George Burger, vice president of the organization, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee with a review of small business sentiment for several previous months. He even quoted one member who wrote as follows:

"It is my opinion that the point of diminishing returns has already been reached as far as taxes are concerned. High taxes have eliminated the possibility of any appreciable reward, with the result that many are liquidating their businesses, while others are trimming down their operations to get in shape so that they can liquidate with a minimum of loss."

But other segments of Government kept talking about the upturn in conditions. However, the official report of 5 million unemployed released in March, had a major effect in Washington.

The proposal to combat unemployment by a huge post office building program, if postal rates were increased, fell quite flat.

But many in Washington wonder how stepping up of public work projects can solve unemployment problems brought about by lack of business expansion.

It has also not escaped attention that Detroit, other big employers, were the first to hand out pink slips. On the other hand, small business, which Representative WRIGHT PATMAN characterizes as 95 percent of the firms which employ 20 or fewer people, has been trying to keep their staffs together.

Thus, it is dawning on many in Washington that a few big corporations can provide a great deal of employment when business is booming, but they are the first to throw the economic machinery into a tailspin when conditions soften.

And so, there is growing more and more the feeling that instead of vast Federal projects to take up the slack of unemployment it will be much sounder to give independent business the go ahead signal and trust it is not too late for independent business to take up slack.

Actually, there is nothing particularly surprising about the present situation and conditions.

As evidenced by the constant reports for several years by the National Federation of Independent Business, such a situation was inevitable unless concrete action were taken on an adequate small-business program.

How Local Zoning Laws Keep That School Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Voice of St. Jude in the February issue of this year. This article, entitled "Keep That School Out," was written by the widely published Catholic author, Mr. Paul Brindel, of California.

Mr. Brindel's article is an extremely important discussion of how local zoning laws deny, in many cases, a basic freedom of democracy. As is pointed out by this article, there exists a very serious threat to our democratic traditions in that zoning ordinances are used to keep out private and parochial schools. I am proud that there are groups today on the firing line who are appealing the decisions of these local planning bodies. Mr. Brindel's closing statement from the Notre Dame Lawyer article is particularly cogent:

This country owes its origin to people who refused to be denied the right of the free exercise of religion. If the democratic system is to realize its proclaimed values, zoning ordinances must be designed and applied accordingly.

The article follows:

KEEP THAT SCHOOL OUT

(By Paul Brindel, OSB oblate)

Last March 31, Corpus Christi Parish School was dedicated in Piedmont, Calif., a San Francisco suburb. Several hundred other new parish schools in most of our 48 States have been similarly dedicated this year. What was so unusual about this Piedmont school? Why this article and pictures?

Because that school is a symbol, in fact a monument to religious freedom as set forth in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and repeatedly upheld by the courts of our land. Three years ago, there was grave doubt as to whether Corpus Christi parish ever would have a school for its 800 families. Not because of lack of teachers or funds but because zoning ordinance approved 3,408 to 1,285 in 1936 by Piedmont voters, specifically excluded all private schools from 98 percent of the city's areas. So, when the parish in 1954 applied for a school-building permit, it was refused.

As in other parishes, the attitude of some laity was to bow to the inevitable. There were the usual platitudes. "It's the law, and we can't antagonize our neighbors. * * * The

majority voted that way, and the majority rules in this country. * * * It will hurt our business, or profession. * * * Let"s forget it and send our children to public schools, or to Oakland parochial schools." (Piedmont is surrounded by the city of Oakland.)

Like other priests over the centuries, Father Edwin J. Keller, pastor of Corpus Christi Parish, paid little heed to this counsel of despair, of collaboration, appeasement, and compromise. Nor did the Most Reverend John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco. In that archdiocese, title to parochial schools is held separately by the Roman Catholic Welfare Corporation. Accordingly, attorney for the corporation, Andrew F. Burke of San Francisco, petitioned for a writ of mandate to compel the city of Piedmont to permit erection of the school. The first hearing was before 3 justices of the California district court of appeal. On January 24, 1955, they ruled unanimously in favor of the school, holding the zoning ordinance unconstitutional. Undaunted, the Piedmont city council voted to carry the case to the California Supreme Court at additional cost of hundreds of dollars to the taxpayers of all faiths, or no faith.

On October 27, 1955, the California Supreme Court, 4 to 3, similarly held the Piedmont zoning ordinance unconstitutional, stating:

"Parents have the right to send their children to private schools, rather than public ones, which are located in their immediate locality or general neighborhood."

Corpus Christi Parish could now proceed with its school. But equally important, churches and schools in 47 other States were once again freed from the menace of discriminatory zoning laws and local bigotry. For this California Supreme Court decision reversed a dangerous trend starting in 1948, to the effect that local zoning ordinances take precedence over the free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the first amendment; that even the constitutional right of parents to educate their children as they choose must yield to a reasonable exercise of the police power of the State.

How did this all come about when in 1925, the United States Supreme Court in the famous Oregon parochial school case—*Pierce* v. *Society of Teachers* (268 U. S., 510–534)—had held:

"The fundamental theory of liberty, upon which all governments in this Union repose, excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not a mere creature of the State; those who nuture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional duties."

In his encyclical, Christian Education of Youth, Pope Pius XI quoted the foregoing 1925 decision. He apparently believed the issue settled, once and for all, and so did most Americans. What happened?

One answer is that like all things human, the law is constantly subject to change, to new interpretations. (In 1896 the U. S. Supreme Court approved racial segregation; in 1953 it disapproved it, unanimously.) Actually, the two cases which had upset the legal applecart—the established doctrine of the Pierce case, never should have happened. The first was in 1948 and resulted from the attempt of the Mormons in Porterville, Calif., to build a church upon land otherwise zoned. The Mormons appealed, and lost successively in two California appellate courts and the United States Supreme Court. The same thing happened in 1954 to the Lutherans attempting to build a high school in Wauwatosa, Wis. Why were these two epochal cases lost, while the Piedmont case was won?

The August 1957 issue of The Notre Dame Lawyer, America's outstanding Catholic legal quarterly, gives this answer:

"The Wisconsin Lutheran High School case, like Porterville, proved again the fallacy and danger of invoking only the 14th amendment in zoning law appeals involving churches and religious schools. In both of these cases, the constitutional question of free exercise of religion was entirely neglected. While these cases left much to be desired from the standpoint of constitutional procedure, the Piedmont case was to prove a model in this respect."

Yes; the Piedmont case was a model. A few months later, 3,000 miles away, Porter R. Chandler and David R. Shearer, attorneys for the diocese of Rochester, cited it, and turned to Mr. Burke for advice in winning the right to build a new Catholic church and school in a restricted residential zone of Brighton, N. Y., a suburb of Rochester. This case may well be studied by every pastor, chancellor, and Catholic lawyer, for it bares the latest technique and strategy of the forces of intolerance—evasion rather than outright prohibition.

The 1933 Brighton zoning ordinance did not say you could not build a church or school in zone A. All you needed was approval by the town planning board. But just try to get this approval, as the diocese of Rochester discovered. So, again, a long, expensive legal battle. Unlike in the Piedmont case, the diocese lost in the lower courts. Only in the New York State Court of Appeals in 1956 did victory come overwhelmingly, 6 to 1. One paragraph of that decision might well be memorized:

"We know of no rule which requires that churches may only be established in sparsely settled areas. On the contrary, as was said in *O'Brien* v. *City of Chicago*, 'wherever the souls of men are found, there the house of God belongs'."

And so, the never-ending battle for freedom of religion and education continues, even in these United States. As this is written, the California District Court of Appeals has before it the denial by the Menlo Park City Council of a use permit for a Jehovah's Witnesses church. This denial was based upon "inadequate parking which would create a traffic congestion." It seems a paradox that, despite extreme theological differences, the Catholic Church and the Witnesses have been the most successful in fighting discriminatory zoning laws in a score of States and always winning out, finally.

California has probably the worst record in respect to discriminatory zoning-law cases and some churches are strangely reluctant to fight for their rights in the courts. In 1954, the planning commission of Ross, a San Francisco suburb, refused the Adventists permission to build a church. In September 1957, the First Christian Church of San Rafael, another San Francisco suburb, was denied a building permit. Neither of these cases was appealed, despite offers of free legal assistance.

For the estimated 6 million Catholics now living in United States suburbs, the Notre Dame Lawyer sounds this warning:

"A common denominator in many zoning-law cases is their suburban origin. One-sixth of today's 170 million Americans reside in the suburbs, and the rights of minorities frequently clash with the local public opinion of the miljority in these areas. * * * This country owes its origin to people who refused to be denied the right of the free exercise of religion. If the democratic system is to realize its proclaimed values, zoning ordinances must be designed and applied accordingly."

A Passover—Easter Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as we all prepare to return home for religious celebrations it is fitting that we pause a moment and reflect on the brotherhood which exists between Christian and Jew. Accordingly, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following thoughts on this subject by the Reverend William F. Rosenblum, D. D., from the Empire State Mason of spring 1958:

A PASSOVER—EASTER REFLECTION

(By Rev. William F. Rosenblum, D. D.)

During the closing weeks of last December the celebration of Christmas began just when the observance of Hanukkah came to an end. As the eight tapers of the Menorah burned out in our Jewish homes the lights of Christmas trees all over the Nation and throughout the world burst into glow. To me this succession of rites suggested a truth which all mankind would do well to recognize, which we in Masonry acknowledge, that in our different religions there is a common core of origin and a common significance and appeal.

The fanatics and reactionaries in all our denominations would like to have people forget or ignore it but the fact is that both the Hebrew Hanukkah and the Christmas yuletide, as so many holidays of all our religions, had their beginnings in primitive festivals; in this instance in the revelries which obtained at the winter solstice. Our ancestors, wishing to make their gods understand their need for light and warmth, believed in all their naivete, that by kindling huge fires and dancing frantically around the flames, their deities could be made to relent and cause the days to grow longer again and the cold to abate. Our Hebrew forebears, first to discover the existence of the One God and to abjure idolatry, frowned upon these pagan excesses. They chose their epic Maccabean victory as a more spiritual foundation for the Festival of Lights. When Christianity came to flower it saw in the Nativity a similarly more exalted feason for the winter ceremonial, for its plea to God for the blessings of light.

Thus, too, at the springtide of the year, the thoughts of men have turned from earliest times to the mystery and majesty of the resurgence of nature and renascence of life. They saw the fields dress themselves anew in gold and green, the trees put on once more their leafy garb, the birds find new wing and new voice, the flocks increase. Their hearts burst with the desire to praise the Creator for all this birth and rebirth. The Israelites early eschewed the primitive sex abandon which reigned at this season. They chose instead the historic emancipation of their ancestors from Egyptian bondage as the basis of their joy at the liberation of nature from its cold winter imprisonment. Christianity saw in the resurrection the ideal theme for its Easter ceremonials. In the Sedar, dramatized in story and song in the Jewish home, is the tie which binds us together—Christian and Jew—for this was the Last Supper which Jesus, as a loyal and observant Jew who wished not to add a jot or tittle to his religion, celebrated at the Passover.

Our Masonic fraternity, in its Maundy Thursday pageantation of the Feast of the

Paschal Lamb, employs this tradition to stress lessons of faith, of freedom, of brotherhood and of peace in our own age. Some of our Jewish brethren feel ill at ease because one of the features of this ceremonial is for all to be seated in the form of a cross. Their uneasiness can be understood because over the centuries, and even in recent decades, in the world outside our precincts, the cross has been used all too often by blind bigots and cruel persecutors as the symbol of their hatred rather than the sign of love it is purported to be and what, in genuine Masonry, it was intended to signify from the start.

As I see it, in our modern civilization and especially in our Masonic circles, albeit we will never be indifferent to our differences in creed and custom, since variety is not only the spice of life but in many ways the very law of life, it is imperative to note that our separate religions have developed along parallel lines, that while we do not always travel on the same path, our destination is the same—we are always walking toward God.

The six-pointed Star of David signifies this desire of man to reach toward God and to be in communion with his fellowmen to all four corners of the earth. The Cross of the Christian, sublimely interpreted, represents the same ideal—its perpendicular symbolizing man's reaching from earth to heaven, the horizontal emphasizing that the hand of man must always be outstretched to his brother. Both the Star and the Cross can indeed be accepted today by all people of good will, especially in our Masonic temples and, through our exemplification of this conviction in our daily lives, as keys to brotherhood, as our declaration that all we say and do is in the name of the Lord.—for love and for life.

Uriel, Flame of God—A Christmas Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including, herewith, a unique Christmas card, with strong Easter thoughts as well, which is pertinent to our current endeavors in launching earth satellites. It is felt that this story, entitled "Uriel, Flame of God," may inspire our people beyond the mere mechanics of man's conquest of space.

Written by a young woman named Madalene Lehrer, who also made an illustration inspired by an old German wood engraving of the Middle Ages depicting a medieval seeker's glimpse of the mysteries of the universe, its simply told story of our planetary system seems particularly appropriate for the American people at this time.

The story follows:

URIEL, FLAME OF GOD—A CHRISTMAS STORY

Uriel, the bright archangel stationed in the Sun, guardian over all the luminaries in the heavens, looked out upon the vast Universe and observed that all was well.

Far, far out in space swung mighty Jupiter, largest of the planets, attended by 12 moons, a most marvelous sight. Saturn, next in size, with its picturesque rotating rings and nine satellites. Great Uranus, emitting a greenish glow, lord over five circling orbs. Farther out, hung mysterious Neptune with its two moons. Then, Uriel—whose name means "Flame of God"—peered into the outermost distance, and pitied poor frozen Pluto, in eternal darkness, swinging in its dizzy orbital inclination, and receiving, even at perihelion, only the feebiest rays from the Sun.

Nearest of all, and the smallest, sped swift Mercury. Next, the Angel of Light admired beautiful blue Venue, most brilliant, and 12 times brighter than the brightest star, Sirius. Then came Venus' sister-planet Earth, with its pale moon. And just beyond Earth, the red-hued Mars, commanding two moons, and more sparkling than any star or planet except Venus.

It is decreed that archangel's must labor ceaselessly and be vigilant. Sometimes, to test Uriel's alertness, the Lord sent a comet to sweep the skies with its flamboyant, trailing tail. But these fiery phenomena never disturbed the majestic rhythms of Cosmos.

Once, however, when danger was imminent, it was Uriel, sharpest-sighted spirit in all the heavens, who gave the warning of treacherous Satan's approach toward Earth. But Adam heeded not, and the compassionate Messenger grieved deeply. For it was then that Earth—which had been 1 of the most luminous of planets, although 1 of the smallest—lost most of its radiance. Henceforth, Uriel watched even more lovingly over this willful world, and after a time, himself visited the planet to serve as guide for Enoch. And God sent him also to instruct Esdras in the secrets of the Universe, and to answer his questions.

But now, the Regent of the Sun sighted contently as he guarded his cosmic charges. All were accounted for—the fixed stars and the vagabond comets, the galaxies and nebulae, the auroral lights, even the minutest atoms, and all nine celestial wanderers whirling and spinning with divine precision in their eternal journey around the Citadel of Light.

But wait.

"What is that speck of dust?" exclaimed Uriel as his eyes pierced through the murky haze surrounding Earth. "It was not there before. Now it orbits around Earth, traveling faster than its moon." The Shining One looked long and pondered. Then he knew. That particle was a new moon which man had flung into space.

Swiftly Uriel spread the alarm through Heaven. From their far-off stations instantly appeared the Sons of Light. A great conclave was called in the secret place of the Most High, and the seven archangels stood before God.

Now around each of the Seven glowed such an intense light, that together their brilliance was blinding in its brightness. But even their light was but a shadow in the presence of the Lord. The Chosen Ones who were permitted to look upon His face likened it to a luminous pearl, while sunbeams hovered around His hair, and blazing stars burned in the depth of His eyes. And all around Him radiated an aura of flashing lightning rays so that the effulgence paled the Sun in its splendor.

The Almighty bade His messengers speak.

"The Earthlings are fast learning the secrets of space," began Uriel solemnly. "Their orbiting moon-speck fires desires for greater achievements. They dream of travel to their moon, then Mars." And then he asked, very slowly, "Will they thus help or harm themselves and Space? Shall we assist or delay them in their progress toward the far-off worlds?"

"Let man cleanse his heart and his thoughts," advised Raphael, "before sending up more moons. Let him send up, instead, pure prayers so that I may present them to You freely, oh Lord."

"Earth needs more flowers," reminded Gabriel gently, remembering the time when he was chief of the angelic guards over Paradise. "Flowers purify the atmosphere of poisonous gasses. Earthlings must learn to look up to heaven as the flowers do."

All this time, one of the archangels, while listening, had been watching intently the planet Earth. Suddenly he called out, "Look! It is glowing brighter. What can that mean?" And the others leaned forward to look at the strangely brightening globe.

"Let Uriel explain," commanded the Lord.

The sharp-sighted one replied, "Earth's people are celebrating a time called Christmas. They have lighted all their lamps in their streets and houses, and have adorned even the trees with blossoms of lights."

The Almighty, musing, asked half aloud, "But have they lighted their hearts?" So He looked down to see for Himself. And at the sight His countenance became stern, so that lightning flashed from His eyes.

Michael, beholding the face of his adored Lord, burst out saying, "Yes, once a year they celebrate the birth of the Christ Child by exchanging gifts among themselves, and toss the smallest part to God. They pronounce peace and good will while preparing for war. They pretend to give to the poor in Your name, oh Lord, but create a make-believe character and enthrone him everywhere. Truly," continued Michael, "their plight is pathetic. They meddle with the elements and squander the treasures from the ground, and now they play with a newer and more terrible toy."

Then Gabriel, in a voice trembling with the thunder of indignation, asked, "How long, oh Lord, will You suffer their self-seeking and mockery, and permit their dangerous experimentations?"

"They will destroy themselves," cried the other archangels.

But the Lord remained silent. And as His gaze again followed the foolish planet, the anguish which filled His countenance grew so intense that even His angels averted their faces.

Then Uriel, remembering how Earth in an ancient time had crucified the Lord, shuddered with pain. Slowly on the archangel's shining brow appeared great drops of sweat like purest crystal, and two glittering tears like pear-shaped diamonds rolled down his cheeks. He knelt to hide his suffering and buried his face at the Lord's feet.

"Send me down to the earthlings once more, Lord," he pleaded, "so that I might help them to find You."

Now, if God is moved to compassion for even a small sparrow, how much greater was His love for this resplendent Prince of Heaven, upon whose hands and feet now appeared the stigmata of the cross. The Lord lifted him up, saying, "Wait and see. I gave them power of free will to choose between Satan and Me."

Instantly a nameless thrill ran through the holy assembly. For surely, some faint and feeble sounds had escaped from earth and, penetrating through its choking atmosphere, had floated up to heaven. It was the sound of singing. For there remained among the mislead multitudes on earth some sincere hearts whose joy it was to sing, not only at Christmas time, but always, a song praising God.

The six archangels, turning to Uriel, asked, "What is that song which they sing to the Lord?"

And he answered, "The song is called, How Great Thou Art."

"And know you the name of the man who wrote the song?"

"His name is known," Uriel assured them.

Again the Brothers asked, "What man created that orbiting moonspeck?"

And Uriel replied, "Not one man, but hundreds toiled long and hard to achieve it."

Then the blessed Lord smiled.

And all the archangels knew His judgment, and together with one glorious voice ex-

claimed, "The song is mightier than the satellite, for the song men sent up has reached the Most High."

Then the hosts of heaven and the hierarchy of light caught up the song, and with it the hearts of men.

Uriel, because of his readiness to renounce heaven for the earthlings, now stands at the left hand of God's throne, guarding the luminaries in the firmament, and his responsibilities are multiplied.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear Lt. Gen. Thomas F. Hickey address the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Ga., on March 17. General Hickey is doing an outstanding job as Commanding General of the Third Army. General Hickey has had a most illustrious career in the service, rising from an enlisted status to the command of our largest Continental Army. He has made many friends in the Southeast. We admire his character and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress and the country the following splendid address which was greatly enjoyed by all of us at the Hibernian banquet in Savannah:

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

This is the day when those of us of Irish origin or filiation—wherever we may be—gather together to display our fierce pride in our name and race, and to pay tribute to St. Patrick and that green little isle of saints and scholars. Today—all over the world—the sons and daughters of Kathleen ni Houlihan are meeting for the purpose of visiting again in spirit the land of their forebears, and, to allow their memories to dwell on the triunity of St. Patrick, Ireland and the shamrock. And, there is nothing unusual in these assemblages, because men and women from every county in Ireland have emigrated to every corner of this globe. Exiles continue to be Ireland's oldest and most dominant product. These exiles have generally arrived in time to assist in building a nation. If not—they have arrived in time to govern it. So, the basic purpose of our meeting together—on this the day we celebrate—is to proclaim our love and our devotion to the spiritual and temporal ideals implanted in us at birth by our Irish forebears.

The history of every country to which the sons and daughters of Erin have emigrated bears shining testimony to the part they have played in the establishment and preservation of their adopted country. Their spirit of nationalism has never been a local product. It has reached out to embrace all peoples and nations—wherever the twin evils of tyranny and oppression have raised their ugly heads. The Irishman's love of liberty, nourished through long periods of oppression in his native land, has been the impetus that allowed him to flourish in the free air of freedom elsewhere. No other country in history has lost so many of its people through emigration. Yet, they did not leave from a spirit of adventure alone. They left a country where their religion and language were proscribed; where the cultivation of their history and their heritage was forbidden; and, where their economic life was blighted by trade restrictions and a system of absentee landlordism. It was flight from these unjust conditions that caused our ancestors to leave Ireland and which allowed them to build the long and lustrous record of loyalty, devotion, and patriotism in their adopted lands. And, the Irishman took with him—to the ends of the earth—as he sought liberty and hope, a deep and abiding faith in God; and a reverence and respect for the family, our fundamental social unit and the basis of our society.

These are the hallmarks of the Irishman, wherever he may be. He knows, despite his love of Ireland and his devotion to his adopted country, that every land including his own is a temporary domicile. He knows that outside of Heaven there is no permanent home. And, that is why Irishmen are born missionaries. Steeped in the spirit of Patrick, they have traveled all over the world, combating atheism and unbelief, secularism and materialism, serene in the knowledge that God is monitoring their work. They have always opposed any remedy for man's ills that overemphasizes the importance of material things and pretends that God is not necessary. They have always opposed any false cure that would have matter seen through the senses replace God, and that would produce a code of morality derived from the transient ideas or the irrational whims of an individual, a group or a nation. Their attitude of strength, sturdiness, uncompromising understanding, and strict adherence to important essentials, assisted them in carrying their faith throughout the world. Few of them have had their names inscribed in the calendar of saints, and it must be because God, monitoring their work, knows how the Irish resent the singling out of an individual. Then too—it would have to be a very special soul to be singled out from so many who are so worthy.

And the zeal of the Irish schoolmaster and scholar who spread Christian learning and culture and tradition throughout Europe and the rest of the world, also spread the fame of his race on his journeyings. He it was who knew education in the true sense of the word. He knew and taught that the purpose of education was not alone to fill the mind with knowledge. This is merely instruction. Education, to him, meant the strengthening and development of all man's faculties. He did not confine the term to the intellect alone, because he felt that true education did—or should—be concerned especially with the will. He believed that to impart intellectual culture without moral culture—such as is happening today in many of our institutions of learning—increased rather than decreased the possibilities of evil. Because without imparting the instrument of moral education—discipline—it is impossible to inculcate in the individual, the habit of self-restraint. And, without the habit of self-restraint, the individual cannot develop the willpower that makes character.

What shall we say of the Irish mother whose devotion to her God and to those whom He has entrusted to her care has been enshrined in song and story? Her labor and sacrifice for her loved ones was a willing task—welcome in its never-ending demands on her love and affections. The moral code she taught her children was a simple one but it was a rigid one, too, because it was based on rigid norms of what is right and what is wrong. She taught rules of conduct that were to govern their free actions; as the precepts to subordinate their conduct to what is right and proper. She taught them to respect and obey their parents; to provide for their families; to control their lower appetites; and, above all, to honor God and place their country's interests above their own. And, she taught too, that the effectiveness of this code was based on the restrictions which the individual imposed upon himself through a disciplined mind and an unselfish restraint.

Such is the heritage of those who have made the isle of saints and scholars famous in history. These are the real monuments to the real Ireland. One has to look behind the keen intellect, the strong will, the sharp wit, the blend of realistic bluntness and hidden sentimentality, the mixture of warm-hearted sympathy and hard-headed practicality; the championing of the underdog and participation in every lost cause while, at the same time, remaining the citadel of conservatism—one has to look behind all this to really understand the Irishman. One must get to know the fervor and depth of his religious convictions. God is an ever-present reality to the Irishman. He does not grope in the shadow of atheism and unbelief which surrounds him. He knows that material prosperity is not real freedom. He knows that it is the goals of life and not the goods of life that are important. He believes that no individual or group can be allowed to profit at the expense of public morality. And, he knows that there can be no real freedom unless there is order in our social and moral life. He is still steeped in the spiritual impulse which St. Patrick gave to his race. And, the Christian tenets which Patrick made known to our Irish ancestors over 1,500 years ago are needed—in their practical application—in this country and the world today. The spiritual zeal of the Irishman must be copied if we are to combat the secularism and materialism in our midst.

The man and woman of Irish ancestry is today a bulwark in the defense of our way of life. He mans the ramparts because his history tells him that he has always fought best when alien fog attempted to dim his ideals. Just as Patrick lighted his fire on Shane Hill in defiance of King Leary because he believed that the one true God toook precedence over Leary's pagan gods, so, today, men and women of Irish extraction must keep Patrick's fire burning in this unsettled and contradictory world. The spiritual fervor of the Irishman requires that he combat the atheism and unbelief—and pseudo-liberalism—which is threatening our way of life. His heritage requires that he defend the principles that the basic rights of man are God-given rights; that the purpose of the state is to safeguard these God-given rights; and, that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. He must defend these principles in a troubled, frustrated, and undisciplined world, where an evil, atheistic, materialistic concept of government is an insidious threat to man's liberty and his human dignity as a son of God—a fallacious form of government which has depended on hate and cruelty and violence to subjugate its victims.

Love of God and love of country—these are the moral virtues which light the way against the forces attempting to engulf us. And, his continued glory in his name and his race requires the Irishman to fight against the pagan enemies confronting him today as did his ancestors combat tyranny, oppression, and injustice from the caves and hills of Ireland. So, let us tonight—as we watch in spirit—men and women of Irish ancestry gather together all over the world, to join in the laughter and songs of Ireland—let us remember that a part of our heritage is to share in their faith. This faith is a virtue that a Communist can never possess. This faith is a light that will guide us to our goal despite the indifference and apathy and neglect which surrounds us. This faith is a knowledge preserved and maintained by our ancestors through the centuries. This faith proclaims one eternal truth. And, it is this—the future belongs to no man or group of men. It belongs only to God.

Religious Imperatives and the Foreign Aid Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein views of some of the key leaders of major riligious faiths which appeared in a publication of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order entitled, "Religious Imperatives and the Foreign Aid Issue."

RELIGIOUS IMPERATIVES AND THE FOREIGN AID ISSUE

VIEWS OF SOME KEY LEADERS OF MAJOR RELIGIOUS FAITHS

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, national director, Society for the Propagation of the Faith: "Our moral duty to aid the underprivileged arises from the fact that we have superfluities and the superfluities of the rich are the necessities of the poor. It was a pagan, Terence, who said: 'Charity begins at home.' It was Christ, the Son of God, who in the parable of the good Samaritan said that charity begins away from home with people who are not of our race or country.

"In aiding underprivileged countries we are not to think of ourselves as superior because we are economically wealthier; or that those who are aided are inferior because economically poorer. * * * We need to justify our wealth by sharing it; we need to thank God for making us the most prosperous Nation on the earth; we need the blessing of heaven on our hearts and the grace of God on our whole being. Therefore with humility and not with pride and superiority we extend our hands to the needy. Theirs is the burden of being underprivileged; ours is the burden of being overprivileged. It is their stomachs that are empty; it could be our hearts that are empty. In any case, they could conceivably do without our aid, but we cannot continue to be without justice and charity.

"The foreign aid of the United States must introduce some factor besides the economic, political, and military, one which is the strongest in our national traditions and one which the Soviets not only lack but repudiate. They have one fear in our dealing with the rest of the world, that we will take cognizance of that defect which makes them suspect by all the peoples of Asia and Africa, and that is our belief in God, the dignity of the human person, the freedom of conscience, and the principle that the state exists for man, not man for the state. When we go along with the Communist line that matter alone matters, we are weak and they are strong, when we give economic aid on the basis that matter alone does not matter, they are powerless and we are strong. "This is the crux of the question of foreign aid."

Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, president, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America: "All of us, as members of the one body of mankind, are entering upon a completely new era of history—the nuclear space age. We welcome the coming of this age. It is more exciting than the age of Columbus and Magellan. We should look upon it as a part of the ongoing purpose of the eternal God, moving toward a goal that is bigger than any political, ecclesiastical, or nationalistic interest. In the presence of this completely new development in history we can no longer think in terms of 1 nation or 1 continent alone. We must think in terms of the universal and the ultimate. For we are now not only 1 Nation under God, but 1 world under God. This is true whether or not we believe it.

"One of the greatest weapons of the spirit that we could possibly use is certainly that of mutual aid and economic assistance—the kind of aid that will make substantial investments both of public and private money in underdeveloped areas, thereby helping the impoverished nations and at the same time increasing the level of trade, commerce, and industry of our own country. * * * Many people in America have the idea that we are engaged in a vast giveaway program in the field of foreign aid. Actually, it is a very tiny proportion of our mutual-security program.

"A program of mutual aid should not be considered primarily as a weapon or a tool in our fight against communism. It should be based upon an interest in people as people, human beings who are in partnership with us as children of God, and deserving of the same blessings that we enjoy. At the same time it is only fair to recognize that such a program will powerfully counteract the Communist thrust.

"We are now in an international storm of revolution, nationalism, and the unknown dangers of the nuclear space age. I dare to believe that if the major political parties will rise above party alignments and provide for the basic needs of our own people and the world's people, they will receive the increasing support of the Nation. May God with the help of His love and grace help America to rise up in the true greatness of its people and fulfill its mission to the world."

Rabbi Theodore L. Adams, president, the Synagogue Council of America: "We have come here because what is at stake is an overriding moral issue affecting the brotherhood of man and essential spiritual values in face of an unprecedented onslaught of materialist atheism.

"It seems to me that the necessity for this conference reflects a failure on the part of the American people, a failure to act in consonance with its highest ideals.

"What are these ideals?

"They are, first the ideals of our biblical faith; and, second, the ideals which inspire America's democratic traditions. These ideals which are shared by the majority of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, have as their central affirmations that God is the Lord of history, the creator, sustainer, and redeemer of all mankind, the judge of all men and nations. To Him is due the supreme loyalty, and not to the State, political party, or ruler.

"We know full well that the changeless values of our religious faith, the democratic institutions of our Nation, and the providential abundance of this good earth, have produced all that is good in us. These ideals and material legacies impose upon us, both as a Nation and as individuals, a moral responsibility to transmit to others, and to future generations, our democratic faith as well as our material wealth.

"As religionists, we feel profoundly that the utilitarian motive of benevolence is not worthy of the United States. The moral character and destiny of America compel the higher motives of compassion, of brotherhood, or respect for human personality.

"If this program fails, it will be the failure not only of the United States Government, but of the pattern of America's moral approach in the eyes of the world. It will not fail because the American people have never left unanswered the challenge of morality."

Reverend Demetrios Kalaris and Rev. John Tavlarides, Eastern Orthodox Church, Washington, D. C., in a joint statement: "We Eastern Orthodox clergymen firmly believe that, in the interest of man's welfare and the manifestation of our Christian charity, special support should be given the policies of foreign aid of the United States. We believe that it is in the spirit of brotherhood under God that our country has provided for the needs of people throughout the world and not as some would have us believe, primarily because of selfish motivation or expediency."

Reverend James L. Vizzard S. J., vice president, National Catholic Rural Life Conference: "All people of informed Christian conscience recognize in the mutual-security program our Nation's answer to a religious and moral imperative. If we dedicate ourselves to a program for shared abundance, we may never again be called upon to dedicate our lives and our wealth to a program of shared disaster. We believe that here the United States has the opportunity and the privilege to give moral leadership to the world as it has provided political and military leadership."

Opening invocation by Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, Chairman of FRASCO, at White House Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security, February 25, 1958: "Eternal God by whose holy inspiration and almighty power our fathers won their liberties of old, we their children and Thine ask in this day of testing that we may be renewed in our love of freedom and in the will to sacrifice for it.

"We ask, O God, that the people of America may be ready to hear, above the noise of selfish clamor, the still small voice of God within, the voice which speaks to us of the things that pertain to peace, justice, and charity.

"Especially, our Father in heaven, we the members of this White House Conference on Mutual Security bow in reverence before Thy great name and implore Thy grace and blessing on our efforts to think what is true and do what is right. May a fire be kindled here which shall spread to many hearts in this land of the free, enabling Americans of every calling to see the vision without which, O God, we perish and Thy world perishes.

"For Thine own name's sake. Amen."

The Honorable BROOKS HAYS, United States Congressman from Arkansas (also president, Southern Baptist Convention): "Will the ideas and method of communism win out in this global struggle or will the ethical and religious way of life we have inherited from our fathers prove victorious? I have no doubts about the outcome, but we must be vigilant on many fronts. Mutual security and sane economic assistance to underdeveloped nations are practical ways in which our great country works from year to year to build a world that is more just and compassionate. It is one way to help lay the foundations for a better life on this earth which God has committed to our keeping."

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister, Washington Hebrew Congregation: "The heart of our western heritage of faith is the love of a righteous and merciful God and the love of man, because all men are the children of God. This love must express itself in acts of loving kindness, in aiding our fellow men so that they can solve the problems of poverty and disease, of slavery and tyranny. Foreign aid is not only good religion but enlightened self-interest, for the men we help will become allies in the building of a just world."

Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, minister, Marble Collegiate Church, New York City: "For the United States to discontinue or cripple its mutual security program would please the Communists more than any one thing I can think of. Wherever I have traveled, I have found that thoughtful nationals feel American aid constitutes a serious and sincere effort to help them undergird free institutions."

Mr. Harry W. Flannery, president, Catholic Association for International Peace: "It is my humble opinion that if the full significance of foreign aid could be brought home to the American people, they would be ashamed to realize how little of our national wealth is being devoted to its cause. We have been letting the people in underdeveloped countries believe that our interest in them is derived only from our struggle with the Soviet Union. We should give aid primarily, in accordance with our traditions, in the spirit of justice, and because we have a moral responsibility to do so."

Dr. Paul S. Rees, minister, the Covenant Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; past president, National Association of Evangelicals: "My observations abroad convince me that the discontinuance of foreign aid would be a disservice alike to our own country and to the free world. Weakness in administration should be corrected but no countenance should be given to any proposal for doing away with this arm of helpfulness in a world of need."

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta area, the Methodist Church: "Let us not be mistaken, if atheistic communism prevails in the world, it will more deeply wound the human family and damage human society than any merely economic or political system, however bad, could possibly do. By the mutual security program of the United States Government as well as by a powerful revival of the spiritual values underlying our civilization, we can restore hope to the millions of earth and counter unrest and the fear of war with the assurance of peace."

The Right Rev. Angus Dun, Episcopal Bishop, Washington: "I think it is true that you can hardly expect a nation in its corporate political capacity to go beyond enlightened, informed self-interest, but I believe self-interest that is never guided by anything but self-interest will fall short of self-interest. That is, unless it is illuminated by a light coming from beyond the general level of ordinary decencies, it will fall short of the highest interests.

"That is, unless we are helped to look out in sensitivity and pity and generosity toward the desperate needs of multitudes of our fellows, we shall not even achieve the level of our own interests, because it is to our interest that these people trust us, that they respect us, that they turn toward the vaguely understood system of life which has done so much, as we were reminded here, along with very favorable circumstances, certainly, to give us the good inheritance and the position we have."

Dr. A. Powell Davies, deceased, formerly minister, All Souls Church, Unitarian, Washington, D. C.: "There are some people who still trot out the trite canard that loving our neighbor means what we do in direct relationship with him and that we cannot love him through acts of Congress. This is just a tired platitude. In the modern world we cannot even do our ordinary duty to our neighbor except through acts of Congress. This is true within our own country, as we have begun to recognize, and it is also true of our duty to the world."

Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Church, Methodist, New York City: "The time is at hand for the recognition of the interdependence of all nations. This is an age when the incomparable spirit and achievements of America must be applied to the task of creating the economic, social, and political conditions of a genuine world peace, resting on freedom and justice."

Fourteen chaplains and ministers of all faiths to the university students and community at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., in a joint statement: "We are sure, since there is an eternal right concerned with human values, that to ignore the aspirations of people for political freedom, the feeding of hungry men, women, and children, and assistance programs that raise the living standards of people is perilous and will be nationally self-defeating, however many missile bases we erect around Russia or sputniks are put into outer space."

Test Propaganda—Escape From Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the Soviets have unilaterally ceased nuclear testing has had a sharp impact throughout the world. Not too long ago the United States was rudely awakened to the facts of life by the launching of sputnik. In both instances the administration and its leaders sought to minimize these events instead of facing up to the seriousness of the situation.

We do not endear ourselves to our allies and to the uncommitted countries by labeling these things a gimmick. We do not convince our citizens that we will lose our shirts by conferring at any level.

It is late for us now, but there is still time to recoup. We must stop sloganeering and develop a positive and constructive approach. We dare not make mistakes which indicate that a nuclear explosion was heard only 250 miles away, when it was in fact heard almost 2,000 miles away, again reflecting a predisposition on the part of our officials and a negative type of approach.

We must have boldness and imagination, but more importantly we must be honest with our people if we are to survive.

I would like to insert at this point the lead editorial from today's Washington Post and Times Herald, and the column by Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Escape From Reality," which also appeared in the Post today.

The articles follow:

Test Propaganda

If the administration regards the controversy over nuclear weapon tests as merely a battle of propaganda, it is no wonder that the United States has come off so badly. President Eisenhower yesterday termed the announcement of the suspension of Soviet tests a gimmick. It may well be a gimmick, coming as it does just after completion of Soviet tests and before a new series of American tests. But the effect could not really have been offset by just a gimmick on our side.

It is true, as Secretary Dulles observed, that the Russians are formidable propagandists who go to lengths to which the United States will not go. They are capitalizing on men's fears and hopes for their own purposes. But their appeal cannot be countered just by calling it propaganda; nor can these fears and hopes be dismissed as impertinent. The Russians appear to be doing something imaginative and affirmative. We don't. It is as simple as that.

Through a combination of hesitation and poor articulation the administration has accentuated its own dilemma. There seems to have been no very clear idea of what the administration wanted to do in anticipation of the Soviet move—except do nothing. The result is a largely negative position which not even the most polished Madison Avenue gloss could have converted into something positive.

Whether or not the decision not to suspend American tests was right, once this decision was made the administration had two logical alternative courses. One was to make a really thorough, documented explanation of why this country was continuing its nuclear tests—an explanation that avoided the usual pooh-poohing of fears and instead made a sober statement of risks. The best case the administration could make for the testing of clean weapons is that they might permit conversion to the sort of deterrent that would not imperil all humanity in the event of large nuclear war. To make a convincing explanation would have been difficult, but it could have been tried.

The other, and in this newspaper's opinion, far preferable, course was to announce that we were placing further tests under United Nations supervision—and that simultaneously we were making the technology of clean weapons available to the Russians. U. N. supervision would help relieve fears of radioactive contamination. And if the administration really believes in the humanitarian advantages of clean weapons, such as they may be, surely it would be in our own and our allies' interest to encourage the Russians to clean up their own stockpiles.

These courses remain open. A move along either of these lines now would seem belated, but until the administration determines to assert itself in some way this country will inevitably remain at a disadvantage. The best propaganda still is constructive action.

The Escape From Reality

(By Walter Lippmann)

It was an ordeal for Secretary Dulles to have to face a big press conference a few hours after the morning papers had carried the story of the Soviet suspension of nuclear testing. He chose to treat the Soviet move as a tricky and meaningless propaganda stunt, which they with their closed society can exploit, whereas we in our open and free society are unable to match it. This theory may comfort him but it is, I venture to believe, a dangerous form of escapism from the hard realities of the world situation.

For it rests on the notion that our many reverses and the decline of our influence are due not to defects in our policies but to the superior advantages of the Soviet Union in propaganda. That is to say, when our products do not sell, the trouble lies not with the engineering in the quality of the product but in the packaging and the advertising. The whole world would agree with John Foster Dulles if it were not that the world is so gullible that it is being taken in by the Russians. This is flattering to our pride but it is not true.

Consider, for example, the subject of nuclear testing which Mr. Dulles was discussing. He pointed out, quite truly, that the Soviet Union has just completed a series of tests whereas we are preparing to make a series of tests this spring and summer. The Soviet trick is, he says, to suspend the tests which they do not now need for some time to come, hoping to prevent us from making our tests which we very much need to make.

But is this such a difficult trick to deal with? The natural way to deal with it would be to say that when we, like the Soviet Union, have completed our tests, we too will suspend further testing provided the Soviet Union does not resume testing. The world is not so gullible that it would not understand the common sense of this retort.

This retort is not, however, open to us because the controlling fact is that our mili-

tary position in the world is built upon the deterrent power of nuclear weapons. It happens that Mr. Dulles spoke of our desire "to eliminate nuclear weapons effectively from the international arsenals." But why he said this, why he made so utopian a remark, I cannot imagine. For the elimination of nuclear weapons would make quite impossible the strategic containment through a network of alliances to which he is committed.

This is the real reason why American propaganda works badly. If we cannot or will not revise our policies, Mr. Dulles would do better to be candid and to tell the world frankly that we cannot suspend tests because we cannot abolish nuclear weapons without a revolutionary change in our foreign policy. He could then argue that the Russians with their massive conventional forces and their interior lines cannot be contained without nuclear weapons. This would not make him beloved in the world. But it would make him believed.

All this applies to much more than the particular issue of nuclear testing. American propaganda is in trouble not because the Russians are able to lie with impunity but because in so many critical areas American propaganda is trying to sell policies which for one reason or another are obsolete, are fictions, are profoundly unpopular.

There is the central fiction in the Far East that Formosa is China, and that the actual government of China on the mainland ought to disappear. No propaganda can make a policy based on that fiction credible, much less convincing and inspiring. In south Asia there is the fiction, which defies strategic geography, that we are arming Pakistan to defend the Middle East against the Red army. This is a fiction which has earned us the deep suspicion of India. In the Middle East there is the fiction that the Arab States will remain with the West if only we can prevent the Soviet forces from invading them.

And in Europe there is the fiction that Adenauer's Germany will absorb East Germany and that in some unknown way the Red army will roll itself back out of Eastern Europe. The fact of the matter is that the mass of the people do not like these fictions, and the informed leaders of opinion know that they are fictions and do not believe in them. That is why our propaganda works badly.

A wise and experienced man said to me in Paris that the Western World was in a political decline, not so much because the Soviet Union was so strong and so shrewd but because the western democracies made so many mistakes and lacked the political courage to rectify them. Listening to Mr. Dulles at Tuesday's press conference, I wondered whether he was not trying to escape from that bitter truth.

Application for Surplus Foods Surprisingly Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Monday, March 31, 1958.

It is gratifying to see that once surplus foods were made available to the needy people of St. Louis the real demand for these foods proved to be small. The fact that the demand was small places the present economic recession in a more real light:

SEEKING SURPLUS FOOD

Social workers say the number of needy St. Louisans who have applied for Federal surplus foods so far is surprisingly low. This is an encouraging fact. It should not be misinterpreted to suggest that St. Louis does not require the surplus food program.

The measurement of need in these cases has to be on an individual, not a mass, basis. No family should be left without food because the head of the family is unemployed. And unless the recession ends soon, more and more citizens may exhaust their unemployment insurance benefits and also be ineligible, under State law, for direct relief.

Mayor Tucker and the Board of Aldermen saw the prospect of hunger looming here and acted quickly. They are to be congratulated for making the Federal food supplies available. If few citizens need those supplies, so much the better.

The Biggest Fraud in Our Economic History Is the Fictitious Pricing Now Used in the Sale of Consumer Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959 correctly increases the appropriations for operations of Government in fields which will tend to alleviate unemployment. However, our present economic distress has another factor, the rising cost of living. I find little in this bill which bears directly on the cost of living except an increase of $100,000 for the Securities Exchange Commission to protect buyers of securities from fraud and deception. I find nothing in the bill to afford similar protection to the great mass of consumers.

This Congress can and should provide the same protection against fraud and deception to the housewife, the small-wage earner, and the social-security pensioner. An increased appropriation of $100,000 to the Bureau of Consultation of the Federal Trade Commission will protect people now grievously injured by fraud and deception in the sale of consumer goods.

Purchasers of securities have special problems concerning fraud and deception, but the consumer of necessaries of life has even greater problems avoiding the deception worked on him every day in the marketplace. The biggest fraud in our economic history is the fictitious pricing now generally used in the sale of all consumer goods. And there is every indication the fraud will grow in extent and viciousness as competition increases for the disappearing consumer dollar.

Fictitious and deceptive pricing, the offer of phony bargains, have been encountered in one form or another by every Member of this body who has shopped for food, clothing, appliances, or whatever, within the past year. It is acknowledged by the Better Business Bureaus, the voluntary trade associations, and the Federal Trade Commission as the most prevalent, pernicious, and destructive fraud presently deceiving the consumer.

Deceptive pricing usually offers: $50 value, now only $25, when the actual price of the article offered has never been more than $25; or even worse, $50 value, now only $25, when the actual price of the article offered has never been more than $17.50. It artificially raises the cost of living and deprives the housewife, the small-wage earner, and the social-security pensioner of the real bargains they so eagerly seek and now so sorely need.

We can stop this practice. The Bureau of Consultation of the Federal Trade Commission has developed techniques of enforcement sufficient to stamp out such cheating. Within the last year, in spite of a personnel shortage, it has successfully attacked two closely allied deceptions, bait advertising and preticketing.

The Bureau of Consultation, by use of its trade-practice rules, has defined bait advertising for one industry, and in cooperation with the business community is obtaining enforcement in several industries. Bait is an offer to sell a line of merchandise at a ridiculously low price in order to coax buyers into the advertiser's store. Salesmen then pressure and persuade a prospective buyer to purchase more expensive equipment on display. The bait line can never be found, or has already been sold out before the first buyer arrives in the store.

Preticketing is now prohibited in several industries. The practice was used by manufacturers and packagers, usually under competitive pressure by their retailers. The packager merely inserted a price tag bearing a fictitiously high price in the package containing the manufactured article. The retailer then could point to the fictitiously high price tag as proof that he, the retailer, had reduced prices on this bargain.

But these are only allied to the principal evil, which is fictitious, fraudulent pricing. And that deception must be eliminated if the consumer is to have an even break in the market place.

I have looked through the hearings of our Appropriations Committee, its report on this bill and the bill itself. While I note information regarding the availability of the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Consultation, its trade practice rules and advertising-guide procedures to eliminate fraud between the buyer and seller of consumer goods, the bill does not provide funds sufficient to apply these powers for protection of the large mass of consumers. The purchaser of the necessaries of life should receive the same protection we are willing to afford the purchaser of investment securities.

I am deeply concerned that this Congress may allow one of the Federal Government's most vital powers to protect the consumer to be crippled by lack of

funds in a year when its use is desperately needed.

I support this bill in other particulars. I contend, however, that the consumers of food, clothing, and other necessaries should have at least another $100,000 worth of the same protection we are willing to give purchasers of investment securities.

Proposed Legislation for Revision of Reserve Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House a bill which would make more credit available to offset the current economic recession, and would be of particular benefit to many thousands of small and medium-sized banks throughout the country. The bill changes reserve requirements for banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System. The principal change would be to permit banks to count vault cash as part of the reserves they are required to maintain with the Federal Reserve System. The smaller banks known as country banks hold $1.4 billion in vault cash, and would be the principal beneficiaries of this change. By counting these dollars in meeting reserve requirements, we will greatly expand the capacity of these banks to make loans. I am particularly anxious to expand this lending capacity in the smaller banks, which can do so much to help farmers and small-business men. The bill would also lower the statutory range of reserve requirements for central Reserve city banks to make them equal to the requirements for Reserve city banks. This change is in line with action taken recently by the House Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the proposed new Financial Institutions Act.

The bill was prepared by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I am inserting a detailed explanation of its provisions, prepared by the Board:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR REVISION OF SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is proposing to Congress three changes in existing law concerning reserve requirements of member banks. The proposed amendments would:

1. Authorize the Board to permit member banks to include all or part of their vault cash holdings in their required reserves;

2. Authorize the Board to fix the reserve requirements for demand deposits of central Reserve city banks within a range of 10 to 20 percent, instead of the present authorized range of 13 to 26 percent. (For other classes of deposits at member banks, the ranges within which the Board is authorized to fix the requirements would remain as at present.)

3. Make more flexible the Board's authority to permit individual member banks in central Reserve or Reserve cities to carry lower reserves than those specified for banks in such cities.

Purposes of these proposals may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The counting of vault cash as reserves would correct a generally recognized inequity that now exists because many banks find it necessary for operating purposes to hold larger amounts of vault cash than do other banks. Since vault cash holdings and reserve balances at the Reserve banks are interchangeable and both serve the same purpose in influencing the volume of bank credit, they should both be counted as reserves. Counting of vault cash as reserves would also have collateral advantages, such as reducing the costs of transporting and handling currency and facilitating the holding by member banks of larger stocks of currency that would be available over widely dispersed areas for use in a national emergency.

Such a provision would make possible the release of over $2 billion of reserves for all member banks. Country banks hold nearly $1.4 billion of vault cash, amounting to about 4 percent of their net demand deposits, or over a fourth of their present required reserves, while Reserve city banks as a group have vault cash holdings amounting to less than 2 percent of net demand deposits or a tenth of their total required reserves. The vault cash holdings of many large city banks, however, including most central Reserve city banks, amount to 1 percent or less of their net demand deposits and but a small fraction of required reserves. Thus this provision taken alone would not only add greatly to the total supply of reserves but also would have the effect of widening and distorting existing differentials in reserve requirements as between classes of banks. It would, therefore, be necessary to put these changes into effect gradually and to accompany them by partly offsetting adjustments in the reserve-requirement percentages.

2. Under the present law, by reclassifying cities or by abolishing classifications and also by changing requirements, the Board has legal authority to alter differentials in requirements as between the broad classifications of member banks. By using this authority any undue distinctions between classes of banks may be gradually reduced. If vault cash holdings are permitted to be counted as reserves, it would have the effect of lowering the required reserves of each class of banks, but particularly of country and Reserve city banks, where vault cash holdings are relatively large. The Board consequently is proposing no change in the percentage requirements as now stated in the law for these classes of banks—7 to 14 percent and 10 to 20 percent, respectively, against net demand deposits.

It is proposed, however, that permissible requirements for central Reserve city banks be lowered to the 10 to 20 percent range authorized for Reserve city banks. A maximum requirement of 20 percent against net demand deposits for any bank or class of banks is believed to be adequate for any purpose under present or prospective conditions. While this amendment would retain authority for keeping three classes of banks with differential requirements against demand deposits, it would tend to encourage narrower differentials as between classes of banks.

3. Under existing law individual member banks can be permitted to carry lower requirements if they are located in the outlying districts of central Reserve or Reserve cities. This provision permits the Board to alleviate inequities which arise when banks located in such outlying districts are predominantly engaged in business that is similar to that of banks with a lower reserve classification. It does not, however, permit the Board to bring equivalent relief to such banks if they are located in the central districts of Reserve and central Reserve cities. The amendment proposed would permit adoption of more rational criteria for exempting individual banks than can be used under existing law and thereby make possible elimination of some existing inequities.

With the amendments proposed, along with other provisions of existing law, the Board would have adequate authority to make any changes in the structure and level of reserve requirements that are likely to be appropriate under present or prospective conditions. Legislative authority with respect to both the level and structure of reserve requirements for member banks should be sufficiently flexible to enable adjustments to be made in a manner, in amounts, and at times that are consistent with the aims of monetary policy, with the international position of the country, and with the maintenance of a sound and effectively functioning banking system. Existing law with the amendments proposed would permit moving gradually toward a more equitable and rational structure of reserve requirements and toward making in the course of time any changes in the level of reserve requirements, consistent with appropriate monetary policy and sound banking practices, that may be needed to meet the monetary and credit needs of a growing economy.

Statement on Behalf of United African Nationalist Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made to the House Foreign Affairs Committee March 25, 1958, by James R. Lawson on behalf of the United African Nationalist Movement, 2090 Seventh, New York, N. Y.:

FOREWORD

World war III, in its shooting stage, will undoubtedly will everything to Africa and Asia inasmuch as there will not be enough left of the rest of the world to amount to much of anything.

World war III, as a propaganda battle of ideological ways of life, is in progress now. If it remains as such, the world must choose between communism and America's democracy. There is not room for both on this planet. Communism only has a little way to go now to join the total victory. She only has to convert what is left of Asia, and wait for Africa to be pushed into her arms by Europe's stubborn role as colonist. There will be no need for war then. America will be isolated. A mere glimpse of a globe of the world will announce these facts and what they mean to a grammar-school child. It is almost too late for America to wake up and turn the tables. There are only a few grains of sand left in this hourglass of time for man's dream of freedom for the people and by the people, freedom of worship, freedoom of speech, freedom for the pursuit of happiness. Wake up.

Stop America's complicity with French Air Force that bombed the Tunisian town of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef on February 8, 1958.

Recommend that all French forces stationed in Tunisia, including naval base of Bizerte, be evacuated. There has been very little economic aid from the United States to Tunisia.

No action has been taken (in the United States) as a result of the announcement of the French of creating a no man's land

about 200 miles long and 15 miles wide on the Algerian side of the Tunisian border, calling for a wholesale displacement of border-area civilians, similar to that between Israel and Egypt. As prowestern as President Habib Bourguiba is, such situations as these will reasonably force him or his country eventually to go the way of Nasser's Egypt. When this happens will you call him a dictator, a bigot and a Red puppet too?

It is encouraging to note that a United States military mission is training the imperial army in Ethiopia. However, our mission should be to help create a huge block of free peoples dedicated to our form of democracy in the entire continent of Africa. We are sure you must be aware that small sections of democracy can be either overrun or isolated.

America has been making a few steps toward helping countries that already have their freedom. But what about those countries that are fighting for freedom now, like Algeria and Kenya? Are we waiting for world war III with Communist Russia so that we can rescue them from the Communist grip as we rescued Ethiopia, France, and Hungary from the Fascist grip? We could have stopped World War II if we had done right by Ethiopia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia in the beginning of Germany's and Italy's expansion. The stakes are even higher now if we put our foot down on the freedom side of the scales at this moment. The stakes now are clearly phrased with such words as annihilation, total destruction, end of civilization, IBM rockets, sputniks, world communism, atomic- and hydrogen-bomb warfare.

Gentlemen we believe that the only answer to colonialism and communism is nationalism; i. e., Asia for the Asians, the Middle East for the Arabs, and Africa for the Africans.

Just recently we sent the following suggestion to the President:

"Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President United States of America,
Washington, D. C.:

"Mr. President, Russia sent to Cairo a colored Russian of Asian origin to make certain commitments to Africa and Asia supposedly for economic aid on a brother-to-brother basis. I suggest you send Americans of African origin, that is, arm me or some of my associates in whom the African leaders have confidence with a tangible exonomic and political commitment to be delivered at Accra in April. Mr. President, if you fail to do this I feel Africa will go the way of China and the rest of Asia. I have sent additional information under separate cover.

"Yours for a free Africa now,
"JAMES R. LAWSON,
"President, United African Nationalist Movement.
"NEW YORK CITY."

Gentlemen, the following is a documentation of many of the suggestions we have made to the Government of the United States of America during the past 7 years, and as you can readily see, it is always too little and too late.

We said in a telegram February 28, 1951:

"Re bill to send troops to defend Europe.

"Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

"Mr. Chairman, I would like to appear before your committee on behalf of the United African Nationalist Movement and myself. Our views are: No. 1, the European people will not fight; i. e., they surrendered to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy in World War II and will surrender in world war III to communistic Russia more readily, etc.

"No. 2, we propose that the United States Government ally herself with the 500 million African people—those at home and those abroad (20 million in the United States). The industrial potential of Africa you know, etc.

"No. 3, we propose that in order to gain the confidence of the African peoples the United States Government make a commitment to the African nationalist leaders here and in Africa for the liberation of their homeland.

"Sir, if you arm the African under African leadership we will not only defend Africa but will defeat and destroy Communist Russia once and for all.

"JAMES R. LAWSON,
President, United African Nationalist Movement."

The following was submitted to the Honorable John Foster Dulles when he became Secretary of State Designate:

"SUBJECT: WHAT SHOULD THE U. S. A.'S POLICY TOWARD AFRICA BE?

"(Report on advisory committee meeting held Saturday, January 3, 1953, Hotel Theresa, 125th Street and 7th Avenue, New York City)

"We of the United African Nationalist Movement and other interested American citizens of African blood and descent are becoming increasingly alarmed at America's foreign policy toward Africa's fight for freedom versus colonialism. And we feel that our feelings represent the bulk of Afro-Americans that are giving thought to the problem.

"By her refusal to take sides in the U. N. America is aiding and abetting the colonial powers since she is continuing to give material aid to said powers who are undoubtedly using much of it to keep African colonies under their domination. Meanwhile, there appears to be a gradual but definite tendency by the American press to brand Africa's efforts toward liberation with the taint of communism.

"We know that Africans are fighting for the same freedom that America fought for in her own revolution against colonialism. We believe that Africa will eventually free herself from colonialism. We are certain that at the present time the African peoples are far from being Communist in their aim for freedom. However, we feel a genuine fear that America's present policy may drive them into the Communist's camp. We recognize the danger of communism, and we recognize our kinship with the people of Africa. We, whom America has already recognized as the group lease affected by communistic ideas and beliefs, do not intend to sit idly by and watch America turn Africa into another China, thus paving the way for another Korea or Indochina. The destiny of Africa will have its effect upon white peoples all over the globe, and may decide the fate of the world.

"After due consideration and discussion among ourselves, with other interested citizens and various African representatives, we have arrived at certain conclusions that prompt us to make the following suggestions concerning the United States' policy toward Africa.

"1. American policy toward nonwhite independent countries in Africa

"(a) Like other independent countries they must be armed against further aggression with aid through the front door by the United States rather than through the back door by the totalitarian countries.

"(b) Ethiopians are already receiving training in European military schools, yet America has offered no such program for Ethiopians in this country. This situation should be remedied and the required Presidential appointments to West Point and Annapolis should be tendered to deserving Ethiopians, Liberians, Egyptians, and Libyans. Young officers should be brought here for 15 weeks' training courses in all branches of military service

"(c) British troops should be removed from the reserved areas in Ethiopia by March 1, 1953, inasmuch as they may endanger peace and security in East Africa.

"(d) Invite the President of Liberia, King of Libya, Premier of Egypt, and the Emperor of Ethiopia to make state visits to the United States of America.

"2. American policy toward protectorates

"(a) An immediate plebescite should be carried out among the people of these territories, especially in Tunisia, Morocco, and Condominium of the Sudan, as to the type of government they wish and the United States should recognize the decision and the will of the people of these territories for the mutual benefit of all.

"3. American policy toward U. N. trust territories

"(a) As further insurance of a technical, social, and economic progress toward independence, a time limit (perhaps a 10-year plan) should be set with regular annual reports.

"4. American policy toward colonies

"(a) American sympathy should remain with all peoples who aspire toward self-government in their own land or territory.

"(b) Expropriation of lands by colonial powers should be discouraged immediately.

"(c) American arms should be refused to those who are using them on Africans aspiring for their freedom.

"(d) America must remind herself and others that there is no support of colonialism in the U. N. Charter which recognizes the goal of government of the people by the people and for the people.

"5. American policy toward the so-called Union of South Africa

"(a) Break diplomatic relations with and stop all aid to the present Nazi-like regime in that country.

"6. American diplomatic policy toward Africa

"(a) America should assign Afro-Americans to ambassadorial and counselor posts in countries whose population consists of a predominance of black peoples, not only in Africa but in other areas such as the Caribbean. (Not one of the 30 Americans working in Ethiopia is of African descent.)

"7. American aid on the point 4 program

"(a) America should investigate and follow up every American dollar (collected from all groups in America) appropriated to underdeveloped countries. (Not one of the 67 Americans working in Ethiopia under point 4 is of African descent. The same is true of Egypt.)

"(b) One American of African blood and descent should be included in a 3-man commission to investigate these appropriations.

"JAMES R. LAWSON,
Chairman.
"JAMES LEAGUE, *Secretary."*

The following suggestions were made to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 85th Congress, Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program:

"STATEMENT OF JAMES R. LAWSON, PRESIDENT, UNITED AFRICAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT, 2090 SEVENTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

"Foreword

"A little more than one-third of the population of Africa is now free and Africa owes much of that freedom to the influence of America.

"The sympathetic attitude the United States is showing toward the countries in Africa that have attained their independence is very encouraging to us.

"However, we hasten to give the warning that there still exists the other two-thirds of Africa. Two-thirds still in ferment as was China and Korea and as the shadow of Russia once hovered over China and Korea, that shadow now hovers over Africa and Madagascar.

"There still exist countries like Kenya, and South Africa. To forget countries like these out of deference to Europe could cost us the continent of Africa as it did the continent of Asia.

"While we sympathize with America's dilemma due, no doubt, to cultural and racial ties to Europe, we see much further than that.

"We see the world observing that dilemma to be due to race prejudice, observing America attempting to rationalize on some kind of balance between the natural aspirations for freedom and the evilness of colonialism, as in Kenya.

"America must wake up to the fact that the majority of the nonwhite races of the world are not rationalizing on this subject. They see colonialism as evil and the desire for freedom as good. We cannot be so much percent for evil and so much percent for good. If we are not completely for good, we are against it. That is the way we are being judged.

"It is not enough for America to give verbal sanctions to some who are free and at the same time ignore the remainder who are not free. It is not enough to rap Britain and France on the wrists in a good-natured manner now and then concerning this matter. It is not enough to disagree with the colonists on the one hand and to give them the guns to maintain their colonial empire on the other.

"Meanwhile, Russia is extending its sphere of influence from the east coast to the west coast. She has raised her legation to an embassy in Addis Ababa and sent various cultural missions to the Ethiopian populace while the United States talks and debates. Russia has sent emissaries to Liberia and other newly freed countries while the United States talks and debates. Russia is getting ready to send an ambassador to Ghana while the United States talks and debates.

"In the light of Egypt, it is quite evident that Russia does more than talk and debate. Who knows what tangible aid is being given or is in the offering from Russia and who can blams needy countries for accepting it if it is not forthcoming from the democratic country from the west who merely talks and debates? These countries realize they must sink or swim in a world advancing at incredible speed. Countries that do not move fast enough will be lost. They have no alternative but to use whatever means at their command and to accept whatever aid is offered, no matter from whom. Egypt and Israel have proved to be no exception.

"America is notoriously a poor competitor in the diplomatic field of winning friends among the nonwhite peoples. Due, we suspect, to feelings of racial superiority by American emissaries who cannot resist bragging about bathtubs, radios, television, refrigerators, etc. Neither can they resist 'putting on the dog.' All this in the midst of people who are looking for a means to pull themselves up. To such people all this braggadocio seems to stem from bigots not friends. It is becoming quite evident that America does not understand other races of people fighting for freedom. This has been exhibited several times in countries like China, Indochina, and Korea. Russia, apparently, does.

"If this trend continues we will lose the next war by default. The rest of the countries will fall like ripe plums, if Russia succeeds in lining up all the countries containing most of the world's raw materials and manpower.

"We believe that at this very point the United States is fighting for its life.

"Now is the time for America to pull out all the stops, to stand up and be counted. As we have stated in our original message, America was the first country really and truly based upon the fundamental aspirations of mankind to be free. Fundamentally America was the country to be patterned after. America was once the hope of all freedom-desiring countries. Now we hope that it is not too late to wrest the lead from Russia.

"We must hasten to give aid and grants to the struggling peoples of Africa at least equal to that we have given and are giving to Europe which does not appreciate it half as much as Africa will.

"Russia has extended its sphere of influence from the East Coast of Africa to the West Coast.

"It is not enough for America to give verbal sanctions to African freedom and debate concerning it in the White House. The world, including Hungary, is tired of talk. The type of assistance offered by Russia is a formidable challenge to the offerings of a vacillating democracy.

"If America tries to compete with Russia culturally by using the type of propaganda attack she used in China, Korea, India, Arabia, etc., she is doomed to failure. The average American, especially of the Caucasian race, does not understand the darker peoples' fight for freedom from colonial rule. This has been exhibited time and time again. The graves of America's good intentions are being dug all over the world.

"America cannot use white representatives nor even black represenatives who are close to the white way of thinking. America must send representatives to Africa who understand Africans' likes and dislikes, and their hatred for colonial rule. There is only one type of American who can fill this bill—those of African descent who have been fighting for Africa's redemption since the times of Marcus Garvey. We do not mean pseudo-organizations but the bona fide ones who actively took Ethiopia's side in her war with Italy, who took the side of Kenya in her fight for liberation without any tint of communism or hatred for America in their ranks. Organizations which are recognized by these countries as fighting for the overthrow of colonialism.

"Just as important in this competition between Russia and the United States is military aid.

"National Aspirations of the African People

"Invite the President of Egypt, King of Libya, Bey of Tunis, King of Morocco, Premier of the Sudan, and the Premier of Ghana to make state visits to the United States of America.

"United States Policy Toward U. N. Trust Territories

"As further insurance of technical, social, and economic progress toward independence, a time limit (perhaps a 5-year plan) should be set.

"United States of America policy toward colonies

"(a) American sympathy should remain with all peoples who aspire toward self-government in their own land or territory.

"(b) Expropriation of lands by colonial powers must be ended immediately.

"(c) American arms should be refused to those who are using them on Africans fighting for their freedom and independence.

"(d) America must remind herself and others that there is no support of colonialism in the U. N. Charter which recognizes the goal of government of the people by the people and for the people.

"United States policy toward the so-called Union of South Africa

"(a) Break diplomatic relations with and stop all aid to and trade with, as long as the present Nazi-like regime in that country remains in power.

"United States diplomatic policy toward Africa

"(a) America should assign Afro-Americans to ambassadorial and consular posts in countries whose population consists predominately of African peoples, not only in Africa but in other areas such as the Caribbean.

"(b) The United States should appoint an American of African descent Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

"We know that the timetable of liberation for the combined African nationalist movement call for all of Africa to be free and independent with the reins of government in the hands of the indigenous Africans by 1965.

"Economic and military aid, and industrial development

"Public health, education, communications, transportation, roadbuilding, and technical know-how—

"Like other independent countries they must be armed against further aggression with aid through the front door by the United States rather than through the back door by the totalitarian countries. Through loans and grants of $10 billion in a 5-year development and defense program for Africa, at a rate of $2 billion per year for 5 years.

"We recommend the following amounts annually:

	"Millions
"Egypt	$200
Sudan	200
Ethiopia	200
Morocco	200
Libya	100
Liberia	100
Tunisia	100
Ghana	100
Total	1,200

"We recommend that the following amounts annually go to the following countries as soon as they gain their freedom and independence which we hope will be shortly:

	"Millions
"Nigeria	$200
Madagascar	100
Tanganyika	100
Algeria	100
Uganda	100
Sierra Leone	50
Senegal	50
Kenya	100
Total	800

"Special Participation of Afro-American Businessmen

"We further recommend that a special $1 billion fund be set up to finance small business in Liberia, West Africa, as a kind of pilot project—where small business such as the African Lumber and Home Building Co., Inc., can borrow money for expansion in Liberia and/or the Pyramid Trading Co., Inc., could borrow money for small-business operations in Liberia, Prima Cola Bottling Co., and the African Development Corp.

"These companies and several others owned by Americans of African descent could help make Liberia the showcase of American aid and know-how for the other African countries. They will doubt the United States sincerity as long as they see that we have done almost nothing to help Liberia. There is no need to send truckdrivers to Liberia or Ethiopia at $25 per day when there are plenty of truckdrivers just as good to be had at from $1 to $5 per day. This is not only a waste of United States taxpayers' money but Liberia and Ethiopia have to pay this money back with interest. These are the strings that many countries do not want attached to United States aid."

Gentlemen sirs, I am available to answer any questions.

St. Patrick's Day Address by the Very Reverend Charles H. McKenna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, while St. Patrick's Day is gone and past, its memory lingers on. Particularly for those of us who were privileged to hear the remarks delivered by the Very Reverend Charles H. McKenna, O. P., at the 58th annual dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick at Providence, R. I., on the evening of March 17.

A distinguished educator and noted lecturer, Father McKenna is a graduate of the Catholic University of America with the degree of doctor of philosophy. He also holds an earned degree of bachelor of literature from Oxford University in England. Father McKenna's talents range to many fields. While a member of the faculty of my own Providence College, where he also occupied the office of chaplain to the student body, he conceived and caused the erection of a magnificent grotto shrine as a memorial to those men of Providence College who offered their lives for their country in World War II. Today it is truly a landmark in my State.

Father McKenna is now prior of St. Stephens Dominican House of Studies at Dover, Mass. All the members of the Friendly Sons were extremely pleased to have him return to Providence and deliver his memorable address. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include Father McKenna's excellent St. Patrick's speech.

Weeks before the 17th of March, the clarion call for celebration can be heard in every country of the world where Irishmen have settled and been permitted the free pursuit of happiness. In this celebration they are never alone. They are joined by friends and neighbors of every racial origin, by the Italians and the Poles, by the Germans and the French, by the Orientals and the Occidentals—all want to share in the "wearin' of the green" and to glory in the joy of St. Patrick's Day. This is natural, for the Irishman has many gifts—and admittedly a few failings—he has certain qualities of character that endear him to some and estrange him to others, but none will question his genuine sincerity and stoutness of heart. These gifts, combined with an inhate humor have won him many friends wherever he has wandered. And all unite with him in commemorating the feast of the patron saint of Ireland.

In fact, St. Patrick is dear not only to Irishmen, but to all men of good will—to those who revere heroic sanctity, unfaltering faith in God, purposefulness and idealism, unbounded charity and dogged achievement. His gentle love for all the people of God, coupled with a stern denunciation of evil wherever found, his complete dependence upon Divine Providence, his burning enthusiasm in toil—all make him one of the great figures in an era of many Christian heroes.

Winston Churchill, in a book written about two decades ago, made the statement that one of the marks of a great man is that he so ordered the affairs of his own day that the course of future events was greatly influenced by what he did. Certainly no man has left a more enduring impression upon the history of Western civilization than Patrick, slave and saint of the Emerald Isle.

The spread of Christian belief, the development of learning, the growth of culture, not only received a tremendous impetus from St. Patrick, but even today, centuries after his death, the distinct stamp of his holy influence is still apparent. The truth which he preached has persisted as the greatest heritage of the Irish nation. So firmly did it take root in the very soil of the land, so forcibly and so continuously did it flow in the very bloodstream of its people, that neither the ravages of time nor the hatreds of war, neither the trials of prolonged persecution nor the destruction of churches, has been able to destroy it, or even to weaken it. Centuries of struggle and suppression and suffering have merely fanned the flames of faith so that they burned brighter and consumed even those who sought to extinguish that faith. While out of smoldering ruins rose new and bigger churches.

Such is the history of the Irish nation in its efforts to preserve the truth which Patrick taught, preached and lived. Few are the nations in all the Christian world which can boast of such a record of fidelity. Somehow I want to recall the words of the Book of Job, in the 14th chapter: "A tree hath hope; if it be cut, it groweth green again, and the boughs thereof sprout. If its roots be old in the earth, and its stock be dead in the dust; at the scent of water it shall spring forth leaves, as when it was first planted." These words have a particular significance when applied to the life and the work of St. Patrick, when applied to the faith of the Irish people.

Ireland is a country, like Spain, Portugal, Italy, where heresy never found even a brief haven. Other peoples have had their apostles and have followed them for a time, but then faltered in the moment of persecution. But the seeds of faith planted by St. Patrick and watered by the blood of countless martyrs were so firmly rooted that no power, however strong, has been able to destroy that faith. Today the whole Catholic world is profoundly indebted to Ireland not only for having preserved the faith at home, but also for having brought it to others. Missionaries, men and women, have carried the message of the Gospel across the oceans and over desert lands.

The intense love of God that had been instilled in them in the days of their childhood compelled them to seek out the pagan and the infidel no matter what the hazards of the journey nor the personal sacrifice involved. Not only missionaries, but wherever the loyal sons and daughters of Ireland went they carried the truth in their hearts and soon the example of a daily Christian life won many new souls to God. The Irish emigrants have been the strong nucleus of the Catholic Church in every land where they settled. If we praise St. Patrick, it is because he was God's instrument in history and the benefactor of all mankind. He, himself, was the humblest of creatures, but what he did personally and through the people that have been scattered by sacred chaff throughout the world, has merited the commendation of men of every race and creed in every age. Much as the world likes to pursue its purely materialistic aims, it is nevertheless forced to recognize and to pay tribute to the genuine worth, the defiant persistency, the ennobling influence of spiritual ideals. May the present generation of Irishmen throughout the world continue to shed lustre on the name and the labor of Patrick by continued faithfulness to these ideals.

It is an admitted fact that wherever Christianity has spread, there developed along with it a civilizing culture and a learning that brightened and comforted the lives of men. And if Irishmen are noted for their Catholicity, then they have an equal claim to fame in the intellectual world. For long before the great universities of continental Europe had begun, the Emerald Isle had achieved an outstanding record for scholarship. In fact, the continental universities owed their foundations in no small degree to Irish learning and professors who emigrated from Ireland. The classic tradition which had become moribund elsewhere was preserved and enhanced under the influence of him who toiled only with the cross and for the cross. Ireland became the leader in the intellectual world. The Renaissance began in Ireland 700 years before it was known in Italy. Ireland became, by universal consent, the Isle of Saints and Scholars—the proudest title ever given to any land or people.

Undoubtedly there is no quality quite so universally appreciated as courage—not the daring or fearlessness of aimless adventure but that sincerity of heart and persistency which clings to righteousness in spite of hardships. Certainly St. Patrick was a man of courage and conviction. No sooner had had he been consecreated bishop than he set out for the very land where once he had been held captive. He faced enemies of every type, his former owners, the Druid priests whose religion he was supplanting by Christianity. He was intolerant of evil and he expelled the serpents of superstition. The world admires bravery; we decorate our soldiers and sailors who have fought valiantly. One of the qualities that has helped to make Patrick enduring great was his heroic courage and daring.

As we assemble here once again to celebrate the feast of St. Patrick, let us turn toward him not only in praise for the glory of the past. Patrick is also a symbol for the needs of the world today.

1. We need men animated by faith in God and the eternal principles of justice and righteousness. We live in an era which puts too much emphasis on materialism and the pursuit of wordly comforts for their own sake. We are witnesses to the worldwide attack on sacred truth by the satanist enemy of communism. Religion and democracy are challenged: Religion, because it thwarts the development of atheistic communism. A man can never be a real Communist according to Soviet standards and at the same time believe in God. True democracy is challenged as its name is used to disguise the absolutism of dictatorship that openly stalks forth from the Kremlin under the false label of democracy. Therefore we need to preserve our faith in the Almighty.

2. We need, also, today men who will keep faith with each other and have respect for the dignity of man as a creature of God with all the human rights that flow from his spiritual nature. We need men who reverence true scholarship and who believe in absolute principles and will suffer for them.

3. We need men today, too, who—both in public and private life—have a loyalty to the ideals and the traditions that inspired the founders of our own Nation and that have helped since to keep it great.

The principles proclaimed by St. Patrick, if practiced today, will make us individually better Americans, will make our country a better and a happier place to live, because our lives will be lived in the aura of eternal truth which Ireland has never lost.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a statement which I submitted this morning to the Subcommittee on Special Education. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to express my views to your subcommittee, and I know of no more important subject that can be given careful study by the Congress than that of education. On one occasion Aristotle was asked how much educated men were superior to uneducated men. "As much," said he, "as the living are to the dead." Yet, some 150,000 young Americans this year, last year, and the year before did not go on to pursue a college education just because of financial difficulties. One hundred and fifty thousand students out of the top echelon of their classes in high school did not go on to study in college, just because of a lack of means to pay. Each time I think of the Russian sputniks I am prone to wonder how many of those students who did not go to college 10 years ago for the same reason would now be available to help our country, in a time of desperate shortage of scientists and engineers, to win the race for outer space.

Two years ago I was in Africa, the Middle East, and in Asia, and each time I recall my visit to the Asian-African world, where America's vital interests are increasingly concerned, I am appalled once again by the fact that only a handful of Americans can talk the language of the peoples of those two great continents, to say nothing of European languages. It is important to be able to converse in other languages if we are to hope to transmit and exchange the ideas of freemen with the peoples of captive countries. Yet, too few American students today are preparing, through language studies and scientific studies, to meet the challenges that will confront America in the immediate years ahead.

It is no longer mere idle speculation that man may someday reach the moon. We have now crossed another threshhold into the age of space flight. The first Russian satellite was an important technological breakthrough that provided a warning to us to provide enough scientists and technicians of sufficient quality to enable us to regain and hold world leadership in the technological race or else lose our liberties and freedoms forever.

The backward peasant nation that was the Soviet Union 30 years ago has raised itself to a high level of technological accomplishment, even though it may have been at great cost in human suffering. Today, Soviet missiles and rockets face us, to say nothing of a vast fleet of missile-equipped submarines and huge standing armies. America is confronted with a shrewd and ruthless mortal enemy, Soviet Russia, a country under the leadership of atheistic men whose announced objective is the complete mastery of the world, men who are merciless, men who are ambitious, men who will stop at nothing to achieve their goal.

Nikita Khrushchev has boasted that the Soviets will be supreme in nuclear power, in consumer-goods production, in cultural activities, in agricultural production, in education. "We will bury you," he has boldly and arrogantly stated to us.

It is time we realized that the Communists are waging all-out war upon us and that we are locked in a gigantic and momentous struggle which will demand every resource of our intelligence and our spirit if we are to survive. We are in a one-game world series, and we cannot afford to lose any more innings. The Russian sputniks and our own satellites are signs in the sky that the race between the Communist world and the free world has entered a new, a deeper, a more profound dimension. And this race is to the swift; this battle is to the strong. To effectively compete in this contest, there must be a fundamental change in American attitude toward the intellectuals, the scholars in our midst.

America needs more eggheads and fewer fatheads. It was Soviet eggheads who got the sputniks off the ground, and it will be American eggheads who get our Nation off the ground if we but give them the support they need. Frankly, I am on an egghead search. I am looking for more scientists and engineers, more mathematicians and technicians.

Not all eggheads are geniuses. Not all eggheads are potential scientists and engineers. An egghead is simply a thinking, reflecting person, who may well have a strong streak of creativity in him or her. The basic hallmarks are a concern primarily with ideas, a restless inquiring mind, a dedication to something higher and outside himself. Some are hard boiled and some are soft boiled, but we need them all, and it is time that the American people and our United States Government decided to make it possible for a far higher percentage of young potential scholars to move into positions of leadership.

We must have more teachers, and we must have better teachers. That means higher teachers' salaries, so that a teacher can afford to work at only one job, so that he or she can afford to take further training during the summer months. An average salary of $4,420 is unthinkably low. Only about half of the chemistry and biology teacher graduates in 1956 actually went into the teaching profession. Industry's higher salaries are appealing to the teachers, particularly to science and mathematics teachers.

Last fall at Chicago, at a conference of more than a thousand educators and laymen interested in education, the point was made repeatedly that high-school students are capable of handling much more solid intellectual fare than many are now receiving. The quality and the intensity of our higher education can be rather sharply increased by changes in the curricula. This is imperative when we think of the degree the Russian high-school graduate is being force-fed with scientific education.

The other day I learned this from the United States Office of Education's specialist in Soviet education:

"The emphasis on science in Soviet schools contrasts sharply with the situation in the United States. Whereas each of the more than 1 million Soviet students graduating from secondary schools last June had taken 5 years of chemistry, 5 of biology, 10 of mathematics—including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry—less than one-third of a total of approximately the same number of our American high-school graduates had taken as much as a single year in chemistry."

That is only a fraction of the story. In the Soviet Union the school week is 6 days, not 5. The school hours are longer. Study at home is more exacting. Examinations are more severe. A Russian child learns biology in grade 4, foreign languages in grade 5, physics and algebra and geometry in grade 6. Grade 7 teaches chemistry. Astronomy and calculus are taught in grade 10. This Russian data surely demonstrates that many American high-school students could take a considerably richer diet of education, with a strong seasoning of the physical sciences.

What can the Federal Government do to help in this gigantic national effort which our people must make to provide the yeast of opportunity for the gifted young people among us?

First of all, we need a really intensive scholarship program administered on the basis of merit and need. I have introduced a bill to provide 50,000 such scholarships for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and during each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. Persons awarded scholarships under my bill shall be paid $1,000 during each academic year of the scholarship's duration.

Each State would be allotted the number of such scholarships which bears the same ratio to the total number of such scholarships being allotted as its population between the ages of 18 and 21, both inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States between such ages. Any State desiring to participate in the scholarship program may do so by establishing, through its State educational agency a State commission on scholarships and student loans, and by submitting to the United States Commissioner of Education a State plan which provides for the determination and selection, in accordance with my bill, of individuals entitled to and qualifying for such scholarships. The Federal Government would pay the administrative expenses of the State commissions.

In the same bill, I have proposed a long-term low-interest loan program for college students, such loans to be made up to a maximum of $1,000 to any one student in any academic year beginning July 1, 1959, and for each of the succeeding 5 fiscal years. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $40 million annually for this purpose over the 6 fiscal years embraced by the program. Loans would be made on the basis of need and scholastic ability and for the purpose of pursuing a course of study in engineering or leading to a degree with a major concentration in academic work in a science, mathematics, or modern foreign language.

The bill provides that any college graduate who enters Government service in the scientific and engineering or related fields or who enters the teaching profession upon graduation may write off his loan, 20 percent of the loan being forgiven for each year he or she remains in the required profession. This is an incentive that will keep many young people from taking the jump out of teaching in those first years of typic-
out of teaching in those first years of typically low teaching salaries.

My bill would also authorize appropriations for the acquisition of science teaching facilities for institutions of higher education to carry out the program. The appropriation of $75 million annually would be authorized for the purpose of making payments to teachers for advanced study in summer sessions offered by institutions of higher education, and an appropriation of $25 million annually would be authorized for the purpose of making payments to teachers for advanced study in extension courses.

Moreover, 1,500 graduate fellowships would be awarded annually for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years in the fields of mathematics, science, engineering, and modern foreign languages.

Congressional citations would also be presented by the Commissioner of Education to high-school graduates for outstanding scholastic achievement.

Federal control of education would be prohibited under my bill.

Mr. Chairman, we must do our best to find our potential leaders in science and industry. We need techicians, we need diplomats, we need engineers and scientists, we need young people who can speak other languages, men

and women who can probe the atom as well as the vast outer reaches of the universe. I shall do my best to provide our young people with the opportunity they deserve and which our Nation's own vital self-interest demands—the opportunity to develop their talents and faculties through higher education. The discovery of a single genius can upset the military balance of power. The same discovery can contribute more to man's prosperity than the discovery of some vast new body of iron ore. The discovery of a single scientific genius may mean the difference in freedom and slavery, peace and war.

Mr. Chairman, if this free civilization of which the United States is the most formidable part should fail to survive the menace that now confronts it, the historians of the future will point to the tragedy of education in the United States as having been our Achilles' heel.

Sputnik has dramatized our sorry condition. I submit, then, that we must rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom through education, freedom for our generation now and freedom for posterity. Freedom and survival for the United States and those who want to be free everywhere. I trust that the Congress will act to insure this freedom.

Education in the United States has become the neglected stepchild of American progress. Not only education from the standpoint of financial support, but education from the standpoint of substantive content. Our system of education has been so developed that it has been possible to go through grammar school, through high school, and through college, and emerge in a state of utter educational mediocrity. It is an educational system that has flaunted as an ideal, as if it were a religion, not the exceptional man, not talent, certainly not genius. It has flaunted the chap who knew how to make friends and influence people. It has not been what one knows that matters, or what one has achieved, or could achieve. There has been a consequent breakdown of discipline that has corroded the home and debased authority. The handwriting is on the wall. We must act now lest in the end we are weighed in the balance and, like Belshazzar, found wanting.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment you and others of your subcommittee. In conducting hearings on this important subject you are paving the way for legislation which cannot be excelled in its importance to our country's welfare and security. I want to commend you upon the forthright and courageous position you have always taken in this matter, and I am supremely confident that your continuing interest in so vital a subject will direct you and your subcommittee and the full committee to reach an ultimate solution to the grave problems which confront us in the field of education. The very survival, not only of our free educational system but also of our liberties and freedoms as Americans is in the balance. I urge you to continue in your quest for the facts which will enable you to report legislation eventually to the Congress for action whereby the means may be provided to promising students throughout the land to enable them to go on to higher education and to prepare them for the type of leadership so greatly needed if ours is to continue to be the land of the free. I trust that your subcommittee will look favorably upon the provisions included in my own bill, H. R. 11776, but, in any event, it is my greatest desire that legislation be devised which will meet the needs and accomplish the objectives I have sought to achieve. You are in the position to know what legislation is best. I am grateful for the opportunity to submit my views. Action is the order of the day.

Ike's Broken Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recently while testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, I stated that proponents of the Trade Agreements Act were being aided by a propaganda program designed to sell slogans instead of facts. I call the attention of this House to an excellent editorial appearing in the March 31 issue of the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass.:

IKE'S BROKEN FAITH

President Eisenhower demands that the American people put presssure on their Senators and Congressmen to force them to pass his so-called foreign-trade program, a proposed renewal of the Recriprocal Trade Act for 5 years.

The slogan department of the White House has produced a clever cluster of catch-phrases of the type the President favors more and moreto decorate his public utterances.

None of these slogans represents either reason or fact.

Here are two of the slogans coined for Ike's televised address to the American people Thursday night:

Refusal to renew the Recriprocal Trade Act as proposed by Eisenhower would be "returning to the law of the jungle in trade relations between nations."

World trade makes jobs for American workers. "At a time of slack in the economy like the present, these jobs should not be placed in jeopardy by crippling our trade program."

Both of these wordbusters are phony and fraudulent.

Far from creating jobs in the country, the Reciprocal Trade Act, renewed under great pressure from Ike 3 years ago, has destroyed jobs. Indeed, it has come near to destroying the entire textile industry and other industries denied adequate protection against cheap imports from low-wage foreign countries.

The collapse of the textile industry as a direct result of Eisenhower's unsound trade policies may have triggered the very depression he now seeks to end by the passage of a similar, or worse, Reciprocal Trade Act.

A review of the circumstances under which the Reciprocal Trade Act was approved by Congress 3 years ago is in order.

Eisenhower rescued his reciprocal trade program from impending defeat in the House of Representatives by sending the now famous "Dear Joe" letter to Republican Minority Leader JOE MARTIN on February 17, 1955.

"No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure," the President solemnly promised JOE MARTIN and his colleagues on Capitol Hill.

It is ironic tragedy that MARTIN'S 14th Massachusetts District is among the areas hardest hit by textile industry losses resulting from the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Not only has the President broken faith with Congress and the American people, but he has violated the spirit of his own reciprocal trade program enacted 3 years ago.

The 1955 law contains a peril-point provision whereby industries endangered by foreign imports may appeal to the Tariff Commission for relief.

Many such appeals have been made, but Tariff Commission recommendations for higher duties on imports have repeatedly been vetoed by the President.

Eisenhower's reciprocal trade program, in 1958 as in 1955, is based on the proposition that certain American industries—such as the textile industry—are expendable and may be destroyed to help industries in foreign countries, and perhaps some industries in the United States engaged in foreign trade.

In other words, the Reciprocal Trade Act is designed to take away the jobs and livelihood of hundreds of thousands of American workers of the President's own choosing, in order to benefit industries in foreign countries and possibly some workers in the United States.

The people should reject Ike's highly sloganized appeal to pressure Members of Congress into extending the Reciprocal Trade Act, against their own judgment and the best interests of their own section, and despite their sorry experience of the past.

Nationwide School Construction Program as Antirecession Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Frederick L. Hipp, executive secretary of the New Jersey Education Association. Mr. Hipp's suggestion, that large-scale school construction should be considered in any antirecession program, is one that deserves our early and earnest attention:

NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Trenton, N. J., March 26, 1958.

Hon. FLORENCE P. DWYER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DWYER: The New Jersey Education Association respectfully suggests that Congress consider a nationwide school construction program as an antirecession measure. Specifically we would like to call attention to S. 3311 sponsored by Senators MURRAY, COOPER, MORSE, MCNAMARA, LANGER, MAGNUSON, HENNINGS, and NEUBERGER as a possible pump-primer for prosperity. This bill—identical with H. R. 10763—would provide approximately a billion dollars in 1958–59 for school improvement, including construction.

The need for additional school buildings is nationwide. It has been thoroughly developed in congressional hearings over the past 3 years. Perhaps the present recession would not have occurred at all if the school construction bills had not failed of passage by 30 votes in 1956 and by a narrower margin last year.

Schools will have to be built in any case. Elementary and high school enrollments across the Nation are increasing over a million pupils a year. In New Jersey we anticipate 250,000 more pupils in the next 5 years. We are also facing tremendous problems in expanding our public colleges to meet rapidly growing needs.

There seems to be general sentiment that Federal money spent for large scale construction at the present time would help end the recession, and Congress has shown

some disposition to speed up the Federal highway program and boost Federal housing projects. The school construction needs have been just as carefully studied and just as clearly established. We believe that a speedup program on school construction now would provide the schools we need and would serve as effectively as house or highway building to halt the recession.

Our case is that the schools are needed and will have to be built anyway. If there is disposition to vote Federal funds for some kind of construction to meet the recession, why not build schools?

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK L. HIPP,
Executive Secretary.

George J. Dufek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most devoted citizens is Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, who is in command of Task Force 43 of the United States Navy.

Admiral Dufek has been in charge of Operation Deep Freeze, our operation in the Antarctica, during the International Geophysical Year, 1957–58.

It was my good fortune to take my naval training duty last fall in the Antarctia under Admiral Dufek and to personally observe the tremendous task he is doing, not only in the Antarctica, but also as a goodwill ambassador of our country in New Zealand.

Under unanimous concent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, text of a letter addressed to Dr. James E. Mooney from Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, with reference to the completion of Operation Deep Freeze III, together with congratulatory messages from the Chief of Naval Operations and commander of the Atlantic Fleet to the commander, Task Force 43.

OPERATION DEEP FREEZE,
TASK FORCE 43,
March 4, 1958.

DR. JAMES E. MOONEY,
Special Assistant, United States Antarctic Projects Officer, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. MOONEY: Thank you very much for your letter of February 24. It is always good to hear from you as you have such wonderful news to forward. I must congratulate you on all the fine things you have done to present our post-IGY program.

I expect to land at Anacostia, District of Columbia, on the 12th of April. We are in the final wrapup of Operation Deep Freeze III now. Nearly all of our operations are completed, except for the final turnaround of the U. S. S. *Glacier*. She is now returning to the Antarctic for the final sweep of Little America, McMurdo, and Hallett. We have picked up about a hundred of the summer personnel and returned them to New Zealand and the Continental United States. We have had a successful year and I am very grateful that for the first time we have not had any loss of life.

I am very pleased that Dr. Fuchs and Sir Edmund Hillary have successfully completed their trans-Antarctic expedition. They are now at Scott Base and will be brought out by H. M. N. Z. S. *Endeavor*. I feel that I should remain here in New Zealand for the present to make arrangements for next year. There are certain renegotiations to make regarding office space, occupation of our naval aircraft at Wigram and facilities for the Air Force at Weedons and Harwood.

We are very fortunate, indeed to have Mr. Francis Russell, our American Ambassador, here. He is very well liked and is doing an excellent job. Our relationship with the New Zealand Government continues on a very friendly basis. There is a high spirit of cooperation all the way through from the top down to the expedition people, so I feel I should remain here to make these last minute arrangements, plus getting together with Dr. Fuchs and Sir Edmund Hillary and the people who will continue operations in the Antarctic.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. DUFEK.

FEBRUARY 21, 1958.

TO ADM. GEORGE J. DUFEK,
United States Navy:

The officers and men of the United States Atlantic Fleet join me in extending warmest congratulations to all hands of Task Force 43 for setting another record of superb accomplishment despite extreme difficulties and most hazardous operating conditions. I have watched your activities with great interest. Your efforts in Antarctica constitute a major contribution to science and should assure the success of the IGY. Your achievements reflect great credit on the United States Navy and your can-do spirit has been a source of much pride to your teammates in the Atlantic Fleet. Best wishes and well done.

ADM. JERAULD WRIGHT,
United States Navy.

FEBRUARY 23, 1958.

TO ADM. GEORGE J. DUFEK,
United States Navy:

As operation Deep Freeze III draws to a close, I send my heartiest congratulations to you and to the officers and men of your task force for the outstandnig manner in which all hands have supported our Nation's IGY program in the antarctic. Working under the most extreme difficulties and handicaps, your operations were consistently ahead of schedule. The perseverance and resourcefulness displayed in overcoming adverse weather conditions, material failures, and ship damage, was in keeping with the highest tradition of our country and its armed services. I wish you all a safe and happy homecoming.

ARLEIGH BURKE,
Chief of Naval Operations.

The logistic support for our farflung International Geophysical Year activities provided by the Department of Defense, is among the greatest achievements in the history of polar exploration. Under the able leadership of Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, commanding officer, Task Force 43:

Operation Deep Freeze I, 1955–56; Operation Deep Freeze II, 1956–57; Operation Deep Freeze III, 1957–58, have successfully established and supplied the six United States scientific stations, including one operated jointly with New Zealand, in addition to the United States Naval operational base at McMurdo Sound.

OPERATION DEEP FREEZE, III, 1957–58

Deep Freeze III executed a plan utilizing minimum forces to resupply the stations established in the antarctic during Deep Freeze I and II in support of the United States National Committee for the International Geophysical Year.

The basic mission was to resupply the established stations, replace wornout equipment, perform supplementary construction, and to transport the relief scientific and naval personnel to the antarctic, and to return the relieved personnel to the continental United States.

In order to provide the required air support for this operation, Navy long-range aircraft arrived at Wigram Aerodrome, and USAF cargo aircraft arrived at Harewood Field, Christchurch, New Zealand, prior to September 15, 1957. A United States Navy destroyer escort was stationed as picket midway between New Zealand and the antarctic to provide weather data, communications guard and homer navigational facilities. A Navy icebreaker provided surface search and rescue potential in the event of a plane crash on sea ice.

On October 1, 1957, aircraft of the Navy and USAF commenced lifting cargo and personnel into the Antarctic from New Zealand. Upon arrival at McMurdo Sound ice airstrip, the personnel for the outlying stations at Little America, Byrd, Hallet, and South Pole were delivered by Navy aircraft to destination.

When the fly-in of cargo was completed from New Zealand, Globemasters of the USAF 53d Troop Carrier Squadron commenced the resupply of South Pole Station and Byrd Station, by airdrop. The resupply by airdrop of the above stations amounting to over 700 tons was completed on schedule and the personnel relieved and returned to the continental United States prior to Christmas.

In addition 2 round-trip tractor trains, consisting of seven 35-ton D-8 tractors, each pulling two 20-ton sledges, supplied Byrd Station with some 300 tons of cargo from the Little America Base. Total resupply logistic operation for the 1957–58 season required transport to Antartica of approximately 30,000 tons of equipment and supplies, and 700,000 gallons of bulk petroleum.

Ship units of Task Force 43 commenced surface resupply operations of the coastal stations at the beginning of the navigational season in December 1957. Resupply of all stations was completed on schedule by February 1, 1958.

Air operations experienced a number of forced landings at various points en route South Pole and Byrd Stations, but all aircraft were subsequently repaired under extreme conditions and continued to operate in support of the assigned mission.

The U. S. S. *Atka* (AGB–3) suffered one broken propeller blade. The U. S. S. *Glacier* suffered 2 broken blades and 2 cracked, which were subsequently repaired in drydock in Wellington, New Zealand. The *Atka* is scheduled for repairs in the next few days.

The U. S. S. *Burton Island* (AGB–1) is en route to assist the Japanese ship *Soya Maru* penetrate the heavy pack ice in the vicinity of the Japanese station on the Prince Olav coast.

Scientific projects carried out aboard United States Navy vessels and still in progress include oceanography, cosmic ray, rockoon exploration of the upper atmosphere, and meteorology.

Admiral Dufek made the first solid-ground landing in the history of the Antarctic continent on January 31, 1958. The landing was made on a newly prepared strip of beach at Marble Point in the Cape Bernacchi area. The Navy is currently conducting a 2-year survey to determine the feasibility of the Marble Point area as a possible site for a major, year-round, solid-earth airfield. We had opportunity of viewing this area on November 25/and comment elsewhere on the significance of a landing strip here.

Operation Deep Freeze I cost $9,124,000, 3 lives, and extensive ship damage from ice. Operation Deep Freeze II cost $22 million and 6 lives. The total loss in lives has been 9 since 1954; 1 in helicopter crash in 1954; 2 through the ice in 1955–56; 4 in plane crash, 1 through the ice, 1 in helicopter crash. Considering the magnitude of the task, this is

a splendid record, and is comparable with that of any undertaking of 3,500 men, year after year, involving some 35 aircraft and 12 support ships that are at sea 5 to 6 months.

Address of Hon. T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana and I have been working closely together for the sweetpotato growers of our State. Congressman THOMPSON was honored recently by being invited to address the annual Sweet Potato Association meeting which was held in St. Francisville, La. The speech made by Congressman THOMPSON seemed most timely and this speech, followed by his efforts in Washington for the sweetpotato farmers, is further evidence of his interest in developing a better economy for our small farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the text of his speech to the membership of the House.

The address follows:

Being here with you today is a disinct honor and pleasure. I do have the distinction, however, of being the person at this meeting who knows probably less about sweet potatoes than anyone here. I do know of the many problems facing the industry—I know of the problems of the past, too, and I know of the inspired manner in which you, the farmers, the processors and the marketers, have faced up to these problems and we have all seen the results of your efforts. Your work has done more to keep the small farmers in business in our areas than any other one thing I can think of.

Back when you first began the development of the Louisiana sweetpotato program, you had no way of knowing that a badly managed cotton program would allow the traditional cotton farmers of the South to lose thousands of acres of their plantings to Western States. You had no way of knowing that Mr. Benson would allow the traditional rice farmers of our State to be placed in jeopardy by continuing price supports and not controlling acreages thereby allowing those who had lost cotton acres in other States to immediately go into rice. Yet, the organization you started has been a dramatic thing.

I was with State government for 18 years prior to being sent to Washington and my duties then took me into every department of our State. I took particular interest then in the department of agriculture. I well remember the great work done by the late great commissioner of agriculture, the Honorable W. E. Anderson, and at that time his State entomologist, Sid McGrory, who did such a great job and later filled the high position of commissioner. His interest in our farmers was evidenced then, as it is today by his presence here.

You were beset then by just about everything that could have caused the program to be abandoned—sweet potato weevil—government quarantines, lack of sufficient funds for research and development—lack of industry regulations—and lack of enlightened marketing.

How well do I remember the battles we had to secure funds for the sweet potato weevil programs. I was handling State budgets then, so I know. And, finally, through understanding legislatures, we were spending more in Louisiana on the program than all of the other poatto-growing States combined.

Our research program was augmented and soon, through the inspired work of Dr. Julian Miller, we were to have the finest product of any State. I have learned that only recently the cause of cork has been ascertained and will soon be a problem of the past.

The one thing that stands out in my thinking, however, is the fact that producers themselves have paid their own way toward the accomplishment of marketing, advertisement, and self-regulation. The fact that no potato from Louisiana is marketed unless it meets rigid standards of your own making is something to be proud of. Has this been impressive to the consumer? Considering that Louisiana yams represent 40 percent of the Nation's consumption, how can you conclude otherwise?

I have always had great confidence in a good public relations program. I believe that 90 percent of the failures in business is due to the lack of good public relations—considering, of course, that the operators are otherwise qualified. You have done a tremendous job of letting the public know of our yams, both by advertising and by the annual excursions where Louisianians and our beautiful yam queens have received acclaim. And I want to thank the association—and especially my good friend, Joe Arceneaux—for making it possible for me to bring our yam to the attention of the folks in Washington.

From the letters I received I know that others were impressed. You should have seen Washington's most eligible bachelor, when, as an accommodation to him, I named a "Miss Yam for a Day in Washington." I think he was more impressed with the beauty of Miss Fran Anderson than by the yam mask she wore, because he didn't kiss her at all until we removed the mask.

Vice President NIXON was no less gracious. It's amazing how few closed doors there are to a pretty girl.

In addition to the 2 tons of yams given away that day, yams were served in every restaurant on Capitol Hill as a side dish even to hamburgers. I do hope the little excursion was worth the efforts you went to, to make it possible.

When I think of our National Government and its wide scope of activities, I'm reminded of the age-old story of "cabbages and kings." Our present-day Government has its finger in everything—so, perhaps, I could speak today of "Potatoes and Things."

Certainly, we in Louisiana, we of America, have made progress over the years in many fields. This progress has meant—by and large—a higher standard of living, better schools, better medical facilities, better everything. But, if we are not careful, if we lose our sense of values as to what makes America fundamentally a Nation of strong people, the entire development might become one of progress against happiness. We should never only look at the "across the board" benefits of progress. The average may be up, but it may be that because it is up some segment of our population is suffering. When average earnings are up, average costs go up. What about the small farmer—his costs go up just as high as do the costs for industrial workers, but his income has not kept pace. The small-business man is in the same boat.

In recent years I have heard it said by high Government officials that if a farmer is too small to keep pace, let him leave the farm—and many have been forced to leave. There were more bankruptcy proceedings last year than in any year since the 30's. From too many high places in our Government today we hear—big business, big farmers, economic units, big everything. They have even been closing down, or trying to close down, small post offices. What these people don't consider is, that the bigness of this Nation, the traditional success of our Government, is entirely due to a lot of little people. Little people who have maintained the faith of our Founding Fathers of a free life in the pursuit of happiness. All they want from government is enforcement of laws, protection in times of emergency, and a helping hand in times of distress.

High costs today are directly attributable to big subsidies to big business and international politics—much of it at the expense of those little people who can share only in these high costs.

America has been made great since the days of the minute men by their having common meeting places—places where news could be disseminated—where ideas could be disseminated—where ideas could be exchanged—communities where homes could plant roots and the development of inherent loyalty can be nurtured.

Take away the small post offices, such as Mr. Summerfield has been trying to do. Then you take away the common meeting place, you take away the bulletin board—and, in many instances, you take away the identity of the community. The train no longer stops. Neighbors no longer see each other daily. You no longer live in Turkey Creek, or Chicot, or Baines—you now are one of the residents of Highway 145 and must, unless you can drive 30 miles, catch the post office when it goes by. Some savings in money—yes—but what is the cost in the fundamental strength of America which stems from the small community system?

When small farmers are forced to leave the farm, how much do we lose? First, you lose the wholesome atmosphere of a healthy, happy family who lives there, not because of wealth to be attained, but because of a way of life. You lose those hardy, courageous, independent, thinking individuals from whence nearly all of our great leaders have sprung. You lose in money, too. Send the small farmer into town. He must reside where his resources will allow him to. He must accept the most menial jobs until he is trained—that is, if he is fortunate enough to get work at all. No more 4-H Club work for the children; no more chores to keep them occupied, so they may acquire a healthy outlook on life. The streets are their playground; idle minds and bodies create delinquency. The cost to you—check your welfare costs—one-tenth of the costs for welfare payments to a family of six in the city could maintain a happy and productive family on a small farm.

Where else do you lose? If one large farmer now handles crops formerly raised by 10 families—the crossroads store sells one pair of shoes where it formerly sold 10; small service stations, feed mills, in fact, the entire small country community shrinks to nothing—and, as often as not, the farm is now operated by absentee landlords so the profits made by the so-called "economic unit goes to a depository far away from the land from which it was wrenched.

Now, I do not mean that I am against a farm being an economic unit. Far from it—I have seen families reared on 40- to 50-acre farms—I have seen such small farm families send several children through college with little or no assistance from without. Our whole system of research and development and agriculture education has been founded for the purpose of developing means of gleaning more and more production from our lands, while at the same time conserving our soil's resources.

Our county agents have done banner jobs in their work with small farmers. Our home demonstration agents were not trained to visit mammoth farming operations, but have

devoted their time and efforts to assisting the smaller families in becoming more and more self-sustaining—how to raise their standard of living without the expenditure of their cash money. These wonderful workers teach everything from furniture upholstering to the making of clothes, to canning, and many other things that would otherwise dip into the small earnings from cash crops.

Certainly those of us who set up these programs did not share, with Mr. Benson, the theory that small farmers must leave the farm. Let us help the small farmer to become self-sustaining and thereby be classed as an economic unit. You, as an association, are doing your share to bring this about.

I hope that your work will inspire others to follow suit. You know—experience is a great teacher—why do some people forget so easily? Do you remember when in the early days of the ERA and the CWA, how thousands of small farmers left the farms and moved into the cities and towns in order to be eligible for $12-a-week checks or grocery orders? Then, following this, the rural-rehabilitation program had to be started to get those thousands of small farmers and their families back to a stable life—I wonder how many millions were spent on that project. The Government thought it so important then for these people to return to the farm that they purchased, for cash, a mule, seed, tools, and, in some cases, bought the farm and farmhouse. We cannot allow this to happen again.

The strength of our community system, of our small farmers and our small business will determine our strength in the event of a national emergency. Anyone desiring a quiet existence did badly to be born in this 20th century, what with nuclear fission and fusion, space satellites, intercontinental missiles, and the growing cancer of Russian idealogy, we can see no peace even though we may avert outright war.

I have no doubt that our scientists are well qualified to continue to lead in scientific discovery and development. Certainly the Russians launched the first satellite—that was because our leaders failed to realize the value of such a project in world opinion or public relations. We really slipped, and Russia stole the ball—we have regained some world prestige by the launching of the Explorer.

Now we cannot relax. We must prove to the world our leadership, not by bragging of the destructive power of the H-bomb, but by convincing the people of the world that these discoveries can be used to benefit free peoples everywhere.

If confidence is to be built up in America, over the world, it will be by the positive approach in selling democracy—by feeding the hungry (our surplusses could be used for this), by assuring friends of support in times of danger. But not by reaching for the pocketbook each time we face a problem. You can't inspire the will for freedom and democracy by payments of cash.

Remember the Republican slogan of 6 years ago—"Trade Not Aid"—I wonder what has happened to that one. Mr. Dulles seems to think now that charity begins abroad—and after all the discussion of lobbies for our natural gas bill and the subsequent veto, our President has now hired the Nation's best, Mr. Eric Johnston, of Hollywood, to lobby the Americans into pressuring their Congressmen to vote for the giveaway.

Surely we should help our neighbors, but not to the extent that we bleed ourselves white to do it. Not to build highways in Arabia while our people drown for the lack of levees; not to train farmers of foreign lands to grow rice when our farmers starve because of acreage reductions due to the loss of foreign markets.

President Eisenhower told us one day that if we should seek only to arm and create weapons for war and not protect and develop our own natural resources, that we would enter an age of peril. We are still waiting for the administration to place this piece of philosophy into effect. Only this week I saw for the first time the rivers and harbors and flood control bill treated as a partisan measure, with all the Republicans in the House voting against it.

So, you see when I mentioned "Cabbages and Kings" and "Potatoes and Things," I couldn't be far wrong in saying they are related. Certainly, we should worry about and work toward the friendship of King Saud, but not to the exclusion of help to our farmers. We should strive to keep the Suez Canal open to world traffic, but not to the extent of cost that precludes the dredging of the Calcasieu River where our own ships go aground.

You can no more force the people of Cambodia to accept a way of life to which they are not accustomed by the expenditure of funds than the Supreme Court can force its philosophy upon us of the South by the use of troops.

Every major problem can be broken down to small problems—if you solve the small ones, there will be no large ones to defeat you. That is true of our State and Nation. It is true of your efforts in the development of our sweet potato economy. Certainly, you will continue to have problems. I can only hope our Government can approach its problems with the same commonsense and perseverance as you have faced yours.

American Progress in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended a sound and balanced blueprint for American progress in the space age. I especially applaud the emphasis on both military and peaceful development of outer space and the stress on the need for cooperation with our friends in this great effort.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is the logical agency to take civilian responsibility in space. Due to its experience in the field and the fact it is already an operating unit, the changeover to its new duties can be achieved with a minimum of delay and confusion and a maximum of efficiency and cohesion.

It is implicit that the head of the new National Aeronautics and Space Agency will be a civilian. It is my firm conviction the Director should have the equivalent of Cabinet status and should share in the formulation of policy at the highest level. The enormity of the challenge and the tremendous importance of pushing forward rapidly to the frontiers of space make it essential that our leader in this effort be a member of the President's inner circle of advisers.

Mr. Speaker, editorials from the New York Times and Washington Post today have commended the course recommended by the President. Under leave previously granted, I insert them at this point in the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

MEETING THE SPACE AGE

With three American earth satellites circling the globe and the Soviets at work on new and bigger sputniks, President Eisenhower has taken commendable action to keep the United States abreast of the rest of the world in the exploration of that new dimension—outer or cosmic space. He called upon Congress yesterday in a special message to create a National Aeronautics and Space Agency to take over and administer in an imaginative and well-conceived program all present and future space penetration and research projects except the purely military ones dealing with outer space rockets and missiles.

As proposed by the President, the new agency would be primarily a civilian organization for civilian and scientific space technology, designed to expand human knowledge of our earth, our solar system and our universe, improve space vehicles for observation and experimentation, and in cooperation with other nations promote the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. It would operate under a civilian director appointed by the President and would be assisted by a board composed of eminent experts in science, engineering, technology, education, and public affairs, recruited from both the present Government agencies active in these fields and from the outside. For this purpose it would be given authority and financial support that would enable it to attract talent through adequate compensation.

At the same time the agency would also work in close cooperation with the Defense Department, do some of that Department's research work to enable it to take full advantage of the military potential of outer space and in general give due regard to the military factors involved. At least one member of the board would be appointed from the Defense Department to assure close liaison and avoid the delay, duplication, and waste that attended our Vanguard project.

In general, therefore, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency would be a counpart of the Atomic Energy Commission, and since the Atomic Energy Commission has been effective in dealing with both civilian and military aspects of atomic energy there is every reason to expect that the new agency would be equally successful. Meanwhile, pending the creation of the new agency, projects already underway will go ahead full steam.

The President's proposal is clearly a step in the right direction and Congress can be expected to respond with quick action on it.

SPACE DOWN TO EARTH

President Eisenhower's plan for civilian direction of American space exploration is both farsighted and eminently practical. Because of its wide experience in related research, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is the logical nucleus of a new National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Under the President's proposal this civilian Agency would preside over all domestic aeronautical and space science activities except those of a strictly military nature. It also would perform some research for the military establishment in the fashion of the present NACA.

This is a much more sensible arrangement than one which would place such direction in the Pentagon or would assign space exploration to the Atomic Energy Commission because of the promise of nuclear fuels. Apart from missile development and surveillance satellites, the present military interest in space exploration is limited. In any event, the challenging opportunities in space should not be dominated by military considerations. Present explorations under military direction—which are largely civilian in practical composition—can of course be continued until the new Agency takes over. Moreover, the Agency can quickly avail itself

of nuclear fuels when they become available.

From the scope of his message based upon the report of Dr. James R. Killian, Mr. Eisenhower clearly assigns the project great importance. Wisely he would bring to the National Aeronautics and Space Board (which would assist the operating Agency) not only top representatives of the Government, but also private citizens of "distinguished achievement" in science, education and public affairs. Also wisely, he calls for salaries roughly comparable to private scales for employees of the Agency itself.

We trust that the Senate and House, which have established their own study committees, will give early and sympathetic attention to the President's recommendations in this exciting area. Prompt approval of a civilian American program will give this country additional arguments in seeking broader United Nations supervision of all space activities.

Why the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program Should Not Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Bronson Trevor, on behalf of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, on why the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program should not be extended, before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, March 17, 1958:

The American Coalition of Patriotic Societies at its annual convention held on January 30, 1958, by resolution reaffirmed its opposition to the reciprocal trade agreements program as expressed in a resolution passed at its annual convention held on January 13, 1955, which reads as follows:

"REGULATION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

"Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program represents an unwarranted encroachment of the executive branch of our Government upon the legislative responsibility conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas as a result of reduction of tariffs under the reciprocal trade agreements program various industries important to our healthy economy and strong national defense have been injured or forced out of business with consequent injury and loss of jobs by the American workingman: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies in annual convention assembled urges Congress to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act) to expire June 12, 1955, and upon its expiration, the Congress should resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through its agent, the Tariff Commission."

The growing number of unemployed in the United States should cause us to examine with care the legislation to extend the reciprocal trade agreements program. Congress has been supplied with much evidence, according to U. S. News & World Report for March 7, 1958, that thousands of American workers have been thrown out of employment by foreign imports.

President Eisenhower in his message to Congress has argued that these imports were necessary "to provide foreign nations the opportunity to earn the dollars to pay for the goods we sell." This argument is so basic to the whole legislation that it is important to see the incompleteness of its reasoning because there are other ways in which the money can be spent.

With data obtained from the Economic Almanac, 1958, we find that from 1947 through 1956 inclusive, the United States put in foreign hands by spending on imports of goods and services, unilateral transfers, capital investment abroad and the purchase of gold, over $19 billion more than the world spent on our exports of goods and services and on unilateral transfers. The $19 billion went to build up foreign balances, on investments in this country and in the purchase of gold. Is it any wonder that in the 2 years from 1954 to 1956, foreign assets and investments in the United States jumped from a total of $26.8 billion to $31.6 billion? Obviously there is something wrong with legislation which in 10 years allowed over $19 billion, that in theory would be spent on our exports, to be diverted to the stock market and other channels. The Federal Reserve Bulletin for April 1950, pointed out that even during the so-called dollar shortage in 1948 and 1949, foreign investments in the United States, some of them secret, increased by $1.9 billion and $0.9 billion respectively.

The New York Times of January 2, 1955, in a special dispatch from Geneva reported the following: "Flight of capital to United States continues—GATT studies indicates it is a basic cause of chronic dollar crises abroad. * * * The policy implications of these new studies, some of which are based on new data, are substantial and highly controversial. Indeed, they contain so much dynamite that it is highly unlikely the study will ever be published in an official paper. * * * The studies also throw considerable doubt on the thesis that lowering the American tariff is essential to the establishment of better balance in world trade."

The United States because it is a great capital-creating Nation does not need investment here by foreigners of money obtained by them because of our purchases of imports. Until we stop the diversion of this money from the legitimate function of paying for our exports we should expect our unemployment to increase.

This legislation is said to be necessary to meet the threat of the European economic community in creating a common market. It will do nothing of the kind. The common market consists of France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. Our present duties on imports from these countries were lowered in exchange for concessions on duties on our exports to them. The tariff duties of the common market could consist of the highest duty charged by any of the 6 nations so that in 5 cases out of 6 our exports could face a higher duty and yet, for some unfathomable reason our Government does not plan to avail itself of the provisions of the GATT agreement to the effect that when a country cancels a concession each other country which is a party to the agreement may cancel a concession also. The ultimate effect is obviously going to be that our duties will be lower while foreign duties in many instances may be higher than now.

Business Week, of February 22, 1958, in discussing the auto industry says "Right off the bat, the common market and free trade area mean the European market for United States built passenger cars is almost gone."

Another misconception of the reciprocal trade agreements program is that American industry will always try to safeguard the employment of labor in its American plants, by asking for tariff protection. This is not necessarily so because, in the auto industry, for example, there are foreign plants now, according to Business Week of February 22, 1958, which are as low-cost efficient producers as any company in the United States. General Motors, Ford, American Motors, and Studebaker-Packard are now importing cars from abroad and Chrysler is anxious to do likewise. Business Week (February 22, 1958) says, "With the tide running heavily against exports from the United States and toward production abroad, one Detroit executive has been heard to say: 'Before I retire, I hope to see my company producing as many units abroad as in the United States.'"

The President says that the reciprocal trade agreements program is necessary to meet the economic offensive of the Soviet Union. It is a fact, however, that this legislation will not make our exports sufficiently cheap as the prices of our goods are determined by commercial and not by political considerations. When we do subsidize our exports there are immediate adverse repercussions from other exporting nations. Therefore, any benefit must be confined to goods which we might import, rather than to let them go to the Soviet Union. In this instance also, however, the Soviet Union can outbid us when diplomacy dictates such a course. The money to pay for these imports into the Soviet Union could come from the sale of their gold. Although definite figures are not available, Samuel Montagu & Co., a leading British bullion dealer, according to the Northern Miner of February 27, 1958, has estimated that gold is produced in the Soviet Union at the rate of 17 million ounces annually, which would be worth $595 million a year. We must not forget that the value of gold is largely dependent upon the willingness of the Government of the United States to buy gold in unlimited amounts from no matter what source of production. As long as our country stands ready to supply the Soviet Union with an amount of dollars limited only by the size of the letter's gold reserve, it is futile for us to expect to compete successfully with that nation in the arena of economic warfare.

Under the circumstances we do not believe that the arguments are valid in favor of the passage of the bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program and the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies opposes such action.

Speed for Air National Guard Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to remind the Members that on March 21, 1958 I wrote to Hon. Donald H. Quarles, Deputy Secretary of Defense, concerning the withholding of $10.2 million of fiscal year 1958 appropriated funds from the Air Natoinal Guard for its facility construction program. The text of my letter appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1958.

In my letter I pointed out that the Congress had appropriated the $10.2 million to be used by the Air National Guard for the construction of Reserve

facilities and that despite requests by the Air Guard for an allocation of these funds so that contracts could be let during this fiscal year the Department of Defense was refusing to apportion the funds and intended to transfer them to the MATS Working Capital Fund.

Inasmuch as several Members had spoken to me about the need for funds by the Air National Guard and other Reserve components for the continued construction of Reserve facilities, I am very happy to state that in a letter received from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, dated April 1, 1958, I am informed that the $10.2 million has now been released and will be available to the Air Guard during this fiscal year. The projects being proposed as additions to the Air National Guard construction program for fiscal year 1958 have been forwarded to the Armed Services Committee and we are attempting to expedite approval of these projects so that work can proceed at the earliest possible time.

Address of O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy given at the general meeting in Washington, D. C., March 27, 1958:

ADDRESS OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATION-WIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, GENERAL MEETING, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 27, 1958

We are meeting today under the shadow of the over-arching power of the State hand in hand with the assemblage elsewhere in this city of those who presume to speak for the national interest.

Ranged against us are the President, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, heads of national organizations, gigantic business interests, most of the great metropolitan press and news magazines with circulation that run into tens of millions, the great TV and radio chains, scores of big names, internationalists, heavy thinkers—a panoply of visible power so great that, contemplating it, we should be duly cowed, overawed and silenced.

We should disperse and leave the stage to those who are drawn together by the common bond of advertised unselfishness, devotion to the national interest and the peace of the world.

Who are we, who are besmeared with the selfishness of local interests scattered far across the land, but nowhere gigantic, unable to rise above the greed of the man who wants to hold his job, the businessman who wants to stay in business, the farmer who wants to reap a living from the soil he tills or the miner who is so self-centered that he wants to dig coal in the depth of the earth, or ores from subterranean beds or the gambler who draws oils from the ground or fish from the sea—who are we to presume to hold a meeting in Washington under the very brows of those who are so nobly dedicated and who have the power, the voice and the means to display their noble dedication in front-page headlines, over the loudspeakers, and through other media of mass circulation that proclaim their fervor for keeping the public informed, without fear or favor, in virtue-dripping editorials?

Obviously, we should be overwhelmed and humbled before such a brilliant array of selfless idealists who has surely never tasted the arrogance of power or used its pointed lance to subdue a wayward opposition.

It matters not that we may voice the sentiments of the fisherman of New England and the western coast, the coal miners of the mountains of West Virginia and Pennsylvania, the makers of hats, gloves, and glassware, and pottery; or growers of wool and beef, fruits, nuts, and vegetables; or the owners of dairy herds and creameries. We count for little. We do not have the huge oil companies on our side, or the wheat growers and flour millers who though protected by the tightest of import restrictions are among the noblest free traders of them all; nor the big steel operators whom you will also see on the side of the angels; and the vast and now somewhat nervous automobile industry and the shipping lines and shipbuilders who, by the by, know something about Government subsidies.

No. With us are the small toolmarkers, the growers of mushrooms, the vintners, the cloth makers, the producers of ladies handbags, clocks and watches, rope and twine, and hardwood plywood manufacturers, those who make bicycles and motorcycles, carpets and rugs, pins and screws, nuts and bolts. But of what worth are these little selfish people?

Are they not shiftless and inefficient if they cannot successfully sell their wares against the outpourings offered from abroad at prices that can only come from wages that are so low that many of our unselfish opponents are running overseas to hire on the spot those who are willing to work for so little? And who can blame these unselfish enterprisers if they want to ship the product of these lowly paid workers to this country and reap a few handsome dollars in profit?

I ask you, how selfish can you be if you ask that something be done to narrow the handicap that so handsomely favors the noble believers in freer trade? Is it not time that we consider the national interest?

If we speak for the makers of tile, scientific balances, binoculars, laboratory equipment, matches, needles, umbrella frame makers, assorted chemicals, lace, fluorspar, tung oil and wallpaper, should that so embolden us that we should presume to stand against the majesty of the bureaucratic economists who man and have long manned the free-trade bastions of our State and Commerce Departments and wherever else in the maze of the executive domain these bastions have been erected?

Surely we are presumptuous to mount a challenge when the coffers of the Treasury are open to the pamphleteers of the State Department and the propagandists of the Commerce Department to spend freely in the promotion of the ideas and philosophies of the great unselfish groups that, well, if they incidentally make some hundreds of millions of dollars out of their export and import activities and foreign investments, do so in behalf of a noble cause. After all, they do have to eat. Even high idealism has a stomach.

The powers centered in the executive strongholds are surely above question when they have shown themselves strong enough to ignore the Congress as they go about their international negotiations and diplomatic maneuvers.

How can we bring ourselves to challenge so deeply entrenched a crew?

To be sure, in Washington we lack the palaces and balconies that elsewhere in the world in other years marked the close association of the goverment with private organizations for the subjugation of opposition; but we do see today the working of such an association. We see the shaping of a monolithic power, flexing its muscles, with the idea of intimidation, of overwhelming and squeezing out the opposition.

Well, shall be bend the knee and bow out?

Shall we recognize the totalitarian force of foreign relations, to be enthroned over the people in the far reaches of this country who have only the Members of Congress to speak for them?

Shall the Congressman bow out to the diplomat? Is the Congressman obsolete?

On the other hand, is the diplomat a messenger of wisdom who understands better than do our elected representatives the needs of our industries and our economy? Does the foreign diplomat foresee and better express the aspirations of our people than does the Congressman? If not, why should he then have a greater voice in regulating our foreign commerce than the Members of Congress?

Does the State Department voice the sentiment of the people, east, west, north, and south? If not, while the Members of Congress do—is that an explanation of the Department's impatience with or disdain of Congress?

Is that why the State Department or its ready and eager servant, the Department of Commerce, so bitterly opposes the return to Congress of its constitutional function to regulate the foreign commerce of this country?

Why the executive should be so stubbornly opposed to the exercise by Congress of its legitimate authority would be a mystery but for the fact that the unselfish and dedicated souls who seek only to do good in a big way sometimes become so obsessed with their nobility of purpose that they cannot abide opposition; and therefore seek the power necessary to make their policies stick.

And that is where Congress gets in the way. No one Congress can properly bind a future Congress against a change of course if that is what the electorate calls for. Yet such binding is the very heart of the State Department's quest. It is not that the State Department cannot foresee the need of change in direction from time to time; it is that it wants itself to be the one who calls the turn and the direction. That is why it wants Congress out of the way.

So this is the issue.

We are witnessing today an association between the vast power of the Government and very powerful private organizations; both dedicated to the proposition that they know better than the Congress what is good for the country. The meeting is underway right now in the Nation's Capital.

And by heavens they are going to show the country who is who, by wielding the great powers of communication that they have at their beck and call and that they will withhold from us.

They will get the front-page headlines, the editorials, the radio and television time, for they have mounted a spectacle. We here are to be snowed under and buried in oblivion. Is that the American system the State Department wants to export to other parts of the world, or is this a State Department import from abroad?

And now let us go about our business unintimidated and unawed, with full faith in the good sense of the American people when they are properly informed.

American National Red Cross Work and Services in California Blesses Californians and Meets Great Emergencies in California, Also

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to present herewith a letter to me dated February 5, 1958, from Mr. Sheldon C. Williamson, director, Field Service, Pacific Area, including to my attention a report concerning the Red Cross activities in California for the fiscal year 1956–57.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
PACIFIC AREA,
San Francisco, Calif., February 5, 1958.

DEAR SIR: As an elected official representing the people of the State of California, you will be interested in the attached report concerning Red Cross activities in California for the fiscal year 1956–1957.

Perhaps you are not aware that the American Red Cross is the largest, single, private agency operating in the State of California. For this reason, we are sharing the report with you and other selected state officials.

Should you have questions or comments concerning this report, we would welcome your remarks.

Sincerely,
SHELDON C. WILLIAMSON,
Director, Field Service.

RED CROSS PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA—1956–57

The work of the American Red Cross in California in the past year was conducted through 127 chapters and primarily by volunteers.

The needs of servicemen and their families continued to be a primary concern of the Red Cross. Military personnel were provided personal assistance, recreation, and morale-building services by Red Cross staff assigned to offices at 36 military installations and 9 military hospitals in California. Red Cross workers on duty with servicemen in the State gave assistance in 162,133 cases resulting from family crises created by illness, accident, death, financial, and other emergencies, and many routine welfare problems. At the same time, Red Cross chapter workers gave help to servicemen and their families in 51,587 similar situations. Together, field staff and chapter workers made loans and grants to servicemen or their families amounting to $3,272,405. Many of the problems handled both at military installations and in chapters do not require financial help but do require counseling, guidance, and emergency communications.

Red Cross volunteers served more than 12,000 patients at the nine Veterans' Administration hospitals, assisting hospitals staffs with recreation, social service, treatment, and rehabilitation programs. Red Cross representatives at the Veterans' Administration regional offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles assisted 6,981 veterans or their survivors in obtaining Government benefits to which they were entitled, and chapter workers gave help to 8,762 veterans or surviving dependents, besides those served in VA hospitals.

The Red Cross expended $51,202 to provide emergency food, clothing, shelter, and medical and nursing care for the victims of 11 apartment-house, hotel, and forest fires, 1 earthquake, and 1 flash flood and to help 147 families reestablish their homes and livelihoods after these disasters. Since the end of the fiscal year, there have been 3 additional disasters in which Red Cross help amounting to $2,845 was extended to 15 families suffering losses—a fire in San Rafael at the end of July, the Mount Washington forest fire in southern California early in August, and a hotel fire in Fresno at the end of August.

Through the Red Cross regional blood centers in Los Angeles and San Jose, 158,745 pints of blood were provided for patients in 196 civilian hospitals in the State, and 10,849 pints were collected for civil-defense stockpiling. A substantial quantity of gamma globulin, a blood derivative, was provided by the Red Cross for distribution through the California State Health Department, and additional quantities of gamma globulin and two other blood derivatives, serum albumin and fibrinogen, also were distributed free of charge by the Red Cross to physicians and hospitals for use in saving lives and fighting disease.

Red Cross volunteers served in 11 of the State's mental hospitals, taking to patients recreational and hobby activities to help them to faster recovery, and assisting hospital staffs in therapy programs.

California communities were made safer and healthier through the training of 76,552 persons in Red Cross first aid, 139,040 in water safety and boating skills, and 15,756 in care of the sick and injured and mother and baby care.

Through the Junior Red Cross, 2,128,427 young people in 3,822 schools in California learned the ideals of the Red Cross and put them into practical use through a wide variety of community, national, and international service projects which were interwoven into regular classwork.

Teamsters' Union and Labor-Management Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 20, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I expressed myself on the question of labor-management stability and how essential it was to the economic well-being of our country. In the course of these remarks, I had occasion to speak about the relations between Montgomery Ward and the teamsters' union.

I should like, if I may put in the RECORD some of the things I have discovered about the battle the teamsters' union has had in its dealings with this company. It is a story of a fierce and persistent struggle, dating back to 1939 when the teamsters forced the company to sign the first contract after strikes which lasted 10 long months.

In each and every instance since that time the teamsters have won recognition only after they have forced upon the company, National Labor Relations Board conducted elections which showed that the employees wanted them to serve as collective bargaining agents. Never once has thec ompany willingly conceded that the teamsters' union was the rightful agent until an election, conducted by the NLRB, so certified. And even today, the company will deal with the teamsters for employees only in those areas or stores where certification has been established beyond any doubt by an election. This demonstrates rather conclusively that there is no collusion between Montgomery Ward and the teamsters' union.

My study of the situation brought to light facts about the Montgomery Ward-teamster union relationship which I feel are truly reflective of the hard bargaining which is necessary to deal with this company. In the contract negotiations of 1957, a settlement was arrived at only after a strike had been authorized and financial support pledged by the international union. The negotiations extended from March until mid-July, with top officials of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service participating actively in the discussions after mid-May and using their vast experience and good offices to break the stalemate and avoid a disastrous strike.

It seems to me that this one case history, involving 4½ months of negotiations, bespeaks the company's attitude in unmistakable terms. It hardly gives credence to the widely circulated charge that Teamster General President James R. Hoffa can walk into the office of Montgomery Ward President John A. Barr and come out a couple of hours later with a signed contract.

My study has satisfied me that Ward officials recognized the teamsters were becoming impatient and that, since authorization had been granted by the international union for a strike, the company feared the economic consequences. So Ward found it expedient to settle on the best possible terms. This agreement on the fundamental issues did not constitute a so-called master contract but became a pattern for the drafting and signing of individual contracts between the company's mail-order houses, warehouses, and stores and the local union having jurisdiction.

It is my understanding that Montgomery Ward and the teamsters are about to start negotiating a new agreement to replace the one in force which expires on May 31. For that reason I would like the RECORD to show what I have discovered to be the facts surrounding the relationship between the parties concerned.

Statement of Northern Textile Association Regarding Extension of President's Authority To Enter Into Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of the Northern Textile Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass., before the House

Ways and Means Committee on March 20, 1958:

STATEMENT OF NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO TRADE AGREEMENTS

My name is William F. Sullivan. I am secretary of the Northern Textile Association, an organization which represents cotton, synthetic, and wool textile mills located primarily in New England.

Textile mill products is still a relatively important industry in New England, employing about 133,000 workers. The industry is located in each of our six States and constitutes the principal or sole source of manufacturing wages in many communities. Studies have shown that even before the present recession displaced textile workers have difficulty securing other employment. Two hundred and fourteen thousand persons are employed in the apparel and textile industries, which is more than any single industry in the area.

The problems of the textile industry in New England today are the same as those which beset the textile industry nationally. Although New England mills are somewhat more sensitive when depression conditions exist in the industry, recent liquidations and current unemployment are not occasioned by the shift of the industry elsewhere or other regional characteristics, but are due to causes common to the whole industry.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF POSITION

We oppose extension of the Trade Agreements Act in its present form, or in the form proposed in H. R. 10368, for the following reasons:

1. Duties on textiles have already been reduced to a level which does not afford adequate protection to employment and investment in the industry, and hence no further reductions should be contemplated.

2. Present duties being too low, the act does not provide adequate means and guaranties for the establishment of adequate tariffs and quotas where necessary.

3. The act does not provide the necessary means for working out voluntary quota arrangements with other countries, or for the enforcing of such quotas.

The textile industry has been hurt by a number of Government policies, including the Trade Agreements Act as it has been administered. The peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the act have not been carried out in a manner to prevent or correct such injury, and there is no reason to believe that the situation will improve if the same or similar legislation is continued.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

There are today in the textile industry in the United States 345,000 less people employed than in 1950. In New England 140,000 jobs have been lost. It is estimated that in New England alone, since the beginning of 1949, over 205 mills have closed their doors permanently.

In the woolen and worsted branch of the industry, one-half of the production and employment remain in New England, but employment in the industry in the United States declined by 61 percent between 1947 and 1956. Mill closings and short time have continued during 1957 and 1958. Capacity in this branch of the industry has declined accordingly, looms by over 50 percent, woolen spindles by 47 percent, and worsted spindles by 56 percent between 1949 and December 1956.

In the cotton textile industry, spindles in place in the United States have declined by 2.7 million since 1947, and of the 21 million spindles in place today, 1.3 million are idle.

In 1949, 1.5 billion yards, or 15 percent of the production of cotton textiles for domestic use, were exported. Since then exports have declined to one-half billion yards annually. The industry has therefore lost a market for approximately 10 percent of its production. During the same period, imports of cotton textiles have risen from nominal amounts until they absorb approximately 3 percent of the domestic market for cotton textiles. This loss of a market of approximately 13 percent has had serious effects on this branch of the industry.

Although the decline in the woolen-worsted branch of the industry has several causes, increasing imports of wool textile goods during this period have greatly aggravated the depression.

JAPANESE COTTON GOODS QUOTAS

The establishment of quotas on Japanese cotton goods exports to the United States in January of 1957 was a recognition by the Japanese and the United States Governments of the need for quantitative limitations on Japanese imports of such goods into this country. The Japanese quotas established separate ceilings for 23 categories of cotton goods in order to prevent the kind of import concentrations which cause unemployment and liquidations. This arrangement has undoubtedly saved many mills from liquidation.

This quota arrangement developed certain important principles which might well be included in legislation. Most notable are: (a) quotas are established for categories of goods geared to domestic production, and (b) the plan is comprehensive in the sense that it covers all items of cotton goods from yarn to apparel and other finished items.

The arrangement has certain limitations which should be taken into account. In the first place, it applies only to Japan and affords no protection against imports from other countries. It is also voluntary, and it is probable that other countries would not adopt a similar approach. Even if they did, the total amount of imports would be too large for our domestic industry.

The arrangement does not cover textiles other than cotton goods, and hence wool and synthetic textiles are afforded no protection by it.

The Japanese arrangement being voluntary, if Japan decides to change the arrangement, the United States could not hold her to it. Even so long as the Japanese leave the arrangement in effect, the United States has no means of enforcing it or even working with Japan to enforce the arrangement. An example of this is the fact that the Japanese established export quotas on velveteens of 5 million yards in 1956 and 2.5 million yards in 1957. Nevertheless, Japanese velveteens in the amount of 6 million yards were landed in this country in 1956, and 3.3 million yards in 1957, an excess of 21 percent and 52 percent respectively. The principal American producer of velveteen has, as a consequence, been forced to close down and 1,200 more textile workers are without jobs. Similarly, in 1957 1.9 million dozen handkerchiefs of Japanese origin were imported, whereas the quota is 1.2 million dozen. Although Japan has atempted to control these exports, the United States is powerless to enforce the quota in this country against transshipments or other abuses.

Legislation should provide for the unilateral establishment of comprehensive quota arrangements by the United States, with adequate police powers.

WOOL TEXTILE IMPORT CONCENTRATIONS

When the Japanese cotton goods quota arrangement was first announced by the assistant to the President in 1956, he stated that:

"I should like to suggest that in broader aspect, this arrangement is expressive of policies already stated, and prophetic of Federal action most certainly to ensue in similar exigencies. Under these circumstances, the reluctance of manufacturers to expand and modernize, and the reticence of investment houses to arrange financial facilities should be dispelled. To repeat, we shall not permit the Government to stand idly by while industries wither and job opportunities are destroyed."

Nothing has been done about a similar situation which exists in the wool textile industry.

Although the establishment of a tariff quota on wool textile imports in excess of 14.2 million pounds annually is also a recognition that duties on woolens are too low, it is a wholly inadequate remedy for the needs of the domestic industry.

An industry which has been halved in size since the end of World War II, and which continues to be plagued with liquidations, unemployment and short time, should not be subjected to the pressure of substantial imports and the price pressure of imported goods manufactured at costs far below United States standards. The price depression is aggravated by the fact that a number of countries are competing against each other in the American market. Prices are therefore reduced to a level satisfactory to the lowest-cost foreign producer.

The wool tariff quota fails to make any provision whatsoever against the concentration of imports in different categories of fabrics. Under this arrangement all of the 14.2 million pounds of wool fabrics can be concentrated in one or a few types of goods. Imports of woolen goods tend to concentrate in the higher quality goods which are relatively light in weight and contain a relatively greater proportion of labor. For example, imports during the first 6 months of 1957 of woolen and worsted fabrics weighing not over 6 ounces per square yard amounted to over 33 percent of the total domestic production of such fabrics. In other categories of high-quality woolen fabrics, industry sources estimate that imports equal as high as 60 percent of United States production of such fabrics. It is our firm belief, and numerous mill witnesses have testified before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, that many mills have been forced to liquidate because of this type of competition.

Furthermore, the wool-fabric-tariff quota does not apply to yarns, blankets, wool apparel, or other wool products. In other words, many of the matters which were covered in the Japanese quota arrangement are left untouched by the rather crude and inadequate wool tariff quota.

Legislation which makes it possible to use the best features of both of these arrangements would be of value to our mills.

I have taken these two examples in order to call attention not only to their shortcomings but also to the principles of quantitative limitations which they contain. We urge legislation which will implement such principles.

CONCLUSION

A surplus of textiles and textile capacity exists in this country, and present Government policies should be oriented toward helping the industry to maintain all present markets and acquire additional markets for its surplus commodities. There is adequate precedent for such an approach in the case of other surplus commodities. The burden of lost textile markets at home and abroad falls upon the unemployed, their communities and stockholders.

We respectfully urge that foreign trade legislation be designed to prevent further invasion of the United States textile market, with particular reference to import concentrations.

Specifically, the Tariff Commission or some similar body responsible to the Congress, should be empowered and directed to increase duties and establish quotas promptly

where damage to domestic products exists or is threatened. No duties should be reduced unless approved by the Tariff Commission publicly in advance. Commission decisions should be final.

STATEMENT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION

The President has proposed a program to stimulate private production and employment to combat the present recession. He condemns the wholesale distribution of the people's moneys in dubious activities under Federal direction.

The textile industry in this country has been suffering from a severe depression brought on, in large measure, by shrinking export markets and increased imports of foreign goods. Employment in the industry industry in the United States has declined by 344,000 jobs since 1950, and 80,000 jobs since January, 1 year ago. Short time, layoffs, financial losses and liquidations continue to beset the industry.

Federal policies should be guided toward maintaining employment of the 900,000 employees in this industry in this country instead of jeopardizing their jobs by the encouraging of foreign production. Unemployment compensation increases may alleviate some of the hardship but not cure the cause of this unemployment. Payments from the State are no substitute for wages earned.

For the past 10 years the distribution of American money in activities which stimulate the growth of foreign textile mills and subsidize their activities in world and United States markets, has led to the loss of American markets abroad and at home. Production which would provide thousands of jobs in textiles and apparel has been channeled into the hands of foreign mills with the help of United States Government financing of textile machinery and raw materials. United States funds in the amount of $88 million were spent last year for the purchase of foreign textiles. United States funds in the amount of $110 million have been used to supply machinery to foreign mills; and United States funds in the amount of $1,300,000,000 have been used to finance foreign mills with cotton at prices lower than those permitted to American mills.

Simultaneously tariffs on textile goods have been reduced, imports have increased and American workers and fabrics have been displaced.

Millions of spindles and thousands of looms in place in our mills are idle or operating only part time. Federal programs of subsidizing increased foreign textile production create worldwide surpluses, aggrevate the problem of surplus textile products in this country and lead to greater unemployment and idleness.

We subscribe to a program which will stimulate private production and employment in the United States textile industry and condemn the wholesale distribution of Government funds for dubious activities in a manner harmful to our industry. To that end we urge the immediate application of the following measures:

1. Textiles financed or purchased with United States funds be procured from American mills.

2. A substantial portion of all raw cotton exports financed or supported by Government programs henceforth be in the form of textiles.

3. A countervailing duty equal to the difference between the cost of cotton to American mills and foreign mills be applied to all imports.

4. Total imports of textiles not be permitted to increase further, and existing concentrations of textile imports, with particular reference to woolen goods, be corrected. Legislation be enacted which will prevent such concentrations from developing in the future, and provide adequate, prompt, and sure methods of limiting imports which cause unemployment and liquidations.

Guam Legislature Commends Interior and Defense Secretaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, while certain of our offshore areas appear to be suffering from growing pains it is encouraging to note that on Guam, where organic legislation was enacted only 7½ years ago, the people are not only assuming the responsibilities of citizenship in the American tradition but are displaying a notable degree of political maturity. During these few years they have made remarkable progress economically, socially, and politically within the framework of our American democratic system. They have brought about a close working relationship between the military and civilian authorities on Guam without jeopardizing military security and self-government.

This happy state of affairs is an outgrowth of responsible leadership on the part of the civilian leaders and the military commands in this important offshore area. It is only fitting that we recognize these men who are playing a commendable role in their respective responsibilities; Hon. Richard Barrett Lowe, Governor of Guam, Hon. A. B. Won Pat, speaker of the Guam Legislature, Rear Adm. W. B. Ammon, United States Navy, commander naval forces, Marianas, and Maj. Gen. Charles W. Schott, United States Air Force, commander, 3d Air Division, Strategic Air Command.

As evidence of the highly satisfactory relationship and spirit of cooperation between the Armed Forces on Guam and the people of the Territory, I would like to point out the constructive remarks of the speaker of the Guam Legislature on the occasion of their legislative session, January 11, 1958, and the resolutions adopted by the legislature which, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SPEAKER A. B. WON PAT UPON COMMENCEMENT GUAM LEGISLATURE, AGANA, JANUARY 11, 1958

We are pleased to again welcome His Excellency, the Governor of Guam, on the occasion of his second annual message to the people of Guam.

This is the beginning of a new legislative year which marks the 8th year of self-government for our people and we may expect the year ahead to be fraught with many challenging and perplexing problems, the solutions to which will require the highest degree of statesmanship.

While the issues which we will be called upon to decide are local in character, they are nevertheless interwoven in the fabric of the national interest and affairs.

As citizens of the United States, our first responsibility must always be subordinated to those of the Federal Government. In this we share a common obligation with our fellow citizens in other States and Territories of the United States.

However, while we recognize our obligation to the Nation, we cannot ignore the immediate and pressing problems facing the people of Guam. Such matters as improvement of business conditions, the expansion of power and water facilities, the completion of our capital improvement programs, the advancement of our educational system, greater measure of self-government through representation in the National Congress, and the improvement of employment and housing conditions for the people, must all receive our careful and continued attention.

To the attainment of these objectives, we, as representatives of the people of Guam, commit ourselves to work with the administration and with the military commands within the province of our legislative prerogative and responsibility.

I am sure that the message that we are about to hear from the Governor contemplates the realization of our common responsibility.

I now present to you the Honorable Richard Barrett Lowe, Governor of Guam.

Resolution 282

Resolution relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the military services of the United States for their extensive defense establishments within the Territory, and emphasizing the continued desire and interest in welcoming even more extensive military utilization of this Territory

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas in other areas of the world wherein the United States has established extensive military facilities as part of the global battle to defend the free world, dissatisfaction and annoyance over the necessary changes and imbalances attendant upon such establishments have been expressed by the people of such areas; and

Whereas the United States Armed Forces have in this Territory also established large and extensive military facilities which have by their very size and complexity necessarily caused changes and deviations from a normal civilian economy for Guam; and

Whereas despite such initial strains, the people of this Territory have been enormously benefited by the opportunities provided for employment in connection with such military bases and in addition have appreciated the knowledge that such bases are playing a vital role in protecting the American and democratic system; and

Whereas the highly satisfactory relationship existing between the Armed Forces on Guam and the people of the Territory demonstrated convincingly the ability of the American system of representative government, even when operating in comparatively small areas to handle with dispatch and fairness the problems and difficulties large military establishments bring about: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fourth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the Armed Forces of the United States sincere gratitude and appreciation for the extensive military establishments within the Territory which play such an important part in the economic well-being of this island; and be it further

Resolved, That the Fourth Guam Legislature on behalf of the people of Guam does hereby extend a wholehearted invitation to the defense agencies of the United States to establish additional military and related facilities on Guam as such are required in the continuing defense effort necessitated by the cold war; and be it further

Resolved, That such invitation be extended in the comforting knowledge that the demo-

cratic process, whose practices and procedures are now routine in this, the newest American Territory, assures meaningful and successful cooperation by the people of Guam with the efforts of our Armed Forces in such further establishment of defense facilities on Guam, which guarantees the absence of the ill will and dissatisfaction expressed in other areas wherein the American Constitution does not, as it does here, hold full sway; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, Commander in Chief, United States Armed Forces; the Honorable Richard Nixon, President of the House of Senate; the Honorable Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense of the United States; the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Rear Adm. W. B. Ammon, United States Navy, commander, naval forces Marianas; Maj. Gen. Charles W. Schott, commander, 3d Air Division, Strategic Air Command; Lt. Col. Victor Gray, United States Army, 809th Engineering Battalion, and to the Honorable Richard Barrett Lowe, Governor of Guam.

Resolution 212

Resolution relative to expressing the appreciation and gratitude of the people of Guam to the Armed Forces of the United States for the invaluable aid and assistance rendered to the people of this Territory upon the occasion of Typhoon Lola

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas, as part of the services rendered by the Armed Forces, the inhabitants of this Territory were given ample warning of the advent of Typhoon Lola together with frequent reports as to its progress, permitting maximum opportunity for security and protection and resulting in a minimum of loss and injury; and

Whereas the Armed Forces provided shelter for local citizens in military typhoon shelters such as at the naval hospital, provided for the issuance of emergency food rations, aided in the furnishing of building materials for the repair of damaged homes and, in addition, repaired at a very early date the damage to the Inarajan-Merizo Road permitting access to this portion of the Territory at a time when other facilities would have been wholly inadequate to cope with the situation; and

Whereas all of the assistance and contributions of the military forces to the welfare and safety of the people of Guam was accomplished in an orderly and prompt fashion with a maximum of consideration for the feelings and individual problems of the people involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fourth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the commanding officers of the Armed Forces of the United States on Guam, gratitude and appreciation for their magnificent contribution to the welfare and safety of the civilian population in Guam during and subsequent to the advent of Typhoon Lola; and be it further

Resolved, That this most recent contribution of the Armed Forces in Guam further emphasizes the major role which the military forces play in the well-being of the people of this Territory, as well as the defense of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker and legislative secretary suitably engross copies of this resolution and cause the same to be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States; the Honorable Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense of the United States; Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; Rear Adm. W. B. Ammon, United States Navy, commander, naval forces, Marianas; Maj. Gen. Charles W. Schott, commander, 3d Air Division, Strategic Air Command; Col. Gilbert F. Friederich, commander, 3960th Air Base Group; Lt. Col. Victor Gray, United States Army, 809th Engineering Battalion, and to the Honorable Richard Barrett Lowe, Governor of Guam.

Resolution 211

Resolution relative to expressing the appreciation and gratitude of the people of Guam to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, for his sympathetic approach to and understanding of the problems of this Territory

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, visited Guam in August of 1957, and gave untiringly of his time and attention to the problems presented to him by this legislature and other groups interested in the welfare of Guam; and

Whereas the visit of Secretary Seaton was marked by his kindly patience and consideration for the difficulties facing this Territory and, in spite of an extremely heavy schedule, time and attention was given to every person or group desiring to present matters to him for consideration; and

Whereas as a result of the visit of Secretary Seaton, a closer understanding has been reached between the people of Guam and the rseponsible agency of the United States Government concerned with Guam, which understanding has been supplemented by specific correspondence from the Secretary to this legislature in which he commented in detail upon efforts being made by the Department of the Interior to aid in the solution of some of the many problems presented to him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fourth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton gratitude and appreciation for the time, attention, and sympathetic understanding given to the problems of this Territory upon his recent visit to Guam and for his continuing interest in the welfare of this area, as well as for the many specific suggestions he has made for the solution of problems which are of vital concern to this newest Territory of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President of the United States, and to the Governor of Guam.

The Quality of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, last November, in the course of an inspection trip on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I had the opportunity to visit and see firsthand the great work being done in the Noncommissioned Officers Academy of the Seventh United States Army in Germany. The Noncommissioned Officers Academy is under the command of Col. Richard J. Darnell. Colonel Murphy, deputy commander of the Noncommissioned Officers Academy, arranged for me to meet with the staff and faculty of the academy and to visit the classrooms during its active sessions. I was so impressed with the high quality of the staff and teachers at the academy and the enthusiasm shown by the noncommissioned men in attendance that I have prepared a summary of the highlights of the work being done at Munich, Germany.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this summary in the RECORD:

The Seventh United States Army Noncommissioned Officers Academy located in Munich, Germany, is one of the finest examples of a school for noncommissioned officers ever developed within the Army. The academy was originally established as the United States Constabulary NCO Academy due to a shortage of trained noncommissioned officers in the United States Constabulary. Lt. Gen. I. D. White, commanding general of the United States Constabulary, directed Brig. Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commanding general, 2nd Constabulary Brigade, Jensen Barracks, Munich, Germany, to open a school for the purposes of training noncommissioned officers. The first class enrolled on October 17, 1949. The academy was redesignated the Seventh Army Noncommissioned Officers Academy on November 1, 1951, when Seventh Army absorbed the functions and facilities of the Constabulary.

The mission of the Seventh United States Army Noncommissioned Officers Academy is to develop within the noncommissioned officer:

1. An ability to recognize his responsibilities.
2. A willingness to assume his responsibilities.
3. The confidence to apply his technical knowledge.
4. The leadership techniques that apply to his office.
5. The high personal and professional standards that must be maintained.

The moment the student arrives he is directed toward understanding the meaning of that mission. The academy's main objective is to make noncommissioned officers aware of their responsibility and the noncommissioned officers' position in the United States Army. The job of the academy lies mainly in the area of refreshing and reevaluating those aspects of the noncommissioned officers' work that demand leadership and maturity. In essence, the academy receives a man who is already a noncommissioned officer and turns out a finished product who is a better man, a polished noncommissioned officer. The instruction at the academy is one of the finest types of professional instruction given by the Army, and it is important to mention, that for the most part, the instructors are noncommissioned officers. This exemplifies to the students the high degree of ability which can be attained by their own contemporaries. The staff and faculty of the academy, officer and enlisted, must maintain the highest military standards in order to set the example. The high standards demanded of the students, by the academy, in military appearance, conduct, and attitude are an integral part of the mission of the academy.

In addition to its primary mission as a school for noncommissioned officers in Europe, the academy has assumed an important position as an institution to be

modeled and evaluated. As in any educational institution the methods of instruction are closely scrutinized by visiting military and civilian representatives of various schools throughout Europe. The weekly list of visitors is a long one, and it includes all foreign countries and American officials who come to observe the academy in action. The academy's operation and method of instruction have been the foundation for armywide adoption, as evidenced in the recent publication of a Department of the Army regulation.

The impact of the academy's influence is evident throughout the United States Army in Europe. Since its establishment in October 1949 the academy has graduated enough men to supply the noncommissioned officers positions in more than 6 pentomic divisions. The many students who have returned to their units after completing the course at the academy have benefited these units by the wealth of knowledge and refreshed attitude attained at the academy.

The majority of the students have been from the Army; but there have also been students from the Navy, Air Force, and even the Women's Army Corps. Noncommissioned officer leadership knows no branch of service and this reemphasis of the principles of leadership is the basic philosophy of the mission of the Seventh United States Army Noncommissioned Officer Academy.

The Late George Harris Collingwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Harris Collingwood, one of the ablest and most faithful servants of the Federal Government, died yesterday at his home here in the Capital City.

Mr. Collingwood at the time of his death was head of the Natural Resources Section, Legislative Service of the Library of Congress. He was a scholar, a historian, and one of the best informed men in the Nation on its natural resources. He was always obliging, cheerful, and helpful to the Members of Congress who sought information from him. In addition to all this, he was a very courteous, kindly, and lovable American gentleman.

I am certain that many of the beneficial provisions in conservation and natural resources legislation enacted by the Congress in recent years are the result of information Mr. Collingwood supplied to Members of Congress and its committees from the wealth of his experience and his constant research.

The whole country is better and will be better for centuries to come because of his contribution to the legislation of his country.

As one Member of Congress I take this brief time to express my gratitude for the many times Mr. Collingwood has been helpful to me and to express my high esteem of his merits and his character.

America is a better Nation because of his having served it.

Mr. Collingwood was born in Fayetteville, Ark. He was educated at Michigan State College and Muenchener Universitaet, where he studied forest practices in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.

After being stationed for 2 years as a ranger in the Apache National Forest, Ariz., Mr. Collingwood went to Cornell University in 1916 as professor of forestry at the New York State College of Agriculture. As a teacher, he introduced important new procedures for forest demonstration areas in cultivated farm lands, and took a leading part in forest planting programs.

He came to Washington in 1923 to become extension forester in the Agriculture Department, and was an active exponent of forestry education in American colleges.

Mr. Collingwood served as head of the Forest Conservation Division of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association from 1940 to 1946, and was the author of the association's industry program. He later served as an agriculture expert on the Hoover Commission for executive department reorganization, and was a forestry consultant to the United States Chamber of Commerce.

In recent years Mr. Collingwood had devoted his time to research and writing on conservation problems. He was the author of several books in his field, and was a member of the Advisory Council of the National Arboretum, the Society of American Foresters, the American Forestry Association, and a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Arcadia's Doing Fine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk of the current economic situation, resulting in too much pessimism and not enough optimism.

There is no point in talking our way into a depression, as some seem to be doing these days.

So it is encouraging when reports come in detailing economic stability, as is the case with my home city of Arcadia, Calif.

There is no pessimism in Arcadia, only optimism for the economic future.

This is a healthy approach that develops confidence in our economy.

The Arcadia Tribune of March 27, 1958, published an article demonstrating the stability of the city's economy and expressing confidence in the future.

The article follows:

Any way you look at it, business is good in Arcadia, according to figures just compiled by the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce.

Totals just released by the State board of equalization in Sacramento reveal that taxable retail sales here were nearly 8 percent higher for the last 9 months of 1957 than they were for the same period of 1956. Total taxable retail sales here from April 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, were $32,553,594, compared with $30,178,635 for the comparable period of 1956.

Reflecting the general slowdown in sales toward the end of the year were taxable retail sales of $11,709,800 for the last quarter of 1957, compared with $11,769,253 for the last quarter of 1956.

SWIMMING POOLS

Reflecting good times here are local figures indicating that the number of swimming pools in town rose from 1,245 on June 30, 1957, to 1,369 today. Forty permits have been issued since January 1.

Business license receipts to January 31, 1958, totaled $61,056.20, compared to $58,762.67 for the same 7 months of the previous fiscal year. These figures reflect the growth of Arcadia business firms as the licenses are based on the number of employees in each firm.

Further indications of good times are the attendance and parimutuel figures at Santa Anita's 1958 meeting just closed. They indicate a 3.15 percent increase in attendance and 5.12 percent increase in parimutuels. This means a similar increase in attendance taxes for the city of Arcadia.

BANK DEPOSITS UP

Bank deposits in Arcadia increased more than $2 million in 1957 over 1956, and up-to-date figures to March 18, 1958, indicate a rise of an additional one million since January 1. It was pointed out that this sensational rise in deposits came at a time when it is normal for these funds to be reduced because of tax payments and other expenses.

Arcadia is one of the few cities in southern California where the sales tax estimates have not been scaled downward as a result of increased unemployment reports.

Added to these figures is the announcement of a $5,500,000 shopping center to be built at Santa Anita and Live Oak.

ENCOURAGING PICTURE

"This is a most encouraging picture insofar as the economy of Arcadia is concerned," stated I. Verl Funk, bank manager and president of the chamber of commerce.

"Insofar as the Los Angeles Basin is concerned," he continued, "undoubtedly we are going through a period of adjustment or a reevaluation of the economy that probably is long overdue. Anyway you look at it, these facts show that Arcadia has a healthy business climate. They prove that business is good in Arcadia."

The Telephone Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call your attention to a very interesting article which recently appeared in the employees' magazine of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. I believe the article makes a good case for the telephone user. The article, entitled "Our Customers' Telephone Bills Could Be 10 Percent Lower If—," is as follows:

Do your friends and neighbors ever complain to you about the size of their telephone bill?

If so, you can tell them that their telephone is still one of the biggest bargains in their family budget, that it has gone up in price less than most things they buy.

But you can also point out that their bill is 10 percent higher than it would otherwise be, because of the Federal excise tax.

Telephone excise taxes were first levied during World War I to raise Government revenue and to free circuits for war-essential calls. The tax was repealed in 1924. Then, in 1932, during the depression, the tax was reintroduced, and 10 years later increased and broadened to meet the needs of World War II. Three years ago it was reduced, but today, 11 years after the end of the war, the tax is still on the books.

Excise taxes are usually applied to such luxury items as furs, jewelry, and cosmetics. As a matter of policy, no essential service should be so taxed. And we're sure the public considers telephone service a necessity, not a luxury.

Telephone service is the only household utility subject to excise taxes today. There is no such tax on water, gas, or electricity. Our customers, therefore, are asked to pay an unfair share of Federal revenue.

The public carries a heavy burden of telephone taxes, with the excise tax added on top. In 1956, for example, the amount a Bell System customer paid for telephone service included, on the average, $49.25 for taxes. Of this amount, more than $14 was for Federal excise taxes. To put it another way, out of every dollar the customer paid for service, 28 cents went for taxes.

Our customers stand to reap the benefits if the excise tax were repealed.

We know it costs money to run the country. But when the time comes that taxes can be reduced, we think the excise tax on telephone service should be among the first to get attention.

Vice Presidential Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last December I urged that Vice President NIXON be given direct responsibility for speeding up our missiles program. It still seems to me that some sharing of the backbreaking burdens of the Presidency might be considered. In this connection, I should like to include an article by Mr. James Reston, in the New York Times of April 3, in which he makes some telling observations on this subject:

VICE PRESIDENTIAL DUTIES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—President Eisenhower was in good form today.

He arrived at his news conference spouting from the Bible about the glories of spring, and stayed late at his desk for a series of conferences, including an unscheduled 50-minute session with Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. This back-door call by the Vice President, announced later by James C. Hagerty, the White House press secretary, was particularly interesting because the President had told reporters earlier in the day that he could not give Mr. NIXON any major administrative job in the executive branch of the Government.

Nobody would say whether this had been discussed, but it is no secret that Mr. NIXON has wanted new executive responsibilities, and some officials have been hoping that the Vice President would be used to help plan and administer the administration's much-criticized psychological warfare effort. The background of this is as follows:

The President told a questioner at today's news conference that the Vice President had constitutional duties to perform as president of the Senate. He added, therefore, that "it would be impossible" to give Mr. NIXON specified duties within the executive branch of the Government.

WALLACE'S TASK RECALLED

As a matter of fact, the Vice President now has administrative duties in the executive branch of the Government. He is chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, and while these duties are not very important, they are in keeping with other Vice Presidential executive responsibilities of the past.

On July 30, 1941, President Roosevelt established what was called the Economic Defense Board (renamed after Pearl Harbor the Board of Economic Warfare) and appointed Vice President Henry A. Wallace as its chairman.

The other members of the board, under Executive Order 8839, were the heads of the Departments of State, Treasury, War, Justice, Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce. They were to give "advice and assistance" to the chairman, but it was clearly stipulated that Mr. Wallace was "authorized to make final decision when necessary to expedite the work of the board."

Thus Vice President Wallace, during the third Roosevelt administration, served as executive aid to the President in one important field of policy that cut across the responsibilities of various departments and, in this field, every Cabinet member and many of the heads of the independent agencies of the Government were directly under the authority of the Vice President.

NEVER AN ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. NIXON never had any such tall ambitions, but he is acutely conscious of one flaw in the theory that he has been carefully prepared for the duties of the Presidency. This is that he has never spent a day in his life in the administration of important executive policy in any Federal, State, or municipal job.

He has been a Representative and a Senator. He has presided over the National Security Council in the absence of President Eisenhower. He has taken on innumerable ceremonial jobs for the President.

But he has never had any experience in administering policy, in the hard and critical task of seeing that policies are carried through, which is one of the vital responsibilities of any chief executive.

Last year William H. Jackson, of Princeton, N. J., then assistant to the President for psychological warfare, came to the conclusion that one of the grave weaknesses in this administration was that nobody had both time and authority to see that the recommendations of the National Security Council and the decisions of the President were effectively carried out by the various departments and embassies.

DULLES OPPOSED PLAN

He recommended to the President that Mr. NIXON be made chairman of the Operations Coordinating Board, whose job it is to see that Presidential decisions, recommended by the Security Council, are closely and quickly followed.

The President, seemed sympathetic to the idea at the time. But Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who has never forgotten the trouble Secretary of State Robert Lansing, his uncle, had with Col. Edward M. House, White House aide to President Woodrow Wilson, opposed it and it was dropped.

Recently a similar idea was revived. When it became apparent that the Soviet Union was often scoring heavily against the United States in the fields of propaganda and psychological warfare some officials discussed the possibility of bringing the Vice President downtown to serve as Chairman of the Planning Board of the National Security Council, a job now filled by Robert Cutler, a Boston novelist and banker.

This was the background of today's question to the President about Mr. NIXON, but General Eisenhower torpedoed it, apparently without knowledge of previous experiments in giving excessive responsibility to a Vice President.

WHY THE EMPHATIC NEGATIVE?

Accordingly, there was a tendency here today to speculate about why the President had given such an emphatic negative.

He has clearly wanted to prepare the Vice President for any eventuality. He has published a state paper to make it easier for Mr. NIXON to assume the duties of the Presidency temporarily, during any severe Presidential disability. He has given him many peripheral and ceremonial jobs, but he holds back from giving him the kind of experience that Mr. NIXON needs the most.

Why? One theory is that the President simply has not realized this important gap in the Vice President's background. Another is that the President and his White House staff are slightly miffed at the Vice President for speaking out on his own in the last 6 months, sometimes in ways somewhat different from the official line.

Last month, Mr. NIXON told the press that he preferred a tax cut to large Federal public-works programs and remarked:

"That is my position, but I don't say it is or is not the administration's position."

Earlier, when some of the administration leaders were minimizing the Soviet earth satellites (the assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, called it an "outer-space basketball game"), Mr. NIXON publicly took a much more serious view of the Moscow challenge.

More recently, he has been disturbed by the loss of the political and psychological initiative to the Soviets. He has not hesitated to say that this aspect of United States operations overseas, conceded by both the President and Mr. Dulles to be unsatisfactory, was the weakest link in the administration's chain.

It is probably too much to say that he is being punished for his independence, but the fact remains. There is an important job of psychological planning to be done. The President admits as much. Mr. Dulles would like to do it; but the President, for one reason or another, is showing very little interest in giving him the assignment.

National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, most every day, the Members of Congress receive protests from their constituents citing examples of waste in Government.

The leading exponent of economy in Government is the Honorable HARRY E.

BYRD, senior Senator of the State of Virginia. Several days ago, during a hearing, Senator BYRD called attention to an example of real economy in Government and his statement has been editorialized by the Progress Index of Petersburg, Va.

The editorial follows:

A REAL COMPLIMENT

If only because of the attention commanded by waste and extravagance in the Government, stories of the other kind ought not to go unnoticed.

An example is Senator BYRD's comment on the National Park Service. The Senator, and his authority in such matters is not likely to be questioned, says he has never found a nonessential expenditure in a National Park Service budget. Rather, he says, there is not another agency in the Federal Government which can be counted on to get $1.20 value out of every appropriated $1.

The National Park Service is the agency within the Department of Interior which operates scenic and historical parks throughout the Nation. Its recreational and educational services to the Nation are vast, and these services promise to become more important as time goes on.

Senator BYRD's complimentary comment is one which is supported by less informed observations of the Service and the areas which it administers. Other agencies of the Government might well study an organization which could make out a plausible case for unrestrained spending but declines to do so. Evidently it has established a tradition which stands it in good stead.

What Part Will I Play As a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the winners of the American Legion essay contest this year is a resident of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio. Miss Elaine McCullough, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. E. A. McCullough, of 604 Sixth Street, Marietta, Ohio, has written what I believe to be a most interesting essay. Miss McCullough is 15 years old and a sophomore at St. Mary's Parochial School in Marietta. Her essay is typical of the feelings which many of our young people possess as they evaluate their place in our society and their responsibility as citizens of the United States.

I am pleased to recommend Miss McCullough's statement to the Congress. It is as follows:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

"See that basket? See that rim? Come on, Cawley, drop it in." You yell this until your throat is sore. He just has to make this shot good. Yes, right now basketball, swimming, dancing, and pop music are tops on my list, too. I am just a sophomore, but in a few years these musts of a teen-age life will gradually fade into the responsibilities of adulthood. I'll still have to keep the Ten Commandments, but my duty to God and to my country will change somewhat. I'll have to earn a living, vote on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November every 4 years, and I'll have to bear my share of the responsibility of keeping our Nation a Republic.

All of this may sound fairly easy, but it will be a full-time job. And then I'll have to pay taxes. Hmm, not so easy. But when I realize that tax money is what keeps our highways smooth, our streets clean, our parks beautiful, and our country secure, then it seems a small price to pay for rights and privileges which are priceless.

Voting will not be easy either. It will require a little more effort than merely pushing a button as I do now to select a tune on the jukebox. It will take some consideration on my part to know just which lever to pull on the voting machine or which person's name to mark an X beside. Perhaps Mr. Alhorn would make a good President, but Mr. Linely just might be better. And I think that biology questions are hard?

Now that the shock of sputnik on Americans has somewhat ceased, Government officials are beginning to be quite concerned about educational problems. In this field it will not be necessary for me to wait several years to do my bit. I've never before thought of it in this way, but part of my job of being a good citizen can be taken care of here and now. I can get the maximum benefit out of my high-school studies and plan to go to college later on. If I go to college I just might loosen the screw that would send one of our satellites soaring around the world. I could be another Paul Revere and fly my private helicopter out to Bakersfield, Calif., to warn its citizens of flying enemy missiles. The wires just might be down, you know.

I'll probably never do anything quite so dramatic for our country's welfare. But perhaps my little actions, my kindnesses, my everyday duties, and my prayers won't really harm anyone. By the time I have reached 21 I'll probably know what my vocation is and how I am going to use it. In whatever field God wants me, I hope that there will be enough love for God and the United States in me to do my job well.

Recession in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the March 24, 1958, issue of Life magazine is a very timely editorial on our current economic situation.

This analysis should be of interest to all of us, for it pinpoints the approaches taken by both poltical parties in periods of economic recession.

The editorial, which speaks for itself, follows:

In a timely nonaggression pact, Speaker RAYBURN and Secretary of the Treasury Anderson have agreed that neither will sponsor a tax cut without notifying the other. Their pact buys time for sober thought about the recession, which unemployment has made a major political issue.

It should be a political issue but not of the frantic auction variety seen to date. The Democrats are trying to reenact their role of the 1930's as the party against "Hooverism." To avoid the Hoover label, 18 Republican Senators have accepted Democratic leadership on at least one public-works proposal; and even Vice President NIXON has staked out a Republican claim on a tax cut. What are they so scared of? There is not the slightest taint of "Hooverism" on the Eisenhower policy and Republicans will not make votes for themselves by acting as though there were. But there is an honest difference between the Eisenhower and the Democrats' recession policies and the voters deserve some help in having it coherently exemplified.

The difference is this: the Democrats tend to prescribe spending itself as a remedy, while the Republicans must know what the spending is for. While the Democrats seem to be there "fustest with the mostest" remedies, the Republicans must keep one eye on the future of the economy as a whole. Eisenhower said in 1956 that the Republicans are the party of the future. How he handles the slump will be a good test of his words. And it can determine whether the slump is to be followed by another healthy boom or by a really dangerous bust.

One of those taxi drivers who make so much business opinion recently told a fare that the recession was willfully caused by rich people and politicians. He reasoned that, since a recession can be cured, its very existence proves it was planned. His conclusion was that Uncle Sugar need only press lever A, raise spout B, pour a million cupfuls of seedless raisins down funnel C and—hey, presto, the boom resumes. Whether this view be widely held or not, no responsible Republican should espouse it. There are right and wrong remedies, the choice depending on which symptom you want to alleviate. The New Deal did a lot of good things to the United States economy in the 1930's, but the cure of unemployment was not one of them (only the war did that). The Eisenhower administration has already taken strong measures against this recession; and if more are called for, their particular purpose should be kept clearly in view. The chief treatment areas are three.

1. Consumption: Retail sales remain slightly ahead of last year. There has certainly been no panicky buyers' strike. The closer to the ultimate consumer—for example, in department stores—the better is business likely to be. The big exception is new automobiles and the exception to that is low-priced cars. Consumers still have plenty of buying power for any manufacturer who rediscovers pricing and selling.

Advocates of a quick tax cut, like Senator DOUGLAS, argue it would give the economy a jolt by putting money in consumers' pockets. The trouble is that pockets is where most of it would probably stay. A tax cut for its sake has considerably less justification today than the comparable proposal, semiseriously advanced by some New Dealers in the 1930's, to drop dollars from airplanes across the land.

2. Investment: Here is the weakest front. Corporate outlays for new plant and equipment will be down from $37 billion last year to $32 billion in 1958, according to latest estimates. Unless this drop is offset by other expenditures the recession may deepen; and only when capital investment stabilizes or rises again will a firm basis be laid for the next boom.

As for offsets: the administration has already committed itself to enough new Federal expenditures to make up most or all of the difference. The rate of defense spending (thanks to sputnik) will soon be twice as high as it was in the last 6 months of 1957. Public works spending will also be speeded up; so will government aid to housing and urban redevelopment; so will the Federal highway program. These speedups, mostly initiated by the administration, are being given additional gunning by congressional Democrats, who seem more willing than Republicans to ignore the size of the deficit.

As for the next investment boom: a survey of 165 large-corporation executives (to be published in the April Fortune) discloses an astonishing bullishness about long-term propects. A quick tax jolt would not stimulate this bullishness; on the contrary, it might make some businessmen fear the Government had lost its mind. What would stimulate long-term-profit prospects, and therefore another corporate investment boom, would be a serious effort at basic reform of the Federal tax structure. Certainly any tax bill ought to be carefully considered for its long- as well as short-term effects.

3. Unemployment: This is the chief reason for trying to end the recession. It is therefore vital to distinguish between measures that relieve unemployment and those that don't.

Among those that don't are the freeze in agricultural price-supports which the Senate passed last week on the demagogic plea that it was antirecession legislation. This freeze will increase the deficit, but the deficit by itself will not create a single job.

Among measures that do relieve unemployment are Eisenhower's plan to prolong State unemployment insurance payments. But to create new jobs a fourth ingredient must be added to the men, money, and materials that constitute any job. This fourth ingredient is ideas.

The idea of building a post office, school, dam, missile, or anything else useful or salable creates jobs. Thus the Government alleviates unemployment when it starts new projects of this useful kind or redirects old ones toward surplus-labor areas. But you cannot get good job-creating ideas out of a government just by forcing deficits on it. When you try, the Government's idea-men are apt to wind up handing around WPA rakes and shovels. The present level of unemployment is serious enough, but it is not that serious. Its real cure will be a resumed expansion in private business, which alone can keep 68 million men and women at useful work.

Thus if the Republicans are really the party of the future, they will not let the immediate unemployment problem distract them from that of our long-term economic health. The Democrats will see to it that the unemployed are currently vocal; but who if not the Republicans will represent their future, which is bound up with that of the economy as a whole? A policy of squanderation now will revive inflation without curing this recession and thus make the next one worse. If the Democrats wish to go to the voters in 1958 with such a policy, the Republicans will be well advised to fight them on that ground, win or lose. For more will be at stake in 1960, by which time the Republicans, the unemployed, and the Nation will all need another boom. We can be earning it now.

Statement of Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey, Before House Ways and Means Committee, in Support of H. R. 11543, To Provide for Temporary Additional Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of my statement prepared for the House Ways and Means Committee in support of my bill, H. R. 11543, to extend temporarily the duration of unemployment compensation benefits:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the chief question now before this committee seems to be, "Is the rate of exhaustion of unemployment compensation benefits at the present time and in the immediate future of such magnitude as to require emergency action by the Congress?"

Not 3 or 4 months from now, not next year—but now?

In my own view, the answer is "Yes." And this is the reason I introduced the bill, H. R. 11543, which is one of several bills presently being considered by you.

Unless I am badly mistaken, this view is also shared by an impressive number of leading Members of Congress of both parties—including several members of this committee—and by the President of the United States and his Secretary of Labor.

If this view is accepted by the majority of this committee, then the problem becomes, Which proposal now under study, or which amalgam of proposals, promises the most effective and quickest relief of this emergency need?

Again, relief not 3 or 4 months from now, not next year, but relief now?

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that H. R. 11543 can assure the required relief now—before unnecessary further suffering is permitted, and before the downward cyclical effect of benefit exhaustion takes full effect and further depresses the economy.

My bill will provide, through Federal-State-agreement, for an additional 13 weeks of benefits for those people whose benefit rights, under their own State system, have been exhausted this year. Payments will be in the amount the family was receiving when the workers benefit rights were exhausted. Similar relief is provided for Korean veterans who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits. Unemployed railroad workers will also be given an additional 65 days of benefits if they have exhausted their payment-rights this year. This temporary emergency program would run for a 1-year period. It would be financed solely by the Federal Government either by grants to the State unemployment agency or, where no agreement is in effect in the State, through a Federal agency.

The need for such legislation is clearly evident. As Secretary Mitchell testified on the first day of your hearings, "In January and February of this year, 292,500 workers exhausted their regular benefits. It is estimated that a total of 2.3 million workers will exhaust their benefits in calendar year 1958 despite the fact that the potential duration of benefits is now longer than it ever was."

In my own State of New Jersey, the number of workers exhausting their benefits has reached a weekly average in excess of 2,500 as of the middle of March. At that time, nearly 40,000 unemployed workers had used up completely their eligibility for benefits—approximately 1 out of every 4 of the nearly 160,000 claimants for unemployment compensation. The estimated total unemployment as of mid-March in New Jersey was 222,000.

The seriousness of the present unemployment situation is further pointed up by the evidence reported in Tuesday's Washington Post that the administration is actively considering a Federal grant-in-aid program for unemployment assistance for those not receiving insurance benefits. There is no such Federal-aid program at present. And in many States no local program is authorized to assist unemployed who either exhaust their regular unemployment compensation benefits or who were not covered by the system.

In New Jersey, the sharp increase in the number of persons receiving general public assistance, excluding child welfare, old age, disability, and blind cases, indicates the increasing burden on public resources resulting from the rising rate of unemployment compensation exhaustions. As of February 1958, more than 40,000 persons were receiving general public assistance—an increase of 13.9 percent over the preceding month and a rise of 63.9 percent over February 1957.

My bill is substantially the same as the administration's bill except for the fact that it provides that the cost of these supplementary benefits will be borne by the Federal Government in the form of grants, rather than by the States in the form of repayable loans or increased employer tax. The duration of the additional payments will be 13 weeks, instead of 50 percent of the individual's duration under his State program.

In a sense, I believe that this method better carries out the purpose expressed in President Eisenhower's recent message to Congress, which emphasized the plight of the workers and their families who have exhausted their benefits. He stated at that time:

"I believe that these workers and their families should be enabled temporarily to receive weekly benefits for a longer period than is now in effect so that in the current economic situation they and their families can obtain a greater measure of security."

My bill is designed to provide emergency payments of adequate duration, on an equal basis, to the unemployed worker, even though his State may not have conformed to the President's recommendations as to duration of benefits. This, it seems to me, is the only equitable solution. For we should not compound the distress of a worker in a State with benefits of short duration by restricting him to equally short Federal emergency benefits. The 13 weeks of additional benefits in my bill is more realistic, in my view, than variable periods provided by H. R. 11679 which, Secretary Mitchell has estimated, will provide an average of only 7½ weeks of additional benefits.

On the other hand my bill, like the administration bill, retains for the States the important responsibility and prerogative of determining the amount of weekly benefits. Unlike H. R. 11326 and H. R. 11327, the bills of your distinguished chairman and the majority leader, my proposal would not have the effect of increasing benefits, in some cases, in a very haphazard manner. The requirement in the Mills-McCormack bills that the rate of extended benefits will be an amount equal to 50 percent of the individual's average weekly wage (with a limitation that such benefits shall not exceed two-thirds of the average weekly wage earned by employees within the particular State) produces some extremely anomalous situations.

For example, some States with so-called variable duration now provide that short attachment to the labor market, as measured either in earnings or in time, gives only short entitlement to benefits. In many States, a bare attachment to the labor market allows benefits for only 5 or 6 weeks. Progressively longer labor market attachment gives correspondingly longer duration up to the point where what is described as "substantial attachment" provides the maximum duration allowed in the State law. Thus many short-duration claimants, it has been pointed out, would receive more benefits per week than those who were regularly employed and eligible for the State's maximum duration of benefits. As a result, a worker might be eligible for $35 per week for 10 weeks, and then receive $40 to $50 for the next 16 weeks—the period covered by the Mills-McCormack proposal. In contrast, the steady worker would continue to

receive only $35 per week for the entire 26 weeks of his State duration and could receive the higher rate only after his unemployment continued beyond the 26 weeks.

It should be made very clear that my proposal is temporary and deals only with an emergency situation. For I am convinced that the States will continue to improve their systems within the traditional patterns toward the goals set forth by President Eisenhower and our Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell. These objectives, as you well know, call for an increase in the State's maximum dollar payments to the great majority of unemployed workers so that they will equal at least half of their regular earnings, and for a uniform duration period of 26 weeks. Moreover, I suggest that, for such emergency legislation, a Federal grant is more appropriate than a loan inasmuch as a grant will not mortgage the reserves and tax resources of State plans in the future so as to make the liberalizations which the President has recommended practically impossible of fulfillment.

I believe that my bill combines two very important objectives. It will deal effectively with the emergency unemployment situation which now confronts us. But it does not alter the basic structural relationships of our State-Federal unemployment compensation system so that further cooperative progress can be made. H. R. 11543 does not, in any way, change the standards that the States have set in their laws with respect to weekly benefit amounts, eligibility, or disqualifications. Furthermore, there will not be the possibility of employers bearing the full cost of these emergency payments through increased taxes which, in themselves, may have a depressing effect upon the dynamic nature of our economy.

These are important considerations, I believe, especially at this time and in this emergency situation. Legislation, like several of the bills now before this committee, which would involve such structural changes in the present Federal-State unemployment compensation system would also involve the requirement of implementing legislation by the States.

This will take time, a great deal more time than we can afford to take without also taking interim action extending unemployment benefits.

I will readily concede, Mr. Chairman, that there are serious weaknesses in the existing system—weaknesses recognized by leading economists and Government officials, from the President on down, of both parties. These shortcomings include: insufficient coverage, inadequate benefit levels, too brief a period of eligibility, and arbitrary disqualifications.

Clearly, we require a far more comprehensive and uniform Federal-State unemployment compensation system; with provision for more realistic payments and durations of benefits—both in justice to workingmen and women and as a means of securing greater stability in our national economy.

But, as I have indicated, to correct these inadequacies will require State legislation in addition to the Federal legislation you are considering. This would be true even if all the States' legislatures were presently in session and if there was unanimous agreement about the need for and kind of reform which is needed. Neither of these conditions exists.

By all means, let the Congress begin immediately to review and revise the present unemployment compensation system. But let us not fool ourselves into thinking that such comprehensive action will solve the immediately pressing problem of extending benefits for those unemployed who have exhausted and will shortly exhaust their regular benefits.

There are two distinct and different problems here. Congress must face both of them. But let us not confuse them and thereby fail to meet the emergency need that faces us right now.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and consideration. I commend my bill, H. R. 11543, to your earnest study and to your sense of urgency.

Mrs. Emma Grace Fulkerson, Illinois State Mother of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce to the House and to the people of this country that one of my constituents, Mrs. Emma Grace Fulkerson, of Carbondale, Ill., has been selected as the Illinois State mother of 1958. A judging committee considered many extremely outstanding nominees from all parts of Illinois and made this very commendable choice for State mother. The American mother's committee was inaugurated in 1933 as a committee of the Golden Rule Foundation. The objective of the mothers committee is to develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual fiber of the American home. Mrs. Fulkerson has such an outstanding record of devotion to her community, State, and Nation that I take pleasure in printing herein a biographical sketch of her and some of the facts surrounding her selection:

Mrs. Emma Grace Fulkerson (Mrs. Elbert), (60) 610 West Cherry Street, Carbondale, Ill., has been chosen 1958 State mother by a jury of judges of the Illinois Mothers Association of the American Mothers Committee, Inc., at the home of the State chairman, Mrs. A. E. Seymour, Virden, Ill., on March 19.

The Dames Club of Southern Illinois University, an organization on campus, composed of wives of students and married female students, made the successful presentation of Mrs. Fulkerson, who is their sponsor and adviser. These young women, many of whom are also mothers, feel their adviser has all the qualities and characteristics of what a good mother should be. Mrs. Fulkerson has encouraged the interests of the group in educational, cultural, religious and civic affairs, as well as in homemaking. Even though she does not drive a car herself, she has never missed one of these meetings; her genuine interest and concern for these young women has won their complete confidence.

Emma Grace Fulkerson and her husband, Prof. Elbert Fulkerson, have raised a family of 6 outstanding children, 3 sons and 3 daughters. Dr. Elbert Glen Fulkerson, oldest son, is coordinator of secondary education at San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif. He served in the Navy 5 years during World War II, 3 years in the Pacific theater, and when honorably discharged had achieved the rank of lieutenant junior grade. Mrs. Merle Fulkerson Guthrie, oldest daughter, has her master's degree and is a teacher in Belleville Township High School and Junior College, Belleville, Ill. Dr. Delbert Ray Fulkerson, a research mathematician for Rand Corp., a nonprofit organization, was first lieutenant and meteorologist in the Army Air Corps during World War II. He also has night classes in the University of California at Los Angeles. Mrs. Juanita Fulkerson Todd, a resident of Des Plaines, Ill., teaches in Niles Township School, Skokie. Her unusual record of highest awards throughout her academic career at Southern Illinois University, where she also received her master's degree, was in keeping with the family reputation. Mrs. Grace Fulkerson Weshinskey is also a graduate of Southern Illinois University, where she was president of the student council, editor of the school paper and associate editor of the yearbook. She taught school and is a resident of Carbondale. Richard, at 16, is a high school junior "straight A" student. He excels in debate, chorus, trombone and, as an Explorer Scout, attended last year's national jamboree at Valley Forge. Both sons in California have children and Mrs. Weshinskey has one child.

Of this exceptional family, four of the children were graduated from high school as valedictorians of their classes, and the other with scholastic honors. Three of them were graduated from Southern Illinois University with high honors, and the other two from the same university with highest honors in their classes. Four of the children helped pay their way through college by working part time. Extracurricular activities claimed much of their time and interest, such as athletics, journalism, debating, choral work, social, and honorary organizations and school plays. At the same time, they all attended Sunday school and church regularly. Presently, most of them are still very active in church work.

Prof. Elbert Fulkerson teaches mathematics at Southern Illinois University, where he is also secretary to the faculty. He has been awarded a life membership in the National Educational Association for faithful performance of duty. Presently, secretary of the Carbondale United Fund, he was one of its organizers. He is an elder in the Presbyterian Church, a member of the American Association of University Professors, president of Southern Illinois Historical Society and member of teacher groups of mathematicians and scientists and of the board of directors of the Student Christian Foundation at Southern Illinois University. He is author of several articles published in professional magazines.

Mrs. Fulkerson taught in a rural school of White County, where she had been valedictorian of the eighth grade graduating class, when that was a county program. Service on the Williamson County Health Committee and as a volunteer nurse's aid at Holden Memorial Hospital, Carbondale, has claimed a good share of her time. For 31 years the Carbondale Women's Club has been supported by her membership and service in offices and chairmanships. At one time she was president of the Carterville Woman's Club, the Williamson County Federation of Women's Clubs and was organizer and sponsor of the Carterville Junior Woman's Club. She has served the PTA in executive capacities, as well as the Home Bureau. Her husband's position provides her eligibility to membership in Southern Illinois University's Women's Club.

Our chosen State mother has been an active member of various churches and Sunday schools throughout her lifetime. At present, she has a variety of responsibilities in the local Presbyterian Church. Her pastor says: "She has been diligent and faithful in her church work, serving as president of the Church Women's Association, teacher of the women's Bible class and in many other capacities."

As the civic or government reference, the mayor of Carbondale, Hon. John I. Wright, writes of the high esteem in which the Fulkerson family is held and deems it an honor to recommend Mrs. Fulkerson to the Illinois Mothers Association judging committee.

A colleague of Professor Fulkerson supplies the educational reference for Mrs. Fulkerson. Having had four of the prime results of her motherhood in his classes, he made the following comments upon the family qualities: "Among these are a sense of responsibility, integrity, and personal discipline. Respect is another quality steadily developed in this family. The Fulkerson children have never been obsequious or without proper critical evaluation of persons and institutions, but they have also never been too careless, conceited, or blasé to give evidence of honest respect where it is due. Other major virtues, one may be sure, were rigorously instilled at home: Religion, honesty, industry, friendliness, and ethical propriety generally. The result has been a family of children quite unusual in terms of achievement and public regard."

As the mother in this remarkable family, Mrs. Fulkerson has been friend, companion, confidant, comforter, counselor, and inspiration to her children. Even when afflicted with a serious illness herself, she did not succumb to self-pity, but maintained her cheerful, courageous spirit so that she became an example to all who know her, that life can be lived victoriously in spite of any misfortunes.

The maintaining of a superior home and family unity upon the limits of a modest income was not always easy. However, within the limits of the family income Mrs. Fulkerson has always managed to create a home atmosphere of warm, attractive comfort for her family where they might welcome their guests.

Wisely, while her children were growing up, Mrs. Fulkerson devoted herself to them, her husband and her home. Yet, giving themselves to the community is a family precept well exemplified by this mother who has proved to be a leader of exceptional capacity and effectiveness and who has revealed repeatedly the background of distinguished parenthood which makes success for children so much easier than without it.

Presentation of the citation of the American Mothers Committee will be made at a public-awards ceremony, April 13, in Carbondale. Mrs. Fulkerson will be the State's candidate for American mother.

ILLINOIS MOTHERS ASSOCIATION JURY OF JUDGES

Mrs. E. J. Heckel, Downers Grove, president, Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. E. D. McGuire, Makanda, immediate past president, Illinois Home Bureau Federation.

Mrs. Charles H. Woods, Lincoln, governor, Illinois Sons and Daughters of Pilgrims, also 1955 Illinois State mother.

Mrs. E. J. D'Aboy, Springfield, president, Illinois Mission Society of Baptist Women.

Mrs. Ben Michaels, Assumption, president, Springfield Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.

Mrs. M. D. Clinton, Virden, president, southern Illinois division, Brethren Women.

Mrs. Hobart Blair, Virden, State secretary, Illinois Council of Church Women.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.





Appendix

Address by Governor McKeldin in Commemoration of 215th Anniversary of Birth of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, delivered an address in commemoration of the 215th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was specifically the founder of the Democratic political party, was the author of so many of our important public documents, and was without peer as a statesman.

I think that Governor McKeldin's remarks yesterday constitute a complete statement of the public service of Thomas Jefferson and, as such, automatically becomes a great tribute to his memory.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, AT THE ANNUAL COMMEMORATION OF THE 215TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The immortality of Thomas Jefferson rests upon the fact that he knew values. This may seem a peculiar thing to say of a man who was among the most successful of world statesmen, but the proof of it is inscribed upon his tomb. Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State, twice elected President of the United States, negotiator who doubled the size of the country, and founder of a great political party, he ignored all these achievements in writing his own epitaph. He preferred to be remembered as the author of the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia statute of religious freedom and father of the University of Virginia.

Historians, philosophers and politicians have been puzzled by that epitaph ever since and some have seen in it the final display of Jefferson's almost pathological dislike of being conspicuous. But it is precisely the contrary; Jefferson wished to make conspicuous those things that he regarded as his own accomplishments.

He has been governor and President, but every man in public life knows that chance plays a large part in every election, and, of course, the efforts of the candidate's friends play a still larger part. He had been Minister to France by appointment of Congress, and Secretary of State by appointment of President Washington. He was able to make the Louisiana purchase because the fortune of war had put Napoleon in a mood to sell. He founded a political party because the necessities of the moment forced such action upon him.

But the Declaration, the statute, and the university all represented tasks that he assumed of his own free will and that he carried through, not unaided to be sure, but in the manner that he, none other, saw fit to do them. Franklin and John Adams changed a word or two in the Declaration; John Harvie actually introduced the bill for religious freedom; and many others, including as oddly assorted characters as Madison and Du Pont de Nemours, assisted with the university. But men agreed then, and have agreed since, that the driving force in all three was Thomas Jefferson.

Yet not one of these was in any sense an original idea. As regards the Declaration, we have Jefferson's own written testimony that he sought diligently to avoid putting any original idea into the document. It was his endeavor to put into words the things that all liberty-loving men of the time accepted, not to express any new thought of his own. The statute of religious freedom also had a long ancestry, going through the charter of Maryland and the Mayflower compact, to generations of European thinkers and writers. As for the idea of a university, it was certainly as old as Plato's academy, and it is probable that something of the sort existed in China long before Plato was born.

Nevertheless the contribution that Thomas Jefferson made to American statecraft is acknowledged to be among the most important made by any individual. Here would seem to be a paradox: A man who disclaimed any originality for his most famous work, yet became in his lifetime and has since remained in memory one of the most eminent leaders and inspirers of a great nation. How can a man be a magnificent leader if he has no originality?

But it isn't a paradox. There is no puzzle in it at all if we bear in mind that the very essence of successful leadership is an accurate sense of values. The man who knows, apparently instinctively, what is really worthwhile and what has only a surface glitter, the man who never mistakes polished brass for fine gold, is a man whom the people can safely follow. And because there are so few of his kind he will always seem to be highly original, although his basic philosophy is actually as old as truth itself.

Thomas Jefferson knew that in his time two great tasks lay before the American people: the exploitation and development of a continent and the exploitation and development of the theory of political liberty. Both were practically virgin fields, although both had been partially explored for centuries. A great many of Jefferson's contemporaries had eyes only for the continent, and he did not neglect it; he sent Lewis and Clark across its whole extent and by that act became the first to inform the American people of what they really had.

But not for one moment did he fall into the error of believing that taking possession of the continent was the more important task. His sense of values told him that for Americans to learn how to govern themselves successfully was more important than overrunning North America. The continent was, indeed, a storehouse of almost limitless treasure; but the field of political liberty was a storehouse of absolutely limitless treasure. The values that are gained through liberty are, it is true, values of the mind and spirit, not those of the market place. But for that very reason they have the value of immortality, they will outlast silver and gold, they cannot be corrupted by moth or rust, nor can thieves break through and steal them.

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man," he said, and in the three things by which he wished to be remembered he kept that oath. The Declaration of Independence attacked the tyranny over the mind of man exercised by the King or England; the statute of religious freedom attacked the tyranny exercised by bigotry; the university attacked the tyranny exercised by ignorance. To be an implacable foe of tyranny over the mind is a greater thing than to hold any office whatsoever, up to and including the Presidency of the United States.

It took a great man to see that truth, but once seen and proclaimed, it becomes the inspiration of all succeeding generations. For at any one time only 1 many out of 170 million can be President of the United States; but there is none so humble that he cannot, if he will, be a relentless foe of tyranny over the mind. Yet to the extent that a man stands up and fights for freedom, to that extent he shares the greatness of Thomas Jefferson.

So we return to him again and again. It has been nearly a century and a quarter since his heart ceased to beat, but he remains a living presence in this Republic. The grave at Monticello does not contain him, and this marble cenotaph is not his shrine. The living Jefferson abides in the hearts of his fellow Americans, and whenever and wherever one American heart leaps at the thought of freedom, there Jefferson is in action again.

This place is dedicated to his memory, but it is not really a monument to Jefferson. It is a monument to the eternal war against every form of tyranny over the mind of man, and it carries his name only because he fought that war so well. His services to the country as diplomat and statesman were distinguished and we acknowledge them with gratitude. But his sense of values was correct. All that he did in statecraft and diplomacy will pass into oblivion long before we forget that he wrote the Declaration of Independence and the statute of religious freedom and founded the University of Virginia.

The man who devotes his thought and energy to the things that abide is the man whose name abides and who comes as close to immortality as a human being can come. Since nothing that has entered the heart of man is more persistent than his longing to be free, the man who can identify his name with that yearning has secured a place in history that will endure while the love of liberty endures.

The existence of this place turns our thoughts to these things. Hence to come here should be, and I am sure is to all of us a refreshment and a renewal of our faith in the value of things that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, but that are more enduring than wealth, more desirable than power, because their touch lays upon our common clay the lustre of the immortal.

Through Jefferson we pay tribute to all that has made our country great; and the mere payment of that tribute has its effect

upon ourselves. It lifts us a little higher above the level of the brute and a little closer to the ideal. I can think of no more fitting close to an address of this kind than to quote those unforgettable words that are as true today as they were when Pericles addressed them to the Athenians: "I have paid the required tribute, in obedience to the law, making use of such fitting words as I had. * * * For where the rewards of virtue are greatest, there the noblest citizens are enlisted in the service of the state."

Acute Water Shortage Threatens Many Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the fear of a serious water shortage is very real—and completely justified—in many sections of the United States.

As the Austin Statesman, one of our great Texas newspapers, pointed out in a recent editorial, unless adequate action is taken to meet this problem every phase of the Nation's economic life will be adversely affected.

The Statesman editorial outlines the scope of the problem and tells of efforts to meet it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACUTE WATER SHORTAGE IN WATER-SHORT AREAS SEEN IN 15 YEARS

Texas, with a rapidly increasing population, a rapidly increasing industrial complex requiring large quantities of water, a huge livestock as well as agricultural industry, passed through 7 years of the worst drought in Texas' history.

Conditions which brought this protracted drought now seem changed, but Texans are not yet too sure, despite abundant rainfall in the last 2 years, whether the drought has been broken or whether this rainfall is a temporary intermission.

Last year Texas voters ratified a $200 million State bond issue for purposes of supply and conservation and storage, this money to operate as a revolving fund to remedy water deficit conditions prevalent during periods of scant rainfall. Not much has been heard recently on the progress of this program, beyond the fact that it is in the "works."

But the water problem is not alone that of Texas. In 15 years, say Congressmen from water-short areas, there will be an acute water shortage. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico Democrat, says "there is a feeling that not a cussed thing" has been done for the past 3 years on a research program begun 6 years ago by the Department of the Interior.

He has introduced a resolution to authorize the Department of the Interior to construct a full-scale, $10 million demonstration plant to convert salt water into fresh water. Senator FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota Republican, would provide the same amount to build two pilot plants—one to convert sea water to fresh and another on the northern Great Plains to treat brackish water.

Meanwhile the Department of the Interior has announced that the United States will build its largest water conversion plant yet in the Virgin Islands. It will turn more than 200,000 gallons of sea water into fresh water every day.

Behind the renewed congressional activity on water conversion is the fear of a serious water crisis. Agriculture and industry have consumed ever-increasing quantities of water and in some areas there never was a great supply. As the population grows water requirements and usage increase drastically. An adequate program to halt the runoff of water to the sea in times of abundance for conserved used in times of lack of rainfall has yet to be undertaken.

The great problem of water, as growth of the States populationwise and in industry which uses vast quantities in washing processes, not only is to find effective measures for water retention but in the course of the next few years to be able to fill the gap with water from cheap conversion processes.

Senator ANDERSON says the atomic bomb would have required 75 years for development if there had not been a desperate sense of urgency, but there is now the same urgency with regard to adequate water supplies to meet the requirements of a dynamically expanding nation and its economy, and all that has been done so far from the national standpoint is to put sat water conversion in a small pilot plant stage.

The time, many Congressmen feel, is to get the process out of the laboratory and into the field.

In periods of drought the problem of water in Texas is augmented by physical characteristics of the land which find every stream in Texas, from small to medium and large, coursing to the southeast or south to the Gulf of Mexico, losing annually many billions of gallons of water one day to be desperately needed.

The Senate Interior Committee now seems likely to come up with a bill to authorize construction of demonstration plants for seashore areas, including the coastal States fronting on the Gulf of Mexico, southern California, which with other parts of that State has been in the throes of record-making floods, New York-New England States, and inland areas of the great plains and Southwest.

Where there is no water there is little life, no real opportunity for development. The climax of the water problem will be reached in only a few more years, and unless steps are taken to meet it every phase of the Nation's economic life will be adversely affected.

Restore Authority to REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Greenville, Ill., a resolution calling for the reestablishment of the Rural Electrification Administration to its original status as an independent agency. The rural electric cooperatives have been vital elements in farm and rural progress. The cooperatives are concerned that partisan politics will impede their continued service and progress.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration as originally established was an independent agency; and

Whereas the original intent of the Congress was that it be a nonpartisan agency, as it so states in the act and as indicated by the term of the "Administrator"; and

Whereas the act states the Administrator shall approve loans; and

Whereas if REA is to continue under the jurisdiction of a politically appointed member of the Cabinet there is grave danger to the generation and transmission lending program of REA: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the board of trustees of the Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc., do this 3d day of March 1958 urge the Congress to take action to restore to the Rural Electrification Administration Administrator the same authority that he exercised before the Reorganization Act of 1953; be it further

Resolved, That the State Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives further urge such action by the Congress.

EDWARD OPPER,
President.
N. E. WELLS,
Secretary.

Prizewinning Speeches in Minnesota 4-H Radio Speaking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this year as in previous years the Minnesota State 4-H Radio Speaking Contest has been completed with awards going to two outstanding speakers. The stated question for the speeches was "Our country's most important problem—What can I do about it?"

Once more I want to pay tribute to Mr. Leonard Harkness, the State 4-H Club leader, and to Mr. Sam Scheine, the executive director of the Minnesota Jewish Council, for their excellent efforts in organizing and financing the State contest.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech by the first place winner, Mr. Darrol Bussler, McLeod County, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech of the second place winner, Mr. Deann Chamberlain, Swift County, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COUNTRY'S MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM—WHAT CAN I DO ABOUT IT?

(By Darrol Bussler, McLeod County, first-place winner of Minnesota 4-H radio speaking contest)

This moment, if you were to go down on Main Street, United States of America, and ask 50 average people the question, "What is our country's most important problem?" you would probably get 50 different answers; all of which could be correct. For our country has many great problems—problems of world affairs, church problems, problems of the people themselves, just to name a few. And yet when we think for a moment,

all of these problems threaten one of our greatest treasures—that treasure is democracy. I think this is our country's greatest problem—the threats to democracy.

I believe there are three main threats to our way of life. The first threat is the church. Oh, no, not the church itself, but it's the people who do not attend church or a house of worship that are threatening our democracy. For our country needs people of strong moral and religious training. One of my teachers once told me our body's aren't worth a nickel, but it's the spirit within us that makes us what we are. So my first threat is the threat of people not attending church.

The second threat to democracy is world affairs. There are disputes over boundaries, fights for more land, food, and wealth. Struggles to have the greatest power in missiles and rockets. And of course, there is the constant rise of communism which is like a lion seeking what it may devour.

The people themselves are a threat to our Government. It is surprising how little interest people take in their community or schools. You can especially see this when there are jobs to be done in Red Cross, March of Dimes, elections for school boards and community officeholders.

These are what I believe to be the three threats to democracy, therefore, the question arises, "What can I do about it?"

My answer is very commonplace. Approximately a year ago, we received in our mail an envelope which contained some stamps. I looked at one of these stamps and here was a solution to the threats to democracy. This was the Disabled American Veterans' stamp. For those of you who do not remember the features of this stamp, I will review them. On the stamp are two figures—a turkey and a disabled veteran. Between the two figures are the words—we're thankful to be Americans. I will give my interpretations of each of these, and when I'm completed you will have my answer to the question, "What can I do about our country's greatest problem?"

The first figure is the turkey. This figure represents one of the greatest holidays in a democracy—namely Thanksgiving. A day representing one of the many freedoms enjoyed—religious freedom. I can help stop the first threat of people not attending church regularly, by encouraging, and most of all setting an example, so that others will want to participate in young people's organizations, Sunday school, choir, and so forth.

The second figure is the disabled veteran. This figures symbolizes the many thousands who have given their lives and limbs for the love of their way of life. At times, people in a democracy may take opposite sides as in elections, social and community ideas. But when their Government is threatened, they band together as one and fight to the finish for their precious heritage. Wars have been won, wars will be fought if necessary and won, but only as long as each individual does his part in that great play of American democracy no matter how small the part may be. In a democracy, it's the individual that counts. It's the individual that is important and equal. For democracy is like a giant wheel with 170,000 spokes. Since I am an individual in my country, I, too, can fight for my country to keep world affairs from threatening our democracy.

The words on the stamp—we're thankful to be Americans—shows our thankfulness in many ways. We only have to turn on the radio, TV, or look at any newspaper to prove this. Not too long ago, funds were started for a policeman who was shot down to death in the line of duty. Stones like this show that Americans and people in a democracy are thankful. I can help stop the third threat—that of the people themselves, by assisting in community service projects, and community organizations.

Yes, through the ideas of this simple little stamp, we can stop the threats to our democracy.

Now let's take a good look at the word problem—take out the first and last three letters and we have left the word rob. If we do not stop these threats, we will be robbed of our freedoms, joys and happiness. So now let's take this stamp and its ideas to help stop the threats to democracy.

Our Country's Most Important Problem Today—What Can I Do About It?

(By Deann Chamberlain, Swift County, second place winner of Minnesota 4–H radio speaking contest)

Do these headlines sound familiar to you? "Three Teen-Agers Arrested for Armed Robbery"; "Man Fatally Beaten by Teen-Age Mob"; "Teen-Age Gang War Kills 1 and Injures 3"; "Teen-Age Crime Hits an All-Time Peak."

These headlines came from our newspapers—they concern our town and towns within a few miles of us. No doubt you have read each of them; you have heard them on your news broadcasts; you have seen your TV newscasters shake his head over each of them too many times. Quite possibly you know that juvenile crime has reached an all-time peak. You know that not enough is being done to prevent, correct, and punish these juvenile criminals who live in our towns, who threaten us. As a teen-ager I am shocked by the cruelty, thoughtlessness, and lawlessness of teen-agers. I am vitally interested in what can be done to prevent, correct, and solve these problems. Teen-agers must work with their parents and community now to avert national tragedies. Let us consider thoughtfully the possible causes of and solutions to this problem.

When I use the term "juvenile criminals," I define juvenile to mean the age group from 12 to 18 years. I use the term "criminals" rather than "delinquents" because some of our juveniles are no longer pranksters, but are involved in serious crimes, crimes such as theft, assault, cruel murders, and dope peddling. Why, why do some teen-agers commit such crimes?

Juvenile crime is not a situation that can be attributed to any one cause. It is a problem whose causes are many and varied.

Too many of the modern American homes are no longer the hub of the family, but have been reduced to the status of restaurants and hotels. In such homes, houses would be a better term—there is no feeling of togetherness. The mother and father are both working to provide their family with material things; too often these things become a substitute for true love. What does junior really want? A new car, or an understanding relationship with his mother and father? Many parents think that material things are what we teen-agers want, but what we want is love. We want to be accepted by our parents as well as by others, particularly by our own age group.

Many parents are not aware that their youngsters are the carbon copy of themselves. You parents of teen-agers set the social patterns. Science has made life as easy as possible for us, yet even with all the modern conveniences we have, there are chores to be done. Just how many teen-agers have definite chores to do when they get home from school? Not many, I'm afraid, and the ones who do not have responsibilities are most often the ones who get into trouble.

What can we law-abiding teen-agers do about those among us who have given us our bad reputation? Are we to sit back and watch the 20th-century parents and grandparents shake their heads and say, 'What's the matter with the kids of today?" We, the youth of America, can get on our feet and fight to overcome this problem. We can outnumber and overpower the few who are misguided and lead them back to a normal, happy life.

We must help to stop juvenile crime. We often feel that adults fail to see our point of view, but often, we don't see other teen-agers' point of view. If we, who have the good fortune of a healthy home life, accepted the misled teen-agers, took them into our hearts, helped them to feel that they belong, perhaps they could become leaders and good citizens of tomorrow. It is our job, as well as the job of adults, to see that they can reach this goal.

Have we gone out of our way to invite other teen-agers into community clubs, dances, and school activities, or anything under special guidance? These are constructive, worthwhile ways for teen-agers to learn by doing and ways to keep too busy to think of lawlessness. Too often those who fail to get recognition in school or at home, demand recognition by appearing in the headlines as a criminal.

It seems to me there has been a general weakening of authority and respect for authority. We know that teen-agers should be firmly and consistently disciplined at home. Stricter discipline by parents is needed and we teen-agers agree. We don't often admit it, but we do want discipline.

As we have shown before, we need closer family ties, with sympathetic, understanding, devoted parents. Families can make themselves stronger by doing things together. For example, having a family hour every evening and going to church together. We will become too busy and too happy to have time for delinquency.

We have reviewed the facts—weak home discipline, lack of family life, disinterested contemporaries which have accelerated the greatest wave of juvenile crime in history. We have discussed some of the possible solutions—stricter discipline, more unified family life, good example by parents, and a helping hand extended by us teen-agers. Putting possible solutions into practice lies in the hands of all of us. It takes all of us—not just parents, spiritual directors, police officers, and teachers—but we teen-agers as well.

We have much to do before we, the youth of America, can stand on our feet together and say, "Look, America, look at us and be proud."

Let's start today.

Business of the Passport Division of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is interesting to Members of Congress and to American people generally to view the manner in which Miss Frances Knight, with marked efficiency, conducts the business of the United States Passport Division of the State Department.

Earlier this month Mr. Ray Henle, a prominent newscaster, made some comments on the business of the Passport Division, as indicating perhaps some reason to feel that here is one business which is improving in this country, and that is the business of travel overseas. While a little more than half a million

passports were issued last year—564,000, to be exact—it is estimated that this year 690,000 will be issued.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the comments which Mr. Henle made be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS UP IN PASSPORT DIVISION

THREE STAR EXTRA

(By Ray Henle)

There may be some segments of the American people which are feeling the business recession. Certainly a number of industrial areas are. But in one important field a very significant barometer of business shows there is no effect whatever from any adverse business situation. That field is the field of international travel.

The head of the United States Passport Division, Miss Frances G. Knight, has her hand closely on the business barometer as it affects travel. Miss Knight says, "My figures show that only the industrial areas of Michigan, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma so far this fiscal year are applying for fewer passports than last year."

Generally in the United States, the forecast for this year is that 690,000 passports will be issued. This is an increase over last year when 564,000 passports were issued.

The passport business is like mercury. Whenever anything serious happens in the world, passport applications fall off. There is no such falling off now, regardless of recession talk.

Travelers are rubbing their eyes these days when they apply for passports or extensions. Instead of sometimes long delays, passports now are issued within a matter of days. Upwards of three thousand passports are issued daily. It's done by one of the most efficient operations to be found anywhere in the Government.

So far as travel to Europe is concerned, this seems to be the era of the common man. The occupations most listed by the overseas travelers are student, clerk-secretary, teacher, salesman, and lots of average workers going back to visit in the old country. Twenty-eight percent of the passports go to housewives.

The number of persons who say in their applications that they will travel by ship decreased more than 8 percent over 1956, while the number listing air travel increased on some lines as high as 36 percent. Another significant change is in the increase in travel by persons under 20 years of age. It was 35 percent. Compared to only 6 percent increase among travelers from 30 to 50 years old.

One interesting fact, those dreadful passport pictures travelers used to have in their passports are going fast. For two reasons: Miss Knight, the passport director, has sent out word, give the photographer a big smile and have color photos taken, if you wish to do so. The combination of the big smile and natural coloring has improved greatly the pictures our travelers must flash to customs and immigration men and all and sundry foreigners who must see them. The new style photos are good American propaganda.

Taxing Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief editorial entitled "Taxing Teachers," from the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding Memphis, Tenn., newspaper.

This timely comment refers to recent action taken by the Treasury Department in liberalizing its regulations to assure the deductibility of schoolteachers' continuing educational expenses for income-tax purposes.

This action by the Department has corrected a longstanding injustice in the interpretation of our tax laws. It is in line with legislative proposals introduced by myself and other Members of the Congress to accomplish this result.

As pointed out in the editorial, our teachers need this relief primarily, but the ultimate beneficiaries will be our schoolchildren.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXING TEACHERS

The Treasury Department has come to the financial aid of teachers, without the necessity for Congress to reform the law.

Expenses for obtaining further education will be deductible income for tax returns and the benefits are available for educational expenses as far back as January 1, 1954, for those who act quickly. More time is available to obtain adjustments reaching backward to 1955.

Teachers, like members of the professions of medicine and engineering, improve their services by returning to school and by studying the changes developed since they last attended classes. It is appropriate for teachers to have the same consideration in tax payments as the other professions.

Both the need for better teachers and the need of more income to hold the best teachers will be partially answered by this Treasury Department ruling. However, this is probably as far as rulings can go in tax reform for teachers. Advocates of more income for teachers by the income-tax method are likely to have to return to the plan for special action by Congress.

A little more salary to spend because of a little less for the income-tax collector has public support largely because of needs of teachers. It would have even more support if it was more generally remembered that schoolchildren are the real beneficiaries when their teachers benefit.

Congress Should Control Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Congress Should Control," from the April 7, 1958, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD CONTROL

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, long one of the most powerful and influential congressional leaders in military affairs, is justifiably wary of President Eisenhower's proposal for reorganizing the Pentagon.

The Georgia Senator, who is chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, apparently is not going to be a party to any plan which would snatch the military purse strings from Congress.

Commenting on the proposal, Senator RUSSELL said:

"I shall not favor any legislation that would destroy the identity of our Armed Forces. Any further expression of opinion on the President's plan must await the receipt of the detailed legislation spelling out the means and methods and powers that he desires."

Congress certainly is not going to surrender its control over defense funds and just appropriate lump sums to the Secretary of Defense to distribute among the services as he sees fit, RUSSELL declared.

The Senator's cautious attitude is easily understandable.

In the recent past, Congress has surrendered too many of its powers and prerogatives, and it makes for an unwholesome—even a dangerous—situation when too much of this power is centralized in the executive branch of the Government.

As Senator RUSSELL says, the Secretary of Defense already has the adequate authority to properly administer the Department of Defense.

No doubt, President Eisenhower's intentions are entirely honest in proposing the Pentagon reorganization with an eye to bringing about a more closely knit operation of our military services.

Still, it is not wise to remove the control of the military too far from Congress. While it is the duty of the Defense Secretary to administer military affairs, and with the President establish policy, he should always be answerable to Congress. The legislative body should have the final word—certainly where finances are concerned.

We certainly shouldn't like to have a ruling military clique in this country. Such would be entirely foreign to the American way of life.

William P. Rogers, Attorney General of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article describing the background and capabilities of Attorney General William P. Rogers.

The article, written by Anthony Lewis, appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times of Sunday, April 6. I urge my colleagues to read this article, written by an outstanding member of the Times staff, who has covered Washington legal activities for many years.

I believe this article gives a penetrating insight into the career of a capable Cabinet member who exemplifies a high type of leadership.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSEUP OF OUR LAWYER IN CHIEF

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—In a recent appearance at the National Press Club the newest member of the Eisenhower Cabinet, Attorney General William P. Rogers, was asked a dozen

questions about his job and then a hooker about his good friend RICHARD M. NIXON—"How many votes will NIXON have on the first ballot at the 1960 Republican convention?"

Rogers said the question reminded him of a story: At Senate hearings on the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to the Supreme Court, a small man with a hearing aid kept trying to testify. Finally, at the end of the third and last day, he was led forward. "Do you solemnly swear * * *?" the committee chairman asked. No answer. The oath was read again, louder. Still no answer. As the chairman's exasperation penetrated, the would-be witness shook his head and said: "Senator, I've been here 3 days and my batteries are dead."

When the laughter died down, Rogers went on:

"I just want to say that as long as I hold this job, my batteries are going to be dead to questions like that."

The episode throws light on a significant man. Rogers is important not only because he is a member of the Cabinet; among the close advisers of the President he is the closest to the Vice President—officially and personally. In a Nixon administration, Rogers would be even closer than he is at present to the center of American political power.

Now Rogers has come to the forefront of the news as the chief architect and salesman of the administration's important plans for clarifying the succession to the Presidency. Rogers was drafted by Mr. Eisenhower to explain the private understanding on turning his duties over to Vice President NIXON in the event of illness, and it has been Rogers who has pressed Congress for a constitutional amendment to solve the long-term problem of succession.

Questions about his relationships with the Vice President are, therefore, inevitable. But Washington is persuaded that Rogers means it when he says he will take no active part in partisan activity, for Vice President NIXON or anyone else, while he is in the Cabinet. The feeling is that Rogers wants to be known as a good Attorney General, and above all wants to avoid the impression of partisanship which marred the record of his predecessor, Herbert Brownell, Jr.

The most obvious fact about the press club performance is Rogers' ability to charm a tough audience. Even critics say ruefully that he is about the hardest man in Washington to resist these days. It is a fair guess, too, that Rogers had his battery story ready for a NIXON question. Preparation is nine points of the law for a trial lawyer—preparation including knowledge of the audience as well as of the facts. Rogers is, above all, a trial lawyer.

William Pierce Rogers was born in Norfolk, N. Y., an upstate town with a population of about 1,500. He went through college (Colgate) and law school (Cornell) on scholarships, then went briefly with a Wall Street law firm. In 1938 he got a job as assistant to the district attorney of New York County, Thomas E. Dewey. Before he left to join the Navy in 1942, he had tried something like 1,000 cases and learned the flexible, extroverted art of the trial lawyer.

Rogers came to Washington in 1947 as counsel to a Senate committee investigating wartime procurement scandals and "5 percenters," among other things. He won praise for fair procedures, and he stayed on when the Republican 80th Congress was succeeded by the Democratic 81st Congress. He left in 1950 to join a private law firm here. He was so little interested in politics at the time that he gave up what most Washington operators treasure—voting residence in his home State. He says he couldn't afford to pay taxes in New York and in his new home, Maryland.

He got into politics at the top. When the Eisenhower-Taft fight for the Republican nomination developed in 1952, Rogers walked into Eisenhower headquarters at a Washington hotel and volunteered his services. He was sent to New York to meet Brownell and put to work on what turned out to be the determining factor in the fight—the seating of contested delegations at the convention. Rogers was the tactician who got onto the Nation's television sets and front pages the Eisenhower charge of a Taft "steal" of delegates, and it was the promotion of this charge that eventually routed Senator Taft.

During the 1952 convention Rogers renewed his casual friendship with a member of the credentials committee, Senator RICHARD M. NIXON. They had met in connection with NIXON's work as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, when the then Congressman asked Rogers' legal advice on the Hiss-Chambers affair. (Rogers told him to push ahead.) Their common interests (golf, for example) and closeness in age (NIXON is a few months older) had thrown them together.

At the end of the 1952 convention Rogers was asked to come along on the Vice Presidential train and help set things up. Before long that train was the focus of the campaign. With disclosure of the expense fund maintained by California supporters for NIXON, several advisers deserted his cause and began talking about substituting another candidate. Rogers counseled standing fast. He handled communications with the Eisenhower advisers—Brownell, Sherman Adams, and others. And he helped arrange the television speech that recaptured for NIXON the good opinion of the President and public.

The intimate Nixon-Rogers relationship dates from that time. Its closeness would be difficult to exaggerate. The two men relax together and work together. In a typical evening at home the Attorney General is likely to be called to the telephone 2 or 3 times to talk to "DICK." When President Eisenhower suffered the first of his three serious illnesses—his heart attack in 1955—NIXON's immediate reaction was to drive to the Rogers' home. He stayed late into the night discussing the constitutional and political outlook.

As Deputy Attorney General during the first 5 years of the Eisenhower administration, Rogers was primarily known by the public as a friend of the Vice President. But when he succeeded Brownell last fall, at the unusually youthful age of 44, his status inevitably changed. The public image of an Attorney General must be formed primarily by his performance in a job of unusual responsibility.

In a government dominated by lawyers—a fact noted by every foreign observer of American politics since de Tocqueville—the Attorney General is the lawyer in chief. That is a shorthand measure of the importance of the job.

Broadly speaking, the Attorney General's responsibilities fall into two categories. First, and most important, he is the principal legal adviser to the President and to the other Cabinet members. The White House and all the departments have their own lawyers, but on any important matter the Attorney General is consulted. He may be asked for written opinions, which are published as the official legal position of the executive branch.

Second, the Attorney General is the lawyer for the United States in court. With some minor exceptions, the Justice Department represents the Federal Government in all court proceedings, both criminal prosecutions and civil actions, in which the Government may be the suer or the sued. And since almost any political problem may end up in the courts in this country—from civil rights to tidelands—the role of the Government's lawyer is substantial.

In addition, the Justice Department has its own not insignificant investigative arm, the Federal Buerau of Investigation. It runs all Federal prisons and decides when prisoners shall be paroled. Its Immigration and Naturalization Service has vast powers over aliens. And, finally, the Attorney General is the main link between the executive and judicial branches of Government, in part through his status as chief adviser to the President on judicial nominations.

In an interview recently Rogers sketched the work that comes across his desk in a typical day. Nominations, judicial and otherwise, are a staple. There are calls from other Cabinet members—the Secretary of State, say to discuss the return of German assets, or the Secretary of the Interior, to discuss some problem of water rights in the West. There are such delicate questions as when to authorize, and when to announce, an FBI inquiry into corruption charges against members of the Federal Communications Commission.

A difficult factor in the work of the Justice Department is its relationships with the agencies it represents.

"We don't always agree with our clients," Rogers says, "and it isn't like private practice. We don't necessarily accept their views.

"I don't want to give the impression that the clients' wishes are not fully considered, but they are not the only consideration. In private practice the lawyer's job is to represent one person or firm. Here we represent not one agency but the United States. If we think the best interests of the United States are served one way, that's it—no matter whether the particular agency agrees."

This requirement that the Justice Department look at the broad interests of the United States frequently finds it at odds with one agency or another. The best-known recent example was the Department's refusal to defend in the Supreme Court the legality of an Army policy of giving less-than-honorable security discharges to draftees because of activities before induction. The Supreme Court held the practice unauthorized by law.

How well is Rogers carrying out the varied responsibilities of his new job? Opinions, of course, differ.

No one denies that he is an extraordinarily skillful tactician. As Deputy Attorney General, for example, his primary responsibilities were appointments and congressional relations—a spiny pair that won most of his predecessors the enmity of bar associations for being too political, or of Senators for not being political enough. Rogers kept both sides extremely happy. He gave the American Bar Association the new duty of passing on the qualifications of all potential judicial nominees. He charmed Senators by being friendly, available, persuasive—by being superb on the little niceties that don't matter, as one observer put it.

Something of the same qualities that have made Rogers a favorite with Congress have endeared him to the press. He is available, he gives straight answers, he says plainly that he cannot answer when he cannot.

There are those who feel that Rogers is primarily, and too narrowly, a tactician. These critics say that he is a success in personal and public relations precisely because he lacks the reserve, the impatience with petty distractions and minor niceties, and the intellectuality of the typical Wall Street lawyer—Brownell, for example. But, they argue, these are qualities an Attorney General should have. They say that the quick mind, the ready smile, and the tactical mastery that make a natural prosecutor will not substitute for the intellectual toughness needed of an Attorney General.

These critics say, for example, that with all his awkwardness in public relations, Brownell was a demanding supervisor of day-to-day work in the Justice Department, and stood up strongly against political pressures from the White House and the Capitol. They cite his insistence on bringing up several controversial antitrust suits and his action just

before leaving office in rejecting Texas' claim to undersea oil rights more than 3 miles off the Gulf of Mexico shore. These observers fear that Rogers will not face up to the tough decisions but will follow the course of least political resistance.

"Rogers," say one critic, "obeys the Washington rule: 'Always avoid a fight if you can.' He's a master of the lily-pad operation."

The most specific charge in this direction is that during the Communist-hunting days early in the Eisenhower administration, Rogers resisted efforts to ameliorate the Government security program, taking what was seen as a politically advantageous line of toughness. There is well-supported speculation, for example, that he helped block a proposal inside the Department to abandon the Attorney General's subversive list.

On the other hand, an official who was a prominent victim of the late Senator McCarthy says Rogers was helpful during that period.

"From the start Rogers privately called Joe a charlatan, a demagog, and an S. O. B.," this man recalls. "He was never fooled. I'm not saying he went out on any limb, but he always would talk to me and he never knifed me in the back."

Rogers himself denies that he ever identified himself with one school or another on the Communist issue inside the Justice Department. He says: "I don't feel that I've been one way or the other. And I don't think it helps to generalize about what is liberal. I have tried to be reasonable and realistic about the Communist issue."

One observer with an excellent vantage point thinks Rogers has changed in the past year, especially since he became Attorney General. This observer, drawing a parallel with NIXON, thinks that Rogers started 5 years ago with no real political views, no principle except what seemed expedient in the short run, but that he has come around to believe in supporting what is best for the country in the long view.

The battle over civil-rights legislation last year was an important test, this observer believes. Rogers was in charge of the administration's position, and he held out against heavy pressure until he got a bill that he thought would work. A more recent indication of Rogers' frame of mind may have been his decision to go ahead with a criminal antitrust suit against the Radio Corporation of America. Several past administrations, Republican and Democratic, had considered but shied away from this controversial step.

Many more difficult decisions will face Rogers as Attorney General. To name just one area, there are powerful pressures in Congress and the States to reverse a number of recent Supreme Court rulings. The question raised by those skeptical of Rogers is whether he will stand for principle when to do so may seem really damaging politically. The prevailing opinion here is that he will risk the political damage and make the hard decisions, on the theory that in the long run this is the wiser course for his administration, his party, and himself.

Tax-Cut Delay Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to the editor of the New York Times by Eugene V. Rostow, dean of the Law School of Yale University. The letter, which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, April 13, 1958, criticizes the delay in enacting a tax cut.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX-CUT DELAY CRITICIZED—RESTORATION OF FULL EMPLOYMENT IS DECLARED NEEDED TO REVERSE TREND

(The writer of the following letter is dean of the Law School of Yale University.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The delay of the administration, and of the Democratic leadership in Congress, in proposing and passing a tax cut violates the policy of the Employment Act of 1946.

That vital statute declares the continuing responsibility of Government to use all its plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining conditions of maximum employment, in ways which promote the system of free competitive private enterprise.

The recessions of 1948–49 and of 1953–54 were not significantly different in quality from that which began last summer. In both those instances prompt tax cuts, building up small but significant Government cash deficits, were among the most important and effective of the devices used to reverse the downward trend before it had gained much momentum and to initiate strong recovery movements which proved to be the seedbed of growth.

These seems to be a curious belief prevalent in Washington that it would be healthier and sounder for the country if the recession could be stopped, and slow recovery begun, by governmental action other than that of deficit financing. Monetary policy is, of course, a powerful weapon, and it should be seriously used. So are selective subsidies, such as those for housing, which have been thrown into action.

USES FOR EASED MONEY

But monetary policy has been paralyzed by the failure of the administration to establish vigorous programs for eliminating waste and encouraging a high and sustained rate of economic growth. Unless output expands more rapidly than it has during the past few years, monetary ease can quickly lead to renewed price inflation.

Under these circumstances there is nothing to be gained, and much to be lost through further delay in cutting taxes. Many have said that we should have larger programs of aid to education, urban renewal and health. They are right.

But such programs cannot result in increased spending for current output until next year or later. It is now estimated that increased defense spending will not quite balance presently forecast cuts in private investment spending. The volume of spending can be promptly increased only by a tax cut.

We must bury surviving traces of the view that occasional deficits are unsound methods of stimulating recovery. There is no sin in prudent recourse to a governmental deficit in periods of recession, when only the Government is in a position to lean against the prevailing wind. During the last decade the Federal Government operated at a significant cash surplus, in which the surpluses of President Truman's administrations overbalanced the deficits of President Eisenhower's.

COST-PRICE RATIO

Some voices from Washington have echoed the old and pious hope that a little recession might be a good thing, in shaking down prices and improving the cost-price ratio. This is a dangerous illusion.

Such readjustments could not reasonably be expected even in a model world of pure and perfect competition. They cannot be expected at all in the world we live in, where steel prices hold firm even though only 80 percent of capacity is used, and strong unions blindly seek wage increases despite unemployment of almost 15 percent in their industries.

Full employment at stable or even slowly falling prices should be our goal of policy, as Senator BUSH and Professor Burns have rightly stressed. That goal can be achieved, however, only if we make programs to stimulate growth a central part of our full-employment arsenal. Until that is done we had better restore full employment promptly by cutting taxes, or we may find ourselves in a depression of such magnitude as to require very large deficits, and great and totally unnecessary national and international suffering, before high levels of employment could be achieved again.

Such ineptness could demoralize the Western World and threaten the hard-won fruits of the Marshall plan and the very great economic achievements of France, Great Britain, Germany, and Italy. And it would prolong and deepen the present suffering of our own unemployed people—a needless and futile ordeal which serves no national purpose.

EUGENE V. ROSTOW.
NEW HAVEN, CONN., *April 8, 1958.*

Kill With Kindness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial appearing in the Hutchinson News of March 15, 1958, entitled "Kill With Kindness."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KILL WITH KINDNESS

Congress continues on its way to killing the farmer with kindness.

In a misguided effort to protect agriculture, the Senate has passed a bill which would prevent any reduction in existing support prices or acreage allotments. The effect can only be to make the economic future of agriculture all the more insecure.

The measure is almost a directive to farmers to add to existing surpluses. It would guarantee farmers a profitable price for an excess production because more acreage is authorized than markets justify.

It would safeguard farm income for 1 more year, but it will increase the pressure by urban constituents of nonfarm State Congressmen to cut to ribbons the present level of farm aid spending.

Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, led the fight for this farm freeze bill. He describes it as a topgap emergency measure which will hold until Congress has time to pass a new long-range farm program. That is so much hogwash.

Since about 1922 Congress almost annually has been passing agricultural-aid legislation of various ranges. The ratio has been 3 stopgap for every 1 long-term. But no later than 2 years after the passage of every long-range program its shortcomings are so apparent that another stopgap measure has to be rushed through to prevent conditions from becoming chaotic.

This most recent farm-aid action is but another inconclusive chapter in the same old sad story.

This Congress Has Done Nothing To Alleviate Unemployment in the Nation's 149 Distressed Areas

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the furor over unemployment in the United States, the absence by this 85th Congress in taking action on distressed area legislation stands out as gross neglect of the welfare of thousands upon thousands of the American people who reside in some 149 labor-surplus areas.

Since 1955 when I introduced the first distressed-area legislation in Congress, I have constantly called attention to the plight of the unemployed in these distressed areas and pleaded for congressional action. Since 1955 many of my colleagues have joined in the appeal for positive action in alleviating the distress of unemployment in labor-surplus areas.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are over 40 bills pending in the Senate and House designed to provide Federal aid to labor-surplus areas. Hearings have been held in and out of Washington with the result that several hundred witnesses account for over 3,000 pages of printed testimony confirming the need for immediate action.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to emphasize that committees of this Congress have a wealth of information on distressed areas, yet no action has been taken.

Many of us who represent distressed areas have pleaded without success for over a year for action on these bills, which have been pigeonholed in committees of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has asked this Congress for distressed area legislation and stands ready to sign into law a reasonable bill.

On March 11, 1958, when he appeared before the AFL–CIO economic conference in Washington, D. C., Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell had this to say regarding distressed area legislation:

> Congress has had before it for 2 years now an area development bill designed to help communities with high and persistent unemployment. Maybe this bill does not meet with everyone's approval. Maybe it could be improved. The fact is Congress has done nothing about it.

At the same conference, AFL–CIO President George Meany, the Nation's outstanding and most highly respected labor leader, after scolding the Eisenhower administration for what he termed "shortsightedness" relative to today's economic crisis had this to say about the laxity of Congress to deal with the unemployment situation:

> The people on Capitol Hill must share the blame too. There is no excuse for the delay in the Congress.

Continuing he said in referring to labor-surplus areas:

> How about improving the lot of the chronically distressed cities—and remember that figure is growing every day that this recession lasts.

Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress has been indicted from all quarters for its utter neglect of labor-surplus areas where unemployment has been chronic for many years and has been the nucleus for the increased unemployment we have today.

It has been authoritatively stated that if the unemployment in the chronically distressed areas could be alleviated, our unemployment problem would be reduced by 50 percent.

This is borne out by the fact that approximately 62.5 million persons are employed and 5.2 million idle.

By comparison, during the month of February 1957, over 63 million Americans enjoyed full-time employment with approximately 3 million out of work. With a civilian labor force of 68 million, this means that in good times we had about 4.7 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed.

During March 1958 with 5.2 million unemployed, the present recession reveals an average of 7.4 percent of the civilian labor force out of work or an increase in the last 12 months of about 2.7 percent in our unemployment figures.

While it is true that the present unemployment is higher than at any other time since 1941, the closest approach was in 1949–50 with 4.8 million unemployed in February 1950. The Korean war in 1950 turned the tide of unemployment and ended the 1949–50 recession in the same manner that the 1938 depression ended with the advent of World War II. In February 1939 after 7 years of "pump priming," a total of 10.5 million were unemployed, or 19.5 percent of the civilian labor force.

A recent survey of the unemployment situation reveals that it tends to be concentrated heavily in relatively few States and in a few industries such as the railroad, coal, steel, automobile, and allied industries. However, in many other industries, the furloughing of employees has been relatively light.

In short, the survey reveals that not all industries are affected by unemployment and that actually in some fields people are being hired.

Keeping in mind that we have had for several years 149 chronic labor-surplus areas and that these so-called pockets of unemployment prevailed during alltime high employment of well over 60 million people, it is logical to conclude that Federal aid to these chronically distressed areas is the key to providing a solution to the current unemployment problem resulting from 5.2 million jobless persons.

The communities and States have helped, but to do an effective and a complete job Federal aid is needed without further delay.

The residents of the 149 distressed areas certified by the United States Department of Labor as labor-surplus areas have done a magnificent job themselves in trying to accomplish their own economic salvation. Practically every community has an alert and highly energetic area development committee or organization eager to aid in every possible manner to attract new industry to the area. It is with the thought of diversifying the industrial life of the community that the best means is found for cushioning the devastating effects of mass employment.

As a result these area development committees have raised funds locally to the extent that they have scraped the bottom of the barrel. They have had splendid cooperation from area banks in financing the drive to rehabilitate the economy of their respective areas. But banking institutions, too, are hemmed in by State and national banking laws, thus limiting the extent of their assistance, regardless of how laudable the objective may be.

The various States have also extended a helping hand, but in the end the job is of such vast proportions that only Federal aid to these chronic labor surplus areas will insure success of the determined drive to rehabilitate the economy, thus relieving the plight of the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, in a sincere effort to end the fruitless discussion and the resultant confusion that surrounds distressed area legislation, I call attention to my bill, H. R. 6975, which is a compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Spence bill.

The Van Zandt bill, H. R. 6975, is heralded by many as a realistic approach in providing a solution to the deadlock that exists in the enactment of a program to provide Federal aid for chronically distressed and labor surplus areas.

H. R. 6975 retains many of the features of the administration bill and the Douglas-Spence bill. It is regarded as a sane and sensible compromise and should serve as a reasonable and realistic basis for perfecting a legislative measure acceptable to all shades of opinion.

It is my belief that my bill, H. R. 6975, constitutes a genuine compromise between the administration bill, S. 1433, and the Douglas bill, S. 964.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated that I have no pride of authorship regarding distressed area legislation. The time has arrived for the 85th Congress to stop quibbling over details and to unite in providing Federal aid for chronically distressed areas.

At this moment nearly 15 percent of the civilian labor force in my congressional district in central Pennsylvania is unemployed. I know that many of my colleagues have a higher rate of unemployment in their congressional districts. Therefore, I plead in behalf of the unemployed in labor surplus areas that this 85th Congress assume its responsibility by immediately approving legislation that will alleviate the misery of chronic unemployment throughout the Nation.

The Meaning of the Sputnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, who retired from the Army in 1951 after 34 years of military service, has written a timely and very thought-provoking article entitled "The Meaning of the Sputnik." This appeared as a guest editorial in the November 16, 1957, issue of the Saturday Review, and I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues. As a preface to this article I include a letter from J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army, written to General Hester upon the occasion of his retirement. I ask unanimous consent to include this letter and the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter and article follow:

UNITED STATES ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
November 23, 1951.

Brig. Gen. HUGH B. HESTER,
United States Army (Retired).

DEAR GENERAL HESTER: Now that you have retired from the Army after 34 years of faithful and valuable service to the Nation, I want to express to you in some measure my deep appreciation for all you have done and my warm good wishes for the future.

Your personal contributions during your long career have been in keeping with our highest military traditions, and although it is not possible here to mention all of the positions of responsibility you have filled so capably, I do want to note some of your posts of trusts. We were indeed fortunate to have had an officer of your ability to serve in so many important posts in the Office of the Quartermaster General, including that of Deputy Chief Quartermaster, here in Washington just prior to and during the early days of World War II.

Written into your record are the accounts of your distinguished service in various important staff and command positions in the Supply Service, Southwest Pacific Area. Your subsequent assignment as Chief of the Food and Agriculture Branch of the Economics Division in the Office of Military Government of Germany was but further evidence of the Army's faith and confidence in you. For your performance of these duties, you won not only our own admiration but that of our allies as well.

Later, as military attaché in Australia, your forceful initiative and broad experience were again particularly valuable. Throughout these and your more recent assignment as commanding general of the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, you continued to display the thorough professional knowledge and untiring devotion to duty which have always characterized your career. As you review your splendid record, you may well take pride in the achievements which it represents, and I congratulate you upon it.

May you find in your retirement an abundance of happiness and the continued success which you so richly deserve.

Sincerely yours,

J. LAWTON COLLINS.

THE MEANING OF THE SPUTNIK
(By Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester)

What are some of the real reasons for our falling behind the Russians in the race of history?

First, we have propagandized ourselves into believing that nothing significant could be produced by the Communist system—that all observable advances in the Soviet have been the result of espionage or luck. Every competent student of the Soviet Union, of course, has known that this was not true.

Second, under the guise of security needs we have woven a curtain of conformity at the cost of driving many of our outstanding scientists and technologists from Government service and preventing others from joining. While the case of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer is the most celebrated, it is by no means an isolated one.

The third important reason for our lag is organizational. Hitler was confronted with the same problem and failed to solve it. The defense unification act simply failed to unify. Instead of merging the old War and Navy Departments into a single Department of Defense as planned, the present unification act actually provides for 4 Secretaries (Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force) instead of the 2 (War and Navy) before its enactment. It also provides for 5 Chiefs of Staff: (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Chief of Staff each for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps) instead of 2 (Army and Navy) earlier.

The most important reason of all for our reverses, however, is probably the kind of thinking which believes that all progress, including scientific, must be achieved through jungle competition. This philosophy has dominated both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. It is difficult to see how any greater expenditure of funds would have produced greater results under this competitive system. It is not difficult at all, however, to see how the pooling of all our available scientific knowledge and know-how in a major cooperative effort might have produced more favorable results earlier and at greatly reduced costs. Certainly interservice rivalry and business competition have produced less favorable results at greatly increased costs. And it might prove useful to ask why the military services were concerned with the missile or satellite programs at all, other than to set forth the operational characteristics of the missiles required and the quantities of each necessary for defense.

The President was obviously correct when he asserted that sputtering sputnik had not reduced our national security one iota. Knowledge of a thing in itself never increases its danger. What he failed to point out was that the United States had no security before sputnik began to sputter and that the Soviet Union has had none before or since. And what is more, the United States crash program now demanded by all the propaganda medium will add exactly zero to this nonexistent world security, though it may of course be useful in getting the American exploration-of-space program out of the bureaucratic dumps where it now so disgracefully reposes. But putting aside for the moment the marvelous and revolutionary challenge of this new dimension in man's enterprise, and limiting our discussion entirely to the weapon potential of these new gadgets, can we not understand that what the scientists of one polar power can and do produce now, the others can and will produce soon?

An intensification of the arms race is not what is required now to increase our security. The history of all arms races between great powers proves this, for they have always led to war. This one will prove no exception, but it will be different in that the whole of Western civilization will be destroyed instead of only partially as before. For the first time in human history, the farms and factories, homes, schools, and churches and all people everywhere will be in the front line if war comes again. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was stating only a half-truth when he said at his Washington press conference, October 16, that the Soviet Union would have "no privileged sanctuary" in any war with Turkey. He should have added, neither will the United States, Europe, or North Africa, for they too will have no place to hide. This is the real meaning of sputtering sputnik to us and men everywhere.

It no longer serves any useful purpose to debate who or what started the cold war; or why, when, or where it was initiated. It is an evil thing and must be liquidated. It should be permissible, also, to declare that expressions such as "balance of power," "positions of strength," and "power politics" have lost all rational meaning. They are anachronisms in the A and H age and must be discarded.

As possible useful contributions to a new approach, the following suggestions are presented. First, the President should resume discussions with the top leaders of the great powers. The United Nations headquarters offers the proper place for such a meeting, with the President of the United States in the role of host.

Second, the United States should promote instead of oppose the universalization of the United Nations. At this great forum all voices should be heard, not just those nations we or any other people may temporarily approve.

Third, the United States Government should discard its pious attitude about recognition of those regimes actually in control of the instruments of power in other countries. Whether the leaders of any nation, great or small, meet or fail to meet in their official conduct high standards of personal probity is largely a matter of who keeps the scorecards.

Fourth, the United States should sponsor and support a vast economic development program under the auspices of the United Nations in order to eliminate the worst features of poverty now smothering freedom in many lands. It is believed this could be accomplished at much less cost than with unilateral aid, now largely military in character.

Finally, the United States should assume leadership of negotiations designed to remove restrictions on international trade and travel. There is certainly no longer any valid evidence to support the thesis that restrictions on trade with Communist countries have retarded, or will in the future delay, their scientific and technical progress. But there is ample evidence to support the belief that these restrictions have increased the poverty of the world's masses and the burdens of those nations we would convince of the superiority of the capitalist system.

It is worth repeating over and over again, I believe, that the real enemies of man are poverty, ignorance, and bigotry; that wars and preparations for war increase these; and that totalitarianism in whatever form is more often than not the symptom rather than the cause of man's maladies. The persistent sputtering of sputnik merely reemphasizes the importance of and necessity for man's continuous search for permanent peace, the grand design of which must ever remain a federation of the world and a parliament of man.

Canadian Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is much about the recent



Canadian election that the people of the United States have not been told.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I ask permission to include with my remarks the following informative article from the current issue of the New Republic:

CANADIAN CONSERVATION

Canada's population is about 16.5 million, a tenth of the United States. Its recession is serious. Here is how it is meeting the crisis. It started deficit financing immediately. Since last September it has pumped $300 million into low-cost housing loans (the equivalent of $3 billion in the United States on the 1:10 population ratio. It has pledged $67 million in new Federal grants to the provinces ,United States equivalent, $670 million). It has cut the auto excise tax from 10 percent to 7.5 percent (the United States auto excise is unchanged at 10 percent). It has also increased old age and veterans' pensions, and cut personal income taxes $146 million (United States equivalent, $1.46 billion). That's tax-cutting, and it's just started. Washington's next move is even more vital to Canada than Ottawa's. "What makes it worse is," Business Week quotes a Toronto economist as saying, "Americans are characteristically too late in using monetary and fiscal remedies to end a recession."

As to the Canadian election, you know that the Conservatives won a landslide—209 seats in Commons out of a possible 265. The title Conservative is ironic, although it is true that businessmen generally supported Diefenbaker (in the hope of higher tariffs against the United States). But the calibration of the world's political parties is way to the left of America's (the most conservative democracy on earth). A Canadian Conservative is a radical New Dealer in the United States idom. Here are some things which the new Canadian Tory Party backs: maintain Canadas present government-run businesses—Dominion radio, ship lines, railroads and the like; radically increased government intervention in other private enterprise—more government support for farms, fisheries, small business, hydroelectric and steam plants; broaden and extend social welfare services, including the new hospital insurance; and now a great northern expansion program. No wonder few United States newspapers like to discuss what's going on in the great neighborhood to the north.

A Bigger National Debt Won't Make Us Richer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the March 22, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "A Bigger National Debt Won't Make Us Richer."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIGGER NATIONAL DEBT WON'T MAKE US RICHER

Judging by all the clamor in and out of Congress, you might suppose that deficit financing is a laboratory-tested remedy for our economic aches and pains. Yet nothing in the record of the New Deal experiments along this line can be cited to justify the belief that unbalanced budgets create prosperity.

Only last November a congressional joint committee held hearings on Federal expenditure policy for economic growth and stability. One of the panelists invited to testify was Dr. Paul B. Trescott, of Kenyon College, a specialist in the history of Federal fiscal policy. His figures are interesting.

Beginning with 1931 and ending with 1940, we had 10 straight deficits in our annual budgets. Over the same period, the proportion of the labor force which was unemployed started with 16 percent—this January, by comparison, showed less than 7 percent—and ended at 15 percent. In between, the unemployed average rose as high as 25 percent in 1933 and was never lower than 12 percent (1937).

The highest prewar budget was in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, when we spent $9,600,000,000. This, of course, looks like chickenfeed today, so it is possible to argue that deficit financing was not tried on the grandiose Keynesian scale.

During the war, from 1942 to 1945, inclusive, the budget averaged $88 billion per year. That sum included the staggering costs of the war. With those items omitted, today's budget is not far behind.

While it is true that unemployment vanished after 1942 and was replaced by a labor scarcity, it is also true that the needs of the armed services withdrew, at one time or another, a total of 14 million people from the civilian labor force. War conditions hardly made an accurate test of the theory. Still, the spending was enormous, and the deficits were immense, so the temptation is to find a link between prodigal expenditures and a boom.

A few other figures may suggest caution. During a shooting war, it would be necessary to spend whatever is needed to insure victory, without regard to ordinary prudent considerations of the value of balanced budgets. This can stimulate a false prosperity, the kind once referred to as "fool's gold" by F. D. Roosevelt. But it also results in price inflation, with all its sad effects on people with fixed or rleatively stabilized incomes.

The War of 1812 brought about a rise of 50 percent in wholesale-price levels; the Civil War boosted the same index 100 percent; World War I accounted for a 60-percent increase, and World War II, in spite of much tighter controls, saw a 35-percent increase.

All these facts are a matter of record. The advocates of deficit financing ought to warn the people that they are offering a temporary painkiller which has disagreeable aftereffects.

Future Farmers Fear Results of Cut in Dairy Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, just before the recess I received a resolution from a fine group of young farm people in Columbia County, the Future Farmers Club of Poynette High School. These young, prospective farmers are understandably concerned and dismayed by the decline in prices their parents have been receiving for milk during the past several years.

One of the greatest strengths of the American way of life is the opportunity it has offered to young people like these to become independent farm owner operators. That is the career these young people want to choose for themselves. But they see their hopes being chiseled away as farm prices are weakened further and further.

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate, indeed, to listen for awhile to our youth—who must like with the decisions we will make today—in regard to legislation that so gravely concerns the entire future of dairying. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution I have received from these future farmers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that other Members of Congress can benefit from this prophetic voice of our Nation's future.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the future farmers of Columbia County, are opposed to Benson's plan of lowering milk prices. In order for us to keep on producing milk we must receive the same amount or more of money for our milk. We are small farmers that depend on selling milk for a living.

We want Benson to limit the production of milk coming from large dairies. Then the surplus would decrease and the small farmer would profit.

We feel lowering the milk prices would not be the fairest answer to this problem. But cutting production of large dairies would still give them some profit. The small farmer would also profit, not too much more, but there would always be more if this plan worked out.

Sincerely yours,
MARILYN MCQUEEN,
LOUISE STOLTENBERG,
MARY MCFARLANE,
JEROME PETERSON,
DOUGLAS WAUGH,
WESLEY BLACK,
Poynette High School, Poynette, Wis.

Presidents Versus the King's English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from This Week magazine:

PRESIDENTS VERSUS THE KING'S ENGLISH

(By Bergen Evans)

When President Eisenhower used the word "finalize" in his state of the Union message, it set off a clamor among grammarians, both professional and amateur, from coast to coast.

Columnists, editorial writers, and teachers pounced on the uniucky word, labeling it "nonexistent," "hideous," "atrocious," and "meaningless."

The vehemence of these attacks probably surprised the President. The word "finalized" has been in daily use in business and Government offices of this country for a number of years. And in this era of the

organization man, when few people make important decisions wholly by themselves, it serves a useful purpose beyond such words as "finish," "complete," or "conclude."

President Eisenhower can take comfort from the fact that he is merely the latest in a long line of United States Presidents whose grammar has enraged the purists.

Just after the Revolution, for example, Englishmen loved to poke fun at the leaders of the new Nation. In 1787, Thomas Jefferson drew a blast from "The European Magazine and London Review" for his use of the word "belittle" in his "Notes on the State of Virginia."

"What an expression," shuddered the Review. "It may be an elegant one in Virginia, and even perfectly intelligible; but for our part, all we can do is to guess at its meaning. For shame, Mr. Jefferson."

Were Jefferson around today, he'd be pleased to find his word in excellent repute on both sides of the Atlantic.

Andrew Jackson was the first President to bring the language of the common man into the White House. His blunt colloquialisms sent the literary purists of his day into wails of protest.

Among the many linquistic crimes ascribed to Jackson was the origination of the slang expression "O. K." This was alleged by political enemies to be Jackson's benighted abbreviation for "oll korrect." Actually, Jackson was thoroughly literate and an excellent stylist. In The American Language, H. L. Mencken traces "O. K." to at least nine other sources, including the Choctaw Indian word "oke hoke" signifying "Yes, it is."

MAN OF GOOD CHEER

Lincoln attracted almost as much bitter protest, especially during the early days of his tenure, when he was addicted to such pronunciations as "cheer" for "chair," and "seegar" for "cigar." As he became more aware of the harsh scrutiny accorded his every utterance, he became more cautious.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who made the President's English a subject of almost universal attention. Among the words and phrases he is credited with either coining or foisting on the public are "malefactors of great wealth," "weasel words," "pussyfooter," "square deal," "lunatic fringe," and "muckraker." In 1904 he lost the English-teacher vote by writing Yale's Thomas R. Lounsbury that he approved of the split infinitive.

Even so conscientious a purist as Woodrow Wilson was taken to task for his use of such phrases as "we must get a move on," "that is going some," and his pronounciation of "ornery" for "ordinary."

Warren G. Harding, whose grammar regularly inspired blasts from H. L. Mencken, advocated the return of the country to a condition of "normalcy"—a word not then present in Wester's. But P. S., it's there now.

Though the word "normalcy" flourished even before Harding was born, the legend persists that it sprang full grown from his nomination speech.

Harding was also roasted by Mencken for his use of the "one-he" combination (as in "one does as he wishes"), but this time the President was immediately vindicated: a group of 29 philologians took a vote on the usage. Twenty-two found it acceptable English.

THE LANGUAGE PROSPERS

Despite purists' moans, a presidential impurity of speech becomes less offensive by the very fact that he used it. Like Harding's "normalcy," Eisenhower's "finalize" is dictionary bound—it's already in the below-the-line section of Webster's Unabridged.

The best course is to let the purists howl. They have been grousing throughout our history while about them the language has prospered—often with an assist from the President.

A Policy for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Abbott K. Hamilton, of Salisbury, Conn., formerly Director of the Office of Industrial Resources, ICA, has recently delivered an address entitled "A Policy for America: Destruction, Survival, or Creation?"

I am impressed with much of what Mr. Hamilton has to say, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POLICY FOR AMERICA: DESTRUCTION, SURVIVAL, OR CREATION?

(Address by Abbott K. Hamilton)

The Soviet Communist state has been in existence for over 40 years and during that time its threat to western civilization has been increasing with ever-growing strength. Its victories and conquests of peoples are numerous and well known to us all. During this same period of time we have witnessed the decline in world leadership and influence and strength of such important representatives of our western civilization as Holland, Germany, France, and Great Britain.

This change has happened so gradually during our busy and preoccupied lives that in reality we are not fully conscious of the great change in world conditions that has taken place in this relatively short span of time. And this change will continue without any substantial interruption unless we and our Government leaders view what has happened in its proper perspective, determine the cause and then develop a positive program for dealing with the situation.

Russia's success and extension of influence has been due either to the soundness and appeal of the Communist ideology, and its strength and ability to promote that ideology throughout the world or, on the other hand, Russia's conquests have been due to the failure on the part of the free world to adequately and aggressively lead from its natural strength to promote the spiritual, moral, and economic values to which it is dedicated and by which we are attempting to live.

Addressing myself to these two alternatives, I am convinced that no nation of peoples, now under the dominance or control of Russia, sought that position or embraced communism because they were impressed with that ideology or because of what it had to offer. On the contrary, communism's success is, in some instances, because it has been imposed on peoples through force and in others it has been accepted by a people because they were not happy with their then existing way of life and no other alternative had been offered to them. In other words, a vacuum existed and Russia moved in. We did not.

Why are we having trouble in the Middle East, Russia's latest area of penetration? Why is Egypt leaning towards communism? The answer lies in the fact that another vacuum existed and Russia has capitalized on the destitution of the Egyptian people and the personal ambitions of Nasser. Don't overlook the fact that the miserable state in which the people of Egypt exist is after many years of intimate association with the free Western world. Senator HUMPHREY, after his return last year from Egypt, said and I quote: "As an American, the one thing that struck me most was the abject poverty of the masses of people who live in the old Cairo areas. It was a really shocking and touching experience for me. I drove through those areas and walked through some of the streets, and to see God's children in such misery, in such poverty, and at times, in such filth was almost more than one could stand." The people of Egypt feel that they have not benefited from their affiliation with the West and conclude they have nothing to lose and everything to gain by playing with Russia. The unhappy state of mind of the people is the most important reason for Egypt's pro-Communist leaning because if the circumstances of the people were really improving through a long-term constructive program, which we are best qualified to carry out, Nasser and Russia will be powerless.

Here is a case, typical of other areas in the world, where, because of substandard conditions, Russia, with offensive strategy, conquers another nation. The vacuum existed, the ground was fertile, the people unhappy; we were inept and so Russia moved in.

This prompts me to pose the question: Why is the United States losing in its conflicts with Russia when America is the most powerful Nation in the world and the creator and possessor of those things which the vast majority of millions throughout the world seek, and I refer, of course, to certain spiritual and material values. Some of the answers are as follows:

1. Because of our great power and material strength we have become over-confident.

2. The great mass of our people have become more conscious of our rights and privileges than of our obligations and responsibilities.

3. Because this country has never experienced the physical destruction of war, we still can't comprehend the almost complete destruction of our cities and casualties of 40 million people in the first 12 hours of a nuclear attack.

4. Our people and our Government still feel that most problems, in foreign fields, can be solved by spending our dollars instead of applying vigorously our ability and knowledge. This country was made strong and that which we have inherited was created by people of courage and ability without dollars, without wealth. The spirit and determination of the early pioneers who created, let, moved forward, and thought positively are the factors which built the foundation of the great country which is ours today.

These are some of the reasons for Russia's victories but the title of the subject which we are discussing tonight is: "What United States Economic Policy for Survival." Webster defines the word "survival" as "one that survives or remains after others of its kind have disappeared." The word "survive" is "to remain alive, to continue to exist." This definition reminds me of statements made by many of Government leaders from both political parties who, when speaking on foreign policy, etc., emphasize the importance of the defense of our country and the security of this Nation. The word "secure" means "to free from care, fear, doubt, or anxiety—to make carefree or overconfident." These words are being correctly used and illustrate quite accurately the negative thinking of this Nation and some of its leaders on the problems and opportunities that face us today. We are a rich Nation and people and want to hold on to what we have. We are thinking in terms of "protecting" instead of "creating." In contrast, the men and women who founded our Nation had nothing and, with determination, moved for-

ward to create and develop much of what we enjoy today.

The thinking of many of our young people seeking jobs, after graduating from school and college, place greater emphasis on security and less on opportunity. By these examples I have tried to describe the lack of positive thinking that prevails in this country and its effect on the foreign policy of our Nation.

On the other hand, Russia, an underdeveloped and backward nation as recently as the end of World War I, has, under the dominance of ruthless leaders, moved forward to attain that which it did not have. It has not subscribed to the policy of defense because it had nothing to defend in strength. However these were the things it wanted and could only obtain by a positive, affirmative policy. Russia has been consistent in following such a policy even though its methods and objectives have been condemned by the free world. In spite of great lack of developed material strength, Russia, by remaining constantly on the offensive, has made very great strides forward in a short space of time.

At times our method for combating the Russian menace has been to preach or predict the overthrow of communism from within, to constantly describe Russia as weak and therefore to minimize our danger. As late as only a few months ago, Secretary Dulles, in a meeting with congressional leaders, emphasized the internal weakness of Russia because they only had 100,000 cars on the road compared to our over 50 million. A wise antagonist will always overestimate his adversary's strength and accordingly be prepared, but the road to sure defeat is to minimize the power of your opposition.

On March 2 on television, Dr. Edward Teller of nuclear fame and father of the hydrogen bomb said that in the technical and scientific field after World War II in 1945 we were far ahead of Russia. Presently, he said, Russia has caught up to us and at the rate we are both going, Russia will be far ahead of us by 1970. In contrast to Mr. Dulles' statement, I subscribe to the implications of Dr. Teller's remarks.

In brief, I have tried to convey that the tenuous position we now find ourselves in vis-a-vis Russia, in spite of our greater material and spiritual strength, has been because of the offensive strategy of Russia as opposed to our philosophy of defense.

I am sure that most of us subscribe to the policy that we will never use our military might to start a war by launching an attack against another nation. Our military strength should be maintained at the highest level to deter attack and, should attack come, to conquer the military arm of our adversary. Indispensable as it may be for the maintenance of peace, however, there is nothing creative or productive in the military arm of our Nation when considering its primary purpose, and it is the creative and productive strength of this Nation which must be brought to bear on the vast problems which face us and the rest of the world, not in order to just survive, as the title of our subject calls for, but in order that this Nation and all other nations in the world may start now to create and develop spiritual and material values greater by far than anything the world has accomplished to the middle of the 20th century. We must not set our highest standards at present levels. To do so is but to defend. We must recognize that the world is still in its spiritual and economic infancy and that our future horizons are vast and broad and that the opportunities for progress in the future are far greater than the steps which the human race has taken to date. Vision, confidence, ability, and leadership are what are required, and America has all of these qualities, to bring to bear on the condition in which the world finds itself in the year 1958.

When developing a program or cure one must first diagnose the disease. While our problem is twofold, spiritual and economic, not feeling qualified in the first category I shall attempt to address myself to the economic phase.

The root of the trouble in the world today is economic. It is the underdeveloped state in which hundreds of millions of people all over the world find themselves with respect to health, education, and the basic economic facts of life. They are rising up, seeking freedom and independence and a better way of life. And therein lies our greatest strength. Our economy is the strongest the world has ever seen. It was created and continues to be expanded by men and women of experience and competence and the time has come when a positive program should be formulated to bring to bear on these economic conditions in the world the ability and inherent pioneering strength of the people who have helped to make this country the power it is today, and the leader it must be tomorrow.

Our present foreign aid operation in no way qualifies for such a program. Its ineffectiveness in dealing with the heart of the world's economic problem is due to:

1. The extremely limited scope of the policy controlling that operation.

2. The unqualified management in charge.

3. The excessive reliance on dollars appropriated and spent rather than on results obtained.

4. The adherence to Government procedure at the expense of substance. In this connection, may I say that the success and accomplishments of such a world economic operation are controlled in direct ratio to the extent to which experienced management and skilled personnel are responsible for and participate in its execution. Dollars are merely one of the important tools required by qualified management for the proper execution of such an undertaking.

Instead, my proposal is as follows:

1. I recommend that under the leadership of the United States a world economic offensive should be instituted, limited in no way as to time and having as its objective the development of the world's resources accompanied by a continuing rise in the standard of living of the world's population. As to time I am thinking in terms of 100 years.

2. The major role of the United States Government will be to give leadership to such a policy and to create the proper investment climate in foreign lands.

3. Because of the importance of this policy to world peace and world development, the responsibility for its operation should be placed under the authority of a new cabinet position, Secretary for World Economic Development.

4. The overall policy controlling such an operation will recognize at the outset that its continuing success and expansion will have a twofold purpose: (a) the gradual elimination of substandard conditions throughout the world which will result in the defeat of communism and (b) through a marked increase in world trade, a dynamic rise to new plateaus in the American economy. Our export business in 1957 was 21 billion with imports of 13 billion. A proper comprehension of the world development which I am urging should contemplate, as a realistic objective for our foreign trade, a figure of 200 billion in exports and 130 billion of imports, 10 times the present figure. In this connection, bear in mind that the constructive development of the world will harness or create new consumers to the extent of over 1 billion people.

5. While the American Government will give the leadership for this policy, the major responsibility for its execution will be borne by the various segments of our economy comprising industry, agriculture, private capital, the field of education and the medical profession.

6. The successful execution of such a vast operation requires strict adherence to the sound economic policies by which all successful business is conducted.

7. Only to the extent that private interests in these fields cannot operate or carry the responsibility will Government participate or assume the responsibility, and then only if sound economic standards are met.

8. American leadership of such a far-reaching and dynamic policy shall encourage any and all nations to participate subject to their adhering to the basic objectives and standards. In this connection, I submit that even in Russia, as the health, education and economic standards rise so will the fealty to communism decline.

9. The organization comprising the office of the Secretary for World Economic Development, including the secretary himself, shall be composed of men and women qualified by education and long time successful experience and therefore drawn from the specific fields involved and at the highest levels.

Bear in mind, as we are now going, we face world annihilation. We are now in a greater emergency than we were in the midst of World War II. This factor and the great benefits to be derived for American business and agriculture will guarantee the active support and participation of all private interests in our economy.

10. We are now in a business recession; our standing in the world has suffered a marked decline since World War II; Russia's influence has spread. For these three reasons and in order to dramatically emphasize to the maximum the far-reaching significance of such a policy, the President, with the approval of Congress, should call to Washington several hundred of the country's top leaders from all segments of our economy in order to inform them and therefore the rest of the world of this country's decision and the part that the fields of health, education, agriculture, industry, and private capital must play in the execution of this vast program.

Such a meeting will have an immediate and electrifying effect on our own economy and our standing in the world. It will be the first step to be taken to wrest the initiative from the Soviet.

In closing, may I say that this country has never failed when called upon to do a job. The people of America will rise as high as leadership requires.

The job is big but the opportunity to move ahead and not just survive is greater. Let us hope that leadership in this country, and it must come from this country, is as great in vision, courage, and ability as the challenge and opportunity demands.

Remedies for Education: Respect for Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Adlai Stevenson delivered an address to the United Parents Associations on the problems confronting our educational system. With unusual eloquence and insight, Mr. Stevenson placed his

finger squarely on the crux of the problem.

The main body of this speech was adapted as an article which appeared in the April 6 issue of the New York Times Sunday magazine. Needless to say, I commend it to our colleagues.

The article follows:

DUAL EDUCATION PROBLEM: SCHOOL AND HOME

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Our national self-esteem has recently received some rude shocks. We had been living in what has been called the illusion of American omnipotence. Suddenly realizing that it may not after all be universally true that my pop can lick your pop, we are reacting now with a mixture of wounded pride, jittery apprehension and frenzied determination to disprove the illusion.

Part of this determination centers on the launching pads at Cape Canaveral. There has been a sudden decision that our missile development is inadequate.

Part of it centers in the classrooms of our schools. There has been a sudden decision that our educational system is inadequate.

It is obvious, and not very gratifying, that these decisions result not from self-examination and self-criticism but from what has happened in Russia.

It is fashionable to say that the Russian educational system is better than ours. But is it true. They set out to do one job. They have done it. But education has for us a fundamentally different purpose and obligation, an infinitely harder task. Keeping up with the Russians would be for us the worst form of defeatism, of false emphasis, of idolatrous worship of irrelevant standards.

Russian sputniks will not help us answer the question of the quality of education we should seek. That kind of stimulus could at most spur us to an unbalanced effort to produce scientists, and scientists alone. It would not give us either the sustained popular pressure we need to secure educational progress or the basis for the judgments we must make about the quality of our teaching.

There is a much more searching set of questions we must ask ourselves.

Why is it that we only became fully aware of our schools' shortcomings when we were compelled to compare them with the educational system of a totalitarian dictatorship?

What became of our own standards?

What standards have led us to put the glossy frills and extras of our abundant way of life ahead of our children's education? And why have we put the no-shift automobile ahead of abolishing the 2-shift school.

Why is it that today, with more than 5 million men and women unemployed, with slack resources in steel, and with a crying need for tens of thousands of new schoolrooms, we aren't moving immediately to use these resources to fill these needs?

We don't lack the means. What's the matter?

There have been, I think, 2 difficulties.

One is that there has been no mobilization, no resounding, irresistible affirmation of our heartfelt desire for a better education for our children. This is the difficulty a democracy faces while a dictatorship does not, and it is the difficulty that consumers—who are essentially unorganized—always face in their competition with producers. We cannot easily translate into group action our decision to have the educational system we want and can pay for.

And the impact of the Soviet challenge may wear off, I fear. An upswing in our economy will return, and consumer pressure for a myriad of things, useful, useless, urgent, trivial, will return, too. Without profound change in national attitude schools and their needs will slide away again, down our national scale of priorities, behind the automobile and the refrigerator, recreation and travel, liquor and cosmetics, and behind even the recent horror in women's styles. We shall be back in the fantasy world spending more on advertising to the American people than on trying to educate them.

But the second difficulty is in a sense more basic, and one we must charge squarely to ourselves. The softness which has crept into our educational system is a reflection of something much broader, of a national complacency if you will, of a confusion of the priorities of the body, the mind and the spirit.

The imperative today, in my judgment, is that we reassert—so that every person in this country is not left in any doubt about it—every man and woman, every politician, yes, and every teacher and every child—our conviction that children's needs have first priority over all other civilian wants.

We have lacked, I fear, the deep inner conviction that education in its broadest sense unlocks the door of our future, and that it gives us the tools without which the pursuit of happiness becomes a hollow chasing after triviality, a mindless boredom relieved only by the stimulus of sensationalism or quenched with a tranquilizer pill.

A British writer recently defined this fragmented mass mind as one of sensation without commitment. And this behind the problems of school building and equipment, of classrooms and laboratories, of staffs adequately recruited and paid—this seems to me to be the deepest educational challenge of all.

In fact, I doubt whether we shall ever lick the physical problems of education until we have, as a Nation, recovered our sense of what the educational process has to be, and our respect for the disciplines and ardors which it entails. We need more than sputniks without and recessions within to provide a steady, enlightened pressure for better education.

So we must reassert our respect for the disciplines and orders that are part of what education really means.

And we must make it clear that the goal of education is to teach western man not just to survive but to triumph, not just to defend himself but to make man and the world what God intended them to be.

What are the elements of the dedicated purpose and the wise and searching faith which are essential to restore the true meaning of education in America?

I believe, in the first place, that we must recover the element of quality in our traditional pursuit of equality. We must not, in opening our schools to everyone, confuse the idea that all should have equal chance with the notion that all have equal endowments.

Nor is it healthy to discern a hint of privilege and pretension in those whose intellectual abilities are outstanding. Ideals of excellence are not unknown to us. Those who excel in sports, in the arts, in adventure, are accorded that rare pleasure of the human mind—the pleasure of admiration. We must now, I believe, extend this ideal of excellence and teach our young people, indeed sometimes ourselves, to respect, to relish what is in fact the rarest of all our national resources—mental capacity and intellectual grasp.

And pray let there be no more derision of the nonconformists; rather let them be encouraged to speak their minds, to criticize and question. The deprecation of intelligence, the ridicule of the intellectual, has been too often the stock in trade of demagogs and the easy fashion of our times. If the sputniks have helped in any measure toward change in this respect we may yet live to hail Khrushchev as an educational reformer. But the change will not last if it is merely external. Respect for excellence—an idea which we can confidently draw from our classical heritage of freedom—this respect we must learn for ourselves.

The next confusion I would point to is the confusion of the free with the free and easy. The men who founded this Republic sought to do away with the external disciplines of oppression. They did not for one moment believe in doing away with discipline as such. They believed rather in the power of inner discipline, of conscience and of rational restraint to replace the constraints of royal or class government.

It is dangerously easy to move imperceptibly from the ideal of free choice to the tyranny of the easy way out. "Let the child set his own pace" has a delusively democratic swing to it.

And too often, I think, the elective system permits the student to evade the subjects which will tax his powers. Those who would dedicate their choice to harder, tougher studies find themselves cut off from a gay, carefree group who are likely to regard the working student as different. The pressures around him won't sustain his decision to work. He is made to feel an outsider.

The tragedy of this lies precisely in its misunderstanding of true human fulfillment. There can be no real happiness without full commitment, no tasting of the deepest pleasures without the effort and the training needed to make oneself responsive to these higher delights. Students glimpse these truths in certain fields. No one makes the team without hard training. Yet often there is no steady pressure of conviction to show our students that, in every field of endeavor it is effort, responsibility, the commitment of mind and energy that bring with them comparable achievement and satisfactions.

There is much talk in the world today of the uncommitted peoples—meaning the masses of Asia and Africa who will not take sides. I sometimes wonder whether there are not more uncommitted people here in our very midst—people bound by no ideal, warmed by no vision, impelled by no ambition, strengthened by no discipline, and, alas, unlit by any joy.

If once more we could restore the link in our children's minds between the happiness that is their birthright and the ardor, disciples, and responsibility that must lie in its pursuit, I feel we should have remade the foundations upon which all true education rests. I do not believe all our physical programs for education, however essential, will have their true effect without this underlying change of heart.

We hear about adjusting to life. Of course. But what is life today? If this means a child's learning to live easily with the other members of his family and the rest of the people in the block, fitting smoothly into his environment, his church, feeling at ease with the people he sees from day to day, then I think we have drawn the circle dangerously small. For distance and time and space have shrunk; life is never again going to be a local island for any man or woman in the world.

Looking ahead for the long pull—not just to missiles and rockets—the American problem in education is to prepare citizens not merely to live in American society, but to live in an America caught up inextricably in an evolving world community, which, in turn, is seized by both technological and political revolution.

This means new dimensions for education. It means the training of innovators, not organization men, in both science and humanities. It means the understanding of other societies. And it means a deeper understanding of American history and society, not merely as a unique and treasured saga, but as part of universal experience. Instinctive knowledge of the round of American life as it is lived at home is not enough.

Yes, adjust children to life—to life in the world in which they live—a world where, among other things, the vast majority who are poor, the vast majority who are not white, the vast majority who are uneducated, are now demanding their birthrights as children equal in the sight of God.

The schools can't teach children all there is to know about the relationships of nations, about the intricacies of hard and easy money policies, about parity prices for farmers, and about the lethal mists that have been loosed upon the world. But the schools can do a very great deal to teach children that their own ideas are good and worth having and expressing, even in the face of disagreement.

Francis Bacon said a longtime ago: "What man will not alter for the better, time, the great innovator, will alter for the worse."

A society whose survival depends on innovation cannot rely on interdepartmental committees and consensus. It must train men and women to be able to formulate, privately and painfully, new ways of looking at things, who are also capable of standing by their insights, if necessary, against the current consensus.

Perhaps it is the easiest part of the problem to say what the ideals of education are or ought to be. There remains of course the obligation to implement them, to make it possible for the schools to try to live up to them.

I have not discussed here the new dimension of difficulty which is added by the current crisis of numbers in the schools. And yet I would insist a little that there is nothing here that we are not in a position to meet.

The urgency of our desire to export an article of American manufacture to the moon—important as that is—is no excuse for deleting and drastically reducing provisions in the national budget for support of education. The need has not diminished. It has grown.

It should be added that another and very different point of ways and means has come into recent prominence, partly because of its promise for meeting the problem of the overloaded teacher in the overcrowded classrooms—the fuller use of our teaching resources by means of the new audio and visual aids to education.

We are still in the infancy of the development of educational films, television, and the like. Badly used, even overused, they could result in the sterilization of education. But already there has been such progress made along these and related lines that the discriminating administrator and the resourceful teacher can now do a better job for more children in less time and at less cost than ever before.

There is no substitute, of course, for a good teacher. Yet, it is already clear that intelligent use of these remarkable visual materials in the classroom can greatly enrich and enliven instruction, and also release the teacher's fuller energies for the essential part of the teaching job.

I suggest, too, in connection with this problem, that we can make a virtue of necessity by relieving the teachers of some of the jobs they have taken over from parents, and which parents could do.

I taught my three boys to drive a car. I think they can do as much for my grandsons—and let their high-school teachers concentrate on some things that are more important, or, at least, harder to teach.

If our educational purposes are unclear, if the curriculum is chaotic and cluttered with distractions, if the teaching staffs are overburdened with indiscriminate responsibilities well beyond their reasonable capacity to carry, we must expect that our children will be educated for mediocrity instead of for something better.

What does it add up to? Basically, it is a matter, it seems to me, of redefining and of reasserting the fundamentals of our educational faith. Respect for intellectual excellence, the restoration of vigor and discipline to our ideas of study, curriculums which aim at strengthening intellectual fiber and stretching the powers of young minds, personal commitment, and responsibility—these are the preconditions of educational recovery in America today; and, I believe, they have always been the preconditions of happiness and sanity for the human race.

And just because this is so, I do not regard the task ahead of us as one confined to leaders and educators, to influental men and women, or those in the public eye. It is in the home that children first learn what to want and respect, what is important, what trivial, what worthy to be imitated and loved and admired. In the homes of all of us, then, let the recovery begin—in simple respect for work and effort, in delight in all manner of excellence, in trust and love of truth. These are the roots of education. They can grow in every home.

The Peril of Strontium 90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter to the editor in the Washington Post was of great interest to those of us who are vitally concerned about the effects of radioactive fallout on this and future generations. Mr. Selove, author of the article, is associate professor of physics at the University of Pennsylvania and former chairman of the Federation of American Scientists Radiation Hazards Committee. He was a member of the panel convened by the AEC on July 29, 1957, to make the best possible estimate of future strontium 90 levels in bone. I ask unanimous consent to include this letter from the April 9 issue of the Washington Post in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

THE PERIL OF STRONTIUM 90

The publication on April 4 of a report giving the accumulated fallout up to the end of 1957 points up again that the Atomic Energy Commission has consistently taken a highly optimistic attitude toward fallout effects.

According to the consensus of a panel convened by the AEC in July 1957 to make the best possible predictions of future strontium 90 levels in bone, the accumulated fallout due to those tests carried out before 1957 would give rise to average strontium 90 levels in young persons in the Northeastern United States over the next 20 years or so, of 1.5 to 10 strontium units. This range could not be narrowed further, because of uncertainties in required data.

The AEC has now reported a 50-percent increase in strontium 90 levels during 1957. There is as yet no data released on further fallout due to the concentrated series of tests by the U. S. S. R. in 1958, a series which included a number of large explosions. One may reasonably estimate that the corresponding expected average bone levels in Northeastern United States from all tests to the present will now lie in the range of perhaps 3 to 20 strontium units.

In estimating the effect of such levels, it is not correct to believe that there is a safe level. There is good reason to believe that even small doses of strontium 90 can cause leukemia or bone cancer, in proportion to the dose. In this case, it can be expected that an average concentration of 10 strontium units in a large population will produce one-tenth the number of cases of leukemia and bone cancer that would result from a level of 100 strontium units. In other words, there would be no sharp danger level—even small amounts would produce an effect.

It may be 20 years before the important questions concerning the amount and effects of strontium 90 fallout are answered. If the answers should all turn out to lie at the worse end of the present range of uncertainty, then from tests so far we can expect an increase of perhaps 5 percent in the present rate of leukemia and bone cancer, in the Northeast United States. This would mean an increase, in a population of 30 million of the rate of leukemia deaths, from about 2,000 a year to about 2,100 a year.

It is not difficult to see the genuine cause for alarm for groups of people as large as the entire Japanese nation, whose rice crop in 1956 was contaminated by large Russian test explosions to the point where the rice contained 30 times as high a strontium 90 concentration as milk in the northeastern United States, because that rice was developing and being harvested at a time of unusually heavy fallout.

The AEC has not emphasized the possible appreciable harm from the relatively heavy fallout produced by Russian tests. Our officials could hardly raise a furor over Russion-produced fallout when that fallout probably does not total more than the fallout produced by our own weapons-text explosions.

What about the future? "Dirty" weapons are the cheapest large weapons, and the most likely to be used. Large "dirty" weapons will be tested by each new nation entering the weapons race. If the worldwide weapons race is not stopped, we can expect to see each additional testing nation adding large amounts of contaminating fission products to the soil and food of other nations around the world, including our own.

Is our Government nevertheless going to persist in its reluctance to make an agreement to stop tests, on the ground that it wants to develop clean bombs, in fairness to its responsibilities to the American people and perhaps to humanity?

The effects of fallout are not the only nor the best reason for bringing the nuclear weapons testing program to a halt. But they are a powerful reason. The necessity for our development of nuclear weapons in past years would hardly be argued by anyone. But the point is in knowing when to stop.

W. SELOVE.

HAVERTOWN, PA.

Second Tax Exemption for the Working Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill I have introduced today, H. R. 11891, which would provide a a second income tax exemption for a student who is working his way through college.

The additional exemption also would go to the married student.

This bill is designed to correct the inequity in the existing tax law under which two exemptions can be claimed on behalf of a students whose father is helping him through school—1 to the father and 1 to the student—but only 1 exemption is available to the self-supporting or married student.

This legislation was suggested to me by Lauren D. Rice, a student at Whitworth College, in Spokane, Wash. Rice, in a recent letter, pointed out the inequity which gives $1,200 in exemptions for the student whose parents are helping him, but only $600 to the student, like himself, who is working his way through college.

Rice said in his letter:

I feel very strongly that some provision should be made for those students who are putting themselves through college.

I agree with him.

Under the present law, a parent who is providing more than half the support for a child who is a student can claim an exemption for the student, and the student also can claim exemption for himself. My bill would leave this provision unchanged but provide that if the parent does not claim the exemption—that is, the student is not a dependent—the student taxpayer can claim the second exemption for himself.

If the student is single, or is married and files a separate return, he would claim two exemptions.

If the student is married and files a joint return with his husband or wife, the return would show 3 exemptions, 1 for the husband, 1 for the wife, and the additional student exemption.

If the student is married and files no return because he or she has no gross income, then the working spouse can claim the student exemption on her or his separate return.

My bill differs from other proposals which have been introduced to grant an additional tax exemption for students because the latter preserve the inequity in the dependency situation.

The President's Space Agency Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bill recommended by President Eisenhower to establish a civilian space agency. The terms of this bill provide that a civilian-directed National Aeronautics and Space Agency will be formed from the nucleus of the long-existing National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The new agency would guide all United States aeronautical and space activities except those of a strictly military nature.

The President's proposal provides a sound division of authority between the military and civilian parts of our outer space programs. While of course nothing must be done to interfere with military advances at this stage, it may be possible later to bring the military and civilian aspects together under even more centralized control than this bill provides.

But for the time being it is wise to retain Pentagon control of the military explorations of space and to turn the civilian effort over to an experienced and proven agency. I hope serious consideration will be accorded to giving the director of the civilian agency the equivalent of Cabinet status, so that his views will be accorded a full hearing at the highest level.

The race for space represents one of the great challenges before our Nation today. It must be pursued with determination and alacrity. This bill provides a reasonable, sound means for doing just that. It deserves speedy approval by Congress.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 14 marks the 68th anniversary of the inter-American system. We have come to look upon 68 years, about the lifetime of a man, as a short span in the sweep of history. But as international organizations go, more than two-thirds of a century is indeed an existence record.

Our Western Hemisphere organization has much more to recommend it besides longevity. As we observe the havoc wreaked in other regions of the world by hostilities, prejudices and envy, we must rejoice at the effectiveness of our own unique system of international living. However, the contrast between the peace and cooperation which prevails on the inter-American scene with the antagonisms and rivalries in other parts of the world is by no means an inherent situation. American nations are subject to the same national ambitions and temptations that exist elsewhere on the globe. The occasional bloody outbursts in the past between sister republics in the Western Hemisphere prove that we do not enjoy some special immunity from mankind's failings.

With this in mind, the achievements of the Organization of American States in preserving peace and promoting the well-being of the hemisphere's inhabitants come into sharper focus. The fact of 21 countries, weak and strong alike, meeting as sovereign equals to iron out their differences and to cooperate for mutual benefits is an amazing innovation in international affairs. The willingness of the member States to permit OAS intervention to settle disputes peaceably is a most gratifying international development.

The anniversary of the Organization of American States is a time to recall with pardonable pride the unusual accomplishments of our inter-American regional system. It is a time for thankfulness that we in the New World have achieved a degree of international maturity not vouchsafed to more turbulent regions of the world. Above all, it is a time for rededication to Pan-American ideals and goals so that our remarkable regional organization may continue to flourish.

Capitol Cloakroom Broadcast of March 31, 1958, With Hon. Sam Rayburn as Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the Capital Cloakroom program of March 31, 1958, with Speaker SAM RAYBURN as the guest, and Eric Sevareid as the interrogator, which program was carried over the CBS Radio Network. The producer of this program is Michael Marlow:

Mr. SEVAREID. His real friends around Washington and practically everybody in Texas call him Mr. SAM, familiarly, because he is a friendly man, not too familiarly because he is a man of natural dignity, and after all, a man of great power.

A writer once said of him, "SAM RAYBURN is one Texan who does not wear a 10-gallon hat, slaps no backs, and calls his cattle ranch a farm."

He has been Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any man in our long political history. The first radio network interview Speaker RAYBURN ever consented to was on this same program Capital Cloakroom. The second one was also on this program. He is with us again, a proper observance we think for the 10th year of this program's existence. We are seated in the Speaker's private office. It is furnished in the commodious leather style of the old-fashioned.

The Speaker's roots go back a long way. The past has real meaning for him. The life of Robert E. Lee particularly has special meaning for him. The lessons of Lee's life are part of the basic nature and philosophy of SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you first one or two questions about yourself, and the first one is, why was the House and not the Senate always your goal?

Mr. RAYBURN. I was a member of the Texas Legislature when I was a very young man. I was elected speaker of the Texas Legislature 4 days after my 29th birthday. I went there wanting to be speaker. I wanted to be head of the house. I didn't know much and I just said often that God, ignorance, and desperation took care of me.

Then I came to the House and my ambition was in the House. I never had the slightest desire to be a Governor, or to be a United States Senator, and somebody asked me one day when I first thought I would like to be Speaker of the House of Representatives here, and I said, well, I was 8 or 9, or 10 years old, I don't think it was more than that, and I clung to that ambition, and I finally made it after many years, because when I came here there were a great many people far ahead of me, and I

wasn't jealous of them. I didn't envy them their positions, but I waited my time and it finally came.

Mr. SEVAREID. You came in Wilson's days; I remember it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was sworn in in April, 1913, Woodrow Wilson's first administration.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, speaking of your ambitions, it occurs to me then, Mr. Speaker, to ask you this. There have been times in various conventions when a number of your friends have wanted to nominate you for the presidential nomination. Have you ever had that kind of ambition?

Mr. RAYBURN. There was a time when I would have liked to have been President of the United States; of course, not now. But I always answer that by saying that I really never expected to be President of the United States, because I was born in the wrong section of the country and at the wrong time. I think that prejudice is fading, but it faded too late for me.

Mr. SEVAREID. Another personal question, Mr. SAM.

So far as I recollect, you have never traveled a great deal abroad. Your axis has been from Washington here back to Bonham. Why is that?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, my father and mother had 11 children, 13 of us in the house, and then Uncle Jim came to live with us, and that made 14. The bigger the family the closer they get together, in my opinion, and those of us who are living now are just as close brothers and sisters as we were when we were fighting out on the little farm down there in north Texas.

I have led a bachelor's life all the time since I have been in Washington, and unless one of my sisters is here, why I am away from all my blood, and I am a disciple of the doctrine of my oldest brother who once said, "With me blood is thicker than water."

When I get away from here I don't want to go anywhere in the world except home to see my lovely country, to see what little possessions I have, and associate with my brothers and sisters and my other blood and old friends.

Mr. SEVEREID. I gather the soil of Texas with you is thicker than the soil of Europe or Asia.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, if you can remember it now, what would you say was the most difficult decision you ever had to make on that Speaker's rostrum?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, now, I don't know, Mr. Sevareid, whether I would say this was the most difficult one, but this is the one that has attracted the most attention.

You see, when you have a roll call in the House of Representatives, the Speaker can declare the vote or not, and then they have—if it is a close vote, they have what they call a recapitulation, and unless the Speaker announces the vote, then men on the recapitulation can change their votes.

On August 12, 1941, when we were trying to extend the Selective Service Act and keep our Army up instead of having it taken apart when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, the vote was 202—203 for the bill and 202 against it. I declared the vote, and that froze everybody exactly where they were, because I knew for my side we had a one majority, and I think there has been more comment about my action at that time than any one decision I have ever made.

Mr. SEVAREID. I remember that day.

Mr. RAYBURN. My rulings have been appealed from only twice, as I remember it, since I have been the Speaker, and they have got an insignificant number of votes to overrule any decision that I have ever made.

Mr. SEVAREID. You have never had one overruled?

Mr. RAYBURN. No.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, you have watched a great many men, I suppose now thousands, come and go in the House of Representatives. You watched them from that high rostrum, that podium.

What kind of men really make the best and most useful Members of the House?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is here just like it is everywhere else. I just spoke to some school children a moment ago and told them this. There is not so much difference in the abilities of people, as a lot of people suppose. When one person has got common sense, he has got all the sense there is. It all depends on what they do with it.

And I told them, I said you must remember that the fellow at the next desk, in the next office, on the next farm, or the next factory, has as much ability as you have, and he is going to beat you if he works harder than you do.

Now I find very few people that come to the House of Representatives who are not men and women of capacity, and it all depends, just like the fellow starting out in life, as to what they do with that character and sense.

I said to our caucus here just awhile ago when this session of Congress began—I said, "I hope you will attend your committee meetings, because you have sought membership on those committees and it is your duty to go there and learn through the hearings and through the executive sessions what the bill means, and be able, when you come on the floor of the House to explain it to any inquiring Member."

I said also, "I urge you to be here for the opening of the House of Representatives because in the first 30 minutes you find out all that is going to be happening that day, and maybe, especially on Monday, you find out what is going to happen for the whole week. Therefore, if you are going to be a useful and knowing Member of the House of Representatives, you have got to attend your committees, you have got to learn what your bills are. Then you have got to come to the floor of the House and see the program enacted there."

Now a lot of people talk about studying the rules of the House. A man can read the rules of the House for 6 years, in my opinion, and know very little about them, for the simple reason they are complex. They have ben built up over 107 years and even before that, because Jefferson's Manual, a great deal of it, came from across the water.

But you have got to see the rules of the House put in practice, practiced, why a point of order is made, why it is overruled, why it is sustained, and all this and that and the other, and you see it in action.

And then I have advised them to go back the next day and pick up the record and read that debate or the arguments made, why a point of order should be sustained, or should not. That is the only way you are going to learn the rules of the House. And a Member must know a good deal about the rules of the House before he can manage a bill when it comes from his committee or a committee of which he is chairman.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, some people have the idea that we have too many lawyers in Congress, that we ought to have more farmers, labor people, businessmen, teachers, writers, and so on. Do you have any feeling that way?

Mr. RAYBURN. No, it doesn't make a parcel of difference to me what profession the man or woman in the House of Representatives comes from, or is a member of, just so that they are the type I have been describing.

Mr. SEVAREID. Let me ask you a broader question bearing somewhat on this. Our traditional system elects people locally, all in the House from a local district; they are bound to local needs as well as national and international needs. Is this system meeting the tremendous global problems and responsibilities that seem to snow us all under?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I saw an editorial in the evening paper just a while ago, today. It said something about me, that I regarded my district more than I did the country.

Well, there couldn't be a greater cannard in the world than that, and it is a cannard about all the men and women in the House of Representatives.

Now you have got to be elected by somebody before you get here, and that is the constituency in your district, whether it is large or small, and some of them are small, some of them are large in population because since redistricting they have grown up.

But I find the membership in the House of Representatives just as patriotic a group of men and women that could be gathered in the world. Their first duty is to look after the small things and the large things in the districts that send them here, the districts that have given them the opportunity to demonstrate whether they can deal with the States or not.

But I find that on the broad questions that they do not look to their little district. They of course have some idea or want to have some idea about what their people think. But I think in the main, in an overwhelming majority of the cases the Members in the House of Representatives vote for what they think is the best interest of the country.

Mr. SEVAREID. Do they have really enough time, enough help, enough money to put their minds to these enormous world problems?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think so. When I came here we got $1,500 for clerk hire. I hired 1 person at $125 a month.

Well, the Government wasn't as big then as it is now. People didn't write letters like they do now. People didn't ask for favors like they do now, and all those things. But we have grown up now to the point where I feel that each Member of the House of Representatives has enough help in his office to transact his business. I know I do.

Mr. SEVAREID. You think the pay is sufficient?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do, since it has been raised the last time, I think it is sufficient pay. I think the average man can come here and live on this and raise his family.

What the trouble was a few years ago, the salary was so low a man with a family came here and got poorer and poorer every year he stayed.

Mr. SEVAREID. I know many who did in those days.

Mr. Speaker, you have a kind of a fierce loyalty to your political party. Many of us over the years have acquired the feeling that the differences between the Republican and Democratic parties have grown fewer and fewer. How do you see it? Do you see a basic difference?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I do of course or I wouldn't be a partisan, I wouldn't be a party man. The Democratic Party started out under Jefferson, the Republican Party started out under Hamilton.

Alexander Hamilton was a brilliant man, a brilliant young man of 30 years of age when he attended the constitutional convention in Philadelphia in 1787. He wasn't there a great deal of the time because the things that Franklin and Morris and Madison and people like that were doing about setting up Government didn't please him too well.

Now what we have always said was the difference between the Jeffersonian theory and the Hamilton theory was this, and I think that has lodgement in some Republicans now, I will not say all of them. That is the way to make the country prosperous; was to make those at the top very wealthy, and that wealth and those profits would trickle down to the ones below them.

Now that theory has been practiced a great many times, but it has never succeeded.

The Jeffersonian theory was, and it is our theory now, that you want to make the country prosperous, you make those at the base, the man on the farm, the man in the shop, make him prosperous enough to give him a buying power and then he will put everybody to work, because he buys things with the things that he makes.

Now that is one fundamental difference, and of course there is one fundamental difference between the Demacrats and the Republicans on the tariff. The tariffs got so high, they built such a wall around this country that we had to do something about it.

Since World War I we have become the greatest surplus-producing country in the world, and still are. Now money doesn't cross the oceans to balance the trade between country and country. It is surplus goods for surplus goods, and I think McKinley was credited with saying 60 years ago, "We cannot sell where we do not buy."

Then we came along to the Roosevelt administration and Cordell Hull was more responsible for it than anybody. With his help we set up the reciprocal trade arrangements.

Now there are many Republicans that never have voted for the extension or the putting into effect of reciprocal trade. Now we have got to have reciprocal trade. In other words, as an old friend of mine once said to me, he said, "You cannot be in the world and not of it."

If we do not have a reciprocal trade act, unless we have agreement with other countries as to how much tariff we are going to charge them and how much they are going to charge us, we are going to be out of the world as far as trade is concerned, in my opinion, and therefore we must, in my opinion, for the defense, for our foreign policy and all extend this reciprocal trade. We have a great many Republicans, as I say, who have never voted for it. They believe in building the walls around this country pretty high.

Now it has got to the point where the other fellow can build a wall just as high as we can and it will defeat trade, and if we stop trading with our allies and the people who have been trading with us, there is no place for them to go except to Russia or some country that might be unfriendly to us.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, do you see any other basic differences between the parties?

Mr. RAYBURN. There has always been a great basic difference between the parties on the question of foreign trade. The Republicans have always believed in a tariff for protection. Now that might have been justified many years ago when we had infant industries in this country, but since we have the most giant ones in the world, since we are the greatest surplus-producing country in the world, we must trade with other countries.

Money doesn't cross the ocean to balance trade between country and country. It is surplus goods for surplus goods. If we don't take the surplus goods of other countries, then they can't take ours.

McKinley once said, I think it was nearly 60 years ago, he was the author of a great tariff bill and he said, "We cannot sell where we do not buy."

These tariff laws have built a wall around this country that is pretty hard for the surplus of other countries to get over. The Democratic position has been a reasonable tariff, or it was years ago for tariff revenue only. But after the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which is in effect now, except for that great statesman Cordell Hull brought in what is known now as reciprocal trade arrangements; that is where we sit down with the other countries of the earth and determine which tariff they can pay to get into this country and how much they are going to charge us. It has worked splendidly, and we have tremendous trade and commerce with all the nations of the world that are friendly to us especially.

Now we are up against it this year because that has got to be renewed, and, as an old friend of mine said one time, we cannot be in this world and not of it. And if we do not extend this Reciprocal Trade Act and keep up the kind of trade we have now, we will just be out of the world, as far as trade and commerce is concerned, and it would be the worst thing in the world that could happen to this country, in my opinion, because somebody will trade with these people and they will not have the walls around them that some of our people want built around us. That is one of the fundamentals, tariff and taxation is one of the fundamental questions that separate the two parties.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, what about this session of Congress? Are they going to extend this Reciprocal Trade Act?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I hope so. I am going to do everything in the world I can about it. I understand the President is doing what he can. He made a speech down here the other night to a group that was nationally televised. I hope it has an effect in bringing in some support for this bill, and I believe it is going to pass, because I just think we cannot afford to fail to pass it.

Mr. SEVAREID. How about this session of Congress generally? What has been the progress? It usually starts very slow.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think we have had greater progress in this session of Congress up to Easter than any Congress I have served in in many years.

Mr. SEVAREID. That is quite a statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. I can read off to you what we have done up to now. We have passed, and in the President's hand, special defense construction bill, debt ceiling increase, price-support freeze on agriculture, which the President vetoed today, second supplemental appropriation, supplemental defense appropriation, supplemental Labor Department appropriation, Treasury and Post Office appropriations. Those are all law except the one that the President vetoed. The bills in conference, the postal pay increase bill; it probably won't get up before Easter; rivers and harbors authorization; we will probably adopt that conference report tomorrow; highway construction is in conference. When they will agree on that I don't know.

But then the House has completed the military pay increase, Small Business Administration, independent offices appropriation, Interior Department appropriaton, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation, and the technical amendments to the Tariff Act.

And we will tomorrow or the next day pass the Agricultural Appropriation Act, and that will leave us just two big bills to pass, big appropriations; they will be public works and the Defense Department. Now, I don't know any session of Congress from January until April that has done a bigger job than that.

Mr. SEVAREID. That is a very considerable statement, considering the history of this, of the rate of progress.

Mr. RAYBURN. Usually we get started slowly.

Mr. SEVAREID. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. And don't get into high gear until after Easter.

Mr. SEVAREID. What about the great measures for combating this depression or recession? Are we doing enough? What ought we be doing?

Mr. RAYBURN. I don't know whether we are doing enough or not. We have taken the lead in that. I remember Senator JOHNSON introduced a resolution. Congressman McCORMACK, the majority leader of the House, introduced a resolution to try to unfreeze some of the money that is over in the Defense Department, and within a few days after that the Defense Department—and we passed the resolution through the House and through the Senate—they unfroze $450 million for installations in public works.

We have passed the rivers and harbors bill. We will probably adopt the conference report on that tomorrow or the next day. We have passed the housing bill that will build 200,000 houses and put 500,000 people to work, and housing can start faster than anything, and we have done some other things that I don't recall to my mind at the moment, but unemployment extension of benefits, we are going to take that up, have a hearing on it on the 29th. We will pass that and that will put money in the pockets of a lot of people.

So in these billions that we are making available, if they are wisely expended, it is going to give us a great lift.

Mr. SEVAREID. Do you have very firm personal feelings about a tax cut?

Mr. RAYBURN. I don't want a tax cut if we can avoid it. If we can't pull out of this thing without a tax cut, then I will be for it.

Mr. SEVAREID. And you would wait until when, summer?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; I don't think we can wait that long. I think we have got to make a determination of this in April or early May.

Mr. SEVAREID. That would be a problem for this session, however, to face.

Mr. RAYBURN. That would be a problem for this session; yes.

Mr. SEVAREID. You have seen this country go through a lot of economic changes, Mr. Speaker. Do you think there is any chance at all we could go into another really deep depression?

Mr. RAYBURN. If we hadn't taken the action that we have taken, I mean this Democratic Congress, and hadn't of done it hurriedly, I think we were on our way to a deep depression.

I have the faith to believe that we are going to put enough people to work, we are going to get enough people the buying power that in all probability in April or May or June we will reach the bottom of this thing and may start up. I am hoping that.

It doesn't make any difference to me what party gets the credit for it. I want to get out of this thing and to get out just as quickly as possible, because when people are unemployed, when they do not have the money to buy the things that are necessary for their livelihoods, they get in a bad humor, and I don't want to see our people in a bad humor.

Mr. SEVAREID. You have also seen this country commit itself in a thousand ways in a thousand places in the world as we have grown bigger and more responsible.

Do you think we have committed ourselves too far, in too many places? Can we do this job all around the world?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, we have been doing it. I think the Marshall plan saved Western Europe from communism. You take a man sitting there under his vine and fig tree with nothing to do, his transportation is gone, his factory is down, his wife cold, emaciated, his children cold and hungry, he will vote for any kind of a change because he can't do worse than for him and his family to starve and freeze to death.

I think the point 4 program did a great thing, and I am still for carrying out this program. I am perfectly willing to vote for the $3,900,000,000 asked by the President, and whether he gets all of that or not, I hope we give him a substantial sum, and I think that we can carry this load, and if we can do it and make friends with it, it is going to be money well spent.

Now my interpretation of the situation in the world is that we have not made as many friends as we should have made, for the simple reason that it hasn't been properly handled.

Mr. SEVAREID. Do you think we are too negative, as a lot of critics say, about the Russians and their various proposals? Do you think we have got in a rut on these great questions?

Mr. RAYBURN. I said on December 3—and that has been awhile ago—that the Russians were beating us on propaganda. In my opinion, they have beaten us ever since. For us just to freeze and say "No," no summit unless we can get our way about everything, no this, no that, and the other, I think it is hurting our hope for peace, or hope for cooperation with the world, and especially—now Russia is a big country; it is the biggest except ourselves, I mean, as far as wealth and army and able to support itself. I think that the time is fast approaching when we have got to come to some kind of an agreement and understanding with Russia, if we go into a summit conference with them.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, I gather it is your view then that the Russians have been outfacing us in propaganda and in psychological terms all around the world rather badly. Does this in your mind then lead you to the firm feeling that we are going to have a summit conference, that we ought to have one?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, it has been my thought all the time that with Russia propagandizing the world and beating us in propaganda, I will say, because they put themselves up as the people who want to bring about peace, which we now doubt if they do—they have been beating us, and they are selling their produce to the world, to a very great extent, and it disturbs me very much.

I think we have ultimately got to have another summit conference, and the sooner we get an agreement with Russia on what we are talking about and to get at it, I think the best it will be for the United States of America.

We just cannot allow Russia to create the impression in the world, and a lot of people don't know us much better than they know the Russians, that they are the peace party and the peace people of the world, and they want to stop the ghastliness of war, and that this great western democracy is impeding that, and I think that impression is going out through the world, and I think the sooner we can get with the Russians and prepare for a summit conference, I think the better it will be for us and for all the free world.

Mr. SEVAREID. There is much in the news now about stopping the atomic tests. Two years ago your party candidate for President about this time of year proposed that we take the lead in stopping them. Have we now been put in a great hole in terms of propaganda by the Russian action?

Mr. RAYBURN. I have always thought that the explosion of these dangerous things should be stopped, if we could get the people of the world together on that who had these destructive instruments. And I remember very well Governor Stevenson saying that he would like to stop it, but he was misunderstood and they thought he wanted it done unilaterally. I do not think he had any such thing in his mind at all.

But I have thought for a long time that it wasn't doing the world any good to carry on this program of exploding these destructive things, and I am also fearful of what they might leave in the atmosphere and in the ground that would be dangerous to human beings.

Mr. SEVAREID. You are not taking a position, are you, Mr. Speaker, that we should not go ahead with our next series of tests this summer?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know. If Russia ceases to do this and we keep on, I think it is going to add to their propaganda value. I am fearful of that. But I am not a scientist and I am not an engineer, and I don't know just what we might develop if we carry this on. We might develop something that would be for peaceful uses. But I just say this: That on the talk of the summit and the talk of stopping the explosion of these bombs, Russia has beaten us on propaganda all around the world.

Mr. SEVAREID. To ask you one last question, Mr. Speaker, and to come to something that is very intimate and pressing, there has just been a debate in the House a few minutes ago about this, and that is the remodeling of the east front of the Capitol Building, for which you have been a protagonist and a great many people, including some architects around the country are very upset. What is your real reason for wanting to do this?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; they want to put it defacing the Capitol. They want to make, it was vandalism, and so forth. CLARENCE CANNON made a speech in the House the other day that was very interesting.

He said that when Thomas Jefferson came here to be inaugurated, he hitched his horse to a hitching post. He said some vandals had removed that hitching post. There in an inference, a historic inference around this Capitol, at one time some vandals took that down to make room for expansion of the east, the north, and the south fronts, and he said also there was a rail fence around part of the Capitol one time, and when Lincoln came here to be inaugurated as President, they knew he liked rails, and they took an exhibit to him and he said some vandals had taken that down and probably put it into ashes.

Now I think that the east front should be extended. I think I know from talking to the best engineers I know and the best experts that the east front of the Capitol is beginning to be a hazard.

I saw the other day two chunks of stone, that sandstone, that had fallen out of those columns, each one of them as big as each one of my fists. Well, now they deface the Capitol by going and filling up those holes with concrete and painting over it. Now if 35 coats of paint doesn't deface that sandstone that the east front of the Capitol is made out of, I don't see how you could deface it.

But for two reasons I think it is time for it to come down. Those beautiful pieces of cornice up there are falling off. They can't be replaced, and a lot of the impression goes out that this would be so far out that it would hide the Senate and House ends.

Well, this east front of the Capitol can be extended 32½ feet and yet be 40 feet inside of the distance out east of the east front of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

I was talking to a very intelligent lady here a while back, and she was awfully opposed to defacing or removing it. I said, "Suppose it has got to come down. That is all the defacement you could do about it when you take it down. What is the difference then in building it out, extending out 32 feet or 32½ feet and making it exactly like it is now than to reestablish it where it is?"

She said, "Well, I had never thought about that."

We need the 54 rooms that that makes. Somebody said here last year, this is not a memorial. The Capitol of the United States is a workshop, and I wonder sometimes if we had had a Senate and a House wing of this Capitol, if the Senate with 96 Members had tried to crowd themselves into the old Supreme Court room, and 435 Members had tried to sit in this little rotunda out here where they used to have plenty of room when the House of Representatives was 100 Members, I wonder what they would have said about defacing the south end of the Capitol to put the House of Representatives here or what they would have said about defacing the north end of the Capitol to put the Senate end over there. And if we had paid any attention to the people in the past, had paid as much attention to these people that talk about defacement and vandalism, we wouldn't have had any place to work on the Hill.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, my brief reading of history teaches me that SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, usually gets what he wants on this Capitol Hill. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the east front will be changed. I want to thank you very much for taking this time on this anniversary program for Capitol Cloak Room. We are all highly honored. Thank you.

Mr. RAYBURN. Thank you.

Ike's Broken Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., on March 31, 1958, depicting the false position of President Eisenhower in urging renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The editorial is a concise but forceful presentation of the facts involved in the problem now facing the Congress as to whether our trade policies are beneficial or harmful to the mass of American producers.

I urge my colleagues to read this editorial carefully. It should be the basis of facts you will need in making your decision on this quite controversial legislation.

The editorial follows:

IKE'S BROKEN FAITH

President Eisenhower demands that the American people put pressure on their Senators and Congressmen to force them to pass his so-called foreign trade program, a proposed renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act for 5 years.

The slogan department of the White House has produced a clever cluster of catchphrases of the type the President favors more and more to decorate his public utterances.

None of these slogans represents either reason or fact.

Here are two of the slogans coined for Ike's televised address to the American people Thursday night:

Refusal to renew the Reciprocal Trade Act as proposed by Eisenhower would be "returning to the law of the jungle in trade relations between nations."

World trade makes jobs for American workers. "At a time of slack in the economy like the present, these jobs should not be placed in jeopardy by crippling our trade program."

Both of these "word busters" are phony and fraudulent.

Far from creating jobs in the country, the Reciprocal Trade Act, renewed under great pressure from Ike 3 years ago, has destroyed jobs. Indeed, it has come near to destroying the entire textile industry and other industries denied adequate protection against cheap imports from low-wage foreign countries.

The collapse of the textile industry as a direct result of Eisenhower's unsound trade

policies may have triggered the very depression he now seeks to end by the passage of a similar, or worse, reciprocal trade act.

A review of the circumstances under which the Reciprocal Trade Act was approved by Congress 3 years ago is in order.

Eisenhower rescued his reciprocal trade program from impending defeat in the House of Representatives by sending the now famous "Dear Joe" letter to Republican Manority Leader JOE MARTIN on February 17, 1955.

"No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure," the President solemnly promised JOE MARTIN and his colleagues on Capitol Hill.

It is ironic tragedy that MARTIN's 14th Massachusetts District is among the areas hardest hit by textile-industry losses resulting from the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Not only has the President broken faith with Congress and the American people, but he has violated the spirit of his own reciprocal trade program enacted 3 years ago.

The 1955 law contains a peril-point provision whereby industries endangered by foreign imports may appeal to the Tariff Commission for relief.

Many such appeals have been made, but Tariff Commission recommendations for higher duties on imports have repeatedly been vetoed by the President.

Eisenhower's reciprocal trade program, in 1958 as in 1955, is based on the proposition that certain American industries—such as the textile industry—are expendable and may be destroyed to help industries in foreign countries, and perhaps some industries in the United States engaged in foreign trade.

In other words, the Reciprocal Trade Act is designed to take away the jobs and livelihood of hundreds of thousands of American workers of the President's own choosing, in order to benefit industries in foreign countries and possibly some workers in the United States.

The people should reject Ike's highly sloganized appeal to pressure members of Congress into extending the Reciprocal Trade Act, against their own judgment and the best interests of their own section, and despite their sorry experience of the past.

Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a resolution enacted by the City Council of McKeesport, Pa., on March 21, 1958, requesting the President and the Members of Congress to consider an immediate reduction in the Federal income tax and other Federal taxes as a stimulus to business:

"Resolution 7713

"Resolution requesting the President and the Members of Congress earnestly to consider an immediate reduction in the Federal income tax and other Federal taxes as a stimulus to business

"*Resolved by the city of McKeesport, in council assembled,* That—

"Whereas residents of the city of McKeesport, a steel manufacturing center, have been adversely affected by a sharp drop in production of steel by reason of which their purchasing power has been considerably reduced; and

"Whereas in the opinion of city council, reduction in the Federal income tax and of other Federal taxes would increase purchasing power, result in improved business conditions and promote a rise in employment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the President and the Members of Congress be and they are hereby requested earnestly to consider an immediate reduction in the Federal income tax and other Federal taxes as a stimulus to business not only in the city of McKeesport but throughout the United States; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator JOSEPH CLARK and to Senator EDWARD MARTIN, and to Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND."

Given first and second reading March 21, 1958.

Passed finally in council this 21st day of March A. D. 1958.

Attest:

ANDREW J. JAKOMAS,
Mayor and President of Council.
THERESA C. STASHKO,
Clerk of Council.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true correct copy of a resolution of the city of McKeesport, Pa., and that the same went into effect the 21st day of March 1958.

Attest:

THERESA C. STASHKO,
City Clerk.

Resolution Urging Specific Steps To Improve United States Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce urging the Congress to take certain steps to improve the Nation's educational system:

Resolved, That the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce recommend to and urge the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK and EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of the House of Representatives, from Luzerne County, Pa., to lend their influence and assistance so that legislation will be adopted by United States Congress directed towards:

1. Expansion of the national science program in the field of science to improve teacher training, the curriculums and teaching methods of science education, and including fellowships for scientific research.

2. The amendment of Federal tax laws to provide:

(a) Increased incentives for individuals, foundations, and corporations to increase their support for higher education.

(b) Deduction from gross taxable income by teachers of reasonable costs for costs for courses taken to increase their competence and professional position.

(c) Deduction from gross taxable income of a reasonable percentage of the costs, including tuition and fees, for or by persons attending colleges or universities (including junior or community colleges and institutes).

3. Continuation of the college housing-loan program with additional obligational authority and modifications, as recommended by the administration.

4. Establishment of a uniform policy requiring all executive agencies of the Federal Government to pay the full costs of research, military training or other services for which they contract with colleges and universities.

5. Continuation of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers to stimulate local, State and private action to improve science education and the use of scientific manpower.

Passed by unanimous vote of the board of directors of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce at the regular meeting of March 28, 1958.

EDMUND H. POGGI, JR.,
President.
J. MUIR CROSBY,
Executive Secretary.

Inflationary Effect of Tax Cut Doubted by Many Economists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, April 13, 1958, entitled "Inflationary Effect of Tax Cut Doubted by Many Economists." The article criticizes the economic theories of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATIONARY EFFECT OF TAX CUT DOUBTED BY MANY ECONOMISTS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—Would a tax cut, and a resulting deficit in the budget of as much as $10 billion, be inflationary?

President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, have no doubts that it would be. But some economists are not so sure.

Most economists would probably agree that, at the least, such a budget deficit would prevent some price reductions that otherwise would occur in a slump. But many doubt that a serious additional inflationary fillip would be given to the economy by a deficit in that range, incurred to stop a recession.

The belief that deficits are inflationary centers on an essentially monetary argument. The President used it at his last news conference.

A deficit, so this argument runs, involves large additional Government borrowing, and much of this borrowing inevitably will be from the banking system. Such borrowing has the effect of the printing press—adding to the total supply of money, both cash and bank deposits, in the economy.

Other things being equal, a big increase in the money supply tends to be inflationary. Even if there is no immediate upward surge of prices, a money cushion is provided to supply the financial base for a later inflation.

This argument is sometimes supplemented with the view that a tax cut, and the accompanying deficit, could start the economy up-

ward so rapidly as to generate the inflationary pressures always associated with a boom—pressures of excessive demand financed by the new additions to the money supply.

The economists who do not accept the inevitability of inflationary consequences of deficits make their point in a number of different ways. These are the main lines of thought:

First, on the money supply itself. The money supply grows or recedes in accordance with the total of borrowing from the banking system, not just Federal Government borrowing. Business in recent years has been running a far larger deficit than the Government.

In a recession, business borrowing and perhaps even personal borrowing, falls off, as it has already fallen off so far in the current recession. Thus, some of the money creation resulting from the Federal deficit just makes up for money creation that would properly occur in ordinary periods of noninflationary prosperity.

Obviously the magnitudes of the new Federal borrowing and the decline in borrowing by businesses and individuals are important. But the story is not all one way.

A counterpart to this argument is that the inflation resulting from an increase in the money supply is an inflation resulting from excessive demand. But the very definition of a recession is insufficiency of demand.

Pumping up demand now—by more Government spending and by permitting more private spending through a tax cut—would not be inflationary unless the increase were much greater than $10 billion. The deficiency in what the economy is currently buying compared to what it could produce without strain is probably at least $25 billion, according to this argument.

The argument assumes that some effort would be made even by higher taxes if necessary to combat inflationary pressures if they should emerge after recovery begins. The point it that there need be no immediate inflationary effect, and the longer-term effect can be offset at the time.

There is still another facet to this argument. Many economists hold that the main cause of our recent creeping inflation has not been excessive demand but an upward push from either labor costs or excessive prices charged by business insulated from normal competition, or both. The President's own economic report last January suggested that he accepted at least part of this argument.

According to this school, demand has actually been deficient for more than a year. Pumping up demand will not make any worse an inflation that is not demand caused anyway.

Some members of this school go on to argue that a big deficit, by restoring normal economic growth, might actually be anti-inflationary. This is because certain recent experience seems to show that the productivity of labor is higher during prosperity when the economy is working close to full blast. If productivity goes up, labor costs go down proportionately.

Finally, some economists, who accept the likelihood of some future inflationary consequences from the actions taken to fight the recession, believe that these consequences flow far more from the actions of the Federal Reserve System than from the state of the Government's budget.

The real determinant of how much the money supply increases is the Federal Reserve, this school says. Its "easy money" policy is going to create a potentially inflationary "cushion" of added money supply in any event. The Treasury deficit need not make that cushion significantly larger.

Furthermore, this school argues, the best way to prevent a future inflation from resulting from antirecession actions is to have the Federal Reserve resort promptly to a tighter money policy once recovery begins. Theoretically at least, the Federal Reserve could "squeeze out" of the economy most of the extra money that the antirecession actions had pumped in.

Here again, the key point is that there need be no long-term inflationary consequeces of a big deficit, providing the Government acts wisely after growth is resumed.

Some economists point to the fact that there was a budget deficit of $9,450 million in the 1953 fiscal year and that the following 3 years showed the greatest price stability of the postwar period. They hasten to admit that some special factors were involved and that this experience does not prove anything, but they think the evidence is of some value.

And so it goes. The arguments, of course, are complicated and somewhat abstruse. But the layman can safely conclude, at the least, that the case is not all one sided.

United States-Russian Cultural Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

A DRAMATIC EXAMPLE OF UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN CULTURAL EXCHANGE—AMERICAN PIANIST WINS IN SOVIET COMPETITION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on this opening day of the baseball season, it might not be amiss to turn our attention to another type of competition. I refer to the competition between East and West in the field of culture.

THREE ARTICLES ON PIANIST, DANCE, MOVIES

This morning's New York Times contains, side by side, three interesting articles which vividly illuminate this competition. The first is a front-page story describing the acclaim in Moscow for a 23-year-old young American, Louisiana-born and Texas-raised, who triumphed over 48 other contestants in an international piano competition, based upon the works of the great Soviet composer Peter Ilyitch Tchaikovsky. Apparently this 23-year-old pianist, Van Cliburn, has taken Moscow by storm. Naturally, we are most gratified that an American performer has won in such difficult competition.

ENDING SOVIET DISTORTION ABOUT OUR MATERIALISM

We are not so naive as to think that the fact that one American has triumphed in this field will disabuse the Russian people of the misrepresentations which they have so long heard as to our alleged lack of interest in culture. Unfortunately, many Russians may still think of us as cultural barbarians. But this type of proof to the contrary, based upon Mr. Cliburn's triumph, cannot help doing good.

SENDING PERFORMERS, NOT BOMBS, TO MOSCOW

This incident demonstrates a truth to the Russian people; namely, that the only type of guided missile, so to speak, we ever want to send to Moscow is the human missiles who will go straight to the hearts of the Russian people. I mean the masters of the keyboard, of art, of literature, or of drama.

The only type of so-called guided missiles we would like to see come back from Russia are great performers like Gilels and others who will bring about the noise of American cheers, and not of tears and suffering.

A second article in the morning New York Times concerns the dramatic opening performance tonight of the first full-scale dance organization to visit this country from the Soviet Union. This is the famous Moiseyev dance company, which opens tonight at the Metropolitan Opera, and which has already been met by eager enthusiasm in New York, as it will be met in Washington and in other leading cities.

The third is a most important article based upon an address which was delivered last night by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge before the annual Milestone award dinner of the Screen Producers Guild.

LET SOVIETS SEE THE BEST OF UNITED STATES MOVIES

In his address, Ambassador Lodge frankly stated that the Soviet Union is now challenged to fulfill the letter and the spirit of the East-West cultural agreement which was signed last January.

Russia specifically can prove her good intentions by welcoming to her country the best of American motion pictures; films which display an accurate picture of the American way of life, and not the distortions which, unfortunately, for so long have been disseminated to the peoples of the U. S. S. R. This is a fact which Mr. Eric Johnston, head of the Motion Picture Association of America, has likewise long pointed out to Russian movie negotiators.

These three news stories, taken together, constitute, I believe, a most significant commentary on cultural exchange.

THE THREE PHASES OF EXCHANGE

In the first, we see the exchange being carried out successfully inside the Soviet Union.

In the second, we see the exchange about to be carried out successfully inside the United States. I may say, incidentally, that the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra will reciprocate the visit of the Moiseyev Dance Co. here.

But the third story illustrates the long way we still have to go in order to make two-way exchange a true reality.

We are confident that Ambassador William Lacy and his staff on East-West contacts at the State Department will be doing their very best, at the highest possible level, to uphold our end of the bargain, so to speak. We hope that the Soviets will do theirs, so that the January agreement will be fully carried out.

In this instance, as in so many other instances, it is deeds, not words, that count.

I send to the desk the texts of the New York Times articles, and a related Times editorial. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1958]

AMERICAN, 23, IS VICTOR IN MOSCOW PIANO CONTEST

(By Max Frankel)

Moscow, Monday, April 14.—Van Cliburn a 23-year-old American, has won the first prize in the Soviet Union's international Tchaikovsky piano competition. Mr. Cliburn, a southerner who lives in New York, triumphed in what had been regarded as a contest of extemely high standards over three young Soviet pianists and one from Communist China. The awards were voted late last night by a panel of 16 jurors, including 6 leading Soviet musicians. Their choice clearly coincided with that of the Moscow public. Muscovites had wildly cheered Mr. Cliburn's performance in the finals Friday night. Daniel Pollack, another 23-year-old American from Los Angeles, was awarded eighth place. He actually ranks ninth among the nine finalists because there was a tie for second place.

Cowinners of the second prize were Liu Shi-kun, an 18-year-old student at the Chinese Central Conservatory, and Lev Vlasenko, a 29-year-old native of Tiflis, Georgia, in the Soviet Union.

The final standings will not be formally announced until noon today. But they became an open secret about 2 a. m., when the top winners were summoned to the Moscow Conservatory to make color films of the program. There Mr. Cliburn quickly became the center of attention and a number of contest officials had word of the results.

The chairman of the jury was Emil Gilels, the Soviet pianist who toured the United States earlier this year. Last Friday night, after Mr. Cliburn's performance of Rachmaninoff's Third Piano Concerto, Mr. Gilels and others filed backstage to embrace the young American.

Also on the jury were Dmitri Kabalevsky, Soviet composer, who had written a rondo for the final please, and Svyateslav Richter, a well-known Soviet pianist.

Mr. Cliburn, who was born in Louisiana and whose family lives in Kilgore, Tex., is a tall, lanky, boyish-looking young man. He attained his first moments of serenity shortly after the results became known. Still playing for the cameras at the conservatory at 3 a. m., he seemed to have conquered all the dizzying excitement that had possessed him throughout the contest.

WEARY SYMPHONY PLAYERS

All around him were the weary members of the Moscow Symphony Orchestra. Since Thursday they had played 3 hours each morning to rehearse the contestants and from 3 to 4½ hours in the evenings for the actual performances. Yesterday they had started at 9 a. m. They accompanied Messrs. Pollack and Liu in rehearsal and for the contest's last concert in the evening.

Then began the filming, which promised to continue until dawn. Out front was a full house of spectators, similarly incapable of tiring of Tchaikovsky's Piano Concerto No. 1, which had been the major required work for all nine finalists.

The enthusiasm of performers and audience this morning was the most dramatic but certainly not the only indication of the stir that this competition has caused here. Every newspaper has been billing it for weeks. Mr. Cliburn's name has been on tens of thousands of lips in the last week and a ticket for his Friday performance was taken as a sign of standing and influence in the community.

In the opinion of most observers, now confirmed by the jury, Mr. Cliburn did not let his public down. He played wtih exacting technique but with great lyricism, especially in the Rachmaninoff. Dr. Mark Schubart, dean of the Juilliard School of Music, who was here to watch his students in competition, rated Mr. Cliburn's Rachmaninoff rendition as outstanding. Mr. Pollack also is a graduate of Juilliard.

TWENTY-FIVE-THOUSAND-RUBLE PRIZE

Mr. Cliburn will receive a gold medal and 25,000 rubles in cash ($2,500 at the tourist exchange rate). The other cash awards scale down to 5,000 rubles for the eighth prize for Mr. Pollack.

Mr. Cliburn also will have to give a solo recital on Friday and will perform at two concerts with other winners. In addition, he has had many offers for recordings and appearances throughout the country. Mr. Pollack also will make some recordings.

Third place was awarded to Naum Shtarkman of the Soviet Union. The other winners were:

Fourth, Eduard Miansarov, Soviet Union; fifth, Milena Mollova, Bulgaria; Sixth, Nadia Gedda-nova of France; seventh, Toioaki Matsuura of Japan.

Mr. Pollack had received polite applause. He seemed a bit disappointed by his final performance.

"Thank God it's over" he said backstage. "I feel like sleeping for 20 years."

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1958]

RUSSIAN DANCERS REHEARSE AT MET—TROUPE GIVES BREATHTAKING PREVIEW FOR MEMBERS OF OPERA AND OTHERS

(By Lawrence Fellows)

Moiseyev Dance Company of Moscow left its first American audience gasping for breath yesterday at the Metropolitan Opera. And the troupe of folk dancers doesn't open there officially until 8 o'clock tonight.

Thirty-six members of the Metropolitan Opera Ballet had filtered quietly into the darkened house to watch the company of 100 men and women rehearsing passages that stem from their own folklore. The Met's dancers were leaving on tour last night and, it was explained, might "never have another chance to see the Russians."

Before long, as many more persons had made their way into the audience. All of them had very important reasons for being there. Whatever their reasons, they were quickly taken in by the vigor and enthusiasm of the Russian dangers.

In wild, jubilant dances the men hurled themselves across the stage and leaped fairly to the drops above. One American dancer mumbled:

"They're just rehearsing. They're just rehearsing."

GOOD DIET AND HEART

Asked what they eat to get their strength, one of the Russian girls answered simply:

"They eat everything. But it's not that. It's the heart of the Russian people."

Rehearsing The Dance of the Tartars from Kazan, the girls flirted effectively and the men responded with more leaps and bounds and the famous prisyadka, where they seem to sit and kick, but don't sit. They ended with an ease and charm that led another girl to explain almost as simply:

"It's the heart of the Russian people. The boys like to make fun and they try to show off. Each one says: 'Look at me. Look how strong I am, how brave I am. Choose me and not the others.'"

IMPRESSIONS VOICED

The dancers could concentrate only briefly on other aspects of their 3-week stay at the Met and the 10-week tour of the United States and Canada. But there were these observations:

Americans are warm and generous.

New York's billboards make their heads ache.

People shouldn't have to pay to cross a bridge, and especially not twice just to go to the airport and return.

The cultural-exchange program, under which they came and the Philadelphia Orchestra will go to Russia, will improve mutual understanding.

The stage at the Met is full of holes.

But much more exciting was the action on stage. They turned repeatedly to shout: "Khoroshi prizhok," good jump; "Ochen khorosho," very good.

The Moiseyev company, the first full-scale dance organization to visit this country from the Soviet Union, will open with an advance sale of approximately $300,000. It will be seen in 12 numbers created by Igor Moiseyev, based on the folk vocabulary of the various peoples who make up the Soviet Union. The same program presented under the aegis of S. Hurok will be given at all performances.

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1958]

LODGE PRESCRIBES FILMS FOR SOVIET—AS PEACE STEP, HE CALLS ON MOSCOW TO SHOW MOVIES DEPICTING TRUE UNITED STATES LIFE

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., April 13.—Henry Cabot Lodge challenged the Soviet Union tonight to take a step for peace by permitting the Russian people to see Hollywood movies that did not distort American life.

"The world is waiting to see whether the cultural exchange agreement signed in Washington last January is going to be allowed to make friends for America inside Russia," the United States representative to the United Nations declared.

Mr. Lodge spoke before 1,000 film and civic leaders at the annual Milestone award dinner of the Screen Producers Guild. Spyros P. Skouras, president of Twentieth Century-Fox, was guest of honor as the 1957 recipient of the award for outstanding contributions to motion-picture development.

NEGOTIATIONS GOING ON

A Soviet delegation recently arrived in Washington to assist in cultural negotiations. No formal report has been made on progress toward an agreement on the selection of movies the Russians might wish to acquire, or terms for their sale or lease. The exchange agreement between the two countries left open the conditions for business transactions.

"The first signs from the Soviet side are far from encouraging," Mr. Lodge said. He quoted the late Mike Todd as having said:

"The U. S. S. R. wants any American-made film that shows American life at its worst. It will show anything that depicts Americans as hoodlums or morons."

Mr. Lodge said the producer made the statement this year after having returned from his second visit to the Soviet Union. Mr. Todd was killed March 22 in a plane crash.

CHARGES VILIFICATION

Mr. Lodge continued: "America should say this to the Soviet leaders: 'Let us show your people how Americans really live. For years you have been carrying on a systematic, wholesale campaign of vilification against America. If you really want to relax tensions, let your people see the best American movies. We challenge you to make this one step for peace.'"

While the United States and the Soviet Union seem to be in a deadlock in terms of military security, Mr. Lodge warned, the struggle between communism and freedom does not end there.

He said motion pictures and other forms of communication that protected the image of America abroad could make important contributions toward creating a community of independent nations which understand each other and respect each other regardless of all the differences in their ways of life.

In this respect, he said, the motion picture industry can do things which are beyond the power of a free government. This is an inspiring challenge for Hollywood, he added.

"Yet, greater still, is the challenge of reaching the minds of the people behind the Iron Curtain, where American films are practically excluded and where 200 million people have been systematically misinformed about us by their leaders in an effort to make our whole way of life look bad as the Communist dogma says it ought to look," Mr. Lodge declared.

He paid tribute to Mr. Skouras, who came to this country as an immigrant from Greece, as a wise and splendid citizen. He called him a film leader who understood the responsibility that goes with great influence.

[From the New York Times]

THE ARTS AS BRIDGES

The music lovers of Moscow are an exacting lot. To win their admiration and affection an artist has to near the top in his field. It is particularly pleasant, therefor, to learn that a young American pianist, Van Cliburn, has taken Moscow by storm. He has won the International Tchaikovsky piano competition as well as the hearts of his Moscovite auditors.

Something similar will happen tonight in our own city, we suspect, when the Moiseyev Dance Company opens its 3-week engagement at the Metropolitan Opera House. An enviable reputation precedes this company, whose repertoire is based upon Russian folk dances, a form of art whose lively and colorful nature has long been world-famous. We hope and expect that the Moiseyev dancers will win applause here as deservedly as has Mr. Cliburn in the Soviet capital.

It has long been all too evident that bridges of friendship and understanding need to be built between the Soviet and American peoples. So far as politics are concerned, we seem unfortunately to be still far from such bridge building. But events such as Mr. Cliburn's appearance in Moscow and the Moiseyev dancers' performances here remind us that the arts give us alternative means of promoting such understanding. The Soviet citizens who applauded Mr. Cliburn in Moscow cheered him for his piano playing, and by so doing implicitly paid tribute to American culture. Those Americans visiting the Metropolitan tonight will be doing the same for the culture of the Soviet people.

We need many more such artistic bridges, and it is the great merit of the recently concluded Soviet-American exchange agreement that it promises to further significantly such reciprocal visits. The more such exchanges there are, the better.

Resolution by the American Car & Foundry on Unemployment and the Need for Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Berwick, Pa., Borough Council on the current unemployment situation and the need for Government contracts for the American Car & Foundry Co. which is located in Berwick:

BERWICK, PA., *April 3, 1958.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Berwick Council at their meeting held March 17, 1958 discussed the situation caused by unemployment conditions and the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the American Car & Foundry industry is the only heavy industry within a 30-mile radius of Berwick and this industry is now suffering from a severe decline in business and is forced to layoff approximately 50 percent of its normal working force of a normal employment of between 2,500 and 3,000 people; and

"Whereas this great number of unemployed will seriously affect the economy of several communities and we, the members of the borough council are fully aware of the possible hardships that may be endured by these unemployed: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the council of the Borough of Berwick on the basis of the record of production of the Berwick AFC and its employees, during peacetime and through two world wars, respectfully solicit your aid in helping Berwick and the surrounding communities get their measure of aid through defense contracts now being let to distressed areas; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the ACF in Berwick with their exemplary record in defense production and economy in the past, and with the facilities to immediately go into production upon receipt of orders thus furnishing employment to many people, we will appreciate any consideration and assistance you may be able to render the people of this area."

Respectfully submitted.

D. WM. ARNDT,
Secretary, Berwick Borough Council.

Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item which appeared in the April 12, 1958, issue of the Washington (D. C.) Daily News:

(By Milton Berliner)

Salty Harry S. Truman was even saltier than usual as he worked his way through the first day of a 4-day visit to Washington.

From the moment he stepped down yesterday from the New Haven, Conn., train out into the cold drizzle until his final public appearance of the day, he answered questions freely, offered opinions copiously and spoke frankly and calmly about some of the things that used to get his dander up.

ONE REGRET

For example, about firing Gen. Douglas MacArthur from the Far East Command.

"I have only one regret about that," the former President told the Reciprocity Club at a Mayflower luncheon. "That I didn't do it sooner and that's the God's truth."

Mr. Truman spoke at the luncheon upon invitation of an old friend, Barse Stonebraker, a past president of the club.

"I said one day last May to Harry Truman," Mr. Stonebraker explained in introducing the guest of honor: "'Will you do it?' And he said, 'You're damn right I will.'"

Mr. Truman laughed and blushed a bit.

When Mr. Truman got up, he recalled that he first knew Mr. Stonebraker as a livestock commission man back in Kansas City about 40 years ago.

"And that's where he got the bull," Mr. Truman said.

Then he turned to Herbert M. Pasewalk, club president who had spoken earlier, and said: "You've had some cow pasture experience yourself."

Mr. Truman talked a bit about foreign policy and how the President alone is responsible for it.

"When the President negotiates a treaty," he said, "he gets the advice and consent of the Senate. And sometimes he gets a hell of a lot of advice and not much consent."

He recalled the trouble he had with a Russian Ambassador who telephoned an hour or two before a White House dinner to say he couldn't come.

Mr. Truman said that this upset the whole complicated seating arrangement and a State Department official came to him and asked him what he should tell the Russian Ambassador.

"'Tell the s. o. b. to go to hell and that we didn't want him in the first place,'" Mr. Truman said he told the official.

EAST FRONT

The former President launched into crackling defense of the project extending the east front of the Capitol.

"That old building is just about to fall down," he said.

He warned that "some old Senator who has had too much lunch" will walk through the Capitol one day and start the collapse.

IDENTIFICATION

Later in the day, Mr. Truman received a a Universal Travelcard.

The presentation was made because several weeks ago when he checked out of the Mayflower and wanted to sign the bill, the cashier, Miss Edith Holmes, failed to recognize him.

"I'm sorry, sir, but you must have a credit card," she told him.

Political Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

POLITICAL RECESSION

Anyone who says the current recession is the result of natural causes unrelated to politics is not too astute a thinker.

Of course the recession is political.

Numerous spokesmen for the administration repeatedly declared that interest rates were being raised arbitrarily to halt inflation. The very inspiration of the tight-money policy and curtailment of national defense spending was political.

Now, once again, when more than 5 million unemployed are crying for jobs, Eisenhower says, "Go slow." Why? Because business forces who can see no further than their nose are afraid that any concessions to the people in the form of improved unemployment compensation or tax cuts may ultimately affect the profits of business.

In short, a controlling clique of the big business world is willing to ride out the recession from a position of economic strength which will enable them to drive some competitors out of business and make the long-term future especially rosy for the survivors.

The Eisenhower business administration is still calling the Nation's shots from a business point of view. Until someone in Wash-

ington formulates policy based on helping the consumer to get spending money in his pocket, all the gaff from the administration will be little more than hot air.

This is a political recession and the way it looks now, only politics in November will reverse the trend.

Hell's Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Barron County Electric Cooperative is one of the finest REA co-ops in Wisconsin. It has distinguished itself as the pioneering electric cooperative. The Barron County organization is, I believe, the largest in membership of the cooperatives in Wisconsin. One of its most distinguished members, and its former president, Mr. John E. Olson, is now serving as president of the Dairyland Power Cooperative, which is the world's largest rural electric cooperative, producing and transmitting electrical energy to some 75,000 rural users in four States. Mr. Willis Jerome, present president of the Barron co-op, is a distinguished leader in the State rural electrification movement. Manager Otis G. Berger has established a record of efficient and competent operation which is the envy of the Nation.

Mr. President, this fine cooperative recently held its annual meeting at Barron, Wis. The farmer-owners who attended the meeting expressed themselves on two matters which I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the two resolutions adopted by the Barron County Electric Cooperative.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

BUILD HELLS CANYON DAM

The steady increase in unemployment in our Nation today; the continuing need for more and more low-cost electric power for defense emergencies facing our Nation; the ever-increasing need of Midwest farmers for low-cost fertilizer; the protection and preservation of our natural resources, are all matters of vital concern to the farmers and the farm-supported communities of Barron and adjacent counties.

Therefore, we, the members of Barron County Electric Cooperative, assembled in annual meeting in the city of Barron on March 19, 1958, stand together in supporting the full development of our river basins, including Federal construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River; that its great electric power generation potential, and complete capacities be utilized without excessive profit toll to private interests, and without endangering through partial and restricted use of major power site the continuing and crucial need for electric energy in abundance.

OPPOSE ENDING REA PROGRAM

The tremendous progress of rural electrification in America during the past decade has been made through the direct efforts of rural electric cooperatives, or by their stimulation of effort on the part of an industry that showed little desire to serve rural America prior to the advent of the Rural Electrification Administration, as an agency of our Federal Government.

Under the original policies and provisions of the Rural Electrification Act, the electrification of our Nation's farms has increased from 10.9 percent in 1935 to approximately 94 percent today. This vast achievement on the part of rural electric cooperatives has been attended by far-reaching benefits into the channels of labor and industry, at no cost to our Government. Under the prevailing policies and provisions of the Rural Electrification Act, our Federal Treasury has also been benefited by an accumulation of profit, realized from loan funds, at interest rates paid by rural electric cooperatives, approximately $53 million over the cost of such loan funds to our Federal Treasury. Thus, since 1935, the interest rate paid by rural electric cooperatives on their loan funds have been sufficient to sustain the REA program without Federal subsidy, or without cost to the American taxpayer.

Therefore, we the members of Barron County Electric Cooperative, assembled in annual meeting in the city of Barron on March 19, 1958, reject the proposals of the administration in Washington to jeopardize the economic position of our cooperative and deter its continuing progress, by substituting policies and provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1935, that would subject our future need for loan funds to the manipulations of private sources for adequate and dependable financing.

We further request that this resolution be submitted to Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE, Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, in Washington, that they may know our membership opposition to Senate bill 2427, and House bill 8714, both bills designated to cripple or destroy the Rural Electrification Act as it now governs our Congress and the Rural Electrification Administration.

A Sound Antirecession Step—An Accelerated Highway Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement I recently submitted before the House Public Works Committee in support of H. R. 11418, which I introduced, and similar measures:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MARCH 25, 1958, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 11418

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee in support of my bill, H. R. 11418, which is identical to H. R. 10422, introduced by the chairman of your committee, Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, a Member of Congress from New York.

H. R. 11418 would compensate each State that has had a toll road incorporated into the Interstate System by providing equivalent mileage for said State. This equivalent mileage would be designated as part of the Interstate System and would thus become eligible for 90-percent Federal aid.

Under my bill, those States which were forward-looking enough to prepare plans, finance, and construct needed highways before the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 became law, would be properly compensated. Instead of being penalized for their progressive attitude, these States would be given this additional mileage to replace the mileage incorporated into the Interstate System. I might point out that this equivalent mileage would be given to the States only when the States initiate the request for the mileage.

I believe that this additional mileage would provide another form of public works construction which would be a stimulus and a shot in the arm to the economy of the States wherein these roads would be constructed. The local areas where the highways would be laid out would receive an opportunity not only for the increased circulation of money but, in addition, the impetus of additional employment by the creation of new jobs that this work would necessitate.

From the Clay report through the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Congress has recognized the principle that in some form or another there should be an equitable reimbursement to those States whose State-constructed mileage was taken away when the Interstate System was created. There have been a number of proposals put forward as to reimbursement; and a report has been filed by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I have studied this matter carefully and, in my opinion, the increased mileage which this bill provides would in the long run be the most beneficial and the best form of reimbursement that the States would receive.

I thank you for the opportunity of appearing before this committee and trust that this bill will receive favorable consideration by the committee.

Extension of GI Business Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the passage of Public Law No. 85-364 included extension of the GI business loan guaranty. I am very much in favor of this program and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following letter from Mr. Paul G. Couvrette, of Thief River Falls, Minn., who gives very excellent reasons for continuing the program:

THIEF RIVER FALLS, MINN., *April 7, 1958.*
Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KNUTSON: As a former serviceman in World War II, I am writing in protest to the Goverment's bringing to a close the GI business loan guaranty, which I understand expires July 25, 1958.

Many veterans up until the present time have not needed to make use of this aid. However, due to changing times and conditions, it could prove to be, not only a nice cushion, but a great aid in starting one into a business, without which it might prove to be utterly impossible to get financial aid to do so.

Why the bill should ever expire I cannot understand. We never know when or what is apt to turn up and having this to rely on can make possible the attaining of a goal or the grasping of a long waited for opportunity.

Each loan, as you know, is always thoroughly screened and the applicant must be qualified by experience and know-how and have a reasonable chance to succeed before it is ever approved. So why take away such a big help for your veterans, merely because of a time on the calendar.

We must protect the small farmer and businessman. They are the backbone of our country. Our present system is giving everything to the big fellow and standing idly by watching numberless people lose their businesses and farms because there is no one to stand up and fight for them. Where better can he turn than to his government, whom he served so well and, as in many of our cases, gave up our business cheerfully to serve when we were needed?

Kindly give this your special consideration and effort. I am sure it will be greatly appreciated by all the services and no doubt greatly influence their voting.

I would appreciate hearing from you regarding what is being done to preserve this priceless help and also learn of your views on the matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL G. COUVRETTE.

The Creation of a Coal Research and Development Commission Will Stimulate the Production and Conservation of Coal Thus Relieving Some of the Unemployment in the Coal-Producing Areas of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in behalf of my bill, H. R. 9593, designed to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal through the creation of a Coal Research and Development Commission. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, APRIL 14, 1958, BEFORE THE MINING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9593

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your subcommittee in behalf of my bill, H. R. 9593, designed to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal through the creation of a Coal Research and Development Commission.

As many of you know, I represent a bituminous-coal area in the heart of Pennsylvania where a depressed economy has existed for years because of decreased demand for coal.

Since the close of World War II, except for a brief recess brought about by the Korean war, unemployment has plagued my congressional district. At this moment 15 percent of a 90,500 labor market is unemployed mainly due to the loss of our eastern seaboard coal markets and its effect on the coal and railroad industry.

In Clearfield County, which is among the 3 counties in my congressional district, 20 percent of the population of the county is living on public assistance and surplus commodities; while in my 3-county area, 13 percent is living on public-assistance benefits and surplus-food commodities.

As you can see the situation is extremely serious and presents a compelling problem.

One of the legislative approaches that I have made to bolster the sagging economy of the central Pennsylvania area is through distressed area legislation, and at the moment there are 40 bills pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee providing economic assistance to these areas. It is my hope that 1 of these 40 bills will be enacted into law during this 85th Congress.

Another legislative approach I am making to bolster the sagging economy in Pennsylvania is through H. R. 9593, now before this subcommittee. This bill, which was introduced in August 1957 will encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission.

Such a commission would in effect give our coal-producing regions a greater opportunity for lifting themselves out of the economic doldrums that have persisted for the greater part of the period since the conclusion of World War II. While there is no question about the need for a distressed area program for the present and the immediate future, over the long run a research and development plan for the coal industry as provided in H. R. 9593 would lessen the burden placed on Federal and State budgets.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the current situation in the central Pennsylvania coal industry. While final figures are not yet available, there is no disputing the fact that central Pennsylvania's bituminous coal production in 1957 decreased from nearly 58 million tons in 1948 to 36 million tons or nearly 40 percent. A further deficit of several million tons is expected for the year of 1958.

From the standpoint of employment we had nearly 49,000 persons employed in the coal industry in the central Pennsylvania area as compared to 22,600 as of December 31, 1957. These figures represent a drop of nearly 45 percent. From this information you can readily understand why my district is classified as a labor surplus area and has been for years.

One of the obvious reasons for restricted demand for our coal is the unabated waves of residual oil that sweep into our east coast markets. For almost a decade I have been insisting that a law is needed to check this unfair competitive practice, and we who represent coal States have enjoyed a measure of consolation in the administration's voluntary program for ebbing the flow of crude oil and products from alien petroleum fields and refineries. The assurance required for safeguarding the domestic fuel producer and our American workman cannot be guaranteed, however, until a legislative barrier is set up as may be provided through a quota limitation when the request for extension of the reciprocal trade agreements is considered by Congress.

Wherever corrective steps may be taken in this regard by the 85th Congress, the necessity for a Coal Research Commission will remain. The fuel upon which we place dependence for America's economy and security of the generations ahead must be ready for immediate delivery when called upon.

Mr. Chairman, the research program as provided for in my bill, H. R. 9593, will not only assist in increasing coal production and coal utilization but will provide also for improvement in transportation methods. This is borne out by the fact that teams of railroad management and labor have indicated accord in the approach undertaken in H. R. 9593, as have the great industrial fuel consumers of our Nation.

Members of the House and Senate have an opportunity through the creation of a Coal Research Commission to erect a monument to the progressive attitude of the 85th Congress. Therefore, enactment of this bill into law will symbolize the determination of this legislative body in guaranteeing the availability of energy resources for this period of international crisis and for the years and centuries beyond our own lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to lay aside any pride of authorship as far as this type of legislation is concerned. My plea here today is that a bill may be perfected and enacted into law that will bring into being a Coal Research and Development Commission.

Information in the hands of our Government and this subcommittee is replete with evidence of the need for a Commission to formulate and execute an overall research program for the coal industry.

In addition, I firmly believe that the fruits of this Commission will restore coal to its economic prominence in this country and in doing so alleviate many of the ills of unemployment in the coalfields of our Nation.

Frankly, this legislation is desperately needed by the coal industry and the coal areas of the Nation.

Aid for Distressed Areas Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Jenkins Township-Yatesville, Pa., School District urging aid be given to distressed economic areas, particularly those located in the anthracite coal region:

Whereas the Jenkins Township, Yatesville Borough School District is located in Wyoming Valley and is in the heart of the anthracite coalfields; and

Whereas the taxes derived from the assessment of anthracite coal has been the main source of revenue for the aforementioned school district; and

Whereas the depletion of anthracite coal deposits have materially reduced the income of said school district; and

Whereas many of its residents have been forced by unemployment to leave said district to seek employment elsewhere; and

Whereas the conditions aforementioned have caused said school district to be placed among those classified as distressed; and

Whereas said school district and its residents are in need of State and Federal aid; and

Whereas the Honorable Daniel J. Flood, Senator Joseph Clark, and Governor Leader have introduced, or are in process of introducing, legislation designed to aid distressed areas: Be it

Resolved by the Jenkins Township, Yatesville Borough School District, and it is hereby resolved by the authority of the same as follows, That Hon. George Leader, Governor

of Pennsylvania; Hon. Daniel Flood, Congressman from Luzerne County; and Hon. Joseph Clark, United States Senator, be immediately contacted and their aid solicited to support the bills introduced in the Congress of the United States and in the House of Representatives and Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, designed to aid distressed areas, particularly those located in the anthracite coalfields and to do everything in their power, whether by legislation or otherwise, to bring relief to these areas as soon as possible.

SARA COYNE JORDAN,
President.
WALTER BECHTAHL,
Secretary.

No Prohibition—Back Door or Otherwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I delivered before Labor's Committee To Celebrate the 25th Anniversary of Repeal, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, April 7, 1958.

The address follows:

NO PROHIBITION—BACK DOOR OR OTHERWISE

(Address by Representative EMANUEL CELLER)

If the chemise or sack dress is here to stay, then shudder we must. I am told by some very vocal sociologists and psychiatrists that the chemise or loose bag dress is really an expression of nostalgic yearning for the Flaming Twenties. If this be so, we are a doomed people. When I see a woman with one of the square dresses, I expect her to do the Charleston—the dance of the prohibition days.

Is there a connection between high prices and high skirts, no waistline and economic bust, the glorified sack and prohibition? There may be something it it, after all.

Aside from the chemise—and what can the helpless male do before the onslaught of fashion?—there is a serious question we must face. Are we taxing ourselves into prohibition?

On beer there is a Federal tax of $6 per barrel and a State tax of $3 on the same barrel. The retailer pays $28.50 for a barrel, and thus one-third of his cost is tax. This cost is passed on to the consumer.

Hard liquor pays the prohibitive tax of $10.50 on a proof gallon. As you know, it was increased from $9 as a temporary measure during the war. But taxes, once put on, like a tattoo are almost impossible to remove.

And what has been the result? A gift to the moonshiners, without their even having to answer the $64,000 question or sending in a slightly used bottle cap. What actually has been accomplished is the encouragement of the bootleggers and hootch runners to get into business, while the legitimate interests are inclined to curtail theirs.

Last year, Federal officers cooperating with State agencies, seized, 11,820 illegal stills, and it is estimated that an additional 3,000 stills were seized by State authorities working independently of Federal investigators.

There are people who are under the impression that all the moonshine activities are hidden in the hillbilly country; that the moonshine activities are unorganized and carried on by bearded old men and barefoot boys on Tobacco Road, with only a flintlock with which to bar the revenuers. The truth is that we find such stills here in the heart of a city like New York. The market is here, the opportunities are here. Moonshining is big business—organized big business—operating from such sites as empty factory buildings, disused garages, condemned tenements, and the like.

They sell to retailers, who pass on this poison to their customers. They sell cut-rate to bellhops, taxi drivers, and the hangers-on to be found in disreputable night spots.

Heavy taxation is their kindest friend, encouraging, aiding, and abetting illegality. The exorbitant, unreasonable taxation is money in the coffers for them—and death to their victims. Only a short while ago we were treated to the tragic spectable of 24 people who died after having consumed a rot gut offered to them in place of legal, properly distilled, and properly inspected liquor.

An excessive tax is an open invitation for the gangster to enter. A reasonable tax which, in turn, would be passed on in savings to the consumer would offer little incentive for the unsavory to pick up where the tax man left off.

Nor would the Government lose with a reasonable tax. The cost of enforcing legal manufacture and distribution of liquor alone makes up the deficiency, not to speak of the increased revenue from personal and corporate taxes that would result from the increased sale of legal liquor. Bad liquor, like bad money, chases away the good. Consumption does not decrease. The traffic follows the cheaper cost.

Let there be instigated a genuine move to cut these taxes and you can be sure that the greatest howls of all will come, not from the prohibitionists, as might be expected, but from the crafty, the greedy, the racketeer who has profited most by the unreasonable, unreasoning liquor tax.

Let me read to you what Thomas Jefferson wrote to a friend on December 12, 1818:

"I rejoice, as a moralist, at the prospect of a reduction of the duties on wine. It is an error to view a tax on that liquor as merely a tax on the rich. Prohibition of its use to the middling class is condemnation of them to poison whisky."

But then, of course, we still have with us the prohibitionists, those self-righteous, self-deluding people who have learned nothing and forgotten all from the prohibition era. Churchill had it right. When he was approached by prohibitionists, he said, "I've taken more out of alcohol than alcohol has taken out of me." I remember a temperance orator holding up to his audience a glass of whisky and dropping into it an angle worm. He said, "See how the worm squirms, suffers, and dies. That is what alcohol will also do to you. Now to change the illustration, I take a pail of beer in one hand and a pail of water in the other and bring both pails to a hard-working donkey toiling in the fields. Which will he drink? The answer of course, is 'the water'." Then the temperance man asked the audience "Why?" and with one accord the audience shouted, "Because he is a jackass." Maybe it's time to start the movie camera again and reel off the days of bathtub gin, of murky speakeasies, of gangland killings over the division of territories, the hijacking, and the general contempt for law and order that pervaded that period. Maybe it's time again to recall the hip-pocket flask, the initiation rites of the young into that illegal, ill-starred world. Maybe it's time to remember the new-made millionaire fattening on the corpse of decency and lawfulness; the rum-runners, the doused lights, the sneaky opening and shutting of doors, the hypocrisy, and the soul sickness that the noble experiment left in its wake.

Never in the history of our Nation were we closer to degradation. We ran wild. Were we not then—all of us—a little mad? and, yes, even suicidal?

But the prohibitionists are still prohibitioning, and all their mouthings are "don'ts." Don't advertise beer and liquor. Don't serve liquor on airplanes. Don't advertise whisky over the radio or television. Don't sell liquor here, there, everywhere. Don't trust man's disciplines. In short, let's all behave as if we were weak, foolish, criminal, insatiable, intemperate, all wrapped up in cellophane to protect us from our own sense and sensibility.

In the year 388 A.D., some 1,600 years ago, a wise man said:

"If you say, 'Would there were no wine' because of the drunkards, then you must say, going on by degrees, 'Would there were no steel' because of the murderers, 'Would there were no night,' because of the thieves, 'Would there were no light,' because of the informers, and 'Would there were no women,' because of adultery."

The perennial prohibitionist is like the perennial censor: Only he is qualified to tell us what is good for us. Substitute his judgment, his taste, his wishes, for our own—and all will be well.

Discipline begins with yourself always, and not with the next fellow.

I speak strongly because I fear me that the time of fear and indecision lend themselves to the delusion that there is a panacea, that there is a cure-all that can be swallowed in one gulp, and then all will be well. This is the kind of thinking to which the prohibitionist is addicted.

How securely the prohibitionist is now hemmed in by good sense, we do not know. He'll get out if he can. He'll get out if we let him.

We are here to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the repeal of prohibition. Actually, we are celebrating the return of good sense, the return to law and order, the return to self-respect, the return to rationality. The "noble experiment" is one of the greatest insults this Nation had to endure, and its horrible consequences are, in part, still with us. There ought to be a law against laws like that.

In closing, I want to strike one note of pride. New York and its environs is today the greatest brewing center in the country, outproducing even famed Milwaukee. If we can't have good hitting baseball teams in New York, we can, at least, have good beer.

Conlon in Tribute to Irish Martyrs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article by a noted scholar of Irish history, Mr. William J. Conlon, 23 Breed Street, Lynn, Mass., which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on April 6, 1958.

The article follows:

CONLON IN TRIBUTE TO IRISH MARTYRS

(William J. Conlon of 23 Breed Street, noted scholar of Irish history and a native of Belfast, Ireland, today pays tribute to the martyrs of Easter Week 1916 in Ireland, the 42d anniversary of which is observed today.)

EASTER MARTYRS

As an Irishman born in Belfast and raised there to an age where I had to suffer and fight for my Catholic faith and for my native land's cause that was there denied, I would be happy to pay my humble tribute to the brave political martyrs of 1916 who, under God, were largely responsible for the present partial freedom Ireland now enjoys in which she controls in great measure the public properties and governmental branches that God intended every nation to enjoy within the borders of her own lands.

Who were some of these revolutionary leaders of 1916? Were they what the public press, especially in England, would have us to believe: Wild, restless insurgents, recklessly taking things into their own irreverent hands? No, indeed. They were especially in their representatives, men of calm and cultured pursuits.

There was Sir Roger Casement, knighted by the British for his consular service to them, a tall, gaunt figure with a pale, careworn face, a dark, full beard, eyes tired, but restless, feverishly glowing when animated with his passion for justice, dreamy and distant when he was silent. He was an Ulster Protestant who was converted to the one true faith shortly before he died. There was Eion MacNeill, professor of early and medieval Irish history in the National University in Dublin. There was Tom Clark, a family man, 58 years old, gray haired and spectacled. He was the son of an English soldier, but his mother was Irish.

There was Thomas MacDonagh, a gentle teacher of English literature at the National University, Dublin, and a tenderhearted poet. There was Joseph Mary Plunkett, dreamer and mystic, writer and poet, whose father was director of the National Museum of Ireland and a papal count, made so by Pope St. Pius X. There was Eamont Ceannt, a Dublin clerk, a family man and one of the then living authorities on the language and culture of Ireland. There was James Connolly, 46, a married man with a family, who had the trained knowledge of men and life that comes only to the fearless and astute poor. And there was Padraic Pearse, 36, unmarried, and calm, and beautiful with a controlled power of selfless resolution to make his country free. His mother was Irish, but his father was an Englishman who set up home in Dublin, in the humble trade of a monument mason.

PADRAIC PEARSE: WRITER AND EDUCATOR

The leader of this Irish Revolution, Padraic Pearse, whose title was Commandant General of the Army of the Irish Republic and President of the Provisional Government, was as gifted and as refined in culture as a man could be. Yet, when he spoke, even in the pouring rain at a meeting in open air, he held his thousands of hearers under the power of his idealistic integrity. All his life he suffered, as any real man must suffer, from the knowledge that his country was a slave state under the heel of the clever and propagandising English.

In Ireland, England controlled everything: the post offices, the railroads, the banks, hotels, all government offices, education, trade, army, navy—all. He vowed as a boy that this sinful and long maintained injustice would come to an end. And it would come to an end in the only way such error can come to an end: by the shedding of blood; his own blood which he vowed he would pay and did pay, though he might have to do it alone. As he said himself, "As it took the blood of Jesus, true God and true Man, to redeem the world, so it would take the blood of Irishmen to redeem Ireland from her enslaver."

Yet was this man Padraic Pearse, a man of cultured parts. He set on foot a movement that brought back, in a new way, the native Irish language that England destroyed in Ireland. He talked and wrote in Irish until he became fluent, and learned. He built himself a cottage on the west coast of Ireland, in the seacoast small town of Rosmuck, and there he learned the metaphor of the centuries of spoken Irish where best it can be learned, as he himself says, listening to mothers speaking to their babies and children.

"Since the wise men have not spoken I speak, who am only a fool * * *" was his humble and fierce way of beginning his life of public oratory. The work he intended to do, and did do, is presented to us to read in that touching and pure epic, a play he wrote called The Singer.

To bring back Irish culture and traditions, he took the practical step in 1908 of founding near Dublin his own boys' school called St. Edna's. He knew, as any man with sense knows, that boys and girls should be educated in separate schools, and in many respects in separate ways. I wish to God every educator in America, especially teachers in the lower grades of school, would read his wisdom of education taken from the wisdom of the antique world. A clear mind, in reading his plans and practice, can readily see that along the lines he pointed out and went is the solution of our present chaos and delinquency in American education. Most of what he had to say on education is found in his booklet, "The Murder Machine" in which he tells how England had managed, by her system of education in Ireland, to murder the growth and flower of Irish souls.

Padraic Pearse told his own Irish people that the system of education devised and forced upon the Irish in Ireland by their English oppressors was a black degradation of Irish children. This forced education turned out, or aimed to turn out, Irishmen who were marketable things. Not thoughtful men and women. The English conceived this system of education for Ireland because they thought it useful to their own English ends. This English system should have, by right, aimed to draw forth the students it repressed, it should have inspired, it shed; it should have hardened, it enervated. It taught something, but it formed no character.

Padraic Pearse called this English-invented system of education "the murder machine." He spoke of it as a vast, complicated, far-reaching multitude of arms carrying out mysterious and long-drawn processes of shaping and molding. It ground night and day. It obeyed immutable and predestined laws. It was as devoid of understanding, of sympathy, of imagination as any other piece of machinery that performs an appointed task. Into it fed all the raw material of Ireland. What could be fashioned grew into the English civil service. What could not be fashioned was relegated to the limbo of a bruised and shapeless thing called waste.

Padraic Pearse raged in fury against the code of morals taught in the English system of education—the mean code of the counting-houses. He wrote, "Every education must be said to fail which does not bring to the child two things: an inspiration and a certain hardening. No dream is more foolish than the dream of some sentimentalists that the reign of force is past, that the world's ancient law of unending strife has been repealed, that henceforth the first duty of every man is to be dapper. The first duty of every man is to be good and to be strong. We want again the starkness of the antique world. There will be battles silent and terrible, or loud and catastrophic, while the earth and the heavens last, and woe to him who flinches when his enemy compasses him about."

PADRAIC PEARSE: THE SOLDIER

From 1914 to 1916 the plan of the Irish Republican Brotherhood was mapped out in careful and complete form. It was a plan of uprising and revolution. England was at war with a formidable foe, the Germany of the Kaiser. The opportunity was at hand. Though there was no betrayal of the secret plans, as the day set for the blow at England drew near the leaders knew that the uprising could not meet with material success, and that it was to be a spiritual victory attaining its end by the loss of the battles and the shedding of blood. The few and poorly armed would go anyhow, despite certain failure and death. But Padraic Pearse knew, and the other brave leaders knew, that this blundering and feeble blow at English tyranny would take fire from its very failure and awaken the world to a sympathy and admiration and moral support that would result in the most tremendous gain for Irish freedom since perfidious Albion first pressed the robber's foot on Irish soil.

Padraic Pearse taught his pupils that no man can live finely and nobly who hoards life too jealously. He taught them that only those are at peace with God who are at war with the powers of darkness. He believed that teaching was a priestlike vocation, stressing the old Irish word for a teacher: a fosterer, one who fathers the growth of the minds and hearts of his children, his pupils. Padraic Pearse warned of grave mistakes: "Instead of endeavoring to raise themselves to the level of their pupils (the moral, emotional and imaginative level) teachers incline to bring their pupils down to theirs. Instead of a vision of ultimate truth, many teachers substitute the mean philosophy of this world. So many teachers either never treat of the One Book God wrote, the Holy Bible (and they are content to submit to a system that relegates this one Book to an obscure and vague book among the works of men), or else they treat of this God-written work to destroy the eternal fullness of its message and its meaning. How can teachers face God at the hour of their death never having told their students of the necessity and glory or Mary, God's own virgin mother, or never having told their open-hearted intellectual children where God can be found and had: in the blessed sacrament of the altars, truly present but hidden there.

Padraic Pearse yearned for freedom, especially in education, as a parched man yearns for water. "Our English-conceived and controlled educational system in Ireland needs the divine breath that moves through free peoples," he wrote in 1914, "a breath that no man of Ireland has felt in his nostrils for so many centuries, the breath that once blew through our streets and kindled, as wine kindles, the hearts of those who truly teach and learn."

There seems to be a parallel between this uprising of Irishmen at Easter 1916—doomed to failure and death—and the much larger and more evidently religious uprisings called The Crusades. These nine Crusades—coming at planned intervals from 1095 to 1272—were what the worldly prudent would call foolhardy and wastefully hazardous military exploits doomed to failure. Yet are they written into history, and into the Books of Heaven, for the glory they won that is not of this world. Hundreds of thousands of Christian men left all to march their humble and suffering ways to redeem the Holy Land from the possession of the infidels who believed neither in Christ as God nor in Mary as God's Virgin Mother. "God wills it," was their marching cry; and on and on they tramped in almost certain foreknowledge of the doom that awaited their sacrifice. Yet is their glory remembered, even in the writings as such a writer as Baimes. "Numberless nations arise," says the great historian about the Catholic Crusades "they march across deserts, bury themselves in unacquainted countries, expose themselves to all the rigors of climate and seasons—to deliver a tomb. Grand and immortal movement, where hundreds of na-

tions advance to certain death, not in pursuit of miserable self-interest, not to find an abode in milder and more fertile countries, not for earthly advantages, but inspired only by a jealous desire to possess the tomb of Him who expired on a cross for the salvation of the human race. When compared with this, what becomes of the lofty deeds of the Greeks chanted by Homer? Greece arises to avenge an injured husband: Europe to redeem the spulchre of God."

Easter Monday 1916 was a holiday in Ireland. All was sunny and quiet.

The Irish volunteers, those who were going through with the uprising despite failure of the full plan, were on the march. In Dublin the volunteers there assembled at their various stations. A party of them, hundreds strong, marched along O'Connell street at noon. The Metropolitan Dublin Police, suspecting nothing, cleared the way for them. Such parades were not unusual in Ireland. The marching men halted before the English-controlled and English-owned General Post Office. At a word of command, revolvers in hand, they rushed into the building and took up their quarters there. The tricolor of the flag of the Irish Republic was raised on the Post Office flagstaff. The Dublin police, being unarmed, withdrew. The English military, under General John Maxwell, was called out. It took some days before the English soldiers could capture the Post Office from the insurgents; and even then it was accomplished mainly by the English setting the building on fire and burning it down. Many lives were lost on both sides. The Irish leaders surrendered and were all shot without trial and their bodies buried in lime. Among these was the Commandant-General of the Irish group, Padraic Pearse.

CONCLUSION

Padraic Pearse has done his work. No soldier was ever more sure of his purpose nor of the death that he must die. All his life he schooled himself to this one, this seemingly wasted sacrifice of his life for his country. No one could swerve him from his appointed task. He steeled himself against the call of his heart for a loved wife and children and a home.

"Naked I saw thee, O beauty of beauties, but I blinded my eyes for fear I should fail," he wrote of his own heart. He feared that wife or friends too close to him might distract him from the giving of his all for the freedom of Ireland.

I would like to close this encomium of a hero with a few observations. No man whoever lived was less a hypocrite than Padraic Pearse. No man could be more gentle by nature, more loving of children, more admiring of women. The one word that suits him best to describe the whole of his life from the cradle to the grave was soldier.

Anyone who takes a plane from America and lands at Shannon Airport in this year of Our Lord 1958 will sense immediately that he has arrived in a country alive with a newfound freedom and life. For this new spirit of liberty that Ireland now knows all free men can thank Padriac Pearse and his fellow heroes for the blood they shed to bring the wondrous glory on. But the task is not yet done. As long as the six northern counties of Ireland are kept severed from their own people by the direct and deliberate military power of the English usurper, the ghosts of Padraic Pearse and his brave army will haunt the dreams of all free men in all the corners of the free earth. Make no mistake about it: England is forcing the hand of true Irishmen in the old land, and if England will not yield to national justice in the calm and ordered ways of peace, then Irish blood will once more be shed to bring the cause of Padraic Pearse and of Ireland to the full circle of its Godwilled fruit of all Ireland free.

How Padraic Pearse would have scoffed at the spirit of the modern times when we, as Holy Scripture says we will be, are ruled by the effeminate; and by the effeminate I mean what Holy Scripture means: The weak, the passive, the compromising—those who live in the flabby spirit of the unbrave. Such comfortable and odious effeminacy is evidenced everywhere, even in a weekly run by the Jesuits called America. As a sample of what such a periodical can dish out to the youth of our land, I give this one example out of a possible thousand. Treating of a book published by the MacMillan Co. called (God save the mark) "The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell," the editor of America allows the reviewer to say in the March 28, 1958, issue: "The hero (Oliver Cromwell) is not likely to be acknowledged even by those who read this admirable book." That is the language of the effeminate, the kind of language that Padraic Pearse would rise in fierce anger against because he was a man.

One more word and I am through. Padraic Pearse had one favorite passage from Holy Scripture which he quoted frequently. It was the theme song of his brief 36 years. The passage is taken from the Holy Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ according to St. Luke, the 11th chapter, verses 21, 22, and 23:

"When a strong man armed keepeth his court, those things are in peace which he possesseth.

"But if a stronger than he come upon him, and overcome him; he will take away all his armor wherein he trusted, and will distribute his spoils.

"He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth."

May the brave, pure soul of Padraic Pearse and all the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God and Mary rest forever in peace. Amen.

WILLIAM J. CONLON.

LYNN, MASS.

United States Cockroach Exhibit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from a recent issue of the Washington (D. C.) Daily News is inserted in the RECORD for the information of Members of Congress and in the hope that someone will explain why cockroaches—American variety—should be exhibited at an international fair:

UNITED STATES COCKROACH EXHIBIT ASSURED FOR BRUSSELS FAIR

The United States will exhibit 36 cockroaches at the Brussels World Fair after all.

The exhibit, prepared by the National Science Foundation as part of a display of United States scientific progress, was shipped to Brussels by boat several weeks ago.

But the cockroaches arrived in no condition to be displayed. In fact, they had all been squashed.

(Science Foundation officials suspect some seaman with little appreciation of science stepped on them.)

When Dr. Thomas O. Jones, assistant chief of National Science Foundation's office of scientific information, learned of the fate of the cockroaches, he telephoned New York, San Francisco and finally Minneapolis to get a new exhibit.

Scientists at the University of Minnesota finally agreed to grow another batch of cockroaches.

Conditions in the German Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have received a thoughtful letter from Miss Lois A. Bottoni, a resident of Milwaukee, Wis., who is teaching in the American dependent school in Worms, Germany. She tells of some of the serious problems American teachers have in attempting to do a good job of teaching American children in the 180 schools we operate in Europe.

I know from my visit to Germany last fall, and my study of the German educational system compared with ours, how important it is that these schools be the show window of American democracy in Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Bottoni's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WORMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
APO-28, IN CARE OF POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y., March 11, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am Lois Bottoni from Milwaukee. At present I am teaching in the American dependent school in Worms, Germany, which is one of about 180 schools in Europe. There are more than 80,000 American children attending overseas schools run by the American Government. These children of servicemen are certainly entitled to the same education that is available in the States, but unfortunately they are not receiving it, in many cases due to inadequate numbers of teachers, and inadequate facilities. At present 75 percent of the teachers leave the system after only 1 or 2 years. The educational loss is unbelievable, and the financial loss to the Government is no less great.

The Department of Defense conducted a survey and study of the schools in 1956, and they published a report which listed needed changes requiring legislation, but we haven't seen a bill resulting from that report. Congress has not had a chance to act.

We are not even paid as teachers are in the States. Unless we teach all the time, summer, Christmas, Easter, we may not get paid even our yearly salary. Teachers are given a GS-7 rating, equivalent to a rank of a sergeant or second lieutenant, but we cannot rise above that, regardless of education, degree, competence, or years of experience. How can the schools possibly have stability when the teachers feel so insecure that they dare not remain with the schools? Most of the schools start with a completely new faculty each year.

Here are some of the recommendations for legislative action, the result of a study by the Overseas Teachers Association (an NEA affiliate):

1. Establishment in Washington of a central office, headed by a civilian educator, wholly responsible for the Department of Defense.

2. One set of rules and regulations, with one interpretation, defining equal benefits

and responsibilities for all teachers, and not subject to variation by local authority.

3. A written contract for all professional employees. Contracts for 1 year.

4. Establishment of a single salary schedule based upon training and experience, quoting the salary to be earned during the school year. Suggested salary of first year teachers with bachelor's degree is $4,950, 11 annual increments of $250 each bringing the maximum salary to $7,700 for the 12th and succeeding years. Extra credit for advanced degrees.

We are constantly being visited by German school groups and educators and we are under constant comparison with our German counterparts. In Germany, where schools and education receive such respect, it behooves us to present the best possible picture of America through our schools and teachers.

As one of the voters from your State, I ask your utmost cooperation in bringing this matter before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LOIS A. BOTTONI.

An Intelligent Plea for Fair Treatment of Our Accredited Private Business Schools, Their Teachers and Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, for consideration by the Members, a substantial part of a most intelligently appealing letter, on behalf of our private-business schools, recently forwarded to me by Mrs. Dorothy L. Salter, the distinguished president and director of a private secretarial school in my home city.

The facts and contentions outlined by Mrs. Salter serve to remind us that the independent business schools have, indeed, contributed greatly to our national educational needs and are deserving of equitable treatment with colleges and universities in any Federal aid to education program.

I understand that representatives of the National Association and Council of Business Schools are planning to call on Members of Congress next week in connection with pending legislation, and I earnestly hope you will all be able to find the time to listen to them in accord with our responsibility of being fair to all segments of our American society.

The letter follows:

SALTER SECRETARIAL SCHOOL,
Worcester, Mass., March 17, 1958.

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONOHUE: As the president of an independent business school serving the people of this area, I am greatly concerned about the wording of the various educational bills being introduced in the Congress of the United States. I note that these bills do not include the private schools in the matter of Federal aid.

I think I hardly need tell you of the role this type of school has played in helping thousands of young people, and some not so young, to go forth with a light step and a confident mien, capable of earning a good livelihood and making a real contribution to the sound business structure of our American way of life.

The Salter school has been in operation for over 20 years and has trained thousands of students who have gone forth to assume positions of trust and importance in communities both near and far. The private business schools of the United States train, according to reliable figures, more than 500,000 students a year. Certainly, such an important facet of education should not be overlooked in the consideration of bills dealing with education. Actually, our schools are community colleges which strain every effort to meet the needs of the people in a given area; and we do it without calling on a taxpayer to appropriate a single dollar in subsidies. In fact, we contribute to the tax coffers on every phase of operation and, so far, have kept our heads above water—though how we do it, I don't know, when the major colleges of the country are almost all operating in the red. How much longer we can hold out with the competition of unlimited public funds stacked against us is a serious matter.

My question then is, "Why have the business schools not been included in the various bills now under consideration?"

Graduation from a high school is as essential to entering a private business school as it is to entering an institution of higher learning. Why should there be any discrimination against allowing tax deductions for tuition payments to a student entering a college from one who enters a private business school? In fact, the need for such relief is more apparent for students attending our schools than institutions of higher learning. As a general rule, our students come from the lower income brackets where the cost of an education makes it difficult for families to pay. Certainly we must not only raise the standard of living in the upper segment of our population, but we must also bring up the standard of living for the lesser skilled persons, so that they too can enjoy prosperity. Any tax relief which would discriminate against students attending our institutions would be grossly unfair.

We note that there are bills to allow teachers to deduct costs for additional courses of instruction. What about the teachers in the business schools? We attempt to train our teachers and to raise the standards of our teachers as high as teachers in institutions of higher learning. Why should these teachers who perform a useful service for over half a million young people every year be discriminated against when they wish to take additional courses to do a better job? Remember that our schools train many secretaries and accountants. It is necessary for our teachers constantly to do a better job and thereby turn out a better product for the American businessman. Certainly any bill that would allow teachers to deduct for special courses should include all types of teachers.

Still another classification of bills deals with aid to institutions of higher learning for the teaching of scientific and engineering subjects. The Salter School belongs to the National Association and Council of Business Schools in Washington, D. C. This organization represents over 500 of the leading business colleges throughout the country and has been in existence for over 45 years. The association has had numerous discussions with engineers and scientists and we have found that in many cases there appears to be no shortage of engineers or scientists but they tell us that they do need trained secretarial personnel who understand technical terms, as well as technical aides. This would free them from some of the routine work which could better be done by skilled persons trained to help along their particular lines.

As a result of these discussions, the business school is now developing courses of instruction to train these people to meet the needs of the engineers and scientists. The private business school, because of its unique flexibility, is the only type of institution that can adjust its program to meet the present need for these lesser skilled personnel. We feel that in any legislation the role of the private business school should be considered.

Representatives of our association will be glad to call on you to outline in person what the business school field is doing in greater detail than in this letter. I am sure that after listening to them, you will be impressed with the contribution made by the independent business college. May I just call to your attention the fact that the private business schools under the World War II GI training program trained 3,500,000 veterans, as compared with 2,200,000 trained by the colleges and universities.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. DOROTHY L. SALTER,
President.

Citizenship: A Two-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

CITIZENSHIP: A TWO-WAY STREET

The United States Supreme Court has been hearing three cases which involve the power of the Federal Government to regulate issuance of passports for foreign travel.

Once again the cases concern Communists. And once again questioning from the bench reflects that strange state of mind in the present Court which has inflated to vast proportions the concept of "individual rights," while undermining that vital companion concept: individual responsibility.

Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin told the court: "Sometimes the interest of the individual has to give way to the interest of the whole community." To which Chief Justice Warren replied: "But does your right as a free American to travel have to give way?"

We do not presume to anticipate the judgment of the Court in these cases. But the public comment of the Chief Justice is illuminating because it follows the general line of recent Court reasoning which has leaned over backward to the point of somersault in favor of Communists, rapists, thugs, and murderers, while tying the hands of the Government in its efforts to combat crime and Communists and protect the rights of the vast law-abiding majority of the American people.

In these cases a major point is whether the Secretary of State may deny passports to Communists, to supporters of the Communist movement and to those who refuse to say whether they are Communists or not. When a defense attorney argued that the State Department had no right to halt travel by Communists, even Justice Frankfurter suggested that the State Department was entitled to answers to some questions.

Right there is the broad issue: whether citizenship is a two-way street; whether all of us have obligations—as well as "rights."

It is, of course, fantastic to argue, as a few have, that our Supreme Court is under

Communist influence. Even Chief Justice Warren, we are sure, shares our complete abhorrence of the Soviet system of tyranny and terror. No; what we are dealing with is something more subtle—and therefore more serious—because it is less easily understood by most people.

We are dealing with a biased viewpoint which goes to the other extreme from the Soviet system. In contrast to the rigid Communist discipline, it would virtually abolish discipline. Instead of making the State supreme and the individual nothing, it would make the individual supreme and the Government increasingly incapable of fulfilling its responsibilities.

Traditional American doctrine has followed a middle way—balancing the rights of the individual with those of the State, to the end of promoting the general welfare as the Constitution commands. The present Court has all but abandoned that middle position.

The middle way recognizes what one court has called a natural right to travel. It rejects dictatorial and arbitrary restrictions upon that right. But it also rejects the idea that the right is unlimited and unqualified, and that those who exercise it have no obligations to their country in so doing.

Measures have been offered in Congress to curb the power of the Supreme Court, since the Constitution limits the appellate jurisdiction of the Court to such regulations "as the Congress shall make." This newspaper opposes those measures. They are too extreme on their own account.

Yet there is no denying that the Supreme Court has fallen sharply in its enjoyment of public confidence. We would, however, prefer to see the Court provide its own remedy—through self-restraint, thus restoring those checks and balances which have kept our constitutional system healthy and strong. To that end, we would like to see the Court rediscover the fact that citizenship is a two-way street.

A Child's Heritage From Theodore Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we remember Theodore Roosevelt as a statesman and as a soldier but the Cross Street School in Williston Park, N. Y., one of the fine schools in my congressional district, pays homage to him for his legacy to the youth of our country.

This is what the little children in the third grade of the Cross Street School have written about Theodore Roosevelt in their yearbook Cross Currents:

LETTERS OF T. R. ROOSEVELT TO HIS CHILDREN

Mr. Roosevelt wrote to his children very often. He liked to write to them when they were away at school. Then when he went away on trips he always told them about the animals he saw and often brought home a pet for them—one time a dog and another time a badger. In the margins of his letters, Mr. Roosevelt would draw pictures for his children to show what he was writing them. He always called them pet names in his letters, like "Dear Pussycat", "Dear Ethelkins," or "Dear Archie Boy." I think Mr. Roosevelt liked his children very much. You could tell that from the way he wrote his letters.

We took a trip to Sagamore Hill, Mr. Roosevelt's home on October 15, 1957. There were many old-time things there. We saw an old-fashioned telephone on the wall, an old-fashioned sewing machine in the nursery that you had to pump with your feet, and there were old-time carriages in a barn outside which horses used to pull. In one of his letters to his children, Mr. Roosevelt said his horses were afraid of the new machines which were the automobiles which were just beginning to be used.

There was a special room on the third floor of Sagamore Hill where Mr. Roosevelt kept his guns and swords. There was a shovel there which was used to dig for the first railroad, and the button Mr. Roosevelt pressed for the first train to start. There were all kinds of flags in this big room from all over the world, and many kings and famous people sent presents to Mr. Roosevelt when he was President.

Later we went to Teddy Roosevelt's grave and there we saw a stone where something he said was carved on it. He said, "Keep your eyes on the stars and keep your feet on the ground."

We talked about this and decided that Mr. Roosevelt meant that we must dream about things we would like to do someday, but we have to work hard to make the dreams come true.

And this is what their parents have to say:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND THE PTA

Your PTA is happy to have been invited to contribute a page to Cross Currents and since your theme this year is Theodore Roosevelt we offer you another interest of this very remarkable man.

Way back in 1897, a group known as the National Congress of Mothers was formed to work for the welfare of children and their right to protection and a healthly, happy home and an education. That national congress was the beginning of what you now know as the parent-teacher association or PTA and Theodore Roosevelt, then Governor of New York was one of its ardent supporters.

In 1899, he agreed to serve on the advisory council of the national congress and held the chairmanship from 1900 to his death in 1919. Later he explained his undeviating support of the organization saying, "I feel that your congress of mothers is the association for which I care most among all associations of either sex with which I have been brought into contact."

While he was President he arranged to invite representatives from every nation to attend the First International Conference in America on the Welfare of the Child, under the auspices of the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.

He also advocated the participation of the father saying, "Now and then the people forget that exactly as the mother must help the breadwinner by being a good housewife, so the father, in his turn must in every way back up the mother in helping to bring up the children." He would be glad to know that the PTA now has many men included in its 10,694,474 members.

Carlton Cadettes Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess it was my pleasure to entertain in Washington the senior members of the Carlton Cadettes of the Jefferson Davis High School, of Houston.

Forty-one members of this excellent marching group spent 4 days in Washington. It was my great honor to welcome them, and to manage a vist around the Capitol.

The young ladies also visited Mount Vernon, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, the Bureau of Engraving, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other places of historical interest in this area.

They were accompanied by two capable and charming sponsors, Mrs. Lorraine Nix and Miss Frances Newton.

Mr. Speaker, the growing practice of school groups throughout the country visiting the Nation's Capital is a wonderful thing. A visit to Washington gives to these young people a deeper appreciation of our Government and what it means to every citizen. The great buildings and monuments here are more than stone and mortar. They are living symbols of our great Government. I wish every school group in the country could have an opportunity of visiting Washington.

The young ladies who were a part of the Carlton Cadettes visiting Washington were: Mary Helen Adame, Michelle Beere, Elaine Blum, Sandra Bond, Vivian Brewer, Diane Camp, Edith Collings, Beverly Cox, Judy Dawson, Barbara Foster, Jo Ann Francis, Peggy Frantis, Jerri Glodfelty, Jane Hight, Sylvia Holder, Lee Ann Jett, Janet Kasper, Sandra Kreinop, LaJuan Krus, Sally McClung, Barbara McKeehan, Sharon Merchant, Nita Monkres, Betty Montgomery, Kay Moseley, Liz Nias, Carol Pettigrew, Joyce Robinson, Mary Ann Sands, Carol Schroder, Mignon Seymour, Simone Simon, Pat Smith, Wanda Speer, Barbara Spencer, Patsy Stewart, Lynn Taylor, Nancie Truss, Joy Walkinshaw, Ann Wilkerson, Margie Zarco.

Selling American Labor Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, another specific example of the unfavorable effects of our foreign trade policy as presently administered is clearly outlined in the following letter from one of the major industries that has for many years supported a large labor population in my community:

AMERICAN CAR
AND FOUNDRY DIVISION,
ACF INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Huntington, W. Va., March 31, 1958.

Hon. WILL E. NEAL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing on a subject of extreme importance to our company and to its employees.

In the billions of dollars of funds provided by the United States since 1950 for foreign aid—no inconsequential part of which has been used for the purchase of railway cars—our industry has not shared to any appreciable extent primarily as the result of price

advantages enjoyed by our foreign competitors.

The domestic car building industry currently is in a depressed state. In a 2-year period its backlog has dropped from 69,000 cars to 15,800 cars. During this period, workers employed by the industry have decreased approximately 50 percent. Our plant located at Huntington employs 1,200 workers and is already affected.

This places extreme importance upon the foreign business which involves the use of American dollars to purchase equipment. We believe that prompt action should be taken to reduce or halt foreign-aid purchases of railroad cars abroad and to build them in the United States.

It has come to our attention that legislation will very likely be introduced shortly amending the Mutual Security Act to provide that some substantial percentage of the dollar amount of such purchases of railroad freight and passenger cars be built in the United States.

The importance of such legislation to our company and its employees is, I believe, obvious. We earnestly urge that you give it your study and support.

Naturally, we should welcome the opportunity of supplying you with any information that you might desire in evaluating the need for action in the light of the desperate situation facing the American railroad car building industry.

Sincerely,

W. B. CHELLIS,
Works Manager.

Federal Support for Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 I asked permission to reprint an article from the St. Paul Dispatch by Robert Johnson on a statement by Dean Walter W. Cook, of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, on the subject of industry's stake in our educational system. Under unanimous consent, I insert Dean Cook's full remarks on which Mr. Johnson's article was based:

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

(By Walter W. Cook, dean, College of Education)

The American people are convinced, and have been throughout their history, that the quality of our educational system determines the future welfare of their children and the ultimate fate of our Nation. They also believe that our power to produce, our high standard of living, our rating as the first nation of the world, should be sufficient proof to all that the educational philosophy of this Nation has been sound.

The prime strength of our educational system has come from the determination of the people to make certain that their children have better educational opportunities than they themselves had enjoyed. The great strength of our educational system also comes from the millions of dedicated and inspired teachers who have worked their 50- and 60-hour weeks underpaid in all cases, and unappreciated in some. The support of public education has always been in the too little category, coming largely from small property owners through an outmoded property tax. Today, with over 25 percent of the population of this Nation in school, we spend less than 4 percent of our national income on our schools, including colleges and universities—a total of less than $13 billion.

We spent 2 billion more than this sum on smoking and drinking alone. We spent more than twice this sum on owner-operated automobiles.

The last Gallop poll to determine how the American public felt about Federal support for the public schools was reported in the Twin City papers on January 22, 1956. Sixty-seven percent of the votes were for Federal support. Now, who blocks Federal legislation of this type? The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers are two of the top blockers. And these blockers have, thus far, been effective. The Federal support programs that have been introduced have been defeated. On March 22, 1958, the Twin City papers carried the notice that the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce opposed Federal scholarships for science education as neither necessary or desirable. It is doubtful that this reflects the opinion of the rank and file of businessmen.

Our Nation has a long history of Federal support for the public schools. The Federal Constitution leaves the control of education to the States and the States have delegated this control to local boards of education. The Federal Government created the common schools and the State universities by setting aside 2 sections of land in each township for the support of common schools and 2 townships of land in each State to found a university. Some States received more. Abraham Lincoln signed the first Land-Grant College Act to teach "such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts." Federal support for vocational education was inaugurated during World War I. Since that time there has been no basic Federal legislation in support of public education. We have built highways, homes, dams, electric powerplants, hospitals, and many other important things, but our fundamental institution—public education—has been neglected.

The avalanche of postwar babies is just passing into high school. Many communities have completely exhausted their local resources in building elementary schools. Within the next 8 years, high school and college enrollments will double. Less than half of the States have the financial resources to pay for the schools that they are going to need. Where are they going to get help?

We must continue our all-out local support, but if the Federal Government were to divert 4 percent of the national income into public education this would enable us to have really superior schools, it would still require only one-third of the amount we are now spending on defense, and less than one-third of what we are planning to spend on highways. Actually, the Federal Government now acts as a collection agency for the States in some cases. The highway program is a case in point; the Federal Government is in a better position, in some situations, to tax for them than is a local governmental unit. This is more economical; it is socially desirable; it is practical.

But the problem of education is more than an adequate plant. There are not enough teachers to do the job. The high-school teacher meets classes 5 hours a day plus study halls, homerooms, preparation for classes, setting up laboratory equipment, counseling, plus extra-curricular activities, reports, and paper work. The typical teacher meets from 150 to 250 pupils each day. The pupils turn in homework, problems in mathematics and science, essays, themes, reports. If we allow the teacher 1 minute to mark a paper, it is a 3 hour job; if papers take 5 minutes, it is a 15-hour job. Working a 50-hour week, the teacher still cannot have the satisfaction of a job well done.

A senior high-school pupil typically carries 4 subjects; he could very well carry 5, and many could carry 6. This would require at least 30 percent more teachers even if we maintained the 50-hour-per-week load. If we worked teachers no more than we should and pupils as much as we should, we would need 50 percent more teachers for our present enrollments.

If America is to have the type of educational system we should have, and as good as the people want their children to have, we will have to double our expenditures for public education in the next 10 years. It is as simple as this. The job can only be done if the Federal Government steps in and bears a share of the cost.

And the returns to the entire Nation will be great. Let me give a single illustration that isn't too well known. During the Korean war, only 1.3 percent of Minnesota recruits were rejected for intellectual incompetence. This was the best record for any State. The average for the Nation was 16 percent. But in 14 States, more than 20 percent were rejected, and in one State 56 percent of the recruits were sent home. We—all of us in the 48 States—are vitally concerned with the strength of this Nation. We are also concerned with the quality of education that is available for our children no matter where they are. Society as a whole—manufacturers as well as teachers as well as farmers—demands an increasingly large number of educated and trained citizens to provide the services and skills and goods that characterize our civilization.

Should Bomb Tests Be Continued?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, arguments for and against the continued testing of nuclear bombs have been whirling around us and the following article, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on Friday, April 11, sets forth a view which certainly must be given every serious consideration:

MANY GOOD REASONS FOR UNITED STATES BOMB TESTS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Communist-conceived and pacifist-supported movement to ban further nuclear tests still seems to be growing.

Fanned by the horrendous warnings from many scientists, more and more sincere Americans are coming to believe that bomb testing by our Government is a sort of irresponsible fooling with race suicide.

There is of course no hope of convincing some of them that our administration is not risking race suicide. They want to believe that it is. But I am convinced that if most thoughtful Americans learned the facts, they would cease their protests and stand with Western leaders in the determination to continue testing a while longer. These facts are available to anyone who seeks them.

Here are some of the more important.

First, the American administration is convinced that it could, if it cose, set off new bombs under circumstances which would render detection all but impossible. Therefore, it believes the Russians could do the same.

There are three methods of detection: seismic (earth shocks), magnetic, and sound waves. An underground test leaves no detectable magnetic or sound traces. It does create seismic disturbances which can be registered at considerable distances. But such disturbances can be made so slight that, except to people informed in advance and watching for them, they cannot be distinguished from small earthquakes which are going on most of the time.

Therefore—our administration thinks—they cannot be surely detected. Hence, any agreement with the Soviets that does not provide for inspectors everywhere over the vast Soviet territories, could be violated with impunity by the Kremlin. When Moscow offers full inspection, that will be another story. So far it has not done so.

United States experts have other reasons, however, for wishing to continue nuclear testing a while longer.

One is, the real need for certain further information. For instance, what will be the effect of an H-bomb detonated by a rocket flying above the earth's atmosphere? The results will be important in case a struggle for outer space should ever develop—which is possible.

Another reason is taking some of the horror from nuclear weapons by making them "clean"—that is realtively free of the fallout danger.

Moreover, some American experts would favor our telling the Russians how to make clean bombs once we have them. They assume that even the Kremlin men would prefer to survive a nuclear war—and fallout is no respecter of persons.

So long as the United States has only "dirty" bombs the cynical Russians may figure that our humanitarian President and his generals would hesitate to give the order to use them, since their use would mean the deaths of millions of Russians as well as friendly allies in Russian-occupied capitals like Warsaw, Prague, etc. But once we have clean bombs, the homicidal effects will be limited pretty strictly to the targets. Therefore, American leaders will feel freer to retaliate against any sort of Communist attack—and thereby contribute greatly to the deterrent value of the weapons.

In short, for several compelling reasons, the United States administration seems justified in continuing the tests of nuclear weapons somewhat longer. And those who, for whatever reason, urge immediate stoppage are—consciously or unconsciously—working against the best interests of the United States and the other free peoples.

Don't Like Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Record-Herald, of Indianola, Iowa, on Thursday, April 10, 1958, and which was a reprint of an article which appeared in the Winterset Madisonian of Winterset, Iowa:

DON'T LIKE BENSON

Moore and More in Winterset Madisonian—We don't like Benson. Federal Reserve Board figures show Iowa least hurt of any State in the current recession.

We don't like Benson. Madison County bank deposits are more than half a million ahead of last year.

We don't like Benson. Sales-tax figures show a gradual increase in purchases over the past 4 years in Madison County.

We don't like Benson. Last week 43 Hamp pigs sold at $29.60 per hundredweight. Six gilts brought $75 per head.

We don't like Benson. Fourteen steer calves brought $29.30 per hundredweight. Ten Whiteface cows brought $210 per head and steers topped at $38.50 in Chicago.

We don't like Benson. Depressions have always started with low farm prices.

What's the matter with Mr. Benson? He isn't being fair to us.

We need a whipping boy out here. We thought we had one, but we can't keep on this way. Please, Mr. Benson, do something.

Only 11 Weeks To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a grim reminder to those who feel there is no need for vigorous action to get America out of the present serious recession.

It is an article by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, which appeared in this morning's Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald, entitled "Only 11 Weeks To Go":

ONLY 11 WEEKS TO GO

(By Joseph Alsop)

DETROIT.—Here in this great capital of the limping motor industry, the Eisenhower administration's wait-and-see approach to the depression does not look very sensible.

If you want to be convinced, just drop in at UAW Local No. 3, across from the big, dingy old Dodge motor plant in Hamtramck. Then spend a day or so ringing the door bells of the endless rows of little 1- and 2-family houses inhabited by Dodge and other Chrysler Co. employees in Hamtramck and East Detroit. What you see in them is the cruel letdown of a vast army of industrial workers by the system they have been taught to trust implicitly.

The morning I went there, Pat Quinn, the president of the Dodge local, was leading a protest march of jobless auto workers to the State capital in Lansing. So all activity temporarily centered in the small office of "Big Pete" Telisky, the local's tall, sallow-faced, hot-tempered vice president.

I had hardly introduced myself when Richard, a still-young man who had been working for Dodge for 10 years as a crane and elevator-hoist operator, rather hesitantly entered to ask "Big Pete" if he knew "anywhere they were hirin'." "Big Pete" said bitterly: "Boy, you cant' buy a job in this damn town." Richard nodded disconsolately, as though this were the answer he expected.

It was a rough answer for him, all the same. His father, who worked for Dodge for a quarter century, had bought a house on time just before he died 5 years ago. In those days, both father and son were working, so the payments of $75 a month had been easy to carry. Richard had managed pretty well alone, too, when he was bringing home $80 a week. The car, the furniture, the washer and dryer, and television were all paid for, and he had kept his mother and younger brother fairly comfortable.

But now the little family's whole income was down to $42 a week of unemployment benefits. Those house payments took nearly half. Richard had "tried everything, even janitor." So had his 17-year-old brother, "but they ain't even hirin' boys in stores." And worst of all, "we only got another 11 weeks of benefits to go, and after that there'll be nothing but the welfare."

Richard was followed by sturdy old Charles, 15 years a torch welder, who "done all the show jobs for the company except 1 year." After Charles came Herman, the slow-spoken southerner, who was threatened with repossession of his car. The procession went on all morning, and all the men who came had the same essential problem.

All suddenly had their income cut in half, after 9 or 10 or 11 years of steady work on the same job. Like most of Detroit's other tens of thousands of jobless auto workers, all were now between 9 and 13 weeks away from the end of their unemployment benefits, when there would be no income at all. All had time payments to make, which they could hardly carry even now. Richard, indeed, was the luckiest, for no other man I saw had paid for everything except his house. The Detroit welfare department will at least try to help Richard keep his house, by offering the mortgage-holder the money allowed for relief recipients' rent.

Ringing doorbells along the gray streets, the story was again the same. Only here, it was grimmer and more poignant, for one actually saw the furniture and the washers and the cars and the homes that were in danger. One saw the children "who drink water now," and the harassed wives who "didn't know how they could manage much longer," and the men who seemed unable to overcome their surprise at being at home on a working day.

As time went on, one became obsessed by the thought of "the end of the 26 weeks" (of benefits), which all these people spoke of with a sort of defeated dread.

Maybe Congress will pass the bill adding another 13 weeks to the 26. Maybe automotive employment will pick up again, when the time for the new models comes in September. But even so, half the things these people have gained will be lost in the interval, because "we just can't meet the payments and feed the kids."

Then, if there are no jobs to be had when the benefit period ends, the whole pattern of life of all these people will simply fall into squalid ruin. And they stand, remember, for many hundreds of thousands of jobless industrial workers in scores of other cities besides Detroit.

Closeup of Our Foreign Aid Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to to me there is a tendency in Congress to oversimplify and overgeneralize in discussing our foreign-aid policies. However, the realities do not correspond to any black or white pattern.

The real need, I believe, is for a constant reanalysis of these policies in the hope that we may wisely improve and

revise them to meet changing conditions.

A most penetrating analysis of our foreign-aid dilemma, written by Peggy and Pierre Streit, appeared as a lead article in the April 13 issue of the New York Times magazine. This article should be "must" reading for those who are seriously concerned about the future of our foreign-aid programs.

The article follows:

CLOSEUP OF THE FOREIGN AID DILEMMA

(By Peggy and Pierre Streit)

Many Americans, both in and out of government, have tended to look to the American foreign-aid program for a solution to major problems confronting the United States in the Middle East. They have seen in economic aid a means of bringing greater stability to pro-western governments of the area, thereby reinforcing the strength of the free world; and of satisfying the growing demands of the common man of the Middle East for a better life, thereby reducing his susceptibility to the blandishments of communism. In short, foreign aid has been seen as one way of serving the long-term interests both of the Middle East and of the United States.

Ten years of American assistance, however, do not seem to have brought these results. The Middle East is still in ferment. Despite millions of dollars the United States has spent in the area, governments the United States has backed are still insecure, the people the United States has tried to help are still destitute and restive. There is little doubt that in the past 10 years, American prestige in the area has been shaken and that Soviet penetration, both military and economic, has made headway. Why?

Possibly part of the answer to this perplexing and exceedingly complex question can be found by examining the American economic-aid program as it operates in a small Iranian village which we shall call Shahabad.

Shahabad is typical of many Iranian villages in appearance, in the subsistence level of its people and in the pattern of its economic life, for it is subject to an age-old feudal-like system by which the villagers, as tenant farmers, work land owned by a landlord in return for a percentage of the crop.

And Iran is typical of a number of countries of the Middle East: the bulk of its population is underfed, sick, and illiterate; the land is ruled by a few men who, to a large degree, represent neither the people nor the people's interests.

Five years ago, when an American technical-assistance program was begun in Shahabad its inhabitants were undernourished, dirty, illiterate, superstitious, and plagued by smallpox, dysentery, tuberculosis, venereal disease, and malaria. The peasants earned their meager diet, which consisted almost exclusively of bread and tea, as tenant farmers. Their landlord owned and managed their village and its affairs.

A primary objective of the aid team was to help the peasant improve his agricultural techniques and hence gain more food. Therefore, one of the first technical-assistance projects was the improvement of local crops. In 3 years, the use of an inexpensive insecticide wiped out an age-old wheat scourage and, as a result, the crop yield was more than doubled. In theory this would have seemed a sizable boon to the peasants. In fact, it was not, because of Shahabad's ancient land-tenure system.

Under the system, one-fifth of the crop is allotted to the man who owns the land; one-fifth to the man supplying seed; one-fifth to the man supplying water; one-fifth to the man supplying beasts of burden; one-fifth to the man supplying labor. In Shahabad, as in much of Iran, the impoverished villagers supplies only the labor, and hence receives only one-fifth of the land's fruits. His share of the yield doubled but it seemed ranklingly small alongside that of the landlord who, as supplier of land, seed, water, and beasts, received a doubled four-fifths share.

Another way in which American agricultural technicians sought to benefit the farmer directly was to teach him what any American farmer knows; that maintenance of the land, building of irrigation ditches, and leveling the earth are part of the vital job of making soil endure and produce. The Iranian farmer understood this but did nothing because in Shahabad, as in much of Iran, land is rotated by the landlord from farmer to farmer annually. Few men will find any incentive for long-range work in a field that another man tills the following season.

American aid technicians also tried to improve and increase the peasant's bread and tea diet by persuading him to cultivate small vegetable plots in his yard. In some villages this innovation was successful. But in Shahabad, the landlord refused to allow water to be used on vegetable beds, preferring to have it used on a cash crop from which he too could benefit.

What do these examples indicate? They indicate, among other things, that an assistance program that makes sense by western standards may not yield the expected results when applied to a society that has not reached the same level of social and political development. In Shahabad specifically, deep-rooted, long-range economic improvements will, to a substantial degree, be frustrated until there is social and political evolution in the system.

If this is so, it might be asked why American aid, know-how and influence should not be directed at changing this framework. Several major considerations inhibit such action. First, if the United States were to attempt to use its influence to change the system, it would expose itself to the charge of interference in the internal affairs of another country. This, the United States cannot do and has pledged itself not to do. It has no choice but to work with and through governments.

In Iran the question of exerting pressure or influence on the Government is particularly touchy because the Iranian parliament is composed largely of landlords. These are the very men who find it in their own interests to keep the Government to a large degree as it is and has been. They see little cause to change a traditional system under which they have prospered greatly.

There are notable and encouraging exceptions to this rule—men and ideas and forces working toward reform. The Shah of Iran and a few other dedicated and realistic members of the Government recognize the vital need for basic change and have tried to bring it about. But so far there is relatively little indication that most of the landlords care to follow suit. For them to do so, in fact, is tantamount—in their own eyes—to committing economic suicide.

Another factor militating against abrupt change is the position of the landlord in the village. As things now stand, he is vital to the welfare of the villagers, for he performs a multitude of functions which they, in their ignorance, cannot. He buys grain and markets produce. He keeps irrigation ditches open. He tells the peasants when to sow the wheat, water the crops or pick the cotton. He lends money. Until the Iranian economy and society evolve to the extent that they are able to provide such facilities as agricultural-extension aids, credit banks, cooperatives, and other services traditionally provided by the landlord—until the farmers are educated to perform the traditional landlord functions—the present semi-feudal system will have to remain.

A third factor that inhibits American intrusion in this problem is that Iran in particular and the Middle East in general are economically, strategically, and politically vital to the security interests of the United States and the free world. To risk sparking abrupt change in the social or political structure of the area could well foster instability, if not chaos. The Soviet Union would almost certainly gain from such instability, and the United States would consequently face grave threats to its security.

Because of the reluctance of the United States to use its influence to press for political and social reform in Iran, the technical-assistance program has tended to turn its emphasis to the noncontroversial fields of public health and education. In Shahabad, the success of the aid program in these fields has been impressive. In 5 years malaria has been all but eliminated. The number of schools in the vicinity has considerably increased, granting many peasants education they desperately want. Precious water in many areas is clean and available in quantity.

This is a heart-warming achievement. But the very success of these programs is causing many Americans misgivings about the future. For it is not difficult to see that improved health and education unaccompanied by improvement in social and political opportunity must inevitably build pressure for radical social reform. A sick man doesn't have the energy to protest against being heavily taxed or being obliged to turn over four-fifths of his crop to a landlord. A healthy man frequently does. An illiterate peasant doesn't know that some of the world's peasantry have overthrown their landlords. A literate peasant will soon find out.

Thus, not only are the regimes the United States is supporting going to face mounting internal opposition, but the United States, as backer of these regimes, will be viewed, and, in fact, is already being viewed, as the defender of reaction and repression. This at the same time that the Soviet Union has managed to associate itself with Egypt and Syria, which, in the eyes of many Middle Easterners, are the most dedicated to radical social reform.)

Increasingly village men with a limited degree of education are being thrown into contact with men with just a little more education. These are the semieducated interpreters, technicians, teachers, and students who pass through or work in the villages, and who have begun to drive home these points—all with a germ of truth—to the villagers.

First, that where the Americans have been working, some of the landlords have grown richer. Second, that since the Americans arrived, a Government composed largely of landlords and one that is feared and distrusted by the peasants, has grown stronger. And, third, that since the Americans arrived, the voice of the Tudeh Party, which is Communist supported and is one of the few voices that speaks, however dishonestly, for the destruction of the age-old social system, has been throttled.

Scores of conversations between these reporters and partly educated young Iranians can be summed up as follows:

"After the fall of Premier Mohammed Mossadegh, in 1953, the United States gave economic aid to Iran which kept the Government of the Shah from collapsing, and so helped keep Soviet influence out. We were glad because we don't like the Russians and we did like the Americans. We hoped then that you would use your influence to help bring the fundamental changes we want. But you haven't. The Iranian Government is stronger than ever and has done almost nothing that we can see to help the people. We hear that Iran is rich from oil revenues and that the Government has a 7-year plan that is going to help us. But we don't see any results from it. And we don't trust our Government enough to have much hope for the future."

A better-educated Iranian said:

"Some Americans try to explain to us the problems of the American Government. We understand that Iran is strategically located and that America feels it must be kept out of the Soviet orbit. We understand that Iranian oil is vital to the West. We understand that if Iran falls to Soviet influence your system of government and your standard of living and your rights and freedoms are in jeopardy. But what of us? We don't like the Russians, but if they moved in tomorrow our people couldn't be much worse off than they are now."

In other words, the overall picture held by many Iranians, and which is filtering down to the peasant, is frequently one that tends to convince him that America is really on the side of reaction and repression. It is a picture which cannot easily be altered by argument; by pointing out, for example, that though the landlord may enjoy short-term profits, the American technical assistance program can bring long-term benefits to the peasant; that when the Communists and their Tudeh followers agitate for radical reform, they seek to replace one system with another, equally, if not more, oppressive.

The difficulties facing the United States in the Middle East are not new. They were experienced by Great Britain before us and were summed up in the July 13, 1957, issue of The New Statesman:

"Until then (the Suez crisis), as the paramount power, Britain's primary interest was necessarily the maintenance of stability; and this meant that, however much Britain might wish to encourage political and economic reform in the states they patronized, in the last resort the preservation of the status quo—and hence the feudal regimes that constitute it—was more vital. Since November 1956, however, this regional burden has been shouldered by America. Henceforth the sheiks and kings, the landlords and merchants, will look to Washington for protection.

"What does this mean in practice? At present and for the foreseeable future, America will be tied to the ruling feudal cliques who constitute the only section of Arab society willing to cooperate with the West on the West's terms. * * * So long as the nationalists are oriented toward Russia, America will find itself unable to encourage a progressive evolution toward democrasy. Nationalism will become synonymous with communism, and America will be forced to accept the paradoxical task she assumed in the Far East; preserving freedom by permanent autocracy.

Is there a way out of the dilemma the United States has interited in the Middle East or must we be doomed to appear to side with reaction against the mounting cry for change and reform?

In seking an answer to this difficult question it is essential to keep in mind one fact previously mentioned: that in the Middle East economic development is intimately related to political and social development. The first cannot be effectively pursued without promoting the latter. Economic development without social and political development must tend to benefit the few, reinforce the status quo and prepare the ground for possible violent upheaval.

There is no doubt that Washington is keenly aware of the dangers inherent in a policy which excites the cry for reform while it actively strives to keep the lid clamped down. There is also no doubt about the limitations in trying to resolve this dilemma. But over a period of years—years of frequently bitter, though revealing, experience—some avenues of approach to the problems have been found.

For instance: Some United States officials (but by no means all) have recognized that more emphasis must be put on the type of technological development which will tend, automatically, to hasten peaceful social and political development. There are many examples of this; one is the agricultural cooperative. In cooperatives, men pool their resources and work together—a new concept to peasants who have lived an ever-man-for-himself existence for centuries. Through cooperatives they can obtain credit, they can sell their crops for better prices, they can buy machinery for their mutual use and benefit. More important, perhaps, they learn principles of democratic elections in choosing their co-op leaders; they learn to manage their own affairs; they learn self-confidence. In short, they learn many of the functions performed for centuries by their landlords, and hence help prepare themselves for the day when they can emancipate themselves gradually and peacefully.

The nature of the change the cooperative can bring is illustrated by an incident in a village served by one of the few American-initiated cooperatives in Iran. The landlord-appointed "mayor" of the small community had long refused to join the cooperative. Despite his dire predictions of failure, the organization prospered. The mayor then finally decided to join, convinced he could dominate its activities as he had always dominated village life.

At the first co-op meeting in which he participated, not only was he bypassed for high office, but the villagers voted down every proposal he presented. The American who told the story described (with considerable pleasure) the look of amazement on the mayor's face when he realized that the power which had long lain exclusively in his hands (as the agent of the landlord) had shifted, at least in part, to a heretofore disorganized and impotent group of peasants. The consternation of the mayor was matched by the amazement of the villagers as it dawned on them that their fate no longer rested exclusively with another man.

From that day on, the mayor showed a new respect for the peasants, a respect possibly born of a shrewd assessment of new realities, and the villagers displayed a new sense of unity, responsibility, and confidence.

It might be asked why a landlord would tolerate the development of cooperatives likely to challenge his status. The answer is that the landlord, as well as the peasant, benefits from them. Aside from helping to increase the production and profits of the land, the cooperatives reduce the landlord's financial risk in his agrarian holdings since they can often borrow independently; they free him of many headaches involved in supervising his holdings, and they reduce the frequently nefarious role of the landlord's agent in the village—a man who often engages in financial shenanigans detrimental to the interests of both the landlord and the villagers.

In short, the cooperative, though it might threaten the position of the landlord in the indefinite future, substantially helps him in the immediate present, and hence is tolerated, even encouraged by him.

Another approach to the problem of bringing social, political, and technological progress to Iran is through the enlightment of the landlords. Iranian landlords are certainly no more greedy and selfish than most men. They are the way they are because circumstances made them so. Generations of social and political instability—of periods when the whim of a king could wipe out their holdings or their lives, or when drought could devastate their crops—contributed strongly to the creation of a group that clings stubbornly to its gains, blind to the social handwriting on the wall.

If Iranian landlords can be shown as western capitalists have learned, that the prosperity of an employer frequently grows with the well-being and prosperity of his employees, a great step could be taken toward a solution of Iran's problems. Already in Iran a few (very few) landlords have agreed to such small but important reforms as leasing land to the farmer for an extended period, thus giving the tenant an incentive, hitherto absent, to fertilize and develop his property. The returns under the new system have been considerably greater for both farmer and landlord, and the landlord is now, slowly, seeing the possible benefit of other reforms.

Yet another example of how American economic and technological assistance can be broadened to include social ends lies in the fields of education. Traditional Iranian education has been predominantly urban directed—a pattern that prepares a man for hard-to-find civil-service type of a job in a big city. A new pattern of practical vocational education is evolving to help keep the villager peacefully and profitably occupied on the land where he is needed.

Placing increased emphasis on the development of cooperatives, campaigns to enlighten landlords, and new types of vocational-education programs are not cited here as offering sweeping answers to American foreign-aid problems in Iran or elsewhere in the Middle East. The problems are too complex for that.

Nor are these fields of activity cited without a realization that they are fraught with hazards of their own. It is a grim fact of life in the Middle East that the aspirations and desires of mankind, once aroused, may outstrip the ability of any group or any government to fulfill them. There is always the danger that villagers who have tasted the power the cooperative brings will not be content with just a little power.

The suggestions presented are given merely as avenues of approach to some of the dilemmas of the Middle East—ways in which the scope of the American aid program can be enlarged to include a vitally needed social and political content as well as an economic one.

Profound change is in progress in the area. The peasant is on the move, and no matter what anyone does, he will continue to move. His struggle, now beginning, parallels in many ways the struggle of Western man for dignity, for freedom from oppression and exploitation, for all those rights the West now tends to take such much for granted.

In some way America must associate itself with the aspirations of the common man of the Middle East. America must not allow itself to feel that siding with reaction is one of those deplorable but unavoidable facts of international life. A foreign-aid program that recognizes the need for social and political development as well as economic development, that seeks to promote both, hand in hand, is one of the few instruments the United States has to cope with some of the fundamental problems of Iran and other Middle East areas.

Which Way to Defense Strength?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been brought to my attention a most interesting analysis of the present defense situation throughout the world. This analysis by a retired commander in the British Navy deserves thoughtful study. Under unanimous consent, I include this article by

Sir Stephen King-Hall in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ARMIES ARE NOW OBSOLETE

(By Sir Stephen King-Hall)

It seems wholly wrong to assume without any investigation that what may broadly be called military power is the only way in which defense can be made effective.

Nor should we be impressed or unduly influenced by the fact that from the earliest known times to the present day, physical force and weapons from the spear to the atom bomb have been the outward and visible signs of defense.

VICTOR'S POSITION

Today it is generally recognized that a victorious war cannot be expected to pay a cash dividend. On the contrary the plain fact emerging from two world wars is that after a short period of material suffering the vanquished emerge in a stronger economic position than that of the victors. The victors find themselves in the absurd position, for reasons which appear to be directly in their own interests, of having to finance the recovery of the vanquished and the more complete the physical losses of the enemy the more up-to-date is the new economy which rises from the ashes of defeat. (The late Earl Lloyd George told us that he had come to the conclusion that it was a great mistake to win a total military victory.)

An interesting and recent example on a small scale of this phenomenon is to be seen in the experience of the Kikuyu tribe in Kenya. The other tribes are saying with a deal of reason: "Look at the money and effort which are being expended on social services, rehabilitation, etc., for the Kikuyu. Is it necessary to stage a Mau Mau rebellion in order to receive all these good things?"

An honest answer would be: "Not necessarily, but it might be helpful."

There is another relatively new factor in history which must be taken into account.

We seem to have reached a stage in military evolution in which resistance, both passive and active, of a civilian population which refuses to acknowledge defeat even though its professional forces have been defeated or because it had no conventional forces to be defeated is a new factor in war.

Gandhi's passive resistance campaign in India, the German passive resistance which defeated the French in the Ruhr in the 1920's; the Sinn Fein nationally supported terrorist campaign; the Israel victory over the British mandatory administration; the Algerian struggle; the EOKA movement in Cyprus; the resistance movement against the Nazis, all belong to the new development.

It seems to be of significance that all those civilian resistances were part of ideological struggles and illustrated the truth of the saying that one can do most things with bayonets except sit on them.

Tentative conclusions are as follows:

1. We aim to defend an idea.

2. There are some grounds for believing that an idea can prevail even when the opponents of the idea are physically superior and able to occupy the territory of those defending the idea.

3. In the modern world a military victory cannot produce an economic dividend. Still less can there be any profit in a military victory obtained by nuclear weapons.

DEFENSE BY EXTERMINATION

As mentioned above it is generally taken for granted that the basis of defense against aggression must be military force. We have, however, reached an unprecedented state of affairs in the evolution of destructive force through the invention of nuclear weapons.

They possess two characteristics which are novel.

The first is that their destructive capacity is so enormous that there is no practical physical meanse of defense against these weapons. This fact has been selfevident so far as the United Kingdom is concerned for several years, but is now officially accepted.

The second novel characteristic of these weapons is that each time one of them is tested there is an addition to the poliution of the earth's surface and atmosphere.

Although the whole subject of fallout and the strontium risk is a matter of scientific controversy, there is agreement that if tests were carried out over a long period on a large scale the human race would probably exterminate itself in preparing to defend itself.

The peculiar character of the nuclear weapon has given a very real meaning to the hallowed principle that all nations maintain defense forces for protection against aggression. In the prenuclear age it was always said that the purpose of armed forces was to prevent war, and there was some truth in the statement; but the use of the word "deterrent" and the idea it expresses is a product of the nuclear age. It is insufficiently appreciated that our defense strategy is now based on the belief or hope that an idea will be effective and the idea can be summarized as follows:

"Nuclear war would be mutual suicide. It is not rational to be suicidal. You—the aggressor—can destroy us but your own destruction will be practically coincidental."

The facts lead to the conclusion that the time-honored theory that defense against physical aggression must take the form of physical means has worn very thin and needs to be regarded with much suspicion.

Moreover, experience has shown that aggression by the Communist states can also be political, and since 1945 this form of aggression has been the most dangerous and insidious. Paragraph 27 of the white paper on defense writes about British responsibilities under the Baghdad Pact to prevent Communist encroachment and infiltration and goes on in the same paragraph to refer to bomber squadrons based in Cyprus capable of delivering nuclear weapons. The value of nuclear bombardments as a means of preventing, say, a Communist coup d'etat in Persia is not clear to this writer.

TOTAL DESTRUCTION

There is a theoretical or philosophic reason for doubting whether military force is any longer assuredly the best way to counter military aggression of a nuclear type. It is an established principle that to every form of attack there must exist a means of defense. We have now reached a stage in the development of the attack which enables total destruction to be achieved, and as it is physically impossible to put the whole of a modern social system 100 feet underground and turn the United Kingdom into a nation of troglodytes it might seem at first glance that the principle has broken down.

But is seems to have been forgotten that the principle does not say that the answer to an attack must be of the same order of things as the attack.

If the answer to a nuclear attack creating total destruction is merely to enlarge the area of destruction nothing of value has been achieved.

If, however, having reached the ne plus ultra of physical attack we are imaginative enough to realize that we have not simultaneously reached the frontiers of human thought we should have no difficulty in moving forward beyond the physical into the psychological.

THE DRIFT OF DISASTER

The object of the new strategy of defense is to change the minds of the men in the Kremlin.

To those that will at once raise the cry that this is asking the impossible the reply must be:

1. They are human beings who have for one reason or another changed their minds on several occasions since 1945.

2. Through the policy of the nuclear deterrent we hope—and some people believe—we are already operating on their minds and influencing their thoughts. If we are not, the deterrent idea has failed.

If our strategy should be to change the minds of the men in the Kremlin how is this to be achieved technically? There seem to us to be two broad lines of approach: the direct and indirect.

The direct approach consists in doing things which might make an immediate impact on the minds of the rulers; the indirect approach is composed of policies designed to influence the minds of the masses in the Communist-controlled countries.

At this moment we are disposed to think that as part of our psychological campaign for defense there are strong arguments for considering whether the United Kingdom should not announce unilaterally that it will not carry out any further tests and that the forthcoming test will be abandoned.

Something dramatic and easily understood by mankind needs to be done to break the deadlock and arrest the drift of disaster.

Do the chiefs of staff really believe that an announcement of this nature would leave the United Kingdom more defenseless against nuclear attack than it is at present?

Having taken this step we should use it as the starting point for a tremendous and worldwide educational campaign explaining the horrors of nuclear war, the dangers of tests, etc., and say: "Now you can see why Her Majesty's Government has taken a lead and perhaps risks in this matter."

I picture a sum of £100 million being spent on this propaganda which ought to be an all-party effort. I refuse absolutely to admit that given imagination, energy, and funds the great educational campaign should not penetrate beyond the Iron Curtain.

In this connection and beginning with the satellite states a really great effort (£50 million) should be made to increase contacts with the masses in those countries. Every effort should be made to organize exchange visits between young people on a very large scale. We should put as much effort and money for this kind of thing as we do into a nuclear-bomb test.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

No doubt these ideas will be very startling to many people but we beg and entreat them to remember that we are faced today with the old problem of defense in a completely novel setting.

It is almost as novel as if we woke up some day to find that this world of ours was liable to aggression from another planet. Our present problem is of this novel nature.

The Manchester Guardian wrote on April 15 that "Dependence on the ultimate deterrent is inevitable." It went on to say that the alternative was "conventional forces on a massive scale" or "a fully pacifist policy." A point worth thinking about is that if we succeed in producing some form of standstill in development of nuclear weapons and do not succeed in making progress with disarmament in conventional weapons are we likely to be able to persuade the people of the West to stand the racket of conventional forces on a massive scale? We doubt it.

What about a fully pacifist policy?

The truth is that this possibility has never been thoroughly examined from a strictly political-strategical angle. The pacifist policy has usually been defended from a moral point of view.

I am thinking of a policy which it would be more accurate to call defense by passive resistance.

I am not saying it would work. I am saying that no one has thoroughly studied its

possibilities in the light of the novel and unprecedented defense problem which now faces the United Kingdom, Western Europe, and to a lesser etxent the United States of America.

In order to find out some more about this I have reached the conclusion that a royal commission should be established with the task of expressing an opinion upon the problem of whether our way of life could be defended by passive resistance and if so what the plan should be. If a royal commission is not considered to be the best instrument then a special committee of the imperial defense college should be put on the job.

We have said quite bluntly in the white paper that we cannot afford our present expenditure on defense. We have made heavy cuts in our conventional forces and transferred our faith to nuclear weapons with all the imponderables and unknowns which go with them.

I remarked to a well-known member of Parliament: "Suppose Great Britain only had three airborne divisions, a few tactical aircraft, and a very small navy, what would happen apart from the obvious and immense gain to our economy?"

He replied: "My first reflection is that our influence in the world would at once decline"—he paused and added—"at least I suppose it would."

Is this certain? Gandhi's influence rose with the rise of passive resistance; so did that of the African bus boycotters.

Has it or can it be proved that a United Kingdom with an intelligent and sophisticated population educated to regard a national plan of passive resistance as the defense policy of the country would lose influence? I think there is a case for a very thorough investigation of this matter.

GOP Attacks Truman Jobless Aid Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article, "GOP Attacks Truman Jobless Aid Record," which appeared in the Washington Star, on Sunday, April 13. In view of the present deluge of irresponsible remarks being levelled at the administration from some quarters, I am of the opinion that we ought to occasionally take a look at the real facts. I am told that ex-President Truman is today testifying before one of our committees concerning present unemployment conditions, and for this reason I think we owe it to ourselves and to the people of this country to review the accomplishments—or, rather, the lack of accomplishments—of his administration in dealing with the 1949–50 recession. Unemployment reached 7.8 percent of the labor force in 1949 during the Truman administration, and it took the Korean war to pull us out of this serious economic slump. Yet, today with unemployment less than 7 percent, we find these same new dealers, or fair dealers, or whatever they want to call themselves, criticizing the present administration. Mr. Speaker, I for one think it is time for the truth to be heard.

The article follows:

GOP ATTACKS TRUMAN JOBLESS AID RECORD

(By Gould Lincoln)

Republicans yesterday leveled a double-barreled attack on former President Truman as an economic expert. Mr. Truman is the first scheduled witness to appear before the House Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow in its inquiry into unemployment conditions.

Republican National Chairman Meade Alcorn charged that Mr. Truman twice left Washington for long vacations in Florida after he had been told of high unemployment figures during the recession of 1949–50, and had done practically nothing to help relieve the economic situation of that period.

Representative TALLE, of Iowa, ranking Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee, charged that House Democratic leaders have loaded the committee's witness list with antiadministration witnesses, starting off with former President Truman. The Democrats, Mr. TALLE said, are using the hearing as a "loudspeaker for Democratic political propaganda," and described Mr. Truman as the "advance pitchman."

Chairman Alcorn's anti-Truman statement was in reply to Mr. Truman's attack on President Eisenhower in New Haven April 8. In an interview the former President said that if he were in the White House today, with the current economic recession in effect, "I'd be doing something. I wouldn't be sitting still or playing golf."

TRUMAN HIT EISENHOWER

President Eisenhower at the time of the Truman criticism, was planning to spend this weekend—as he is doing—near Augusta, Ga., playing golf.

Mr. Alcorn said that Mr. Truman has the right to offer criticism at any time and on any subject he chooses. But, Mr. Alcorn continued, in his current attack on President Eisenhower, Mr. Truman is demonstrating again "he possesses a rather convenient memory of events in his own administration" he might bear in mind.

"In 1949," Mr. Alcorn continued, "a serious economic recession began in the spring and unemployment grew through the summer and into the winter. President Truman and the Nation were told in November that unemployment the previous month had mounted to 3,823,000 or 6.1 percent of the smaller working force of that time.

"On November 28, President Truman left Washington for Key West, Fla., where he spent 24 days. He returned to Washington on December 21, and 2 days later left on a holiday trip of a week to Independence, Mo.

READS 1950 RECORD

"The recession, meanwhile, deepened through the winter and into 1950. A peak was reached in February when 4,828,000 or 7.8 percent of the working force was out of work—slightly more than the 7.7 percent who were unemployed this March. That figure was announced the first part of March, 1950. On March 13, President Truman again left Washington for Key West where he spent 29 days.

"The latter trip was taken shortly after Mr. Truman said in an interview that up to 5 million unemployed was unsupportable and it was healthy for the economic body if job seeking went on at all times."

Mr. Alcorn added that a search of the record showed that Mr. Truman and his administration did little to cure the 1949–50 recession beyond canceling a tax increase he had proposed and by directing that some defense contracts be channeled to areas of especially high idleness.

"That recession (1949–50) drifted along for 13 months—including all four seasons—from 5.2 to 7.8 percent unemployed each month before the economy was revitalized by the outbreak of the Korean war."

VIGOROUS MOVES CITED

The Republican chairman said that in contrast to the Truman administration's inactivity in the earlier recession, the Eisenhower administration has moved vigorously in 50 ways to stimulate the economy, and that the latest figures indicate the Eisenhower program is paying off.

"Employment," he continued, "is stabilizing after a disturbing period, aggravated by severe bad weather." He said the administration has moved to provide direct aid to the unemployed by recommending an extension of unemployment-compensation payments. If this program is adopted, Mr. Alcorn said, it will be the first such step taken by any administration to meet a downturn of the economy.

Representative TALLE's attack was in the same vein. He said:

"In Mr. Truman's new role as an economic expert he might be able to answer why the cost of living under his administration rose more than 50 percent compared with about 7 percent under the Eisenhower administration, why unemployment reached some 7.8 percent of the labor force in 1949 compared with less than 7 percent today, and why he vetoed an antirecession tax cut measure in 1948 which was later enacted over his veto by the Republican 80th Congress. In Mr. Truman's case the Korean war came along to bail him out of his economic problems.

"Since Mr. Truman obviously fails to qualify as an economic expert his appearance before the committee serves no other purpose than as advance pitchman sent on ahead to set the stage for the flow of antiadministration propaganda to follow in the weeks ahead."

Positive Americanism—Address of Martin D. Schwartz, Chairman, AMVETS National Americanism Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening the AMVETS honored former President Harry S. Truman and Mr. Martin D. Schwartz, chairman of the AMVETS National Americanism Committee, with Americanism awards at a formal dinner at the Mayflower Hotel.

Mr. Truman was honored for his exceptional contribution to a positive Americanism program which has strengthened American democracy.

Mr. Schwartz was given the Ray Sawyer award for his part in founding and guiding the Americanism program of the AMVETS.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the acceptance address by Mr. Schwartz:

POSITIVE AMERICANISM

Mr. President, Commander Satullo, members of the NEC, distinguished guests, AMVETS. I accept this award with humility, and shall always cherish it with pride.

Its real significance lies not in this handsome plaque about which my grandchildren may someday be curious, but in the excitement and satisfaction of examining ideals which have made the very name America a touchstone which men have used for a century and a half to measure their aspirations for a better life. I am humbly grateful for the opportunity which past commanders and Commander Satullo have given me to make this contribution to my country.

AMVETS is an organization founded on the principle that what is good for America is good for all its citizens—not just for certain individuals or special groups. My contribution to the AMVETS Americanism program was possible only because this organization is more dedicated to the name "American" than to the word "veteran"; because AMVETS sees the strength, the hope, and the greatness of America in citizens who know what America is all about.

Throughout the ages, men have regarded their own times as difficult, alarming and even fearful. Each of us in this room tonight has participated in at least 1 major war and our distinguished guest speaker has been an important historical figure in 2 wars. But world-shaking cataclysms do not suddenly explode out of nothingness. They are the culmination of many other historical events which have tried the souls of men just as present problems demand solutions by us. None of us can measure the long-term significance of day-to-day events. But the past is prologue to tomorrow and history provides clues to today's trends. From knowing and understanding our own development as a civilization we can learn to meet each tomorrow as it comes with strength and without fear or faltering—provided we hold inviolate the way of life we have inherited and are true to its ideals.

On thing upon which there is general agreement is that we are living on the threshold of a new space age. The challenge to America of this new age may be providential. We have been startled by the quality of non-American technology and scientific skills and suddenly realized another facet of world leadership: We must be vigilant for ourselves as well as for the rest of the world. The dawn of the space age has brought both a rude awakening and an invaluable alerting to America—not a disaster but a welcome warning in time. The most important thing we have learned is that while we have maintained a strong military posture we have let down our guard in another equally important area—the education of our people. As a nation we are beginning to realize that the strength of our democratic system stems not so much from our physical wealth as from an enlightened citizenry who can utilize our resources most effectively for our protection and development.

The American dream of freedom and equality carries a more powerful message than Soviet propaganda but we must be able to get it across and keep it foremost—to our own people here at home as well as to the other peoples of the world. We Americans will fail in our traditional role as champions of freedom unless we reaffirm the values of human dignity to each succeeding generation of our children. To teach them we must first teach ourselves.

Here then is the basic premise upon which we base our Americanism program. America is the embodiment of immense ideas. These ideas have been magnificently framed and developed by men of giant stature who helped create the American dream from the first days of Jamestown and the Mayflower compact right up to the present. America is also a unique polyglot culture which has adopted the best attributes of each creed and color which make up our melting pot. What we have today is still a mixture of backgrounds—with little exception all dedicated to perpetuating the American ideal.

Ideas are more important than the men who conceive and implement them. Ideas can die just as men die, the principles of wholesome government can be abandoned unknowingly, the flower of a civilization can fade unless constantly renewed. The fact that we are heirs to the great American tradition does not mean that we all fully appreciate or understand it. Unfortunately, knowledge is not inherited. Neither is love of country nor concepts of human rights. These must all be learned.

We like to believe that Americans have a peculiar affinity for liberty, but the truth is that an instinct for liberty is not enough. "It must be reinforced by understanding—an understanding as widespread as the instinct."

It is this understanding which true lovers of freedom must seek. For freedom means just what it says; that any American may think and say and do what he likes, so long as he respects the right of every other citizen to do the same; so long as he does not act traitorously toward his Nation or deal treacherously with his neighbor. This is positive Americanism. We believe it is better to appreciate and develop the virtues of the American ideal than dissipate our vigor in the fruitless panic of subversive hunts. National security requires that a government possess in addition to a strong military capability, the means to insure its own internal existence. Thus its people and their attitudes toward its laws and institutions are the best guaranty of its continuity. No American, no matter how well motivated, has the right to sacrifice our traditional bulwarks of liberty—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and its Bill of Rights—in order to lash out at alleged disloyalty in our midst. Misguided patriotism can be as dangerous as treason and is considerably more difficult to discover. Human dignity and individual liberty are indivisible in a free society. If a single person is ever deprived of the guaranties of our legal system then each of us has lost a little of his own security. It is against such imperceptible erosion of our way of life, painstakingly erected for so many decades, that we in AMVETS have directed our program of positive Americanism—our constant search for better ways in which to rekindle pride and devotion to the American dream.

Rear Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, a great teacher who more than 20 years ago helped excite my interest in our American heritage, recently wrote these words of solemn warning:

"The passion for freedom may not die, but it grows very cool at times, and our times are one of them. I would that that passion which animated our forebears might revive and conquer the craven fear of communism. What use to defend our liberties by such means as will destroy them? Woe unto America if these political freedoms are continuously scorned and flouted; for they embody not only the experience of eight centuries of struggle by English-speaking peoples; they are founded on immutable principles of justice."

These principles of justice are the birthright of every American—and the heart of the AMVETS Americanism program. Why we are what we are.

Our Americanism program is education for American living, the bedrock upon which the preservation of our country rests. AMVETS recognizes that America must have the best weapons in the world for its protection; but its most powerful weapon is its people who know, love, and identify themselves with America's hopes and traditions. Otherwise we, too, may become in history another great Nation which forgot its heritage and thereby lost itself.

Only educated Americans can fulfill their obligation of good citizenship so each of us can live safely in America and America may live safely in the world. If we are to win the ideological war, our own values and how we live by them will convey to the rest of the world our convictions of the dignity and worth of every human being. We must be as zealous in reaffirming this basic creed as in building ICBMs.

This is the task which AMVETS has undertaken—to promote education in American ideals so that Americans will understand the principles which have made us a great Nation—so that we can intelligently present those principles to the world, that this Nation, so conceived and constantly rededicated may endure.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for many years than it is charitable to recall, Republican spokesmen have been pointing out a dangerous pattern in our economic life. This is the perilous trend of diverting an ever-increasing share of our national income to government. In fiscal year 1956, about 30 percent of our national income went to meet the combined revenue demands of Federal, State, and local governments. As a consequence, nearly a third of the fruits of our national productive effort were largely lost for purposes of creating new wealth.

While we may disagree as to the extent to which government is nonproductive, I believe we can agree on some basic points. Governments, by their very nature, cannot create as much as they consume—and they most certainly fall far short of the wealth-creating capacities of the private segment of the economy.

If the implications of this situation seem remote or academic, we can approach it from a different point of view. The consequences of this growing burden of government become very clear when we examine its effects on the average wage earner. It then becomes a matter of dinner-table economics. It has been recently calculated that the average worker puts in nearly 2½ hours of each 8-hour working day to pay his total tax bill—the sum of the taxpayments he knows about and the hidden ones in the goods and services he buys. By comparison, food for his family and himself requires a little over an hour and a half. To house his family, this worker must labor about an hour and 25 minutes. The remainder of his family's needs, such as clothing, medical care, transportation, and all the rest are met by his working the remaining 2 hours and 20-odd minutes.

When we put it on this basis, the question of taxes seems to center on some pretty basic questions for the average man:

Should he be required to work nearly an hour longer each day to pay his taxes than to feed his family? Does government give him services which are worth an hour more of each day's labor than that required to house his family? I doubt that many taxpayers would consider nonessential governmental services of higher value than life's necessities.

Quite understandably, there is widespread sentiment at the present time for tax reduction. However, when we come to the question of which tax reduction plan is best, we face a great variety of proposals. Unfortunately, much of the discussion concerning tax reduction is based on the hope of giving the economy a mere shot-in-the-arm. Little attention is being devoted to the reform of the tax system, essential for long-term expansion of the economy.

Some of the tax reduction proposals have been characterized as quickies. This type would grant temporary reduction for a month or more, then go back to present rates. Advocates of quickie plans argue that the extra money left to the taxpayer will pour into the economy and start us on the upgrade. To accept this proposal, we would first have to believe that the public would spend their extra money quickly, and on the rights things. Even granting this highly unlikely eventuality, we are still faced with an eventual return to the present tax rates. It is the present overly progressive system of tax rates which many believe have helped in causing the economic situation we are presently attempting to remedy.

We come then to modification of the rate structure and how best to improve it. We can agree, I trust, that our principal objectives should be the equitable distribution of the tax burden and providing a tax climate which will encourage economic expansion. On March 13, I introduced a bill entitled the "Tax Reduction Incentives Act of 1958." Enactment of this bill would updoubtedly have some stimulating effect on the present state of the economy. This feature, however, is far outweighed by the more permanent and far-reaching objectives of the plan.

As a primary consideration, I proposed the reduction of all personal income taxes by 10 percent. In the case of the low-income taxpayer, the need for tax reduction requires little justification. This is a pure and simple case of hardship which few deny. However, when we come to the middle- and high-income brackets, the enthusiasm of some for tax reduction tends to diminish. Setting aside considerations of equity for the moment, it is in these brackets that tax reduction can have extremely significant long-term effects. If the rates in these brackets are designed to encourage the taking of risks on new ventures, the new jobs of the future will materialize.

The maintenance of present jobs and the creation of new jobs require money. As to how much, the average capital investment for each production worker in America rose to $16,000 in 1957. This amount has been steadily increasing over the years and is approaching double the investment that was necessary but 10 years ago. With this in mind, the question of securing the risk capital of the future assumes great importance.

Historically, a vast amount of risk capital has been obtained from persons in the higher income brackets. The large element of chance involved operates to exclude those who would be destroyed financially by the failure of a new venture. Consequently we must get this part of the capital necessary for business from the people who now pay it in taxes.

The current recession has tended to focus popular attention on the growing shortage of risk capital—a problem which has deeply concerned many economists and businessmen for several years. Human nature being what it is, it should not surprise us that investors have become increasingly reluctant to finance less than a pretty sure thing while taxes prevent a return commensurate with the risk. If we truly wish to encourage personal incentive in the investment field, we must alter our tax rates. We must alter them so that a succesful risk investment is capable of providing a clear financial advantage over the tried-and-true investment.

An additional means of stimulating economic expansion is to grant some relief in the area of the corporation tax. It is regrettable that a segment of public opinion still considers this tax as having little effect on the average individual. Actually it affects all of us very directly in what we pay for products and the number of job opportunities from which the labor force may choose. It is a hidden tax we pay in everything we buy.

It is axiomatic that profits attract outside capittal. With more than half of most corporations' profits going for Federal taxes alone, we must reduce the rate or suffer a prolonged period of economic contraction. Although business is investing billions in plant and equipment each year, recently only about 10 percent can be related to net expansion of fixed assets. This is in contrast to expansions of 30 percent in the years immediately following World War II.

A reasonable reduction in the corporate rate will provide the much needed incentive to corporations and investors to finance the development and marketing of the new products and services necessary for an expanding economy.

Equitable tax reduction, for both individuals and business, promises far better results than a series of hastily conceived pump-priming projects which have little basis in true need. This approach failed before and there is no reason to expect superior results today. Our need is not simply for more dollars. Our need is to remove the obstacles to long-term expansion in our economy. To accomplish this we must restore those financial incentives neces-

sary to an economic environment which fosters the willingness to take chances.

It is not our custom to place much credence in the many self-serving statements emanating from the Kremlin. On those rare occasions, however, when a statement appears to be borne out in some measure by fact, we must take notice. Premier Khrushchev has declared economic war on the United States, to use his unfortunate expression, and there is abundant evidence that this is the case.

Our preoccupation with the Soviet threat of arms has delayed our full realization of that nation's economic power. While Khrushchev's boast that his country will soon assume world economic leadership conveniently overlooks certain basic facts and figures, there is no merit in denying that Russia has come a long way in a comparatively short time. This national record of accomplishment, as with all nations, is largely the result of superior accomplishment by certain individuals.

While it might please us to think that all Russians lead a cheerless existence as vassals of the all-powerful state, we know this is not the case. Although outwardly professing strict adherence to the doctrines of Marxist socialism, the Russian rulers have succeeded in stimulating their scientific, industrial, military and intellectual talent by offering rich economic rewards.

It would seem that we have something to learn here, or more correctly, something to remember. While we have proclaimed to the world the virtues of the free enterprise system, many of our internal actions have operated to reduce its effectiveness. We have permitted a system of taxation to develop which imposes its severest penalties on the talented and creative.

It must, then, be the classic irony of our times when we must be reminded by the Communists of something we practically invented. Perhaps we will be reminded of Lincoln's words on providing economic incentives for outstanding achievement. Abraham Lincoln knew human nature well enough to see the need to add "the fuel of interest to the fire of genius." We have strayed far from this course, but a surpassing virtue of our system is that we can alter direction if we so will.

There can be few accomplishments this Congress might claim which hold greater promise for the continued economic supremacy of our country than the strengthening of personal economic incentives. There are equally few things, which if ignored, carry with them such potential for disaster.

Medical Programs Without Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an outstanding address on the subject Medical Programs Without Waste, delivered in Washington recently by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

There being no objection, the address as ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL PROGRAMS WITHOUT WASTE

(By Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey)

Health is one of our Nation's most precious possessions. Without it, our startling achievements in the laboratory and on the production line, in space research and missilry, would hardly have been possible.

Concerned as it is with safeguarding our Nation from attack and subversion, it seems only logical that the Federal Government would also take high interest and a large measure of responsibility for the Nation's health.

Most of us realize, of course, that the greatest killers in history have not been bombs and bullets and other instruments of war, but disease and pestilence. Gradually, as the world's expanding population testifies, we are gaining the upper hand, but many forms of deadly disease still remain unconquered. We still have a tremendous job ahead.

Government's role in this battle is a large one. Its efforts are directed primarily—and rightly so—toward research and experimentation in the never-ending quest for new and powerful antibiotics and other medical weapons in mankind's longest and most costly conflict.

In fairly recent years, however, the Federal Government has widened its activities and field of responsibility. Not only are Federal dollars going into basic research, but billions more are also spent to provide specific medical service to some 30 million citizens, or about 1 in every 6 in our population.

Some $4 billion to $5 billion is expended yearly in the Government's vast medical program. That equals about 7 percent of our total Federal budget. It is almost as much as we expect to spend in fiscal 1959 in our accelerated missile development and earth-satellite program.

So, by any measurement, the Government's health activities stack up as a tremendous undertaking.

First, let us examine these activities in greater detail. We should know, to begin with, just who is and who is not directly benefiting from the program.

Among the 30 million Americans to whom full or partial medical care at Federal expense is offered are:

Four million persons, mostly military personnel, who are entitled to complete medical care.

Three and a half million veterans, disabled in active service and in the line of duty, who are eligible for complete medical care.

Twenty million persons, including 17.5 million veterans with no service-connected disabilities, who are entitled to medical care on a facilities-available basis. Others in this group are the dependents of military personnel, and retired military personnel.

Some 2.5 million Federal employees who are eligible for limited on-the-job health services for occupational injuries and disease.

These figures speak for themselves. When the Government assumes responsibility, even in a limited way, for the medical care of 30 million people, it has staked out for itself a considerable stake in national health activities.

As in so many cases of burgeoning Federal operations, with more and more control slipping out of the hands of private citizens and settling in Washington, the expansion of Government medical services evolved gradually and a hodgepodge structure of bureaucracy has come into being over the years.

The Hoover Commission and its medical services task force, once they started surveying facilities, found themselves visiting no less than 26 different Federal departments and agencies. And within these agencies, the Commission pinpointed 66 administrative units engaged in health activities.

So it came as no surprise to the Commission's experts to learn that little coordination existed, that duplication and overlap was the rule and not the exception, and that the medical planners forged ahead with projects for new hospitals and other facilities with little regard for, or knowledge of, what other agencies were doing.

This sort of go-it-alone policy extended right into the Defense Department's different branches. The Army, Navy, and Air Force operated their own medical programs, with only the feeblest efforts at cross servicing in the interest of economy and efficiency.

As a result, the Hoover Commission estimated that on an average day in 1955, for example, 63 out of every 100 beds in military hospitals were unoccupied.

Specifically, the Commission estimated the average daily number of military hospital patients at 34,000 in 1955. Some 93,000 beds were available, along with nearly 5,000 physicians, 2,000 dentists, 7,500 graduate nurses, and 71,000 technicians and other medical personnel for a grand total of 85,000 persons.

As you can see, on the basis of these figures each patient in a military hospital in 1955 had two persons available to tend to his needs—possibly to keep him from wasting away in loneliness in wards that were two-thirds empty.

It is also interesting to note that the average daily patient load in military hospitals, in the period 1952 to 1955, declined from 57,000 to 34,000, or 40 percent. During the very same period, expenditures for construction of new military hospitals climbed from less than $12 million in 1952 to $62 million in 1955, or more than 400 percent.

And these data refer only to hospital construction in the United States. The Defense Establishment was also busy building hospitals in other parts of the world. This required less than $18 million in 1952—and $37 million in 1955.

Taxpayers will take sad note of the fact that this situation existed at a time when the need for new civilian hospital facilities was widespread across America, and at a time when many States, counties, and communities were engaged in a desperate search for hospital building funds.

Equally disturbing is the fact that trained medical people, always in short supply to care for our fast-growing population, were pressed into military service to staff half-empty hospitals and clinics.

Many of you will recall the work of the first Hoover Commission, more than 10 years ago. That Commission spoke out vigorously against excessive hospital construction with Federal funds. By the time the second Commission was organized, the problem was aggravated and even more alarming evidence of waste and extravagance was uncovered.

Of course, we often encounter the argument that all these military hospitals are necessary in case of emergency. We are told that 55,000 or 60,000 unused beds does not represent $500 million wasted, but $500 million prudently expended against the eventuality of a hydrogen holocaust and its terrible cost in dead and wounded.

Now all of us want our Nation to be strong and stay strong. We want to be prepared if war comes, and with 60 cents or more out of every Federal dollar going into national defense and security preparation, there is little reason why we shouldn't be prepared if what we hope never happens does happen.

But wouldn't it have been wiser to have taken that $500 million, which represents only one-half of the average construction cost of the unused beds in military hospitals, and

invested it in new civilian hospitals and clinics? Wouldn't these facilities be equally available for war emergency, while giving us a lot more mileage out of our health dollars in peacetime?

By coincidence, Americans spent an estimated $505 million for private hospital construction in 1957, about three-fifths of which came in the form of voluntary contributions.

In other words, the cost of constructing the unused beds in military hospitals, based on 1955 data supplied by the Hoover Commission, equals the current total annual outlay for the Nation's private hospital facilities.

Another authoritative witness to the high rate of Federal spending for hospitals, weighed against the sums available for this purpose outside of government, is the Health Information Foundation, a private organization in New York City which conducts extensive continuing research in this field.

In its latest publication the foundation disclosed that between 1928 and 1956, the number of beds in private proprietary hospitals (as opposed to private nonprofit hospitals) declined 50 percent and the assets per bed in these proprietary hospitals now average only about $4,300, a level half of that for all hospitals.

In contrast the foundation points out, assets in Federal hospitals, including military, increased fivefold in the same period. The number of beds in Federal hospitals tripled, and the assets per bed doubled. In 1956 each bed in Federal hospitals represented over $10,000 in assets, or some 25 percent above the national average.

Thus far I have stressed the waste of dollars and manpower in the Defense Department's varied health programs. Don't get the impression that this waste is confined to the Defense Department. It was found by the Hoover Commission throughout the range of Federal health activities.

Of course, the situation varies from agency to agency, for some make better use of their health budget than others. Nevertheless, the Hoover Commission has clearly shown that the shortcomings in our present medical programs are serious enough to warrant our immediate attention.

The question, then, boils down to this: What is the most effective means for corrective action? Here, too, the Hoover Commission has shown the way with its proposal to establish a Federal Advisory Council of Health.

At the request of the Commission, I introduced legislation to establish the Council at the last session of Congress. The bill, as I am sure you know, would set up a strong council of both laymen and members of the medical profession, whose function would be to continuously evaluate and make recommendations on Federal policies and programs relating to medical care and national health.

It may be that there are other ways in which the purpose of this bill may be accomplished. I should point out that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the principal adviser to the President on health programs, and certainly nothing should be done to limit his responsibilities in this area. It has been argued that, rather than set up a new agency, an interdepartmental committee could be established to correlate the health functions of the different departments.

The simple fact that the bill calls for the creation of a new Federal body is enough to raise storm signals on Capitol Hill. There are many Members of Congress—and, frankly, I am one of them—who believe that we already have too many boards, offices, commissions, and councils cluttering up our administrative structure.

Nevertheless, I was honored to sponsor the bill because it deserves a hearing. It properly focuses attention on a very real need, and the Hoover Commission has my profound gratitude for bringing this need to public attention. The question, then, is not whether the bill itself will pass, but whether its objective can be achieved. The objective is simply this: to bring about more central planning and coordination on health matters at the upper level of the executive branch.

It is my hope that you will help generate an active public interest in this objective. That is my appeal to you who have gathered here to help us face the problems which confront our Government.

After all, the inadequacies which the Hoover Commission exposed in our national health programs are too serious to be further ignored in apathy and inertia. In this high-powered, jet-propelled space age, the good health of our Nation depends more than ever before upon top-flight planning, careful coordination of resources, and diligent policy guidance.

No one knows yet what new diseases, what unheard-of forms of bacteria, what new challenges to medical science await us in the mysterious reaches of outer space. When the time comes, we must be ready to meet these problems and overcome them.

Meanwhile, there is still a lot to be done here, not only at home, but in the many lands around the globe. In our relatively brief history, America's men and women of medicine have contributed richly to the world's store of health knowledge. The Jonas Salks, Walter Reeds, John Enders, and uncounted other heroes of health have earned the lasting tribute of grateful people everywhere.

The American tradition in medicine and health is a matter of national pride. With your help, we can make sure that the Federal Government maintains and strengthens that tradition to meet the demands of the future.

Proposed Amendment to Merchant Marine Act of 1920

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Chattanooga Times of March 22, 1958, in support of the provisions in H. R. 9833 and S. 3065 to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 to permit the Bowaters Southern Paper Corp. to own and operate barges upon the inland waterway system.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADOPT THE AMENDMENT

We can see no reason why the great Bowaters Southern Paper Corp. should be barred from operating its own barges on the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers in order to bring wood to its east Tennessee plant to be converted into newsprint. It intended to use the inland waterways for that purpose when it constructed the huge newsprint mill, but a Merchant Marine Act of 1920 says that a corporation under foreign control cannot operate barges on the inland waterways. Bowaters is an American subsidiary of a British company.

The Merchant Marine Act was adopted just after World War I. Jitters from that conflict still prevailed, but certainly the authors of that act did not intend to prohibit free shipment of newsprint paper in peacetime.

Senators KEFAUVER and SMATHERS propose an amendment to the act. It would give the right of shipment by barge to any corporation if a majority of the officers and directors and 90 percent of the employees are citizens and residents of the United States and if substantially all the raw material is bought in this country. Bowaters would conform to that amendment and in all fairness the amendment should be adopted.

Farmers Union Endorses Proxmire Dairy Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I greatly pleased by the action of the Wisconsin Farmers Union in its annual convention recently in endorsing the long-range dairy program which I have sponsored in the Senate.

The Farmers Union resolution stated that the delegates "do hereby endorse the basic program as outlined in Senator PROXMIRE's farm bill—and other bills carrying the philosophy of greater farm income—as a means of controlling production and maintaining fair prices for farm products."

The Wisconsin Farmers Union has distinguished itself over nearly 30 years as a militant and effective champion of the family sized dairy farmer. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to have this splendid organization give its approval to the proposals I have offered for solving the dairy farmers' problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the major resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Farmers Union delegates at their 27th annual convention in La Crosse printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY CONVENTION DELEGATES

FAMILY FARM POLICY

Whereas there is every indication that the family-size farm is going to be squeezed out of the picture as a farming unit; and

Whereas we believe that the family-size farm is one of the strongest links in our democratic form of government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, petition Congress, President Eisenhower, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson, asking them to cease the policies now being pursued in Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand that all Government price-support measures be designed and administered in such a manner as to favor family-size farms to the extent that this American tradition shall be safeguarded.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas dairying is a fairly unchangeable industry, with dairy farmers unable to change to other types of agriculture because of such reasons as investments, dairy herds,

geography, marketing systems, and basic knowledge of dairying; and

Whereas the dairy farmer is now suffering depression, along with other segments of the agricultural economy; and

Whereas we do not feel that 100 percent of parity should ever be considered high: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record as opposing the proposed reduction in dairy price supports from 82½ percent to 75 percent of parity, and be it further

Resolved, That a direct appeal be made to President Eisenhower for assistance at this critical time.

FARM INCOME

Whereas the present administration has shown a singularly consistent intent to deprive farmers of any influence in the national economy; and

Whereas for the welfare of the whole economic structure, farmers must develop methods to insure the survival of the agricultural community; and

Whereas these methods must operate without putting additional burdens upon the United States Treasury: Be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby endorse the basic program as outlined in Senator Proxmire's farm bill—and other bills carrying the philosophy of greater farm income—as a means of controlling production and maintaining fair prices for farm products.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas the administration insists that we keep the flexible price supports system whereby farm prices can be forced down to any level the administration happens to choose; and

Whereas under this administration farm prices always go down and never up except in an election year: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do insist, that in order to arrange things in a more equitable relationship, the flexibility shall also apply to the rest of the economy. That all salaries of personnel in the Department of Agriculture, including Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and all Government employees including President Eisenhower, shall have their salaries cut to correspond with whatever level of support they deem wise for agriculture. If 60 percent of a fair price is enough for agriculture, it should be good enough for all segements of the economy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congress, President Eisenhower, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

PRICE SPREAD INVESTIGATION

Whereas the farmer's share of the food dollar is currently only 39 cents, while processing and marketing interests take 61 cents; and

Whereas consumers are upset when they learn that the dairy farmer is receiving less than $4 per 100 pounds of milk when they claim that by the quart it is costing them over $10 per $100 pounds; and

Whereas many consumers have remarked that they would not mind paying 20 to 25 cents per quart if the farmers got at least 50 percent, which would amount to over $5 per 100 pounds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, request a full congressional investigation on the spread between producer and consumer prices, on all farm commodities.

LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVES

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has shown utter and complete disregard for any need to maintain an equitable return to farm people for their labor and investment; and

Whereas directives to the Secretary in existing farm legislation read, "to insure an adequate supply": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record recommending that the words, "to insure a just and fair net return to farmer producers—such return to be on a par with earnings of other people gainfully employed," be added to directives in existing farm legislation.

FARM PROGRAM FUNDS

Whereas there is evidence that the administration is contemplating diverting hundreds of millions of dollars of funds, which ordinarily would be used in the national farm program, into nuclear, missiles, and strictly military projects; and

Whereas farmers as a whole are being discriminated against as compared to other segments of our economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates gathered at the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby voice their vigorous opposition and disapproval of any diversion of farm program or school-lunch program funds to missile development or military defense programs.

WAC MARKETING CO-OP

Whereas we believe the farmer's share of the dollar spent by the consumer for dairy products is inadequate when we realize that only 46 cents of the consumer's dollar is returned to the farmer and that it is 2 percent less than a year ago and 15 percent below the 1947–49 average, and

Whereas it is in our interest as dairy farmers living within the Nation's No. 1 dairy State to bolster and promote the sale of dairy products so that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is substantially increased, and

Whereas the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives has now succeeded in organizing a producers' marketing cooperative, whose purpose it is to coordinate dairy sales on a national scale: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates gathered at the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis, February 21–23, 1958, go on record supporting and helping promote the special dairy marketing organization set up by the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives.

STATE SALES TAX

Whereas we believe that all taxes should be levied according to the ability to pay, and

Whereas a State sales tax imposes a greater burden upon the lower income groups who spend most of their income for the necessities of life, and

Whereas the sales tax is being put forward as a deceptive inducement to make people believe that property taxes would be reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–32, 1958, do hereby go on record as being opposed to any State sales tax.

INCOME TAX SECRECY

Whereas the reenactment of the secrecy clause as affecting our State income tax returns has created a situation wherein the State is losing an inestimable amount of tax moneys resulting in a shortage of revenues derived from this source, and

Whereas these shortages in turn are creating a springboard from which the special interest groups are clamoring for the enactment of a State sales tax, therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, do hereby go on record condemning all secrecy in government and demanding the repeal of the secrecy clause in our income tax laws.

SCHOOL SURTAX

Whereas the Wisconsin farm property tax is so high now that the tax has almost become prohibitive, therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, hereby urge that the legislature pass a surtax on income to be used for elementary and high school purposes for the relief of the property tax.

TAXATION OF FOREST PROPERTY

Whereas owners of forest properties under the regular property tax are severely discriminated against as compared to owners of forest land entered under forest crop law, the regular tax being about five times as great as the forest crop law protected properties, and

Whereas the State constitution provides that the rule of taxation shall be uniform, therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, recommend that the tax costs on timber lands subject to the regular property tax be made similar to forest crop law tax costs through a reduction in assessments of standing timber to 15 percent of true value.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Whereas many of our farmers are of retirement age, and

Whereas they cannot afford to retire because of the amount of income tax taken from their life's earnings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record urging our Federal Government to provide a statute whereby farmers 60 years of age or over be exempt from income tax on the first $20,000 of the proceeds of the sale of their property.

TAX ON STATE PROPERTY

Whereas taxes are high in townships where the State of Wisconsin owns land or operates institutions, and

Whereas people living on such State-owned property who are employees of the State receive benefits such as school bus transportation, high school tuition, and other services and privileges equal to those received by those living on private, taxable property, and

Whereas the burden of these services puts an unfair tax load on the property owners in these townships, therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record in favor of legislation which would cause the State of Wisconsin to pay tax on all property occupied by individuals receiving benefits provided in whole or part by local taxpayers.

HIGH SCHOOL AID

Whereas the present system of high-school aids places a punitive burden of taxation against the nonhigh school areas; and

Whereas this discriminatory taxation is being used as a lever to deprive the rural communities of all control of elementary education: Therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23,

1958, do hereby urge that aids for all high-school pupils be on a uniform, nondiscriminatory basis.

* * * * *

REA INTEREST RATE

Whereas the REA has performed services to rural people which should be highly commended; and

Whereas the REA has a record unequaled in the repayment of loans to the United States Government; and

Whereas there is legislation to be introduced in the next session of Congress which will seek to increase the interest rates on REA loans from Government funds; and

Whereas the passage of such a law will cripple and possibly destroy the REA: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record as being opposed to any increase in REA interest rates.

ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

Whereas the Department of Agriculture is neither equipped nor willing to enforce antitrust laws as they pertain to food chains and meatpackers: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record that this function should be immediately transferred to the Federal Trade Commission.

CCC STOCKS

Whereas, when CCC stocks are sold proper credit is not always given to the farm program: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record urging the Department of Agriculture that proper credit be given to the farm program when CCC stocks are sold.

SURPLUS FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Whereas, we feel that the distribution of surplus farm commodities to people in need of assistance is a great help in disposing of surplus food commodities through welfare agencies and also a help in keeping assistance cost to local communities to a minimum: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record as being in favor of continuance of such a program.

INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

Whereas, there is a movement afoot to increase postal rates on first-class mail in order to raise needed revenue: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby go on record in opposition to the increase on first-class mail, but if moneys are needed, they should come through increasing rates on the heavily subsidized second-class mails, magazines, etc. An increase in rates on junk mail is also in order.

REMOVAL OF SECRETARY BENSON

Whereas we believe Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson is representing the interests of processors and distributors; and

Whereas the past performance of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson indicates that he would not be sympathetic to any plan designed to provide parity of income for family farmers; and

Whereas he has thus far pursued a pattern of action obviously intended to destroy all Government price support programs: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 27th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union convention at La Crosse, Wis., February 21–23, 1958, do hereby wholeheartedly urge the removal of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson and favor his replacement by a man who will work for the interests of the family-size farm and restore farm income to a level comparable to that of labor and industry.

* * * * *

Political Slatemaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in many States of the Union the political parties are naming their candidates for the 1958 elections. In some places slates are formed. When a slate is formed by what is known as the State organization, it creates some opposition. On the other hand, if a slate is not formed many voters criticize the party officials for not making suggestions.

Mr. Milton V. Burgess, the political editor of the Pittsburgh, Pa., Sun-Telegraph, discussed this in last Sunday's edition of that paper, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLATEMAKING O. K. (IF I'M ON ONE)

(By Milton V. Burgess)

The forming of slates by the party leaders is an activity which causes many bruised feelings and bitter reactions in the party membership.

It is necessary if the party is to work effectively as an organization, but the slatemakers are never popular with those who do not win endorsements.

The rank and file of voters also distrust this sort of activity, although many times independent voters are among the first to criticize if a party organization does not offer a strong ticket and a carefully prepared program.

The slatemakers are not to be envied.

In the past, in both parties, conferences of leaders attempting to reach agreement on the ticket have been attended with some attempts at secrecy, although in most cases the newsmen have caught up with these sessions and picked up at least some of the details.

In the recent slating of statewide tickets in both parties, efforts were made by both State chairmen to sound sentiment carefully throughout the State before the endorsements were made.

THE FINAL CHOICE

Among the Democrats a group of about 15 leaders reached agreement on the final selections.

Once such agreement is attained there is little difficulty in gaining ratification from the larger policy committee.

In practical effect, much of the same method was followed by Republican leaders.

Arthur T. McGonigle of Reading, who was indorsed for governor, on a recent trip to Pittsburgh explained exactly how the recommendations were reached: first through regional conferences, then through a committee of about 60, and finally through a smaller committee.

Even candidates who do not receive the organization indorsements realize the necessity for a ticket if they are to win decisively.

Harold E. Stassen, candidate for the Republican nomination for governor, denounced the selection of the organization ticket, but immediately formed one of his own.

He explains, however, that his ticket is merely recommended to the voters and is not to be considered in the same light as the organization slate.

IT ALL DEPENDS

Nor does Stassen object to organization, either, if it is friendly—he expressed the view that he has the suppport of a majority of the organization committee members, if they are free to act.

Lt. Gov. Roy E. Furman who is running against Mayor Lawrence for the Democratic nomination for governor is not against organization as such.

Furman was the organization candidate for lieutenant governor 4 years ago, and sought the organization's endorsement for governor this year.

Furman's objection, too, is to the action of leaders who have not gone along with his candidacy.

He said recently that many members of the Policy Committee would have liked to vote for him but said they were afraid.

The business of becoming docile in the presence of fear is something which does not seem to bother Furman personally.

FALSE PROPHECY

He commented once that when he was first elected to the State committee by defeating the organization in a sticker campaign, he became involved in an argument with party leaders over the seating of certain members and that one of those leaders, whom he did not name, shook a finger under Furman's nose and told him:

"You are through politically."

Since then he has been speaker of the house and lieutenant governor, quite a political career.

The threatening business can be overdone.

Voters regard it as an abuse of organization power, and when such threats are clearly recorded the reaction at the polls has been amazing to even the most cynical.

The Vital Role of River Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 10, Mr. Braxton B. Carr, president of the American Waterways Operators, Inc., delivered a very important speech at Greenville, Miss., to a joint meeting of the Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Clubs. More than 300 civic leaders of Greenville heard Mr. Carr tell of the vital role of river commerce in the development of the economy of our Nation. Mr. Carr's visit to Greenville was arranged by Mr. Jesse Brent, president of the Brent Towing Co. and a leader in waterways activities in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Mr. Carr's address illustrates the very fine work that he is doing as president of American Waterways Operators. Under unanimous consent I include a copy of his speech:

SPEECH BY BRAXTON B. CARR, PRESIDENT, THE AMERICAN WATERWAY OPERATORS, INC., BEFORE JOINT MEETING OF ROTARY, KIWANIS, AND LIONS CLUBS, GREENVILLE, MISS., APRIL 10, 1958

I am happy to be in Greenville, for this is the first opportunity I have had to visit your city, although I am a native of your neighboring State of Alabama.

I know a great deal about your city from having heard of it through many of your citizens who are members of the American Waterways Operators, Inc.

I have met and listened to your Congressman, the Honorable FRANK E. SMITH, extol the virtues and the values of Mississippi and her great natural resources and her fine spirited people. These men call Greenville a river town and they say it with pride and the expectancy that others will appreciate all the meaning of the phrase "river town."

These men know the unique industrial and commercial strength and power that a river town enjoys today. They know the tremendous growth potential a river town has in the future of this Nation.

I wonder if you fully appreciate and understand this great growth potential you have or if it is lost to you because of your nearness to your own greatest natural resource, the greatest except for you as a people and your own resourcefulness.

Greenville is here because the river is here. A hundred and thirty years ago, settlers stopped here and began building a community because the Mississippi River gave them an avenue of trade and communication. In 130 years Greenville has had its ups and downs, its depressions, its recessions, its periods of economic stagnancy. Your people have hated the river one year and loved it the next. But through the years Greenville has grown. In the last 15 years her population has doubled.

In those 15 years the river was tamed and made to live in its banks.

The packet boat that once made Greenville a center of trade and commerce has shaken off her paddlewheel and her superstructure and her smoke-belching stacks; she has thrown away her wood- and coal-fired boilers.

In the last 15 years the thing that emerged from the ghost of the packet boat is squat, powerful, and ram-fronted. The towboat was not designed for eye-appeal. She was designed and developed as the most powerful working unit—pound for pound and horsepower for horsepower—of any piece of equipment that moves the commerce of this Nation. In power, dependability, and economy the towboat is a thing of beauty. She captures in the thrust of her propellers more of her diesel engines' usable power in proportion to the fuel she burns than any other power unit that is used in the United States to haul freight. She is the master of her movements, with her capabilities to go forward, backward, sideways, or at any angle with equal ease. She has mastered the rivers' currents with her great strength that ranges up to 6,000 horsepower. She probes the darkness of night and the murk of fog and rain with her radio and her radar to push her great loads of commerce up and down the river at steady, unbroken speeds that permit origin-to-destination delivery of her cargoes at 8 miles an hour—at times a better speed for origin-to-destination than some of our 60-mile-at-hour land carriers. Her depth finders probe the bottom of the channels to keep her moving.

More than 30 of these giants of transportation call Greenville, Miss., their home port. They are crewed and serviced and provisioned here. Most of them were built here. The men who sail them over portions of our great network of 29,000 miles of rivers and canals are Greenville men.

In the 15 years that Greenville doubled her population and became home port for 30 modern river towboats, these boats gathered around them a port full of barges to carry the freight that the packet boats once carried on their decks. The barges have even less eye appeal than the towboats, but they are long and big on service and economy. They will hold and carry, singly, from 600 tons to 3,000 tons, with 1 giant barge having been built with a cargo capacity of 7,200 tons. Some are open barges; some have hatch covers; some are tank barges with intricate systems of valves and vents and pumping systems; some are floating thermos bottles for special cargoes; some are steam-coiled to keep their cargoes hot; some are lined to handle highly corrosive acids; some are special deck types to carry automobiles; some are pressurized floating tanks.

Wedded together in tows—some of which are longer than the 1,031-foot *Queen Elizabeth*—these towboats and barges become single carrying units for as much as 30,000 tons of cargo. Where it counts, on the bottom where these tows ride the water, they are wedded together in a smooth surfaced bottom with a raked bow to break the water so that they move with the greatest efficiency of any cargo carrier in use today.

These tows that in the last 15 years have come to call Greenville, Miss., their home port are a strong muscle in the commerce and industry of the United States.

They are part of a total inland waterway fleet of 4,000 towboats and 15,000 barges operated by 1,700 companies.

They feed the producing hand of industry by moving into it the vital raw materials—coal, petroleum ,and petroleum products, chemicals, ores, heavy iron and steel products, grain, and grain products, wood and wood products, building materials, and sand and gravel.

This commerce of the rivers which planted Greenville on the banks of the Mississippi 130 years ago, and which flourished and died when the packet boat died, has come back in relatively the same span of years that Greenville has recaptured her growth cycle. Today the river boats haul over 8 percent of this Nation's freight in their barges.

They will carry even more of this Nation's commerce in the years ahead because they provide the most economical means of moving our bulk raw materials to our production industries. Men in Greenville who operate the towboats and barges, as well as the crews who sail them, are dedicated to rendering transportation services at the lowest possible cost consistent with efficiency and safety. They have sold their service as no one thought 15 years ago that it could ever be sold. As this Nation grows and prospers, as our population increases, as our standard of living rises and our demands grows for more goods and services, the need and demand for two things that Greenville has to offer will grow out of all proportion to what you even dream of today. Those two resources that you have that are most precious to you are really two in one—water in abundance and water transportation.

The river is a precious resource of great potential wealth. You should guard it and cherish it and protect it.

In 15 years it has helped double your population while other cities your size were losing their population, and more importantly, losing their young citizens. In those 15 years the river has given you a fleet of towboats and barges and their service facilities. It has helped give you two of your largest industries and several smaller but very important ones who depend on the river as their transportation avenue to supply their raw materials at transportation costs which allow them to compete in their sales markets. Your port terminal authority estimates, conservatively I think, that 1,500 persons in Greenville are gainfully employed in jobs made possible because of river transportation. Fifteen hundred gainfully employed because of river transportation means that 6,000—or one-seventh of Greenville's population get their livelihood directly from river commerce.

Greenville is a striking example of the role internal commerce serves in the life of a nation.

Let me say, without documentation, that the histories of the world's great civilized empires will show very clearly that those who neglected or allowed their internal commerce to be strangled all perished and died. World trade is glamorous and profitable and necessary—but internal commerce within the United States must be preserved and encouraged or we too will perish.

Do not misunderstand me in my dedication to waterways commerce. It is not the final and only answer to our needs for freight transportation. We need railroads, highways, pipelines, and airlines serving in their proper transportation capacities, rendering that portion of service which they can render most economically. They too serve Greenville with necessary services. I do not suggest any one of them should be eliminated or hamstrung in any way. But I do suggest that without river transportation Greenville would be less attractive to industry.

I think you must look outside your own city to appreciate my point. I think you have to look at what is happening to the overall industrial growth pattern of the United States.

In the fiercely competitive postwar period, when industry sought every advantage in production and marketing, a relocation of plants was started. This trend in relocation of industry gradually assumed revolutionary proportions. We moved into the greatest industrial production boom that this country has ever experienced and probably the greatest ever experienced in history. Industry's appetite for raw materials which had to be assembled from widely dispersed areas grew out of all proportion to anything we had known. A part of industry's hunger for raw materials was an appetite for process water in quantities available only from lakes, reservoirs, or running streams.

This combination of factors sent our manufacturing industries into a search for plant sites which ultimately led them to the navigable waterways. In the postwar period over $13 billion has been expended by industry on new plants and plant expansions in the Ohio River Valley alone. The aluminum industry is one outstanding example of the type of plant that has gone to the Ohio River Valley. In the war years the aluminum makers turned to the Pacific Northwest where they found what they thought to be an inexhaustible supply of cheap hydroelectric energy as well as the process water which the industry needs. But in the postwar years the aluminum industry has found that it needs a more stable supply of electric energy than can be furnished by hydro plants. It found also that in the Pacific Northwest it was so far removed from its principal raw material and its principal markets that it was losing its ability to compete. The aluminum makers turned to the Ohio Valley. Officials have publicly stated that their new aluminum production facilities will go to that valley because in the Ohio basin they have the right combination of factors which will enable them to compete in the production and sale of their product. A part of that combination of factors, and a very important part, is that the valley has the cheapest sources of steam-generated electricity to be

found anywhere in the country. This cheap steam-generated energy is made possible by generating plants which themselves have come to the river banks in order to haul their coal directly from the mine to plant by river transportation.

I do not suggest to you that water transportation and water supply alone has attracted $13 billion of industrial growth and expansion in the Ohio River Valley. Without the availability of other modes of transportation, other modes which haul the high cost products into and out of the valley, without adequate labor supplies, without accessibility to markets, this industrial expansion could not have taken place in the Ohio Valley. But the availability of economical river transportation and the availability of unlimited water supply in the navigation channels were two of the very necessary factors which made it possible to build this tremendous industrial empire in that area.

While the industrial growth in the Ohio Valley is greater in proportion than any that has taken place in any single area of this country in the postwar period, nevertheless this same type of industrial growth in lesser proportion has been taking place along every navigable stream in the United States. The growth of industry along navigable waterways has outstripped industrial growth in areas without this resource.

Over 2,500 plants have been built or have been expanded on water sites in the last 6 years. The chemical industry has invested over a billion dollars annually in new plants in the last several years and almost all of that industry's building program has been on waterside locations.

While we have reached the highest standard of living ever known to a civilized nation, no one has suggested that we have reached the peak. With the prospects of a growing need for more products to add to the standard of living and with our fast multiplying population, we shall need an even greater production plant than has been built in spite of the temporary economic setback that we are experiencing right now.

Greenville has a tremendous stake in the future growth because of the advantages you enjoy from your location, because of the start you have made to complement your predominantly agricultural economy with industrial diversification. You enjoy advantages which can be exploited over and above many cities of similar size.

Plans to improve Greenville's port by the development of an adequate channel to connect with the Mississippi River and to build industrial sites along your harbor front area represent an aggressive step forward to bring to Greenville even greater benefits from the river. No one is more aware of this than your Congressman FRANK E. SMITH who is a distinguished member of the House Public Works Committee and who has worked and fought to get the necessary congressional authorization for the $2½ million harbor development program which is so important to Greenville's future growth and prosperity. It has been an uphill fight to get authorization, but apparently it will be achieved this year and then you will be ready to proceed with the building of your improved harbor channel and waterfront industrial site area.

At the same time that river transportation is making its tremendous contribution to the growth and prosperity of this Nation, there are strong forces at work which seek to cripple and hamstring waterways transportation and water resource development.

The citizens of a town whose past, present and future is so closely tied up with river transportation should be aware of the dangers that lie ahead.

In November of last year the Bureau of the Budget directed that the Department of Commerce make a study to determine the feasibility of imposing user charges on our waterways. This study is underway. It is being made as a staff study without benefit of public hearings. The study is intended primarily to provide a basis of consideration for further administration action on the Hoover Commission report which recommended that tolls be levied against commercial users of the waterways. Such intent indicates something of a preconceived notion that user charges are feasible and should be levied.

At the same time that this study has been going on in the Commerce Department, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been holding hearings on the "deteriorating railroad situation and its effect on the national transportation policy." A parade of witnesses appearing before that subcommittee has repeatedly recommended waterways user charges, apparently as a means to correct what is considered inequities in transportation.

Since the rivers of this Nation were first used as avenues of transportation and communication to open up the eastern one-third of the United States to settlement and trade, they have been free highways of commerce. The improvements which have been made to these transportation arteries have been accomplished with Federal funds in the expressed belief and conviction that the benefits which accrue from water resource developments are necessary for the general public welfare and are vital to our internal commerce. A waterways user charge will deny a portion of the benefits of these improvements to the public regardless of how it is imposed or under what guise.

We are heading into a fight to maintain the continued free use of the great Mississippi River system as a busy avenue of commerce contributing to the prosperity and future growth of Greenville. It is your fight as citizens of Greenville, even more than it is the fight of the operators of barges and towboats whose job it is only to render services over these waters which give to Greenville its river benefits.

I hope that you will join the fight when it comes to preserve your interests.

We Need an Across-the-Board Price Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the chamber of commerce at Milan, Tenn. In this speech I urged a straight, across-the-board price cut on all levels—manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing as the best boost to the country's economy.

It seems to me that there is some point at which we must call a halt to continuing, month to month, and year by year, rising prices and costs. It also appears to me that prices have reached a point at which the consumer has balked—and balked hard. I believe that following such a voluntary price reduction, we would see a prompt revival of business.

It would hold none of the danger of a tax cut and if business were to be sufficiently stimulated, increased production would more than make up for the reduction in prices and there would be no marked reduction in business profits.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BANQUET, APRIL 12, 1958, MILAN, TENN.

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Webb, distinguished guests, and members of the Milan Chamber of Commerce, it is a great pleasure to have this opportunity to visit in the fine and vigorous city of Milan and to speak here at your annual chamber of commerce banquet.

I have had the chance on many occasions to learn of the activities of the Milan Chamber of Commerce. It is a very valuable institution in this town. I am glad to see by the size of this audience that it has such large support in the community and in the surrounding area.

I know of the efforts which have been made to more fully utilize this great arsenal. I want to salute the Harvey Aluminum Co. for what it is doing in cooperation with the chamber of commerce to utilize the facilities here. And I want you to know that I am continuing my endeavors to keep this arsenal in the mind of the Department of Defense.

I am not going to make a political speech tonight. But I want to tell you that what I have to say is going to impinge on politics. I intend to say something about the current recession and what is being done about it—and what is not being done about it. There is no way I can do this without mentioning the different attitudes on the part of the Republicans and the Democrats. But I hope you will regard what I say as factual rather than partisan.

The first thing we ought to know about this recession is that it was man made. It was deliberately brought about. It was and is the product of a mistaken tight money policy on the part of the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.

The tight money policy was aimed at inflation. Its intention was to curb industrial expansion and consumption by ordinary consumers. It was believed that the resulting slack in orders for goods and services would bring down prices.

It was a mistaken policy. It did not bring down prices. The cost of living has continued to mount month by month. The cost of living is now about 7 percent greater than it was at this time last year—and it was too high then.

The tight money policy resulted in a scarcity of money and higher interest rates. You will remember that Christmas a year ago merchants were hard put to obtain seasonal loans to help carry their Christmas merchandise. Banks just did not have the money to lend.

The price of mortgage money went up—if you could find a place to borrow money in the first place. Housing construction went down.

The price of everything bought on time went up. And as prices rose the demands of labor for cost-of-living increases also rose.

I say that this recession was man made. But the length of it and the depth of it was certainly unintentional. The people at the White House, at the Treasury, and at the Federal Reserve System did not intend that the situation get out of hand as it has. They did not intend for unemployment to mount as high as it has. But they made a further mistake in not recognizing the economic forces that they had unleashed in

time. Even to this very hour they are divided as to what to do about it.

Just last fall, when the signs of the recession were already clearly becoming evident, President Eisenhower warned the American people against spending.

"I am not advocating any buyers' strike," he said, "but I do know this, we should buy selectively and carefully. * * * We should not be spending recklessly and adding fuel to this flame."

That is what he said last fall, about a week before Detroit put its 1958 models on the market. And I may say that his words sent a chill up and down the spines of the automobile manufacturers.

But by March 5, he sang a different song. Unemployment had gone up to nearly 5 million.

At that time the President said, "I believe, of course, that the upturn in our economy will be the result of millions of citizens making their purchases, having greater confidence."

The President put his finger on the key word—confidence. What we have is a crisis of confidence. It is on confidence that the world of business moves.

Everybody likes to point to the vast amount of savings which Americans have accumulated. They are important. But they are not so important as confidence. Confidence is the basis of credit. It must be present in both buyer and lender. The buyer must have confidence that he will be able to pay his bills, his monthly charges. The lender must have confidence that the buyer's confidence is well-founded.

What is lacking now in both business and the individual that times are going to continue to be good enough in the foreseeable future to warrant using credit.

Most people will not buy a house with payments lastlig as long as 20 years or more without faith in the future—their own economic future. On the short term, many buyers hesitate to sign up for 30 or 36 monthly payments on a new automobile without the faith that they will have jobs which will produce the money to pay for the cars.

What we need obviously is a big dose of confidence. It is on the question of what medicine to use and when and where to apply it, that the political parties divide. And the Republicans, of course, are divided among themselves.

We Democrats in the Congress have taken several actions lately to create jobs. It is important to the Nation, as well as to the individuals who are out of work, that those unemployment figures come down—and come down substantially.

We have passed a major housing bill—which the President signed reluctantly—to put new life into the construction industry. It will make mortgage money more readily available, among other things.

We felt that the stimulation of housing was important because it does not take the housing industry long to toot up and get going. Furthermore it touches almost every community in the country.

New houses do more than stimulate the construction industry. They stimulate the home furnishings business, the appliance business, the textile business and many more.

We hope that the effect of this new housing bill will be felt promptly in communities all over the country.

We have also passed a bill stepping up the great Federal-aid highway program. This program provided increased Federal aid for the construction over a 16-year period of a 41,000 mile highway system. It was a landmark in our approach to the highway problem. But it was slow in getting underway. We hope that by the amendments we have now made that this program in Tennessee and other States will move along promptly so that it can provide its own stimulation in orders for road machinery, cement, steel and all the other products which go into highway construction, along with jobs.

We have also been insisting that the various departments of government, especially the Department of Defense to which most of the money goes, step up purchases and contracts with money which had previously been appropriated.

We hope all of these measures will be effective although we understand that alone they may not be enough to turn the tide.

Now the administration has taken the view all along that it was against what it calls pump-priming public works programs in the light of the fact that we are headed for a deficit this year. On the question of a tax cut to stimulate buying it has been unable to make up its mind.

One week Vice President NIXON and Secretary of Labor Mitchell come out for a big tax cut. The next week the White House pulls the rug out from under them.

I want to make it clear that there are things for and against a tax cut now. I want to be frank about it because I know it is a subject of interest and concern to us all.

Let me point out some of the things which are against a tax cut at the present time.

One is that a tax cut of a size sufficient to have any effect on stimulating purchasing would undoubtedly result in a large deficit in the Federal budget. It appears that there is going to be a budget deficit anyway. A tax cut added to that might run the Federal deficit up to as much as $10 billion or more.

This in turn would require another act of Congress either removing or stretching the present limit on the Federal debt.

What this means in essence is that we would have to issue bonds and start paying interest on the tax cut we would be voting ourselves.

There is a second important objection. This is that a tax cut would add fuel to the price inflation which has in no way been lessened by the recession. Many people feel that a tax cut would merely underwrite already high prices and might lead to still higher prices. This is a very serious objection.

On the other hand it is said in behalf of a tax cut that a tax cut is cheaper than a very large public-works program. It is said that a tax cut would have an immediate effect on the economy whereas it would take many months to get a public-works program underway.

It is also pointed out that if the economic situation gets more serious than it is now, that a stimulation of business would be cheaper—since this in itself would create taxable values—than letting our economy slide, and tax collections along with it.

For my part, I do not think a big overall tax cut at this time is advisable. I think there should be some increase in the personal exemption, which would contribute something to the purchasing power of the individual, and an adjustment of small-business taxes, allowing them additional funds which would expand and invigorate business. But, with these exceptions, I think an overall big cut would be unwise under present conditions.

An overall tax cut would be inflationary, and I must say that I agree in good part with Bernard Baruch who testified before Congress last week to the effect that inflation was our greatest danger.

It seems to me that there is some point at which we must call a halt to continuing, month to month, and year by year, rising prices and costs.

It also appears to me that prices have reached a point at which the consumer has balked—and balked hard.

I think what this country and our economy needs is a straight across-the-board price cut on all levels, manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing.

I think that if we had such a voluntary price reduction across the board we would see a prompt revival of business. It would hold none of the dangers of a tax cut. If business were to be sufficiently stimulated, increased production would more than make up for the reduction in prices and there would be no marked reduction in business profits.

I am glad to see that prices are coming down in some instances. Aluminum has now been reduced and the price reduction in this basic material should be evident soon in many things in which it is employed.

Both Montgomery Ward and Sears, Roebuck & Co. have sent out large spring catalogs with prices in many cases reduced by 10 percent.

These price reductions are helpful. But price cuts should not be limited just to retailers or to isolated industries. We need a general price reduction to stimulate purchasing and create jobs.

We particularly need price reductions in basic commodities and services whose costs enter into so many other things. A price reduction in steel would be the most effective kind of reduction. It makes possible a reduction in automobiles, in heavy construction, in a thousand other articles and trades.

It is ominous in my opinion that the steel industry does not reduce prices at the present time. Steel is operating at little more than 50 percent capacity. The earning records of the industry show that it could well afford a price cut and also that the present price of steel is unnaturally high.

I hope that the steel industry would see that it is not only a matter of economics which is involved, but a matter of patriotism.

Prices of automobiles have been going up and up for 10 years or more. There can be no doubt but that high prices have a lot to do with the fact that, although the industry is operating at little more than 60 percent of capacity, some 900,000 unsold cars are today in the hands of dealers across the Nation.

The industry has expressed the hope that the current excise tax on automobiles be abolished or reduced. It is possible that this may be done. But the American public deserves a price reduction in addition.

This is a time for statesmanship on the part of the big business and industrial leaders, and also on the part of leaders of labor.

I will say for myself that I would feel far more inclined to vote for tax reduction if I knew that business and industry generally were also going to give the consumer an across-the-board price reduction.

A reasonable, voluntary price reduction now would stimulate business and make jobs. Unless we get it, inflation is still going to take its heavy toll, purchasing power will continue to decline, and jobs will decline as well.

American business and industry in this long period of inflation has become accustomed to competing in every way except in prices. It would be a healthy thing if price competition, contributing as it does to a dynamic economy, would come back to America.

Millions for Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal, in its Sunday, April 13 issue, pointed to one great weakness in our foreign-aid program. The editorial congratulates Representative

WAYNE HAYS for his criticism of the great error of this Nation in providing generous aid to the corrupt dictatorship of Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, which so extravagantly and wastefully squanders money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIONS FOR THE DICTATORS

Representative WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, Ohio, charges that Lt. Gen. Rafael Trujillo, Jr., son of the Dominican Republic's dictator, is spending a million dollars on a year's stay in the United States.

None of our business? HAYS thinks is is, for the Dominican Republic is down for $1,300,000 in American aid.

Young Trujillo is ostensibly attending the United States army command and general staff school at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. He has an entourage of 7, plus a dog. He has a hotel penthouse and a ranch near Leavenworth.

But currently Trujillo is on leave from the army college. His doctor, he says, thought he ought to go to California because of a sinus condition. He's been attending sporting events, squiring movie stars and having a pleasant time generally.

This bothers Representative HAYS. And he has a point. Here is another case of a family dictatorship which milks the people of its country and lives as lavishly as the old moguls of India. It's not a unique case. Batista in Cuba is a good example of a man using position to build private wealth. Peron did it in Argentina. Perez Jimenez did in Venezuela. Bao Dai did it in Vietnam until he was forced out. (See article by Peter Edson on page 1 of this section about Cuban graft.)

In each of these cases the poverty stricken people of a country were victims of extortion to provide private wealth and luxury for their leaders. And while it occurred this country was forking over aid money to help the countries develop—money required at least in part because of corrupt leaders.

There's something wrong here, as HAYS believes. Proper aid is one thing. Aid to help those whose leaders squander a nation's competence is something else.

The Civil Rights Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the full appropriation for the Civil Rights Commission for the next fiscal year, and I trust the administration will delay no longer in implementing the provisions of the Civil Rights Act passed at the last session.

The first Civil Rights Act in nearly a century emerged from Congress in a scarred condition, but it did come out alive. Certainly the fact that such legislation was enacted is in itself very encouraging. It proves that in spite of the very great difficulties encountered in the Halls of Congress, progress in this field can be made. The opponents of this civil-rights bill, armed with the weapon of debate, set out to kill it as they had defeated such legislation in the past; but this time, even though wounded and substantially weakened, it did survive. The real importance of this action by Congress is that, for the first time in many years, the Legislature has done more than talk about civil rights, and has taken a substantial step toward assuring the citizens of this great Nation that it is not merely a paper democracy. I hope you do not feel that this is in any sense a final victory. The real battle is ahead. This is, at most, a beginning.

Let us now examine, briefly, this new law on civil rights, keeping in mind, first of all, what it was originally intended to accomplish; and, secondly, what it probably will accomplish. The main purpose of this bill, when first introduced into Congress, was to supply legislation which would enforce the constitutional right of every citizen of the United States to vote regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. The bill called for the creation of a Civil Rights Commission with power to investigate cases concerning denials of voting privileges to any citizen. Such a Commission has been established. Part 2 of the bill provided for an additional Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice to head a new Division on Civil Rights. This provision was also adopted in the final version of the bill. Part 3 was originally designed to give the Attorney General the right to "seek injunctions in Federal courts in the name of the United States against any person who has engaged or is about to engage in acts which would deprive a citizen of voting rights or other civil rights." Or other civil rights. This very important part of the bill was struck down by the Senate. If this last part of section 3 had not been eliminated, the Attorney General would have had the power to seek an injunction in a Federal district court against any person who would interfere with another's exercise of his civil rights. For example, if a person or a group of persons attempted to halt or interfere with the desegregation of a school, the Attorney General could take action against them. However, part 3, as finally passed, allowed for such action on the part of the Attorney General only in cases of denial of voting privileges.

The original version of the bill also allowed enforcement for its provisions by civil action as well as by criminal action. In other words, the Attorney General could institute action by getting an injunction ordering the violator to cease his interference. Should he persist, he would be subject to arrest and imprisonment for contempt of court. This provision was also modified by Congress. The Senate and House compromised in that, if the fine levied was more than $300 or the imprisonment imposed totaled more than 45 days, the accused could demand and receive a trial by jury. This jury trial compromise is certainly a very debatable issue in the theoretical sense, but in reality it is a partial victory for those who oppose civil-rights legislation. In the first place, if those opponents of civil rights who claim there is no real need for such legislation speak in good faith, they have nothing to fear from the bill whether or not a jury trial is provided. In the second place, it is a well-known fact that such contempt actions as proposed here are generally not subject to jury trial, especially in the States where the most vigorous opposition to this legislation is manifest. In the third place, it is certainly doubtful that any substantial convictions by jury would be obtained against offenders since the people of the area of the Nation where such cases are most likely to arise are, generally speaking, not only bitterly opposed to civil-rights actions, but in some cases have also openly announced their intention to defy such laws as that laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to school desegregation.

The Civil Rights Act does add one new protection in regard to jury trials. The act provides for uniform qualifications for Federal jurors. The effect of this protection will be to reduce the possibility of discriminatory State regulations being used to keep Negroes off juries trying civil-rights cases.

This has been a sketchy treatment of our new law on civil rights; but I believe it is sufficient to serve my purpose. One can easily see that the final civil-rights bill passed by Congress is substantially different from the original version. During its battle for survival the bill was drained of a great deal of its original strength and purpose. Whether or not it is strong enough to do its job of protecting voting rights remains to be seen. But it will never be able to serve its original purpose of protecting other civil rights. For, if it had been passed in all its facets, it already would have been tested.

No more than a few days after the Civil Rights Act of 1957 was enacted into law, we witnessed one of the sorriest domestic incidents of the last 50 years. I refer, of course, to the tragic and nationally humiliating affair which occurred at Little Rock, Ark. Here was a city which, in compliance with the United States Supreme Court order of 1955 that desegregation proceed with all deliberate speed, had carefully formulated a plan to integrate its Central High School, and was ready to put that plan into effect in all good faith. Then, very ironically, the Governor of Arkansas used his powers derived from law to frustrate the law of the land as laid down by our highest Court. There we had a terrible travesty of justice. There we had troops being used not to protect and enforce the constitutional principle of equal protection of the law, but to flagrantly deny this maxim.

We are all familiar with the events which took place during those few weeks last September. Governor Faubus actually challenged the validity of the Federal Court's order to proceed "immediately" with the integration as planned. Judge Davies, who refused to grant a stay of integration as requested by the local board of education, said:

In an organized society, there can be nothing but ultimate confusion and chaos if court decrees are flaunted—

He meant "flouted"—whatever the pretext.

The Governor announced that he did not intend to call off the National Guard men. Their orders not to admit Negroes to the school stood fast. The Governor, after a conference with President Eisenhower, agreed to abide by the ruling of the Court, hearing to be held on September 20. On that day, Judge Davies granted a temporary injunction against the Governor's use of the National Guard. The Governor complied with the court's ruling, and ordered withdrawal of the troops.

Integration was scheduled to proceed on September 23. A large crowd of more than 1,000 people gathered near the school. Despite the efforts of city and State police, the mob managed to attack newspapermen and Negroes in the area. The eight Negro students were taken from the school and escorted home for their own protection.

The President then announced his intention to use force if necessary to guarantee compliance with the order of the court. The necessity was demonstrated the next day when, despite the President's order to cease and desist, another mob gathered in front of the school. That afternoon the President ordered the Secretary of Defense to federalize the National Guard and to "call out whatever troops might be necessary to insure compliance with the district court order." Paratroopers swiftly moved into Little Rock, and integration proceeded with a minimum of disorder.

Now we come to the question of what might have been done if the civil-rights law of 1957 had not had its teeth extracted by opposing legislators. If part 3 of the bill, as originally proposed, had been preserved, the use of force by Federal troops might have been averted in Little Rock. The Attorney General could have taken action against the agitators who threatened to interfere with the planned integration. It might also be said that most of those who made up the mobs around Central High School would not have been there if they had known they were risking arrest and possible prosecution for violating Federal law. True, this is all conjecture; but the point is that for lack of any law to enforce the integration plan, and to nip interference in the bud, we had to rely on the Presidential power to enforce a court order by use of Federal troops. Would it not have been better to have had such a law?

What the Little Rock incident cost us in national morale and in international propaganda is immeasurable. One fact is clear. We did not gain by this humiliating experience. The President's order and use of troops were not enough to save face, for we had lost face by allowing the whole mess ever to come about.

How many more Little Rocks will there be? How many more flagrant denials of individual civil rights will be perpetrated throughout this Nation because of inadequate legislation to prevent such episodes? How long shall we go on as a Nation denying citizens basic constitutional rights because of such weak excuses as traditions, social systems, and States rights?

Some claim that the protection of civil rights is the task of the States. The States have had their chance to do so. Is it not odd that most of the complaints of violations in the area of civil rights occur in the States which claim that it is their job to protect these rights? Over 50 years ago the doctrine of separate but equal facilities for the races was announced by the Supreme Court. This proposition remained only a doctrine without substance. States most concerned with racial problems did not support this doctrine in good faith. "Separate" remained, but as a matter of fact "equal" was never accomplished. Thus the recent Supreme Court decision that separate facilities are "inherently unequal."

Today we all know that the Supreme Court, by its 1954 decision concerning segregation in the schools, has announced the ends to be accomplished. The need for means by which these ends can more equitably be accomplished has been forcefully demonstrated by Little Rock and other such experiences.

The administration has made clear that it will not press firmly and vigorously for the endorsement of civil rights and civil liberties. As with the other grave problems confronting our Nation at this critical stage of history, the administration refuses to lead the civil-rights problem to a decision. However, a problem of this magnitude, involving basic human rights and a world contest in which freedom itself is at stake, requires more than indifference or inaction. Hence, Congress must press forward the fight begun last year and enact additional legislation to safeguard the constitutional rights of all citizens. I urge early approval of the Civil Rights Act of 1958 which is sponsored by a number of distinguished colleagues and myself who are determined to extend full first-class citizenshp and equality of opportunity to all our citizens without regard to race or creed or color or any other circumstance.

It is over 3½ years since that historic decision by the Supreme Court declared that segregation in public schools is a denial of equal opportunity and violates the 14th amendment. The tragedy of Little Rock and similar outbreaks elsewhere, make clear the need for Congress to provide explicit conditions and machinery for implementation of the Supreme Court decisions. As the Civil Rights Act of 1958 declares, those decisions express the moral ideals of the Nation and the world and point the way to a Nation enhanced in strength and dignity at home and enhanced in honor and prestige throughout the world. It is our clear duty to continue the forward march begun last year.

Why I Am a Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a very excellent speech entitled "Why I Am a Democrat," written by Miss Linda Allford of my home town, McAlester, Okla.

Miss Allford, who is a sophomore in McAlester High School, was one of the winners in a statewide contest sponsored by the Oklahoma State Democratic Central Committee. Both the committee and the young people who participated in this contest are to be congratulated upon the fine quality of the speeches and essays prepared by the contestants. These efforts are a real contribution to better government.

Miss Allford's speech reads as follows:

I first said I was a Democrat because my father and mother, my grandparents, and as far back as we can remember, have been Democrats. Then, too, the people that I admire and like best are Democrats. They're a friendly, generous, happy people.

These were the reasons I was a Democrat until I started studying the principles and platforms of both major parties. Now I know why I am a Democrat. And it's a good thing all my folks are Democrats; otherwise I'd do my level best to convert them.

I am a Democrat because our party has a special appeal for the youth of our State. It is the progressive, forward-looking party. Our leaders are men of vision and courage. The Democratic Party is flexible enough to meet the changing needs of the people—constantly adapting our policies to meet the new challenge in a fast changing world. Isn't it only natural then that young men and women—with most of their lives in front of them—are eager to identify themselves with the Democratic Party?

The Democratic Party, however, has a long and proud history based on the principles of the "greatest good for the greatest number" and "equal justice for all—special privilege to none."

The Democratic Party is the most successful party that has ever served a grateful people. It must be, to have lasted so long—171 years of service to the people since it was founded—with its principles embodied in the Bill of Rights. Thomas Jefferson, founder of the party, believed that any government should be of, and for the people.

In an article in Life magazine, 55 historians evaluated our American presidents. Six were listed great, and of these 6, 4 were Democrats—Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. And of the two named as complete failures—Grant and Harding, both were Republicans.

We should have large signs at every highway entrance leading into our State with letters 6 feet high: "Oklahoma. Built by Democrats" for our party has been in power in Oklahoma ever since statehood. Oklahoma has grown from tee-pees to towers under Democratic State government. Without the successful leadership of Democrats,

Oklahoma would not hold the proud place she does today, as one of the greatest States in the Nation.

We Democrats are proud of this record. And for comparison only, we feel that the public should be informed that the Republican Party contribution to the glorious 50-year history of Oklahoma may be summed up solely by opposition—a negative record—and futile, frustrated, embittered criticism through the Republican-controlled press.

I am a Democrat because I know that for the working man and woman there is no other choice. Because every law that has been passed for the benefit of working people has been passed by Democrats in Congress who believed in the cause, the dignity and the importance of the workingman's well-being, enough to fight for it. Before these Democratic social reforms we had the notorious sweat shops in factories where men, women, and even children worked long weary hours for starvation wages, where men and boys worked down in mines, from daylight to dark, without hope.

Democrats passed the minimum-wage law, unemployment insurance, farm-support prices, and social security, the greatest of all social reforms, bringing dignity to labor and security for all working people—giving new meaning to the four great freedoms—securing freedom from want and fear.

Woodrow Wilson's Democratic administration attacked monopolies and unfair trade practices, declaring that "The labor of human beings is not a commodity nor an article of commerce." An income-tax law was passed to distribute more equally the burden of government, and to reduce the high towering economic peak between the multimillioned rich and the miserably poor.

Democrats also gave women the right to vote in 1918 and have since championed the cause of women in policymaking posts.

Roosevelt, the greatest of all Democratic leaders, believed in the humanitarian philosophy that the legitimate object of government is to do for a community or people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well.

Franklin D. Roosevelt not only saved our country from revolution and economic ruin, but saved the lives of countless thousands through his determined promotion of adequate housing, food, and other necessities of life. Even though bitterly criticized, he made an indelible impression on the hearts and minds of man, that the Democratic Party is the humanitarian party—the party with a heart.

During the 20 years of the last great national Democratic administration, we had, as Stevenson said, "Progress in peace and victory in war."

This Democratic record has made a great impression on me and I have decided that I want to be a part of the party that has made our Nation the greatest in the world.

I am a Democrat because there is a warm sincere welcome for me here. We, the youth, are needed. Today, as never before, with the challenge of a threatened loss of world leadership to Russia—high school and college classrooms all over the country have become our first line of defense. Not only for furnishing the manpower for the Armed Forces, but the scientific know-how necessary to preserve our peace.

But we must also furnish the leadership of tomorrow in our Government by taking seriously our responsibilities as citizens today. Politics is the science of government and, as such, affects everything in our lives, from the kind of schools we attend to the price we pay for food, and our standard of living.

The important factor in this great challenge is that the Democratic Party is willing to share it with us—in the exact degree to which we demonstrate our willingness and ability to serve.

More and more voters, of all ages, are turning to the Democratic Party as the party best able to lead the country in the present crisis, according to the latest polls. During the past 5 years of the present Republican administration, a record number of small businesses and farmers have gone bankrupt because of their tight-money policies—while big companies and chain monopolies are spreading their tentacles over the United States.

Democrats believe that the true test of any government is how the average citizen and small-business man fares. We believe in building from the bottom up—instead of from the top down. As Roosevelt said, "We put our faith in, and give our help to, the little man at the bottom of the economic pyramid."

I am a Democrat because the Democratic Party, made historic by Jefferson, vitalized by Jackson, dedicated by Wilson and Roosevelt, has reached the highest degree of service to the people; and put into plain words by Truman, "The Democratic Party is the people's party—dedicated to serve all the people, not the special interest of a few." The record of the Democratic Party is blazed across the face of the Nation in a stronger, better, healthier, happier life for the common people of America.

Lowell Mason's Grace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, annually, on the opening day of the Washington baseball season, Lowell Mason, a former member of the Trade Commission, arranges a luncheon at the Senate preceding the game. A number of Members of the Senate, the House, and the executive branch of the Government, are in attendance. This year we were honored by the presence of the Honorable Harry Truman, former President of the United States.

The luncheon was opened with grace by Lowell Mason, and I ask unanimous consent that the prayer be made a part of my remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the grace was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Eternal Father, not because we know how to ask rightly, not because our lives are worthy, do we pray to You this day.

We pray for Thy presence at this gathering.

As these leaders of men partake of food and fellowship, make us aware, this is the way it should be with all men to find happiness in each other's presence.

And yet to also find unrest deep enough within us to make Thy word a reality.

Teach us not to abandon in days of frustration, the ideals and aims we acquired in moments of high resolve.

Grant us faith stronger than circumstance and courage greater than our fears. Only by these things can we make Thy presence meaningful.

Amen.

The Invisible Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, all thoughtful Americans are interested in better law enforcement and doing what they can to stamp out the power of organized criminal syndicates. A very good discussion of this problem is contained in an address by Paul W. Williams, United States attorney for the southern district of New York, before the New York University Law Alumni Association. I ask unanimous consent that the major part of his address be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP THE INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT

(By Paul W. Williams)

(Paul W. Williams is United States attorney for the southern district of New York. The following is adapted from an address last night before the Kings County chapter of the New York University Law Alumni Association.)

In this country today, we have a second government extending throughout the entire country and in its parasitic way it is eating at the democratic and moral foundations of our society. This invisible government has millions of dollars at its disposal. It issues its own edicts. It enforces its own decrees. It carries out its own executions. It collects its own revenue. It includes the major criminals of the country, and it has as its allies some public officials tempted by the lure of money and power, as well as short-sighted business and labor leaders. It is a rotten and vicious empire built on greed, murder, and violence.

The numerous groups in our major cities, which originally derived their income from prostitution in the pre-World War I period, have developed into two major syndicates in Chicago and New York. Each has its own committee which decides policy and allocates various criminal enterprises in certain prescribed territories. One might easily refer to the committee as a board of directors and to the criminal enterprises scattered throughout the country as criminal subsidiaries which purchase their franchise from the syndicate with an annual tribute in return for protection. The syndicate's primary purpose is to establish a monopoly in the area of activity where it operates. The advantages of monopoly to the syndicate are to increase its gross income and its power.

The connecting link between the two syndicates appears to be the Mafia. This tightly built and secret organized group, because of its code and willingness to resort to terror, produces many important criminal leaders. With amazing political skill they organize and link desperate mobs and rule with an iron hand.

These two major syndicates are only interested in those activities which yield sums of money in the millions of dollars. Such petty crimes as burglary, robbery, larcency, and theft are not sufficiently lucrative to attract any great amount of interest from the syndicate. The major sources of income have been prostitution in the pre-World War I period, prohibition in the twenties and thirties, and gambling, racketeering, and

other illicit traffic in the forties and fifties. In 1950 and 1951, it was estimated by the Kefauver committee that $20 billion were involved in gambling. There is little reason to assume that the figure has dropped to any appreciable extent. In Chicago, from 1945 to 1950, $150 million per year were played in the policy racket alone. It is realistic to think of $150 million a year as the amount presently played in New York City.

This concentration of economic power at the disposal of the criminal syndicate and its leaders represents the most serious aspect of the threat to the country. This power is primarily employed first, to infiltrate legitimate business and labor unions; second, to purchase respectability; and, third, to influence and buy elected public officials and law-enforcement agents.

The danger of organized crime to the country is grave, and if organized crime advances in the next 20 years as it has from 1920 to 1958, I do not wish to visualize the consequences.

The responsibility for this increasing danger lies not only with the criminals themselves but with the public at large. For example, those officials who compromise themselves by whatever means in order to aid the syndicate are equally criminal. Those civic groups which look in another direction abdicate their leadership in democratic institutions in favor of the unscrupulous and the corrupt.

The elimination of the criminal syndicate can only be accomplished by a concerted effort.

There must be an agreement among State and Federal authorities that the criminal syndicate and its subgroups will be attacked in every State and in every field of activity in which it operates. Unless such an overall and sustained effort on a national scale is forthcoming, the syndicate can always shift its operations to another county or State, or enter a new field of activity, or lie low until the possibility of apprehension has passed.

This overall effort must come from Congress, the Federal enforcement agencies, the States, the press and the public at large.

Congressional action in the form of investigating committees and legislation serves a number of vital purposes.

The broad power of committees such as the Kefauver committee and the Select Committee to Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field has permitted investigations which have focused national attention on a particular facet of organized crime.

These investigations have usually aroused the conscience of local citizenry and resulted in local action.

The investigations have led to specific legislation to remedy the abuses and evils which have been uncovered.

The second important element in this campaign against organized crime are the Federal enforcement agencies. I have particular reference to the Department of Justice and the United States attorneys, working under the supervision of the Attorney General, the FBI, the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

* * * * *

The State, moreover, can make use of its agencies in the same manner as the Federal authorities. Legislative investigating committees, grand juries, intelligent and honest license commissioners, a well-paid and trained police force—each can be effective in its sphere. The crucial factor, however, is probably a State attorney general who has the power of criminal investigation and supervision of the State police. This power would permit action in any part of the State, and he could assist local officials.

The fourth essential element in the fight against the crime syndicate is the crusading newspaper. There are few persons, including criminals, who can withstand the pitiless glare of publicity.

Lastly, the final element in the fight is the public itself. Wherever businessmen, labor leaders, and public officials are known to accept advantageous relationships offered by criminal syndicates, it is up to the business community, labor unions, and the public at large to fight unceasingly with every means at their disposal.

These are five elements which I believe can effectively engage and destroy the invisible government: Congressional action, Federal law enforcement agencies, State agencies, the press, and the general public. Working together, they are invincible; separately, they have proved pretty ineffective.

Mr. Truman's Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday former President Harry S. Truman made a splendid statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee. The Washington Post in an editorial published this morning has commended President Truman for the wisdom of his proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S VISION

It is next to impossible for former President Harry S. Truman to make a nonpolitical statement—and just as impossible for Republicans, it seems, to give him a chance to try it. This circumstance tends to dilute the usefulness of testimony by Mr. Truman on a politically explosive issue like the recession. But for those willing to leave aside the Truman references to "do nothingism" and the carping reminders from the other side, of Mr. Truman's failure to prevent a 50-percent increase in the cost of living during his White House tenure, there is much wisdom to be found in the former President's testimony yesterday before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Particularly to the point where Mr. Truman's enjoinders to the Congress to act and plan for an expanding economy. He advocated large increases in both defense and civil spending, not because this would cure the recession tomorrow, but because there are urgent national needs to be met and because a long-term program to meet them is the indispensable basis for sustained economic growth. Not really forgetting, it would seem, his own reluctance to see taxes cut in 1948, Mr. Truman contented himself with proposing a fairly modest $5 billion tax cut which he insisted ought to be linked with the plugging of various loopholes that, in his view, would nearly compensate for the reductions granted to low- and middle-income taxpayers. Whatever the practical chances of enactment, such a package would have considerable appeal—and it would not invite the inflationary perils of a much larger straight tax cut.

Mr. Truman's call for a bigger budget was perhaps the most significant part of his testimony. It would be unfortunate if his suggestion of modest tax reduction and reform were permitted to obscure this more important aspect of his advice. He would have Congress provide $3 billion more for defense starting next year and $5 billion more annually by 1964—not as much as the Gaither report recommended, but enough to support a badly needed expansion of conventional and tactical nuclear forces and to accelerate military research. His proposal for an immediate 50 percent increase in foreign economic aid and an eventual outlay of $2.5 billion annually for this purpose is equally important, and, like defense spending, has its justification in something far more fundamental than the present business recession.

Similarly, the higher outlays he urges for education, public health, and public assistance programs are part and parcel of any realistic concept of an expanding economy and a growing population, and a refreshing emphasis after the years of near obsession in the Republican administration with cutting off needed future growth in these basic Federal services. Mr. Truman's economics may be as fallible as the next former President's; but his large view of the Nation's destiny, its needs, its capabilities is, just now, exactly what the country needs to hear.

Editorial Commendation of Secretary of Agriculture Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials published in Massachusetts newspapers which have just come to my attention. One is from the Christian Science Monitor and the other from the Springfield Union.

Both of these editorials commend the ability and integrity of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and evidence an approval for which Secretary Benson's programs are held in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield Union of March 8, 1958]

THE $12 BILLION FAILURE

When a Secretary of Agriculture calls 25 years and $12 billion worth of Federal farm programs a failure, it is time for the country to sit up and take notice of the farm bloc heads who, only yesterday, voted to freeze price supports on all farm products at 1957 levels, so that farmers' prices won't be depressed any more than they are.

Yet this tremendous expenditure, says Mr. Benson, has made little or no contribution to the problem of low-income farmers, in whose name farm programs are frequently defended. He has served notice, in the most emphatic terms, that unless the United States begins to take a realistic attitude toward farming, the problems will magnify and multiply.

The technological revolution has robbed the parity formula of meaning. But the more basic reason is the assumption of farm legislators over the years that they could defy, indefinitely and with impunity, the laws of the market place. The classic instance was the continuation for 10 years after World

War II of the rigid 90 percent of parity price support system which had been introduced as a wartime measure to spur maximum production of basic crops for war needs.

The goal must be a gradual return to a free market in agriculture. No other conclusion, indeed, is possible. Government intervention has been tried for a generation and it doesn't work. This plain fact still does not move the members of the farm bloc; they have been ignoring facts for years. But it is a sign of hope that a Secretary of Agriculture has the courage to tell the truth about agriculture.

The Nation, perhaps, could afford this $12 billion. It cannot longer afford laws—and lawmakers—bent on building bigger failures for the future.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 4, 1958]

BATTLER BENSON

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—If Ezra Taft Benson doesn't resign one of these weeks as President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture—and there are indications that Ezra is defending his scalp pretty successfully—his triumph will be due in the main to these factors:

1. That he is an honest, courageous individual who is firmly dedicated to carrying through a difficult policy in which he strongly believes. And that President Eisenhower is confident that the Benson brand of farm policy is best in the long run for American agriculture, and that the Benson brand of courage is good for the Eisenhower camp and the Republican Party.

2. That the battle pro and con Benson is by no means wholly one-sided. The Secretary has a lot of support in the cities, where consumers are finding out just how much farm-price supports cost them in terms of taxes and to some extent higher food prices. The Secretary also has support in rural areas, where farmers must consume farm products subject to high supports.

Recently Secretary Benson has been receiving an average of 50 letters per day, of which 90 percent are actually pro-Benson.

3. That the farm picture is rapidly changing in these swift-moving years, with the farm population reduced from the 65 percent of the total population 100 years ago to 12 percent today and with splits and divided opinions plaguing and attenuating the historic strength of the farm bloc.

4. That farm income has been rising slowly, until now per capita farm income is the highest on record and farmers actually may be closing the economic gap somewhat on their recession-hit city cousins—although it is still true that farm income has not risen so fast as has the cost of things farmers must buy.

5. And as a final touch of political realism—or resignation—there is the belief that if Secretary Benson resigned, this wouldn't necessarily lift the entire onus of farm discontent from the Republican Party. Which has led quite probably to the conclusion in President Eisenhower's mind that it's best to stick with a right policy and go down, if one must go down, with flags flying.

It is significant for Mr. Benson's future that on the very day a Midwest congressional delegation was at the White House presenting to the President the case against Benson, eight Republicans rose in the House of Representatives to praise his policies. Two were from Ohio, where the farmer must buy price-supported grain to feed his cattle, poultry, or hogs. Others represented large cities like Chicago and Dallas.

Secretary Benson himself takes the battle in good heart, equipped with a built-in conviction that the cause is righteous. He believes that if it were only possible to do a wide-ranging job of educating farmers to the facts of farm surpluses—their cause, cure, and impact on prices—his present unpopularity would rapidly diminish.

Then more farmers would discover that the post-Korean downtrend on farm prices has ceased. Many more of them would realize that high price supports have helped to price such exports as cotton and tobacco out of the world's normal markets. The world's largest tobacco market is no longer in Winston-Salem, N. C., but in southern Rhodesia.

They would see the American farmer as passing through a long transitional period. There is a trend to bigger farms, more able to cope with lean-and-fat years. The Nation's population is booming and moving more and more into a protein diet which requires more farm acreage. Meanwhile millions of acres are being lifted out of cultivation annually by new airports and highways, to say nothing of urbanization's bites into the countryside.

The farm scene is very intricate. It's still difficult to persuade a farmer that he's getting too high a price for anything when consumer goods hang high. Washington still must come up with more effective measures for withdrawing marginal farm acreages from production, and for encouraging resettlement of marginal farmers.

Many of the letters which reach Secretary Benson—frequently from farmers—tell him he is on the right track, advise him to keep up the fight. He might build even more support if he could find the time and the means to address the whole Nation, and not merely the farmers, on the intricate problems of agriculture, what lies ahead, and the more-than-stopgap solutions which he would propose.

The Cost of Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Anderson, S. C., Independent on April 12, 1958. This editorial, entitled "Ike's Recession—Senator Russell's Analysis of the Cost of Indifference" was written by former United States Senator Wilton E. Hall who is publisher of the Independent. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE'S RECESSION—SENATOR RUSSELL'S ANALYSIS OF THE COST OF INDIFFERENCE

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, Southern spokesman and one of the most influential Members of the United States Senate, blames Ike's recession on indifference.

Speaking before the annual meeting of the Elberton Chamber of Commerce, Senator RUSSELL cited:

1. The indifference of certain big industries.

2. The indifference of big labor union organizations.

3. The indifference of Ezra Taft Benson.

Webster says indifference means unconcerned.

Wall Street, ravenous for higher profits, has fostered monopoly and price-fixing.

Big labor, dues hungry and constantly seeking higher wages without corresponding increase in production, has contributed to higher prices.

Consequently, both have come near pricing themselves out of a market in which consumers' cost-of-living has reached a record high.

Contributing to this high cost of living is the paradoxical situation—a creature of Benson's administration of the farm program—which finds farmers' income going down while food prices go up.

Senator RUSSELL pins a major share of the blame for Ike's recession on the bungling of the farm program.

Many months ago Senator RUSSELL and the other level heads in Government were warning that the declining fortunes of the farmers would sooner or later be reflected in the rest of the economy.

Benson and Ike and the rest of the Republican regime scoffed. They still regard the farmer as expendable.

Benson, Senator RUSSELL said, "has been the most expensive Secretary of Agriculture this Nation has ever had. The farmer's share has shrunk considerably, yet prices on food and clothing are skyrocketing. Benson has taken more money from taxpayers than any three of his predecessors, including Henry Wallace. He has tried to make impractical theories work. He's a typical Republican."

Indifference to the well-being of the average, wage-earning citizen, and the small farmer has been a trade-mark of the Republican Party throughout.

With the possible exception of Theodore Roosevelt, who later broke with the old-line GOP, Republican Presidents have been unconcerned with the problem of the people, and Ike has proven one of the most indifferent of all.

Another Republican trade-mark is placing politics ahead of all else, even national security.

Over the past 5 years the mania to provide Republican politicians with a balanced budget has resulted in loss of both United States power and prestige in a world that has become more hostile by the year.

One doesn't forget that Senator RUSSELL long ago predicted that Air Force and other defense cutbacks engineered in the earlier years of the Eisenhower Administration would place the United States years behind Soviet Russia in the race for air superiority.

Today there is every indication that Soviet Russia equals the United States in respect to air power in most spheres, and excels in some.

The politically-inspired bungling of the security program has confronted the United States with the usual result of pennywise pound-foolishness—we're going to have to spend much more to catch up than it would have cost to keep ahead 5 years ago.

The Georgia Senator warned his listeners there is no magical formula by which the Nation's defenses can be maintained without money.

The point is that we don't want our country to go into oblivion as being the wealthiest Nation on earth—and with little armed might.

The unconcern fostered under Republican regime—the indifference which has resulted in Ike's recession—also represents an undercutting of national security since a healthy economy is necessary to any defense program.

Senator RUSSELL, as usual has made a keen analysis of the situation confronting Americans. We agree with the words of Congressman PAUL BROWN, who, in presenting Senator RUSSELL to the Elberton audience, described Winder's great son as "one of the outstanding statesmen of all time whom I hope will be our next President."

Ceramics and the Future of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that one of the fastest growing industries of the future will be the ceramics industry. A remarkable number of new uses are being found for all kinds of ceramics.

The State of South Carolina is richly blessed with the raw materials used by the ceramics industry. Moreover, the people of South Carolina are alert to the possibilities for industrial expansion in the ceramics field.

On April 12 there was celebrated at Clemson College the fifth anniversary of that school's ceramics laboratory. On the same date there appeared in the Greenville News of Greenville, S. C., an editorial entitled "Ceramics and Our State's Future," which discusses some of the developments in the ceramics field in the State of South Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CERAMICS AND OUR STATE'S FUTURE

Ceramic materials are among the most abundant of all our resources and, fortunately, South Carolina is richly endowed with these.

Almost without the public's knowing it, (for it has not been a spectacular sort of thing) research and development, much of which has been carried on at Clemson College, has brought us to the threshold of a whole new era of important industrial progress.

This will be commemorated at Clemson today when business and industrial leaders from all over the state will gather to celebrate the fifth anniversary of Olin Hall, the Clemson College ceramics laboratory which was built and equipped with a $630,000 grant from the Olin Foundation.

Charles L. Horne of Minneapolis, President of the Foundation, and other officers will be honored at campus events and a luncheon. Their foresighted gift and their cooperation with officials of Clemson and the State Development Board and others has started an industrial saga which may in time become fabulous.

Ceramic materials essentially are a form of mineral, basic elements of the earth which, when found in sufficient quantity and are readily accessible, may be more valuable than silver and gold. They include clay, sand, kaolin, vermiculite, and many others, some of which may not even have been discovered as far as putting them to use is concerned.

Until a few years ago, the ceramics industry was limited mainly to the manufacture of brick, tile, pottery, cement, and the like.

A little more than 10 years ago, vermiculite was unknown. Now it is used as an insulating material and for other purposes. Ways are being found to combine it with other materials to produce a light but strong and durable structural material. Vermiculite is mined and processed right here in Greenville County, by the Zonolite people and the Olin laboratories at Clemson have done much valuable research and experimentation.

Glass has been manufactured in Laurens County for many years, but in this Piedmont section of South Carolina glass is being turned into a textile fiber. The process by which this is done gave birth to a whole new industry.

Vitreous materials have long been familiar in bathroom plumbing and the like. The Kohler Co. is opening a huge new plant near Spartanburg to manufacture these fixtures. At first, most of their raw material, a special kind of clay, will come from abroad, but it is expected that some day our own State itself will be the primary source.

Furthermore, the space age will bring about wider and even fantastic uses of ceramics. Ceramics can withstand extremely high temperatures and already have found uses in the nose cones of guided missiles.

It is not inconceivable that in time space ships will be coated with a ceramic substance to enable them to withstand and throw off the heat generated by high speeds. That may be only the beginning.

Visionary? Of course. But without a daring vision of the possibilities in the field, and confidence in the future and potential of South Carolina, Olin Hall and the ceramics lab for research and instruction would never have been. It has already paid off in many ways. Directly and indirectly, it has contributed to the establishment of several new industrial plants in our State.

For that reason, we wish to join with Clemson in commemorating the anniversary of the project and in expressing gratitude to Dr. Horne and his associates.

Is Walter Reuther More Dangerous Than the Russian Sputnik?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the New York Daily News publishes, daily, a very interesting column entitled "The Inquiring Fotographer." On Saturday, April 5, the column was concerned with the question: "Senator GOLDWATER recently said: 'I consider Walter Reuther more dangerous than the Russian sputnik.' Do you?"

The majority of the answers given to that question are very interesting, because they incline to agree with the junior Senator from Arizona. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUESTION

Senator GOLDWATER recently said: "I consider Walter Reuther more dangerous than the Russian sputnik." Do you?

WHERE ASKED

Various spots.

THE ANSWERS

Harry Stanton, Marshfield, Mass., town moderator: "Yes. At present, the sputnik isn't much of a threat. Neither is Reuther. However, his ideas and philosophy are a great threat to free enterprise. We can defend ourselves from an outer threat much better than one from within."

Jack Heettner, Christopher Street, merchant: "No. Some of Reuther's ideas are good for the country. It was he who fought for and established the guaranteed annual wage. However, Reuther's demand for part of the profits of corporations would be bad for our economy."

William L. Doyle, Providence, R. I., newspaperman: "Yes, because the sputnik is more propaganda than force. Reuther can get a lot of support with the wrong ideas, but as soon as he becomes a real threat to the United States, he will be shut off immediately. There are any number of ways that this can be done."

Al Kasper, Long Island City, salesman: "I'm inclined to agree. You must remember that Reuther spent 5 years in Russia. We can surmise the kind of education he got there. Certainly, his technique as a labor leader is totalitarian. That, to me, represents a threat to our own democracy."

Daniel M. O.Connell, Hartford, advertising: "No. If Walter Reuther should ever become an obvious threat to our country, publicity in newspapers would prompt his union membership to cut him down to size. Union members are among the most vocal opponents of communism."

Richard C. Scott, West 60th Street, investor: "Yes, because the sputnik is no great threat now. However, if the sputnik develops into an ICBM and Reuther projects his ideas to the same extent, I agree that he can become more dangerous because he will tend to divide our people from within."

Address Delivered by Dr. Jose Antonio Mora

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on last Sunday afternoon, April 13, 1958, it was my great pleasure to be present at Winter Park, Fla., at a special convocation of Rollins College, observing the 25th anniversary of the Hispanic Institute in Florida. For this notable occasion the convocation speaker was the distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, formerly the Pan American Union, Dr. Jose Antonio Mora. The address of this universally recognized statesman, scholar, and effective advocate of peace and hemispheric friendship was so interesting and inspiring that I feel all Members of the Senate will welcome the opportunity to read it. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Mora's significant address may be included as a part of my remarks, and may be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. JOSÉ A. MORA, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, AT ROLLINS COLLEGE AND THE HISPANIC INSTITUTE, WINTER PARK, FLA., APRIL 13, 1958

This is an appropriate occasion on which to speak of the OAS, because in this month of April we are celebrating Pan American Day and Pan American Week. It was on April 14,

1890, that at the first conference in Washington approval was given to the creation of the Union of the American Republics, with the installation of a small office for the exchange of commercial information. This office was to become, later, the Pan American Union, and finally the Organization of American States, its present form. This year the celebration has a special significance, since it marks the completion of the first 10 years of the charter of the OAS, signed at the Ninth International Conference of American States in Bogotá in 1948, and of the American declaration of the rights and duties of man, approved at the same conference.

This is a good time, then, to examine the work accomplished in this first decade by the Organization of American States, which was created to strengthen the peace and security of the continent, to prevent possible causes of difficulties, to ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that might arise among the member states, to provide for common action on the part of those states in the event of aggression, and to promote, by cooperative action, the economic, social, and cultural development of our regional community.

We should stress one underlying characteristic of this inter-American institution: It is based on moral and juridical principles; it is not set up on a temporary basis or solely for immediate practical ends to meet an emergency. It does not seek merely utilitarian purposes, but rather is a consolidation of the ideals that were born with the emancipation of the colonies of Anglo-Saxon, Spanish, Portuguese, and French America, to serve a common destiny in the New World. "The true significance of American solidarity and good neighborliness can only mean the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, of a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man," reads the preamble to the Bogotá Charter, and it adds that "juridical organization is a necessary condition for security and peace founded on moral order and on justice."

These fundamental principles are developed in greater detail in the provisions of the charter. They give nobility and spiritual estate to a document that has an important historic significance, because what came about as the result was that the 21 members of the community solemnly signed, and their respective legislatures ratified, principles and standards that had been the subject of polemics, discussion, and opposition for many years. The charter is the culmination of a process begun by Bolívar, one that has been in constant and gradual upward evolution ever since. The Bogotá Charter offers to the peoples of the Americas the tools with which to continue the undertaking started by Bolívar and help fulfill the continent's historic mission. The confidence and the faith that all the Americans have reposed in an international juridical order and in the principles of universal ethics are a valuable force that has produced outstanding results, a force that we should continue to foster unceasingly. The regional collective security achieved since 1947, when the Rio Treaty was signed, is the cornerstone of the inter-American system, because it has demonstrated that the community has the ability to meet effectively any threat to the peace or any act of aggression against any of the member states of the OAS. The treaty was invoked on a number of occasions between 1948 and 1957, always successfully. In the latest instance, in the situation between Honduras and Nicaragua, an extremely satisfactory solution was reached—recourse to the International Court of Justice, to which the conflict will be submitted. This fact does honor to the two parties in the dispute; but it also does honor to the juridical maturity of America, and particularly to the Organization of American States upon whose Council, acting provisionally as organ of consultation, it was incumbent to deal with the matter.

The trend followed by the American countries in this respect differs in many respects from the tendencies apparent in other parts of the world. Of evident concern to those who observe the world picture is the precarious status of international law in the face of the predominance of political force. In these days there is the fear that juridical principles and the traditional doctrines of law will be subordinated to measures of expediency or for the maintenance of the balance of power. One of the most outstanding contemporary jurists, faced with the present situation, has asked: "Is it really justifiable to speak of a deterioration in the juridical methods of settling disputes between states?" Such a deterioration unquestionably exists in world affairs. But it is possible to affirm that, within the inter-American system, confidence in the peaceful methods upheld by international law for solving international disputes has not diminished; on the contrary, it has obviously been strengthened, ever since the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Río de Janeiro and the Charter of the Organization of American States entered into force.

During the period since the OAS was set up, the faith of the American countries in their ability to preserve international peace in our hemisphere in view of the effectiveness of the treaties in force, has been greatly strengthened. Confidence in peace is what makes the smooth process of law possible. This shows how right Politis was when he stated that "the reign of justice presumes peace." In inter-American relations, this is the most highly valued gain that can be noted from the 10-year existence of the OAS.

The inter-American system requires and, as a matter of fact, is in itself a dynamic force for peace—a peace that creates new forms of cooperation and of interdependence among peoples. The principles of the Bogotá Charter are open to a continuous development and an upward progress. All the agencies within the system are at the disposal of the member states, to be properly used and to provide effective service. Thus, that basic document brought into being the six organs of the OAS: the Inter-American Conference; the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs; the Council; the Pan American Union; specialized conferences; and specialized organizations. At different levels and with varying authority, all further the development of the Organization and facilitate the creation of new policies to meet the circumstances or the demands of continental relations. The Inter-American Economic and Social Council, which meets in Washington, and the Inter-American Council of Jurists and the Inter-American Cultural Council, with their respective permanent committees in Río de Janeiro and Mexico, make studies and recommend action to meet the situations that arise from day to day in their respective fields of activity.

Perhaps the efficacy of the Bogotá Charter and the achievement of its noble purposes will depend upon the readiness of the governments to have recourse to those organs. After all, it is the governments that have the final say as to whether the agencies will, in practice, do an effective job. The possibilities of the OAS were duly taken into account in the deliberations of the 10th Inter-American conference, held in Caracas in 1954. When the report of the Pan American Union was studied, it was recommended to the member states that they utilize the services of the organization more because its potentialities as an instrument of international collaboration were recognized.

This year the OAS also celebrates the first 10 years of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, which was likewise signed at Bogotá, in 1948. Among the virtues of this document is the fact that it is the first declaration of this nature in the history of mankind to be subscribed to by a group of governments. Until then, all documents dealing with human rights were the internal declarations or acts of different countries. The American declaration also served as a precedent for the universal declaration signed on December 10, 1948, and was used as one of the basic documents for drafting the world document that the United Nations is about to commemorate, quite justly, as one of the most significant acts in history. The American declaration had the original feature of setting forth the obligations of man, in addition to his rights.

These principles have been incorporated in the inter-American system, in the form of a proclamation, and are guiding principles for the conduct of the member states. Later, the Declaration of Caracas in 1954, reaffirmed the human rights included in the Bogotá Charter and the American Declaration, and at the same time maintained that they should be developed further. At Caracas all the American states were called upon to unite their efforts "to apply, develop, and perfect the above-mentioned principles, so that they will form the basis of firm action designed to attain, within a short time, the effective realization of the representative democratic system, the rule of social justice and security, and the economic and cultural cooperation essential to the mutual well-being and prosperity of the peoples of the continent."

The aforegoing background shows the interest with which these topics are discussed at OAS meetings, where an effort is made to encourage the application of the doctrines and the principles that it upholds, so that they may be perfected to the degree to which economic, social, and cultural progress of the American peoples is advanced.

It gives me particular pleasure to talk of human rights on this occasion, when I have the honor to speak under the auspices of Rollins College and the Hispanic Institute, both outstanding for their work to promote inter-American culture. One of the fundamental rights proclaimed by the American Declaration is the right to education, which is based, article XII says, on the principles of liberty, morality, and human solidarity. One of the major concerns of the OAS is the matter of educational planning. The Pan American Union is now making preparations for an inter-American seminar, which will be held in Washington this June, to study the overall planning of education in the Americas. The seminar will examine current social, economic, and cultural conditions in the American countries in order to formulate the basic objectives of education and propose long-range programs. It will also serve to evaluate the results obtained so far, so that it may consider the techniques and the work methods needed to insure the continuity of educational plans, with the changes that it seems advisable to introduce.

These plans are designed, after all, to bring about the maximum utilization of the human resources available in the Americas. All the natural wealth and all the efforts for economic development have no other meaning than to serve human beings. There is even more urgent need today to encourage the creative abilities of man for the building of a better civilization, since we are living in a truly new world opened by the astounding discoveries of science and technology. Science and education occupy commanding posts, on the highest government level. The American nations must seek in education the road that will lead to the fulfillment of

their common destiny and their role in the history of mankind.

It has been said that to educate is to train and condition man so that he may become adjusted to changing situations and better serve his community. We must educate Americans to live in the interdependent and unified community composed of the peoples of our hemisphere, and to profit to the utmost from the science and technology of modern civilization. The utilization of nuclear science for peaceful ends—a proposal that was made, we must recall, by President Eisenhower in his atoms for peace plan—is opening vast possibilities for the well-being of all peoples on earth; it will have a very special meaning for those who live in America. The Committee of Presidential Representatives of the American Republics so understood it when, in its report of May 1957, it stated that this matter constitutes one of the most important fields for inter-American collaboration, and recommended that it be an activity in which the OAS should participate. The Council of the OAS has already taken steps to establish the Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission as a consultative body, composed of one technical expert from each American Republic, to help with national and international plans for the utilization of the atom, by making the training of personnel and research in nuclear science possible. The Pan American Union is to begin by studying the needs of the countries in this respect and looking into the possible information services that the OAS might provide. The Pan American Sanitary Organization will be responsible for research in the field of health, and the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, for the application of nuclear energy to agricultural development.

Educating the American peoples makes it necessary for us to redouble our efforts to train technicians, scientists, and research workers in all fields of knowledge. The OAS is about to participate in a campaign to disseminate learning, science, and technical training by means of 500 annual fellowships, distributed among all the American countries. We hope that each fellowship will be an investment that will benefit the entire community by helping to make knowledge—principally scientific and technical—more widespread so as to accelerate the economic and social development of our peoples.

We must do more than promote the education of the masses and combat illiteracy; the times demand that intelligence be discovered thus offering to the mind of man opportunities to reveal new scientific truths through basic research.

The idea of popular education as mere adjustment to the community and to social solidarity once led to the concept of the training of the common man, but today education needs to be used for the training of the uncommon man, the one able to discover the most complex secrets of science. If that is to be done, we shall have to give increasing support to the universities, activate them, and provide them with laboratory equipment, as was recommended by the Economic Conference of the OAS, held last year in Buenos Aires. Although 100 percent success in such continentwide plans may seem too ambitious a goal, these programs are being encouraged and furthered by the OAS, as far as its means will permit. With regional centers for research and training; with programs of technical cooperation and direct technical aid; through seminars, roundtables, specialized conferences; and many other means of international collaboration, we are supporting every effort put forth by the countries to raise their economic, social, or cultural standards. In this connection we look forward to great things from the universities and colleges of the United States, because of their modern teaching methods. Florida is a State whose strategic position, human resources, and extraordinary cultural opportunities make it particularly well fitted to participate in inter-American undertaking. Here the students from our countries find familiar and hospitable surroundings, with a sizable proportion of the population Latin American in origin and an integral part of the community of this magnificent peninsula. European culture and civilization in what is now United States territory were introduced with the conquest of Florida by the Spaniards, who bequeathed us its beautiful name, so redolent of a living garden. I am certain that in the future Florida, whose destiny and progress are assured, will continue to be, as it has been, in the past, a point from which sympathy with and friendship for the peoples of Latin America have always radiated.

We recall here with admiration, the work of those settlers who brought, with the Spanish language, the first church and the first school to the United States; but we also look today with admiration on the gigantic modern civilization of the State of Florida, which has placed in the service of democracy the cultural gains of human progress.

Rate Increase and a New Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the April 4 edition of the Greenville, S. C., News, entitled "Rate Increase and a New Post Office."

The Greenville News agrees with me and supports my contention that the Postmaster General has no right or authority to attempt to tie new post-office construction projects in with the 5-cent stamp he is advocating, or with any other postal revenues.

The Post Office Department can spend on new buildings only what Congress appropriates to it and all revenues the Post Office Department collects from sales of stamps go directly to the general treasury. Obviously postal rates and new buildings have no connection.

I desire to see new post offices and new Federal buildings in every community in South Carolina where they are needed. So does the Greenville News. But the issue of a postal-rate increase has nothing to do with the need of post-office buildings.

I ask that this editorial from the Greenville News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I believe it is worthwhile reading for all who are interested in the issue of postal rates.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATE INCREASE AND A NEW POST OFFICE

Greenville needs a new post office, as anyone who makes frequent use of the place and, especially, those who have been behind the public area and have seen the crowding of mail and workers can testify.

While it still appears to be in good condition as buildings go, it was erected many years ago and the city and the surrounding area served by carrier delivery from the office have simply outgrown it.

From time to time, Postmaster C. C. Withington has sought additional space for the storage and processing of mail. The growth of the volume of incoming and outgoing mail during the last decade or two is amazing.

Likewise, the Federal offices housed in the building have reached the point of serious crowding.

But we agree with Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON that the erection of a new post office building here, as badly as it is needed, along with others mentioned for this and other States, should not be tied to a postal rate increase.

Perhaps Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield didn't exactly intend it that way when he announced that the Post Office Department would consider building new post offices in Greenville and in other places, if Congress would approve the 5-cent rate for out-of-town first-class letters and other increases now pending.

The Postmaster General long has shown concern over the fact that his Department is operating some hundreds of millions of dollars in the red each year. He has repeatedly suggested rate increases and has asked funds for modernization and for research into better and faster methods of handling the mails in the interest of speed and greater efficiency.

Likewise, salary increases have been requested for postal employees, who have gone a long time without a raise. This, too, has been for some reason tied to the proposed increases in rates.

However, it must be realized that an increase in rates will not automatically result in more funds for the Post Office Department for any purpose. As Senator JOHNSTON pointed out, all postal receipts go directly into the Federal Treasury, and the Post Office Department can spend only what Congress appropriates to it. It has no earmarked funds, as do some State institutions and departments in South Carolina.

Thus it is obvious that, even with the rate increase, whether any new post office buildings were erected would depend on whether Congress saw fit to appropriate the funds.

We cite these facts not to undercut the Postmaster General's proposal, but to make plain what must take place before Greenville or any other city can hope for a new post office.

As a matter of fact, since the administration and Congress seem to be intent on making jobs and boosting the economy by Government projects, we can think of no better way to do it than by building needed postal facilities and doing what is necessary to improve the mail service.

But the issue of a rate increase is something apart and somewhat incidental.

The Image of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on the occasion of Washington's birthday, Rabbi Morris Adler made an inspiring address to the Congregation Shaary Zedek in Detroit, Mich.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Rabbi Adler's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMAGE OF AMERICA

(Address by Rabbi Morris Adler before the Congregation Shaarey Zedek, Detroit, Mich.)

This is a day that has a special significance in the calendar of the American people. It marks the anniversary of the birth of one of the great spirits of American history; one who is high in the ranks of its Founding Fathers; one who served it in peace and in war and whose memory has been an abiding inspiration. I am sure that in many places the minds of Americans will turn to George Washington and perhaps in thinking of his great contribution and his interesting personality, they will also think of the years of development, of change and of movement that separate us from him. They will think of some of the ideals that beat high in his mind and how he and that dedicated and select group of men wanted to build upon this continent something more than another nation; something more than an empire upon which may fall the mantle of glory and power. This, for them and the people they represented, was to be a new world, a new world in all of the comprehensive meaning of that term; a new world in that it would bring a renewal to the human spirit, a renewal of faith and courage, a renewal that would go forth on expanding waves and touch every shore throughout the world. In the minds of many of those who laid the foundations for our country there was the thought of building a shrine, not simply a place of worship and of prayer but a society that will serve as a shrine of all that is sacred, of all that is basic to human life at its noblest. And the image that they have had of America has been one of the most powerful influences in the shaping of American thought and the mentality of American men and women. We sometimes speak of it as the American dream—the American way of life—the American promise, for deeply imbedded in the very cornerstone of this Republic was the great aspiration to make of America a society in which shall be incorporated high values and noble ideals. This image must not be lost. This image of America as something more than a great and rich continent whose natural resources will never completely be tapped. This image of America as something more than a land of power and wealth, must be cherished by the America of our day. One of the problems we face is that Americans no longer see this image of themselves and of their country with vividness and with consecrated loyalty. Another pathetic fact is that the image of America is misunderstood; that where you go throughout the world the picture which impresses itself upon the minds of a people when the word "America" is mentioned, and it is mentioned everywhere, is an image that is false to the truth; that distorts and perverts our original concepts and completely misunderstands our purposes. In many places of the world, America is thought of as a land devoted to pleasure. It is true that probably in no other country today, and certainly in no empire of the past, has the industry of entertaining people been so fundamental to the entire economy of the country. Thousands and thousands of people follow a career which has no other objective than to bring to you and to me momentary relaxation, to evoke from us a smile and perhaps to bless us for a brief interval with forgetfulness about our problems and our anxieties. In no other country is the entertainer, the man who can make people laugh, the man who has a sense of humor which he can express and communicate; in no other place is the entertainer on such a high social level; in no other place is he as well paid as in our country. No other country confers as much fame upon its clowns and comedians and entertainers as do the Americans. Their names become household words and many young people go to sleep with dreams of emulating those who are our most famous and highest earning entertainers. But America is much more than television programs, than movies, than theaters, than that entire round of entertainment to organize which we have exercised so much ingenuity and invested so much money. And they who think of America only in terms of Hollywood, of large screens, of new devices to make the pictures more vivid, do not understand America. Perhaps the fault is to some extent our own; that we who have been able to manufacture and sell every other kind of product—we who have been able to persuade millions of new customers—we who have been ingenious in opening new markets and creating and stimulating new demands and new needs have been entirely inadequate in advertising to the world what America stands for and to millions and millions of people America is pleasure, America is movies, America is television, America is Hollywood.

In some places America is regarded as the symbol of power. What distinguishes us in the eyes of too many countries is that we have great resources; that we probably have the largest budget in the history of the world for any one country; that we have the resources and the factories and the plants and the power to develop those armaments which matter most in an atomic and nuclear age. Every visitor to this country is impressed with our comforts and our luxuries, with the high standard of living attained by millions and millions of humble people. They go back speaking of our assembly lines, of our skyscrapers, of our government with its manifold and ramified bureaus, of our easy spending, and of many other things. And so throughout the world there has arisen a picture of America as a kind of storehouse of power, as a dynamo that can exercise great power and that is blessed with untold wealth. It is true that we are a country of power. No one can fly from here to the west coast and not be impressed by the riches which God has bestowed upon us, by the infinite variety of this continent, by the unimaginable resources with which it has been dowered, by the wealth of this country. One who has traveled in America and has traveled anywhere else comes back with a new sense of appreciation that what are necessities for us are wild and undreamed of luxuries for millions of people elsewhere. But is this all that America is? Is America only plants and factories, muscles and biceps and power? Is it not important that America understand and that the world understand that our power is only an instrument, that beyond the power and beyond our productivity and beyond our factories and our granaries and our plants, there is a purpose which we want to serve. For the symbol of America is not a plant—it's a shrine and we must never forget it.

And there are people in many places who regard America as something primitive for we're so young. How many centuries have elapsed since George Washington? In a world where there are countries that trace back their history for 10 and 15 centuries, we appear in some of the parts of the world, the cultivated parts of the world, as a kind of brash and unpredictable adolescent, as a country that has a surface cleverness, a superficial ingenuity but that hasn't struck deep roots in experience, that hasn't matured, that hasn't developed a culture that is redolent with the ripe wisdom of ages. We're somewhat primitive, powerful, vigorous, curious, enterprising, yes—but also youthful, childish. Read some of the estimates of American culture and you will find they are not treating us as if we were an adult and mature people. A century ago one of the great poets of America wrote about a certain condescension on the part of Europeans when they think of America and that condescension has not dissolved entirely. We are looked upon and sometimes we look upon ourselves as being bereft of maturity, of that assurance that comes from having lived long and on intimate terms with time and with destiny. Consequently in parts of the world our proposals, our books, our thoughts, our ideas, our procedures are not given attention and profound respect because we are so youthful. We came into being only the other day. Relations with other nations are only a recent innovation in our history. We're youthful. We have not yet learned the deepest wisdom of life.

To overcome this image, it seems to me we Americans must begin to live more consciously than we have been doing—in terms of the true image of America. And what is that image? May I describe it very briefly? First America began with a revolt—the most important single event in our early history, the event which preceded our organizing into a Nation was a revolution. We began with a revolution. We began by rebelling against tyranny. We began by opposing the inherited and entrenched privileges of royalty and the aristocratic class which it supported. We began with a fight—a fight against oppression and the whole world must know that that Revolution of 1776 has not yet ended in 1958; that there is still in the American spirit and outlook, a rebelliousness against all tyranny; a revolt against any shiek or monarch or president or dictator who abridges the inalienable rights of people; who curtails their freedom; who deprives them of those freedoms and liberties which were meant for every human being who draws breath. What it would mean, to the undecided and uncommitted portions of the world if in their negotiations with us they recognized that we are not only a country of power but that we are a country of revolution. What America represents is not simply an army but a system of ideas, a system of values, a system of convictions which will ultimately spell the doom of every oppressor, of every tyrant, of every czar, of every dictator anywhere. How millions of little people hungering for nothing more than the sunlight, freedom and humble opportunities, would be heartened if they saw America not only as a country with millions and billions of dollars in trade, but as a country that is the eternal opponent, the everlasting adversary of all dictatorship, of all tyranny. We are not only a people whose history began with a revolt—we are a people that began with diversity. We are a people of pluralism from the very first moment. We never belonged to any one race. We were never dominated by any one established church. We stood for diversity, and we say to every country that if you select any one group and make them the bearers of your tradition, the blueblood aristocracy then you have in America an opponent; for we in our country have a replica of all humanity—all the bloodstreams in the world flow in the citizens of America. All the shrines and altars of the world are to be found in the synagogues and the churches and the temples of America. All the pigmentations of the world, brown and red and yellow and black and white—they're all to be found here. Every ethnic strain, every nationality, every human background has its representative here and none is dominant and none is supreme by virtue of its race. To be sure we haven't completely implemented that characteristic of the American shrine, but we say to all the colored people everywhere, to the brown and the yellow races that have not yet known freedom, America means diversity; America means a freedom that is shared by and distributed among all peoples regardless of appearance or race or color. What it would do to fortify and uplift the spirits of the world if they saw America as the shrine of equality, the equality of those who differ in every basic respect except in their common humanity.

And lastly, America is promise. It's a phrase that Archibald MacLeish, the poet, used not so long ago in one of his books. America is promise. We here in America are engaged in an unfinished enterprise. Ours is an experiment that will never be completed. We shall never come to a rest and say, "all frontiers are closed, all opportunities have been explored, everything that had to be done has been terminated and concluded." America is promise. America says to the world, mankind never stops at one level. Beyond the present there is another horizon. Beyond our attainment today there is a beckoning tomorrow and beyond the twilight and the darkness there is a dawn. If there is anyone characteristic of a free society, it is that it never stops in its tracks—that it keeps searching. People of the world have faith. America is not something that comes to you with finished products. America is not only a country that has a past—it's a country that comes with promise. When Walt Whitman published that remarkable and unforgettable book Leaves of Grass, he sent a copy to Ralph Waldo Emerson whom he so greatly revered and he wrote to him, "Master, I am a man of great faith. Master, we have not come through centuries of caste, of heroism, of fables of oppression in order to halt at this point in this land. The American people will never halt. Always it will seek to extend our freedoms, to deepen them; always it will desire to stimulate the search for truth and more truth so that the errors of yesteryear shall not be perpetuated in the orthodoxes of tomorrow." This is America—a society ever on the march; a society that never becomes reactionary and bogged down by inertia and habit until it is paralyzed and cannot move. The American people, like the human mind and the human spirit ever moves—moves onward, and this dynamic quality of America is not exhausted in developing new engines, devising new machines and new methods of production and administration. This dynamism is the dynamism that will give the American people no rest until all humanity has moved forward to a new and higher plane on its torturous process of development and history. This is the shrine of America, and we could do no better in observing the birthday of George Washington, a name so precious to us as Americans, than by recapturing for ourselves this image of the shrine that he and his associates wanted to build; a shrine of rebellion and revolt against all oppression; a shrine of respect for all humanity, independent of color, or race or background; a shrine that looks forward to the morrow—that sees today only as the promise of a better, a richer, a happier tomorrow. If we could live in terms of this shrine, there would be built in many other places smaller shrines emulating ours and there would be eradicated from the minds of misguided people their misconceptions about America and they would see us as we ourselves see us. In the fulfillment of an ancient phrase that we read today in Hebrew Scriptures "and they shall build unto Me a sanctuary and I will surely abide in their midst," then shall we have built unto God a sanctuary and He will surely abide in our midst.

Amen.

Dulles' Dedication to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by the senior Senator from Massachusetts entitled "Dulles' Dedication to Nation." This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 9, 1958. I subscribe heartily to the statements contained in the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES' DEDICATION TO NATION—SECRETARY'S STEADFASTNESS IS CALLED BENEFIT TO UNITED STATES AND OBSTACLE TO FOE

(By LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is another in the statesmen's series of columns being written by distinguished personages in the Government, national affairs, business and the military for Thomas L. Stokes, who is seriously ill.)

I am glad to have this opportunity to pinch hit for one of America's best-liked columnists, Tom Stokes. I have always had respect for his integrity, although frequently we are at opposite poles in our thinking on current issues.

Since the beginning of our Nation, courage and fortitude have been hallmarks of America and the American way of life. Our cities, towns and farms were carved out of a wilderness; our Government was created out of a fight for freedom.

We have had to have strong leaders to guide us during the growth of our Nation. Courage and determination are, therefore, among the most priceless qualities of our heritage and of those who serve our country. These qualities have very much distinguished our present Secretary of State.

The primary duty of a Secretary of State is to advance the interests of our country around the world, protect American citizens and their interests in other countries and to do his utmost to keep peace. Secretary John Foster Dulles has done just that.

He has always worked primarily to promote the security of the United States and the cause of peace. He has indeed devoted his entire life to advancing the interests of our Nation in international affairs. Without his guidance of these tremendous international problems, we might well have suffered many more setbacks and achieved much less in our cold war struggles.

President Eisenhower's policies with Mr. Dulles' advice and guidance have kept us out of war without sacrificing our principles and without compromising the objectives which we seek. Although from day to day we cannot be sure that we are free from the threat of aggression, we have maintained under this leadership peace without compromise.

But whether we agree with Mr. Dulles' policies or not, I think all of us must agree on one thing—he has been determined in his beliefs, steadfast in his devotion to America's peaceful objectives. He has stood firm for the principles he knows to be in the best interests of the United States.

He has been bitterly attacked here at home by those who disagree with his handling of our international problems. At one time he was sharply criticized for his statement that our Nation was on the brink of war; yet at the same time he is criticized for giving way in the face of the Communist aggression.

He is attacked for failing to inject any daring new ideas into our foreign policy, yet he is criticized for his personal visits with heads of state all over the world—a Dulles innovation. He is attacked for refusing to accede to the futile gestures offered by the Russians with respect to a summit conference; he is criticized for not being more vigorous in demanding the return of American citizens held by the Communists and in the same breath he has been criticized for not permitting Americans to travel in those areas where the Communists have been known to seize visitors from the Western World.

His steadfastness in the face of bitter attacks has repeatedly paid off in advancing United States interests throughout the world. He stood fast when the last stronghold of Nationalist China stood in the shadow of the Communist tyrant—Formosa was saved. His firmness in the face of the crises in Vietnam and the Middle East has proved to be insurmountable to the Communists.

The recent SEATO meetings in Manila have indicated an unusual singleness of purpose among its member nations. After the first day of meetings, when all of the speakers joined to voice a common anti-Communist purpose, the Soviets renewed their propaganda barrage against Mr. Dulles.

These characteristics of Mr. Dulles have been particularly manifest in his stand on the Russian urgings for a summit meeting. He has been firm in his insistence that all preparatory steps must be concluded before any such conference is held.

He and the President want to insure that a summit conference has a chance for real progress toward the achievement of world peace and that it is not merely a spectacular vehicle for Communist propaganda. At the same time we certainly will not close any avenue, no matter how difficult the task may be, to achieve world peace. But we must not be deluded into a summit conference which because of lack of adequate preparation can only result in an opportunity for increased Russian propaganda.

Mr. Dulles has negotiated more with the Russians than has any other living American. Thus his judgment as to the conditions under which negotiations will best serve the interests of the free world is of utmost importance, not alone to us but also to our allies.

Since the retirement of Winston Churchill, Mr. Dulles has become the No. 1 target of Communist attacks. More propaganda has been directed against him by the Soviets than against any other living person.

This is a tribute to his courage and to his effectiveness as a negotiator with the Russians during the past decade; his only sin is his dedication to America and the principles we stand for. For this I commend him; he deserves the support of all Americans.

I thank Tom Stokes for the opportunity to say these few words. Let us hope he is back with us soon.

Citation for Cervantes Medal Awarded to Hon. Spessard L. Holland, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, earlier today my senior colleague had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, delivered at a special convocation of Rollins College, observing the 25th anniversary of the Hispanic Institute of Florida. With his characteristic modesty, my distinguished colleague declined to mention the fact that at this April 13 meeting of the Hispanic Institue of Florida, the Senior Senator from Florida was awarded the Cervantes Medal in recognition of and gratitude for his outstanding service in behalf of

Latin America, his own State of Florida, and his Nation. I was most pleased when I learned that the Cervantes Medal was to be presented to my distinguished colleague, for it is indeed a high honor and a much-deserved tribute to his public service.

Mr. President, I think it appropriate to have preserved in the RECORD the citation for the Cervantes Medal awarded to Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, at Rollins College, April 13, 1958, by the Hispanic Institute of Florida, and I ask unanimous consent to have the citation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR CERVANTES MEDAL AWARDED TO SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND AT ROLLINS COLLEGE, APRIL 13, 1958, BY THE HISPANIC INSTITUTE OF FLORIDA

Today marks the 25th anniversary of the Hispanic Institute of Florida. As you know, the purpose of the institute is to create and encourage interest in the Hispanic world and to promote a better understanding and cooperation among the Americas.

One of the first actions taken by the directors of the institute was the establishment of the Cervantes Medal. It was designed by one of its members, Emilio Carles, and financed by another member, Mrs. Sanford Bissell, who always, until her death, kept an active interest in the institute.

The purpose of the Hispanic Medal is to recognize outstanding achievement in the Hispanic field. In the past 25 years the medal has been awarded mostly for outstanding contributions in the field of art and letters. Recently we also have honored men and women whose contributions have been that of public service and unselfish devotion. This year the medal committee has decided to mark the quarter of a century of the institute by awarding two medals.

It is our good fortune today to award the Cervantes Medal to a native son, educated in Florida and honored by every institution of learning in the State. He has served his native State as a lawyer, judge, governor, and as a member of civic and social organizations, holding important executive positions and discharging his duties honestly, efficiently, and as a true southern gentleman.

Since 1946 he has represented his State in the Senate of the United States. It is in this connection that his services have proven invaluable to foster and advance the cause of pan Americanism. It is because of his zeal and effective work in discharging his duties as a member of special committees, delegations, and numerous contacts with Latin American countries that the institute today wants to honor him and recognize the splendid work he has done and all he has accomplished.

In 1950, as a member of a Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture, he was responsible for the successful campaign to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. In 1952 he served as our congressional representative to the meeting of our Pan-American Highway Congress in Mexico. In 1954 he went to Caracas as an official observer to the Third Pan-American Highway Congress where he received an award for his work in the development of the Inter-American Highway. In 1955 he was a member of the United States delegation to attend the dedication of two new links of the Inter-American Highway.

In 1957 he was able to secure an appropriation of $750,000 to start on the high-level bridge across the south end of the Panama Canal. This bridge will be the final link in the Inter-American Highway. He has assisted Colombia and Ecuador to secure much-needed loans from the Export-Import Bank.

In 1941 he received the degree of doctor of laws from Rollins College, and in 1944 he was the principal speaker at the dedication of Casa Iberia, the inter-American center of Rollins, his alma mater.

We are, therefore, today only paying a just debt of gratitude to him by recognizing the splendid work he has done for Latin America, his own State of Florida, and his country.

It is obvious, I am sure, by now, and everyone is conscious of the fact that the man that so justly deserves the distinction the institute is conferring on him is our own fellow citizen, the dedicated and unselfish public servant, and to many of us our very much esteemed friend, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, senior Senator of Florida.

Catching a Minnow—Ignoring a Whale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release and letter to the Attorney General, commenting on the Department of Justice's recently announced case concerning alleged illegal pricing practices by automobile dealers in the District of Columbia.

In my view, proceeding against the dealers, while apparently ignoring the manufacturers, is unusual, to say the least.

There being no objection, news release and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, today asked the Department of Justice to consider an inquiry into possible violations of the antitrust laws by the General Motors Corp., to accompany its recently announced case into alleged illegal pricing practices by automobile dealers in the District of Columbia.

In proceeding against the local dealers and neglecting General Motors, remarked Senator KEFAUVER, the Department is trying "to catch a minnow while ignoring a whale."

In a letter to Attorney General William P. Rogers, dated April 9, the Tennessee Senator made clear that he was not questioning the propriety of the Department in launching a case against the auto dealers for possible conspiracy to impose a trading pack giving the buyer the impression of a trade-in allowance.

The Senator noted that at recent hearings by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which he is chairman, a dealer stated that auto dealers were captive. Other evidence indicated wholesale auto prices are at an alltime high, with comparative models similar in price.

"In view of this information," he noted, "to proceed against dealers without investigating the activities of the automotive manufacturers appears to be an oversight." He added, "I should think that the Department of Justice would be vitally interested in determining whether or not the prices of the automotive industry are the result of competition or the result of monopolistic influences."

Referring to trade figures, Senator KEFAUVER pointed to the remarkable increase in General Motors share of total auto production from 46.5 percent in the first quarter of 1957 to 55.9 percent in the first quarter of 1958. "Does it not bring General Motors' share of the total market perilously close to that percentage indicated as doubtful in and of itself?" he asked the Attorney General.

Senator KEFAUVER cited a number of instances of General Motors' conduct and activities on the basis of which he asked the Department whether it did not now have sufficient evidence of abuses to justify exploration. He referred to General Motors' manufacture of diversified products, alleged coercion of its dealers to use General Motors Acceptance Corp., loans to customers reportedly resulting in purchases of cars, sale of parts to franchised dealers, the relationship between GMAC and General Exchange Insurance Corp., and possibly subsidy of some GM divisions by others.

He also emphasized that President Harlow Curtice had told the subcommittee that General Motors sets the price of its cars high enough to guarantee a return of 15 percent to 20 percent after taxes. "How can such a practice by General Motors be reconciled with competitive behavior?" he asked.

In view of the material cited in the letter, and other facts which the Department undoubtedly has available, the Senator asked Mr. Rogers: "Would it not be appropriate for you to consider accompanying the recent case against the dealers under section 1 of the Sherman Act with a contemporaneous case against General Motors under section 2 of the act?"

Senator KEFAUVER stressed he was making this request as an individual, and does not know the views of other subcommittee members on this subject. Hearings into administered prices in the auto industry are scheduled to be resumed April 29.

The text of the letter follows:

APRIL 9, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: I recently noted in the press that the Department of Justice is launching a case against automobile dealers in the District of Columbia. It is reported that the case involves alleged practices by local dealers of concertedly adding to the manufacturer's list price a "trading pack" which enables the dealers to give the buyer the impression of a generous but partially fictitious trade-in allowance.

If these automobile dealers have in fact conspired among themselves to impose these "packs," they have, of course, been engaging in an outright conspiracy in restraint of trade and in violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act. Obviously, effective enforcement of the antitrust laws demands that such a practice be terminated. Without in any way questioning the propriety of the action against these dealers, in reading this announcement I could not help but wonder if the Department was not seining for minnows when it should be fishing for a whale.

During the recent hearings on administered prices in the automotive industry before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, the statement was made that dealers in the automotive industry are not free, but captive. Evidence also shows that automobiles are priced wholesale at an alltime high, with comparative models substantially similar. In view of this information, to proceed against dealers without investigating the activities of the automotive manufacturers appears to be an oversight.

As 1 in every 7 Americans gainfully employed are, directly or indirectly, attributable to the automotive industry, the actions of

the members of this industry bear close scrutiny. I should think that the Department of Justice would be vitally interested in determining whether or not the prices of the automotive industry are the result of competition or the result of monopolistic influences.

I assume that the transcripts of the hearings on administered prices in the automotive industry have been brought to your attention. It is my understanding that such transcripts have been made available to the antitrust division of the Department of Justice. Without prejudging these hearings, I was impressed with much of the data and information that was presented bearing upon the question of monopoly.

According to figures published in Automotive News of March 31, 1958, General Motors has increased its share of total United States production of passenger cars from 46.5 percent in the first quarter of 1957 to 55.9 percent in the first quarter of 1958. This is a remarkable increase in the short span of 1 year. Does it not bring General Motors' share of the total market perilously close to that percentage indicated as doubtful, in and of itself, as stated in *United States* v. *Aluminum Company of America* (148 F. 2d 416)?

I am fully aware that where size alone is not sufficient to prove a violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act, a showing of abuse of power is required. However, in reading the decisions in the Alcoa case, supra, and *American Tobacco Company* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 781), I am impressed with the fact that but little proof of abuse is sufficient. In view of the judicially determined dominate position in the auto industry held by General Motors, it can be held legally responsible for a very high standard of conduct. *United States* v. *General Motors Corp.* (121 F. 2d 376; cert. den. 314 U. S. 618).

It is well known that General Motors is engaged in the manufacture of a diversified line of products. In fact, it was shown during the recent pricing hearings that General Motors is among the first 4 producers in some 30 manufacturing industries. Although diversification is not illegal, nevertheless when it is coupled with tying or other coercive devices, such practices have been violative of law. The General Motors Acceptance Corp. case, supra, is an important illustration. The coercion by General Motors of its dealers by forcing them to use GMAC was a violation of the Sherman Act. The National City Lines case is another example. The offense here was forced reciprocity. General Motors loaned money to National City in return for which it received automotive trade. *U. S.* v. *National City Lines* (186 F. 2d 562). The recent du Pont-General Motors case is another illustration. *U. S.* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., et al.* (353 U. S. 586). The reciprocity in this case was mutually beneficial to both parties.

Quite apart from the Department's action against the dealers, does not the Department now have sufficient evidence of abuses by General Motors to justify exploration? Would it not be productive to examine closely whether General Motors by the practice of reciprocity is not forcing sales of its products in return for loan of capital or purchases? During the recent hearings, Mr. Harlow Curtice conceded that General Motors had made loans of capital to several of its suppliers.

Would it not also be productive to examine the full line forcing or tying practices of General Motors with respect to its dealers to determine how much freedom its franchised dealers have in selecting the parts that they might handle?

Would it not also be productive to examine whether or not General Motors is forcing its dealers to handle its own products exclusively? In this respect, should not an investigation be made into the relationship between General Motors Acceptance Corp. and General Exchange Insurance Corp.? Does GMAC require insurance with GEIC? Does GEIC require that repairs be made in the shops of General Motors' dealers and, if so, can other parts other than General Motors be used?

As General Motors does not make public figures on the profitability of its various divisions, should not an investigation be made of whether some divisions are wholly or partly subsidized by others? An examination of such data is of the very essence in order to determine whether or not the conglomerate economic strength of General Motors is being brought to bear selectively in any divisional field or industry.

During the course of Mr. Harlow Curtice's testimony before the subcommittee, he also stated that General Motors, in establishing its auomotive prices can and does establish the price of automobiles sufficiently high to guarantee a return of 15 percent to 20 percent profits, after taxes. How can such a practice by General Motors be reconciled with competitive behavior?

In view of the foregoing, and other facts which should be available to the Department, would it not be appropriate for you to consider accompanying the recent case against the dealers under section 1 of the Sherman Act with a contemporaneous case against General Motors under section 2 of that act? The record of the recent hearings held before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, as well as the hearings held before the same subcommittee in 1955, leave little doubt in my mind other than the hard core of the monopoly problem in the automotive industry is the concentration of production held by the Big Three of that industry, and by General Motors in particular.

In the general context of trying to preserve competition and prevent monopoly, for the Department to attack the dealers while neglecting General Motors is, as I stated, to catch a minnow while ignoring a whale.

Alhough I am chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I have made no attempt to ascertain the views of the other members of this subcommitee on the subject matter of this letter. I have taken this course principally because the subcommittee has not as yet completed its study of administered prices in the automotive industry.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

The ILO Conference on Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the ILO Conference on Mining prepared by Kenneth C. Kellar and Denison Kitchel. Mr. Kitchel is a resident of Phoenix, Ariz.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ILO CONFERENCE ON MINING

(A report by Kenneth C. Kellar and Denison Kitchel)

Having attended an International Labor Organization conference at Geneva, Switzerland, we are convinced that Alice's Adventures in Wonderland were dull in comparison. We are also convinced that continued participation in the ILO by the United States is not in the best national interest.

The conference to which we were accredited as United States employer delegates was officially entitled the "Tripartite Technical Meeting on Mines Other Than Coal Mines." Convened by the governing body of the ILO, the 2 weeks meeting (November 25–December 7, 1957) was ostensibly called for the purpose of discussing problems of labor-management relations common to the mining industries of the 25 nations which participated. Each delegation consisted of 2 employer delegates, 2 worker delegates and 2 government delegates. Of the Communist nations, Russia and Yugoslavia were represented.

There were four items on the agenda for the meeting:

1. Social problems arising in mines other than coal mines.
2. Accident prevention in mines other than coal mines.
3. Machinery for wage fixing and wage protection in mines other than coal mines.
4. Industrial relations in mines other than coal mines.

In advance of the meeting, the permanent staff of the ILO had prepared reports on each of these items and sent them to the prospective delegates.

The first item, social problems, obviously opened the door to every conceivable and irrelevant topic from childbirth to cemetery accommodations. These social problems were discussed by means of prepared speeches delivered by almost every delegate to the conference at plenary sessions held throughout the 2 weeks period. Captives of the permanent staff of the ILO, we heard speech after speech condemning employers as a class for their ruthless exploitation of the working man. We heard speech after speech extolling the virtues of governmental regulation and intervention in all phases of labor-management relations. We heard speech after speech describing the wonderful freedoms vouchsafed to the workers in Communist countries. And, of course, we heard speech after speech praising the great work of the ILO.

The other three items on the agenda were referred to subcommittees. In this subcommittee framework lay the possibility that we would actually have the opportunity to exchange ideas and discuss mutual problems with the delegates from other nations. But here, again, under the rigid direction of the ILO permanent staff, discussion was reduced to a minimum and the production of embryonic international legislation quickly became the major activity of the subcommittees. Almost at the very outset and as if from out of the blue, there appeared on the desk of each subcommittee member a complete draft of a resolution prescribing in detail the principles, rules, and regulations which should govern all phases of the subject matter under discussion. From then on the discussion consisted of voting on these specific proposals, obviously prepared well in advance of the conference by the permanent staff, acting as the handmaiden of the leftwing international trade unions.

The final day of the conference found us unwittingly convened as an international parliament. For 7 consecutive hours we were maneuvered through the labyrinths of legislative chicanery to produce the end products conceived by the permanent staff long before we arrived in Geneva. In 7 short hours and after 2 short weeks of "discussion," we resolved most of the grave issues of labor-management relations with which the mining industry has been wrestling for centuries.

We can report that the United States employer delegates to the conference were

unique, conspicuous and outspoken in their unwillingness to conform and in their opposition to the socialistic and legislative aspects of the meeting. Taking the position that the conference had not been convened for the purpose of legislating on the internal affairs of their country, their performance might best be described as that of skunks at an international lawn party. We can also report that their independent attitude was the envy of most of the employer delegates from the other free nations, who, because of the ascendancy of labor socialism at home, could not afford to oppose the activities of the ILO no matter how unpalatable they might be.

This is the sinister aspect of this and other ILO conferences. With the exception of the United States and Canada, and possibly Australia, the employers and governments of the world fear the ILO. It is our conclusion that the ILO is the vehicle of the international socialists and the tool of the left-wing international trade unionists.

The United States pays 25 percent of the cost of maintaining and operating the International Labor Organization. We question whether such a contribution, or, in fact, any contribution to national suicide, is in the best interests of our country.

As for the Tripartite Technical Meeting on Mines Other Than Coal Mines, suffice it to say that it was the most interesting, most frustrating, most disturbing, most diabolical and most useless conference we ever attended.

How Are American Institutions Faring in the Cold War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is sometimes said that if the United States ever falls to communism, it is most likely that the Nation will be the victim of an attack from within. We face the dual problem of preparing ourselves for a military showdown with communism while, at the same time, dealing with the kind of communism that slowly and gradually may infiltrate into every kind of American institution.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial entitled "How Are American Institutions Faring in the Cold War?" which was written by the Honorable W. W. Mims, the able editor of the Advertiser, of Edgefield, S. C., and which appeared originally in the Advertiser for April 2, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ARE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS FARING IN THE COLD WAR?

Are free institutions holding their own during this cold war? Some journalist suggests an answer in this comment recently made: "The world is an increasingly tough place for the gracious, unsuspecting, and openly friendly individual to live in."

Of course, a lot depends on one's immediate environment. Even in a hot war a lot of people fail to understand the issues or know the sacrifices or the probable consequences, win or lose.

But there are those even in a cold war who must face the critical moments day and night.

When Mr. Lodge was appointed Ambassador to the United Nations, one of his first decisions was that he would not shake hands with members of the Russian delegation. It is understood that he later changed his mind. But the idea of rejecting a friendly association with the murderers of the Kremlin was forcing its way to the forefront of diplomacy then, and the policy, adopted and abandoned, typified the fact that this country did not and does not specifically know how to deal with the international conspiracy of communism, and its main reliance, therefore, is on a bombs-ready posture.

Ambassador Lodge, representing a professedly Christian Nation which placed emphasis on charity and goodness, nevertheless felt that there is among the American people a compunction with regard to sincerity and loyalty. He must have argued with himself and discussed the problem with associates in his way: How can I practice sincerity and be loyal to the ideals of the United States and at the same time shake the treacherous hands of the enemy blooded with the murders of American soldiers in Korea and of the millions of innocent people who have stood against the advance of communism? How can I represent with good grace the people of the United States shaking hands with men who speak words only to mislead and whose handshake is a part of the planned deception?

Certainly the policies and considerations of the American Government are not too different from the feeling of individuals seeing the influences of communism here in our own country.

The Communists have broken more than 40 solemn pledges. They have demonstrated completely their absence of integrity and principle. They have been convicted, by their own record of treachery, as scheming and bloody criminals.

The western democracies officially may only stand by in an effort of preparedness and try now and then to expose some new propaganda advance while our planes hover the earth with atomic bombs waiting against the day a counterattack is the only alternative.

There is a saying that you can't go over to a neighbor's house and whip the neighbor's child. There is no way this country may reach into Russia to discipline its leaders and bring its people to halt the Communist plans for world conquest.

Actually there may be no need for this. The real need in the meantime may be to halt Communist influences here in our own country.

A gifted American recently told with amazing clarity of the infiltration of communism in every kind of American institution scarcely realized by American people. It is a gradual process of subversion in which we as loyal Americans are led to believe that certain changes are good; that corruptions are to be expected; that things are better, not worse, than they used to be; that politics has always been a matter of selfish purpose, and that cheap, selfish and dishonest manifestations are not alarming, but normal to every period.

The prime question is this: Will we in America lose the very things that our science is dedicated to protect by assuming merely a patient attitude, and waiting out the cold war while communism takes over our own country from within?

If indeed the world is an increasingly tough place for the gracious, unsuspecting and openly friendly individual to live in, we'd better begin to find out why right here in the United States.

Three Books About Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the winter, 1959 edition of the Co-op Grain Quarterly, is an excellent review of three books about agriculture by a reporter for the Cowles publications, Mr. Charles Bailey, who writes for Minnesota's Minneapolis Star and Tribune. These reviews are quite brief, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE BOOKS ABOUT AGRICULTURE
(By Charles Bailey)

In the field of farm policy, it's hard to tell where economics end and politics begin.

Two new books on agriculture and the people who run it illustrate the impossibility of separating the two disciplines.

One of the books is primarily an economic treatise. It is titled "Farm Prices: Myth and Reality," and was written by Willard W. Cochrane, University of Minnesota agricultural economist. Published by University of Minnesota Press, the price is $4.

The other is primarily a political tract. Called Ezra Taft Benson: Man With a Mission, it is the product of Wesley McCune, long-time Democratic farm aid who is now on the staff of the National Farmers Union.

(The McCune book, published by Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., at $2.50, also is available in a paperback edition.)

It is perhaps unfair to Cochrane's scholarly job to discuss it in the same context with McCune's partisan book on the current Secretary of Agriculture. Yet the fabric of Cochrane's work is inescapably treaded with the author's basic credo of proper national policy—and it is politics, of course, that translates policy into action.

Cochrane recognizes (as, unfortunately, so many students of farm problems either do not recognize or pointedly ignore) the fact that politics must play an important part in shaping any national policy for agriculture.

He argues, and persuasively, that "society will not choose" to maintain Federal programs "to transfer into agriculture some amount, ranging from $3 to $6 billion, year after year into the indefinite future."

Present programs, he says, are "hidden under a hocus-pocus of recoverable costs"; the soil bank "has become a farce" that has been used to spread income rather than cut production; and the average farmer is on a "treadmill," forced to adopt new technological practices merely to keep up with the rest of the economy.

Cochrane finds, for varying reasons, that a number of present or proposed programs lead to "blind alleys." He includes the so-called free market approach, the fixed price support program, the flexible price support program, the farm efficiency approach, the domestic consumption increase approach.

"The free market approach solved the surplus problem in agriculture with no regard to the income problem of farmers. The fixed price support approach solves the income problem of farmers with no regard to the surplus problem. Each solves one problem by intensifying another."

The flexible support approach, he says, cannot solve the problem because—and here Cochrane illustrates the inevitable mingling of economics with policy, or politics—"the values and beliefs of society in the 1950's" decreed that supports reached "the lower limits of political tolerance" at about 80 percent of parity.

Cochrane's reasoning leads to the setting up of two "hard policy choices": Should society continue to guarantee the costs of income and price support? What course is best for agriculture to pursue if it receives little or no income support from the rest of the economy?

The author suggests that the first question will be answered "No." He goes on to outline a proposal for controlling farm output—to get farmers off the treadmill—by viewing agriculture as a public utility, with the many small producing units acting together with the help of Government to provide the products required by society at a fair price and at the same time to provide a fair income to producers.

McCune's book is shorter than Cochrane's and certainly less of an intellectual exercise for the reader. It is a study of Benson, as a man and as an official, written by the former Democratic National Committee farm expert and assistant to former Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan.

McCune goes into Benson's past—his youth, his role as a high-level lobbyist in Washington during World War II, his post as a top official of the Morman Church. Also covered are assessments of troubles Benson has run into as Secretary, his relationship with President Eisenhower (Ike likes Ezra) and a critical review of the administration farm program and its results.

Perhaps the most valuable contribution of this strongly slanted political book is the section on the effects of Benson's religious heritage and beliefs on his policy formulation. This is a subject that most newsmen who cover Benson always hesitate to raise.

McCune has no such hesitation. He is not under the reporter's obligation to view public men, whenever possible, in the light of their public acts rather than their personal beliefs. There is no denying, however, that man's personal convictions influence his public behavior; and the reader can find more evidence in McCune's book that economics and politics are inevitably mixed in setting public policy.

He may deduce further, in this case, that the personal moral codes of the political official must also have their effect on his public actions.

Warren Group's Defiant Attitude Seen Divisive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the Supreme Court entitled "Warren Group's Defiant Attitude Seen Divisive," which appeared in the State, of Columbia, S. C., in its issue of April 10.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARREN GROUP'S DEFIANT ATTITUDE SEEN DIVISIVE

WASHINGTON.—The Supreme Court has shown a studied indifference and almost a defiant attitude toward congressional and bar associations' complaints that it has exceeded its constitutional power in recent decisions regarded as favorable to Communist and criminal elements.

Headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, who is the principal target of widespread criticism, the high tribunal has also disregarded the congressional challenge of its alleged actions in making law instead of merely interpreting it.

This controversy over the functions and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has split that body into two hostile factions, which sometimes make no effort to conceal their bitter feelings. In written opinions and sharp remarks from the bench, they reveal that their differences are irreconcilable, Justice Felix Frankfurter acts as spokesman for the anti-Warren group.

LIBERAL VERSUS CONSERVATIVE

Numerous 5-to-4 decisions on these questions during the current session show that the dispute between the Warren liberals and the Frankfurter conservatives has not been resolved definitely.

Final outcome will probably depend on where the two newest members—Justices William J. Brennan and Charles E. Whittaker—take their stand. So far, they have shown no firm alinement with either group.

In general, Warren exalts the rights of the individual against the authority of the executive and legislative arms. The Frankfurter jurists believe that the Court's awesome power to override the other two branches of the Government should be exercised with the utmost restraint.

BITTER WORDS

The Californian and the Bostonian—the politician and the professor—recently exchanged bitter words in a case involving the right of Congress to establish conditions under which Congress could deprive a person of citizenship.

Warren narrowed congressional jurisdiction in this field, while Frankfurter accepted the boundaries fixed by the lawmakers. When the Chief Justice, in defense, declared that the Supreme Court had overruled Congress on 81 occasions, Frankfurter retorted that there was no reason to boast about this assertion of authority.

Then, departing from his written opinion and speaking in crisp, critical tones, Frankfurter noted that many of these overriding rulings had subsequently been reversed by the Supreme Court itself. He reminded the relatively new member from California that the High Tribunal does not regard itself as infallible.

STILL UNKNOWN

With Justices Brennan and Whittaker still unknown quantities because of their late arrivals, the current court lineup is as follows: Warren, Black, and Douglas against Frankfurter, Burton, Harlan, and Clark.

Based on their latest leanings, it is believed that Brennan will eventually join the Warren faction, while Whittaker teams up with the Frankfurter dissenters.

No matter where they wind up, the fundamental disagreement seems to insure a series of wrangles and 5 to 4 decisions considered to be unsatisfactory and unhealthy by Congress, bewildering to jurists in the lower courts, and puzzling to practitioners before the bar.

CONGRESS DISAGREES

Meanwhile, Congress has shown its complete disagreement with the Supreme Court's philosophy as influenced by the Chief Justice. It is expected to enact legislation to circumvent decisions which have freed confessed criminals and convicted Communists.

In a direct rebuke to the Court, the Senate Judiciary Committee has forced a judicial nominee to swear that he will not deliver a decision contrary to the Constitution.

Despite this plain evidence of adverse reaction inside and outside Congress, Chief Justice Warren has generally been able to round up a majority reaffirming the rulings which Congress condemns. In short, the Chief Justice refuses to be swayed by extrajudicial pressures and protests.

In a certain sense, this feud is more serious than the clash between the Supreme Court and F. D. R. over enlargement of the tribunal. Then, Congress sided with the jurists against the White House. Now, a conservative Congress supports the Frankfurter position and denounces the Chief Justice's liberalism.

The Case for Federal Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, last September the magazine Nation's Business published an article condensed from the report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, called The Case Against Federal Reclamation. In the April issue of Nation's Business there is printed a response to the previous article entitled "The Case for Federal Reclamation," prepared by the Honorable George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that this able refutation of the earlier article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR FEDERAL RECLAMATION

(By the Honorable George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah)

Thoughtful westerners—plus many informed easterners, have lately been shocked, exasperated, angered and embittered, by a new wave of attacks on reclamation.

We should, perhaps, have long since been conditioned against such assaults. To us, reclamation in our Nation is the bringing together of land, water and people to produce foodstuffs, fiber and power, thereby sustaining life itself. To virtually everyone born or reared in a land of scant rainfall it seems as illogical to question the benefits of reclamation as it would seem, to a Hollander, quite senseless to argue the benefits of reclaiming land from the Zuider Zee.

We in the West believe reclamation's enemies are blindly or blandly overlooking the economic facts of life in an entire region comprising one of their own prime markets. For a time we thought that our viewpoint was prevailing.

For a time we in the West cheerfully, if naively, had begun believing the era of obstinate obstructionism to the constructive use of water recources was ending. Water shortages in the industrial seaboard and rural Midwest, coupled with the patently successful work of wedding water to land in our region, should mean an end to the stupidity, or cupidity, of enemies of reclamation.

The very program under attack has meant the fullest blessings of the American way of life for countless Western farm and city families, plus a blossoming of large-scale industry and agriculture.

Obviously, reclamation is still a matter on which debates will continue raging until every drop of water coursing down the beds of our Nation's rivers and streams is put to the best possible use. For water is, obviously, one of the good things of life. And men seem fated, always, to argue about how best to utilize, divide, or control the land, the oceans, the waters, and even the air of our globe—not to mention outer space and the accessible planets.

The position I uphold is simple: Reclamation is good business, not only for the 17 Western States, but for the businessmen, workers, and taxpayers of the East, Midwest, and South. It is good investment in the future for the entire nation from every practical dollars-and-cents standpoint.

This philosophy, the case for reclamation, is based on these solid facts: It pays its own way, yet spreads benefits to all corners of the Nation.

We in the West know the damming of rivers and the bringing of water to land is costly. So does the resident of our coastal or Great Lakes region know the dredging of harbors and the clearing of river channels is costly. In the West, our development and survival depend upon reclamation projects which assure our crop output, our power resources, our very existence. In our port cities, the maintenance of commerce basic to municipal and regional existence stems from the navigability of harbors and rivers. Thus in our Nation, since establishment of Federal Government, ports and waterways are maintained by agencies of this same Federal Government—supported by tax dollars of citizens in all sectors of the Nation who realize the economic health of the country is dependent upon this waterborne commerce and trade.

But, when we turn to the costs inherent in reclamation—costs inherent to the economic well-being of fully one-third of our Nation—there are basic misunderstandings about Federal spending on Federal projects. And this, despite the fact that reclamation projects, in the aggregate and individually, actually return most of their construction costs to the Treasury of the United States.

There exists—unadvertised, but very tangible—a promissory note on every reclamation project. The farmers and power users who directly benefit from federally financed reservoirs, dams, and hydroelectric plants repay the construction costs of reclamation projects over a set span of years. Opponents of the reclamation thesis argue with the schedule of repayment, just as they argue the "excessive" cost of projects. Shrugging off the fact that borrowed dollars are faithfully returned to the Treasury for reclamation loans, they conveniently continue to overlook the very existence of repayment schedules.

These same opponents of reclamation likewise overlook another fiscal fact in their continuous warfare against the development of the West. They forget to note that most of the capital required for construction of irrigation features of reclamation works comes—not from the tax dollars of the Nation's citizenry—but from the reclamation fund built up from proceeds accruing to the United States from the Oil Leasing Act, from the sale and leasing of public lands, and other public-land revenues. Much of the land in the underdeveloped West (more than 70 percent in such States as Utah and Nevada) is owned outright by the Federal Government, which leases desirable acreage for mining, grazing, and oil production.

Accretions to the reclamation fund totaled $484 million on June 30, 1957, and collections representing construction repayments, water rentals, power revenues, and miscellaneous revenues amounted to an additional $702 million—a sum substantial enough to give a sizable start on most reclamation projects now authorized, if used directly for such purposes. It is statistics such as this the enemies of reclamation never cite. A few other figures they choose to avoid are these:

Out of $2,961,763,715 expended in total for plant, property and equipment on reclamation projects in the West during the past half century, $355,514,171 has been repaid, $181,515,797 of additional income representing interest on investment in power facilities was collected, and some $60 million in cash payments is made to the United States Treasury annually—including interest on the Federal investment in hydroelectric and municipal water facilities. Income to reclamation project farmers and farm workers totals $666 million in 1956—with a cumulative total income in the past half century of nearly $8.6 billion, and this from land that would have been virtually unproductive without the reclamation projects.

The total cost of the plant, property, and equipment of all Bureau of Reclamation constructed properties which produced this economic wealth has been some $2.962 billion.

There are some statistics almost impossible to get. For example:

Sales of electric energy from reclamation projects totaled 25,654,251,471 kilowatthours in 1956. We know these sales brought $60 million in revenue to the Federal Treasury. But it is virtually impossible to tally dollar output of plants producing finished products with this power, impossible as well to gage the lessened wartime effort; or the lessened output of aluminum and canned goods, lumber and shirtwaists, airplanes and toy trains we would have faced had not these kilowatts been available; it is likewise difficult to learn what the cost of available goods or even the lessening in overall standards might have been had such hydropower been lacking in major regions of the Nation.

It is, however, quite possible and proper to study the statistics attached to a single, small, typical specific reclamation project—and to speculate on what might have been, or upon what might not have been had this project never been built.

In order to survive in the desert wastelands of Utah, Mormon pioneers turned the waters of City Creek onto the parched earth of the Salt Lake Valley in 1847. Later, settlers brought water to other Utah areas to build a new way of life. However, even with this pioneering people whose very religion urges freedom from debt and cooperative but nongovernmental enterprise, the self-financing of truly major irrigation enterprises proved impractical.

In 1900 residents of the Utah County region along the Spanish Fork River found their choice of crops, and the extent of their farming, restricted by the seasonal flow of the stream being utilized to water their fields. They realized a dam in the Green River Basin east of the Wasatch Range, coupled with a mountain tunnel, would divert plentiful precious water—going to waste unused—to the southern part of their county to supplement natural streamflow.

A group of citizens worked 18 months seeking finances for the project. Unsuccessful, they appealed to the Federal Government for aid under the new Reclamation Act in 1904. The project was authorized in 1906, delivered its first stored water to farms in the summer of 1915—and water users have since repaid $2,678,072 to the Government, or 80 percent of the $3,349,424 repayment obligation.

Utahans know this as the Strawberry Valley project. One of the first Federal reclamation projects ever authorized, it brings 60,000 acre-feet of water to 42,000 acres of new lands and lands requiring replacement or supplemental water supplies.

The cumulative crop value from the time of completion to the present is $78,495,856 or 22 times the construction cost. In addition, the Strawberry produces power, municipal water, and recreation with an annual value of $500,000.

But more important, the personal income directly associated with the project is estimated at $18 million a year. For the population growth in the area has been continuous while contiguous areas, comparable in soil and climate, but lacking sufficient water, have shown population and income declines. Utah County, in which the Strawberry project is located, grew at the same pace as neighboring Juab and Sanpete Counties—until 1910 or thereabouts, when the water supply from natural streams was used at virtually its full potential. Since 1915, when the Strawberry began furnishing its first water, Utah County has gained in population, its neighbors have declined, losing purchasing power as well as residents.

Consumer studies by merchandising firms, Federal surveys and market-data reports indicate 12,000 people of the project area's present 24,000 population live in the county as a result of the Strawberry project.

This project, and hundreds like it, is a sound market for manufactured goods from other regions. During the past 5 years there was an average annual sale of 658 new cars and 225 new trucks in the Strawberry project area. Total value $2,337,000. Farmers annually averaged purchases of 156 new tractors costing $263,860 and $235,500 in new farm implements. Two-thirds of these automotive and machinery dollars left Utah, directly aiding the laborer and the economy of Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, New York, and California, and indirectly aiding stockholders of auto and farm-machinery companies throughout the Nation. Purchases of building materials' home furnishings, hardware, clothing, drugs, appliances, and general merchandise shipped to the Strawberry region from all across the Nation totaled $18 million in a recent typical year, of which $10 million left the State.

Continuing our statistics a bit further: The volume of sales involved in interstate shipment specifically attributable to the project amounts to $8,232,000 of which $4,512,000 leaves the State annually. Over $1 million more in products is thus purchased annually from Eastern and Midwestern States than the original cost of the project. And while the population of Utah County rose steadily past the 24,000 mark, the population of neighboring Sanpete County leveled off just above 15,000 in 1920 and has since dropped below the 14,000 mark. Juab County reached a population peak of 10,000 and now has but 5,100 residents.

In part, Utah County's current well-being stems from new industrial plants such as the war-built United States Steel plant at Geneva as well as farm prosperity. This industrial growth was possible only due to water, power, and population resources stemming from the Strawberry project.

Finally, there's the matter of taxes. From 1915 to 1920, the first 5 years of the project, the assessed valuation of the project area jumped from $7,476,837 to $26,890,840, a rise directly attributable to the Strawberry. As for recent years—in 1954—with the project creating jobs and livelihoods which now support 12,000 persons, the total in taxes collected from all sources amounted to $149.83 for State and local taxes and $369.40 for Federal purposes per person. Multiplying these by 12,000 we find the project returning $1,797,960 to the State and local governments

and $4,432,800 to the Federal Government in a single year.

From an investment of some $3.33 million over 40 years ago, the Federal Treasury now receives nearly $3.4 million annually in tax revenues. Not a bad return from an investment in water, land and people. The Strawberry Valley project is relatively small. But in human returns as well as dollar values, it continues to bulk large in the lives of Utahns such as Albert Swenson, one of the early project farmers, who puts it this way:

"Before the Strawberry was finished we used to get one crop of alfalfa on the east bench—and that was it. During a dry year we just burned up."

Now there are three cuttings of alfalfa a season for feeding cattle and sheep, helping provide a stable agriculture and industrial base previously impossible in a semi-arid region.

Just as the Strawberry Valley unit illustrates a typical, sound, obviously successful small reclamation program unit, the upper Colorado River storage project and the much abused Fryingpan-Arkansas project show the scope, complexity, engineering ingenuity—and inherent soundness—of projects now moving forward despite a drumfire of thoughtless opposition. After decades of research, a $760 million basinwide development of the Colorado River is underway, with construction at Glen Canyon dam site in Arizona, and the beginnings of work at Flaming Gorge on the Green River in Utah as initial steps.

The prime contract for Glen Canyon Dam was let for $107,955,522—fully $27.6 million or 20 percent under engineering estimates. Opponents of the overall reclamation program continually charge that costs drastically exceed estimates, but forget to cite such cases in which bids fall well below estimated costs. Enemies of reclamation trumpet that Hungry Horse, Colorado-Big Thompson and similar projects have a poor record as regards to cost estimates—but forget to point out that World War II and the Korean conflicts boosted construction costs considerably between the time first studies were made and the time contracts were let. They forget to point out the vast savings that could have been made had the contracts been let speedily and construction promptly handled before wars intervened.

In pamphleteering efforts to block the Frying Pan-Arkansas project in southeastern Colorado they forget to point out that fully $140 million of an investment of $159,287,000 will be repaid by water users and power sales—much of it with interest—and completely forget the intangible benefits which might result when supplemental water from the Frying Pan reaches a region plagued by periodic drought and crop failure, while bringing no new land under cultivation. Farm incomes will be stabilized; land values rise—and with them taxable values; State and Federal revenues will increase through higher personal and corporate incomes; the purchasing power of the area will rise, meaning more business at national as well as local and regional levels; there will be more water and power for municipalities—providing for growth and industrial expansion, more payrolls, more purchases of raw and finished materials.

Critics of such projects as the Frying Pan-Arkansas fail to see, or at least forget to state, that whole areas of the West must stagnate, must decline, without water. They can only grow through water development. Los Angeles, Phoenix, Tucson, Salt Lake City—such centers obviously add to national prosperity as well as regional well-being. Croplands in California and Arizona producing fruit, cotton, vegetables and cattle for the national market play a role in the economy of the entire United States—as do aircraft plants and aluminum factories in the Pacific Northwest which depend on reclamation projects for hydroelectric power. There will be no such growth in the West as they represent—no further burgeoning cities, no fresh power and crop resources—without such projects as Frying Pan-Arkansas and Colorado River.

What is the Colorado River storage project? Designed to serve an area of 100,000 square miles described as the Nation's last frontier, it will provide water—that most valuable fuel of all—for agricultural development and the progressive growth of cities and towns in much of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The program provides 4 large mainstream dams and 11 irrigation units, participating projects. Regulating the river against floods and preventing further silting at Hoover Dam, creating power and making water available for municipal use are part of the multipurpose uses of project waters, along with the provision of agricultural water supplies. Among those who will benefit as water reaches new farmland, and as supplementary water reaches old croplands, are members of the Navaho tribe, a people badly needing economic aid and security. In creating new, stable, multimillion dollar markets for such eastern products as autos and tractors, clothing and home furnishings, the Colorado River water storage project will not only parallel—but vastly exceed—the proven benefits brought by such a comparatively small reclamation project as the Strawberry.

There is much more, of course. The Colorado program will create a reservoir extending 186 miles up the Colorado and 71 miles up the San Juan from Glen Canyon; Flaming Gorge will provide another beautiful body of water, as will Navaho Dam and Curecanti on the Gunnison. Each will mean recreation of the sort made possible by Lake Mead—attracting new millions of dollars for tourist facilities, gasoline, foodstuffs, sporting goods. The building of dams and access roads will open large sectors of the Southwest and inaccessible portions of the Mountain West, to conservationists, tourists, fishermen and family vacationists.

Finally, such a project, bringing water to the soil, also brings people and power into juxtaposition with natural resources. The upper basin of the Colorado River contains 90 percent of the Nation's known uranium; upward of 30 percent of its copper; 90 percent of its commercially useful oil shale; huge deposits of phosphate rock for fertilizer, vast quantities of oil, natural gas, gypsum, precious metals, tungsten, molybdenum and vanadium. The project will open such resources to development, just as the building of reclamation projects made possible the current growth of the Pacific Northwest; just as the building of dams on the lower Colorado made possible the growth of Los Angeles and the rich farm economy of California's interior valleys.

True, the Colorado River storage project will be underwritten by the Federal Government, but approximately 99 percent of total costs will be repaid by the people who use the power and water—and fully two-thirds of the cost will be repaid in the Federal treasury with full interest.

Which is why, in the West, we equate reclamation with progress, with healthy growth, with healthy industrial and agricultural expansion, which, through the years, have moved America forward.

Problems of Klamath Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of my colleagues in the Senate frequently ask me about the background of the complicated Klamath Indian problem, which I soon hope will be solved by the passage of S. 3051, the bill which I have introduced at the request of the Interior Department.

One of the best summaries of the entire complex Klamath situation appeared as the opening two articles in a series written for the Oregonian of Portland by Ken David, capable staff writer of that daily newspaper. Mr. David has made a careful and thorough study of the Klamath Reservation situation and all its ramifications.

These articles were published under Mr David's byline in the Sunday Oregonian of April 6, 1958. I believe they will serve to illuminate some of the questions and issues which predominate in our efforts to do justice to the Klamath Indians and, at the same time, to save for perpetual use the great forest, waterfowl marshes, and watershed uplands of the 850,000-acre reservation.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. David's two opening articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOES BESET OREGON INDIANS UNDER 1954 EMANCIPATION ACT

(By Ken David)

(The Federal Government's trusteeship over the Klamath Indians of southern Oregon will be terminated August 13, 1960, unless Congress changes the present law, an event considered unlikely. Since the termination law was passed in 1954, its terms have generated continuous controversy and deep concern over the possible economic and social consequences. Following is the first of a series reporting on the termination problem and how it stands to date.)

These are troubled days for the Klamath Indians. Time is running out on the Klamaths as a tribe.

They are confused, most of them, and resentful, even bitter.

No one knows for certain how deep in their past are buried the roots of their present sorrows, but the visible branches are entangled in a series of events of recent years.

The product of these events is total emancipation for the Klamath Indians, a precipitous end to almost 100 years of Federal Government guardian ship of their lives and fortunes.

For years, many of the Indians had sought escape from the restrictive paternalism of Federal Goverment. They dreamed of a distant day of freedom, a day when they could chart their own individual destinies and enjoy the same rights, social, economic and property, as their white neighbors.

Now that day is at hand, and for many of the Klamath tribe, the vague, pleasant dream has assumed the shapeless form of a monstrous nightmare.

LAW BRINGS CONTROVERSY

Emancipation for the Klamath Indians was born of conflict within the tribe and it grew to full flower by the fertilization of hasty, misdirected compromise.

That compromise was pounded together—in the closing days of Congress 4 years ago—into Public Law 587, more commonly known as the Klamath Termination Act, a piece of legislation which has fomented endless controversy, inside and outside the tribe, and generated constant effort to correct its errors and stem the relentless tide tumbling the Klamath Indians toward the brink of emancipation for which only a few of them are prepared and thrusting their 800,000-acre, multimillion-dollar reservation toward what virtually everyone who knows anything about Klamath termination believes will be economic ruin.

The Klamath Indians for centuries roamed, fished, hunted, and multiplied throughout a huge and wild region of the Pacific cotst athwart the boundary of what later became Oregon and California.

Then the white man drifted into this beautiful land claimed by the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of the Snake Indians. These Indians were forced to yield all but a million acres of the rich region they had populated for hundreds of years.

They chose for their reservation a million-acre area lying northeast of Klamath Lake, Oregon's largest lake, an area abounding in game, its streams alive with fish, and its mountains and valleys thickly covered with magnificent stands of ponderosa pine.

The Klamath's ownership of this million-acre wilderness was sealed by the treaty of 1864, and the wisdom of their choice lies in the value of the timber spread across the mountains and down the valleys.

VALUES SPECULATIVE

But the Klamath Reservation has a value beyond its timber resources, a value which can't be measured in cold, hard cash. Within the boundaries of the reservation is a giant marsh bordered by superb grazing land, some of it reclaimed from the marsh. The Klamath Marsh is a nesting, feeding, and resting area for millions of migratory waterfowl, and its importance to the Pacific flyway is incalculable.

The reservation is an area of abundant water, both underground and above ground. And here again, values are speculative. But conservationists estimate that half the water which pours into mammoth Upper Klamath Lake originates within the borders of the reservation. Preservation of this water resource is vital to the production of power, the irrigation of thousands of acres of farmland and pastureland, and the conservation of waterfowl and other wildlife.

ECONOMY THREAT SEEN

Many believe that the valuable resources of the reservation—water, timber, and wildlife—are in jeopardy because of the inflexible terms of Public Law 587, the Klamath Termination Act. They also believe the law, if carried out as now written, will bludgeon the economy of the Klamath Basin, with repercussions throughout Oregon.

Why? Because the evidence indicates that most of the Klamaths will elect to withdraw from the tribe under provisions of the law, forcing the "fire-sale" liquidation of up to 3 billion board-feet of the more than 4 billion board-feet of timber on the reservation, creating a "boom-and-bust" timber harvest on the region and denuding the forest to the point where it will no longer hold back the water, letting it run off swiftly, unchecked by nature. All the Indians who withdraw from the tribe must be paid in cash for their share of the tribal assets.

TWO FACTIONS COMPLICATE TRIBE LAND PROBLEM

(By Ken David)

The Klamath Termination Act which ends Federal Government trusteeship over the Klamath Indians on August 13, 1960, developed from the recent history of conflict and turmoil within the tribe.

Two factions emerged, neither with enough strength to assume distinct leadership. The nominal heads of these factions were members of tribal council and the smaller governmental unit, the executive committee. Policy disputes became frequent, and each faction adopted the device when council matters went against them of walking out, leaving the council without a quorum to conduct the business. Tribal government broke down.

Out of this strife an idea grew; let those who don't like what's going on withdraw from the tribe. Bills were introduced in Congress to create the machinery for this goal. But disagreements prevented their passage, primarily because the dissidents who wanted to withdraw objected to leaving in tribal hands the decision on how much money they would get and how withdrawal would be carried out.

Public Law 587, the final product of this discontent, was also the product of terrific miscalculations. The Indians got termination without understanding what they had. Congress, which had previously adopted a termination policy for reservation Indians, went along with it.

The second serious miscalculation was in the number of tribal members who could be expected to withdraw. No one intimately involved in developing the bill in 1954 anticipated that more than 5 percent of the Klamaths would choose to get out and convert their share of the tribal assets into cash.

The ink was barely dry on the President's signature on the bill when it became apparent that many times 5 percent probably would elect to withdraw.

LAW SUPPORT STUDIED

The sudden awakening to the realization of the economic and social consequences inherent in the termination law jarred the people of the Klamath Basin and rumbled through Oregon, echoing in the halls of Congress and the offices of the Interior Department whose agents had aided in the architecture of the new law.

Timber interests, conservationists, sociologists, legislators, Congressmen, and many others began to study the import of this termination law. Congress was persuaded to extend its final effective date from the original August 13, 1958, to August 13, 1960, to allow more time for examinations of its effect on the Indians and the economy of the Klamath Basin.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, chairman of a Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, has carried the ball in Congress seeking a better solution to the termination problem than offered in Public Law 587.

NEUBERGER, deeply concerned over the consequences of a termination, has amassed a voluminous record from repeated hearings on the issue.

But Public Law 587 still stands, and NEUBERGER has concluded that the prospects for getting Congress to change substantially the terms of the law are bleak.

The termination act sets up a procedure for winding up Federal supervision over the Klamath Indians after 94 years of continuous guardianship.

The law first required the Klamaths to close the roll of tribal membership, effective as of midnight August 13, 1954. That has been done. No child born to members of the tribe after that date is eligible for membership in the tribe for purposes of the act, although they have inheritance rights. Membership now stands at slightly more than 2,000, of which about 1,300 live in Klamath County, mainly on the reservation, and the rest elsewhere in Oregon and in 18 other States.

The law then required the employment of a committee of management specialists with these specific duties to perform:

1. Secure an appraisal of all tribal property, "showing its fair market value by practicable logging or other appropriate economic units."

2. Immediately after the appraisal, give each enrolled tribal member an opportunity to elect to withdraw from the tribe and have his interest in tribal property converted into money or to remain in the tribe and participate in a plan for management of the property remaining after sale of the portion necessary to pay off those who withdraw.

3. Select the portions of the tribal property to be sold to pay off the withdrawing members.

4. Undertake whatever studies and reports deemed necessary or desirable by the tribe or the Secretary of the Interior in connection with termination.

5. Prepare a plan satisfactory to the remaining tribal members and the Secretary for managing the tribal properties not sold.

CLEAR TITLE SET

The Interior Secretary was also directed to give the Indians by August 13, 1958, clear title to property on the reservation previously allotted to them and remaining unsold by them and to clear title to those allotments already sold.

About 200,000 acres of allotted lands have been sold, some of it timber and some grazing land. Consequently, the reservation now consists of about 800,000 acres. A few allotments arer still being sold under supervision of the Indian Agency. The last of these will be disposed of this month.

The members of the tribe are given the right, under the law to purchase the lands put up for sale to pay off withdrawing members and those withdrawing may use the money due them from the conversion of their interests to cash to buy the land. But they have to meet the highest bid of outsiders.

RIGHTLY PROTECTED

None of the cash or property distributed under terms of the act will be subject to Federal or State income tax. But thereafter, all property will be subject to State and Federal taxes.

The act specifically declares that the Indians' water, fishing and hunting rights conferred by treaty shall not be abrogated by the act.

The law also authorizes the Secretary to appoint guardians for minors or incompetents to protect their rights. The Interior Secretary is given the right to determine whether a tribal member "does not have sufficient ability, knowledge, experience, and judgment to enable him to manage his business affairs, including the administration, use, investment, and disposition of any property turned over to such member and the income and proceeds therefrom, with such reasonable degree of prudence and wisdom as will be apt to prevent him from losing such property or the benefits thereof."

The Secretary is also authorized to undertake, if money is available, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the tribe to earn a livelihood, conduct their own affairs and assume their responsibilities as citizens.

No one is satisfied with Public Law 587. So far, however, no one has proposed an alternative except purchase of the reservation by the Federal Government. NEUBERGER introduced a Federal purchase bill but abandoned it for the sake of harmony in favor

of a bill drafted by the Interior Department providing first for private purchase with certain restrictions and then Federal purchase.

But, like Public Law 587, the bill (labeled the Seaton bill after Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton) has produced conflict, inspired by some of its provisions and by facts outside its terms.

Few are optimistic about its prospects. NEUBERGER's subcommittee has aproved it and it is now lodged in the full Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Highway Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Road Pace Quickens," published in the Minneapolis Star of April 9, 1958, dealing with the Highway Act of 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROAD PACE QUICKENS

The Highway Act of 1958, passed by Congress last week, makes an additional $1.5 billion of Federal money available for road-building in 1958. States would add $300 million as matching funds. Sponsors of the measure hope at least 88,000 more jobs thus will be created by the end of the year.

The trouble with highway appropriations as an emergency stimulant to jobs is that a lot of planning must precede actual construction. The huge interstate highway program voted by Congress in 1956 is just beginning to take hold and won't be rolling in high gear for at least another year.

Principal speedup in the new bill is a supplemental item of $400 million for the ABC program (primary, secondary, and urban roads). Ordinarily the Federal Government pays 50 percent of the cost of these roads and the allocations are divided 45 percent to primary, 30 to secondary, and 25 to urban. But the supplemental appropriation, under which the Federal Government will pay two-thirds of the cost, may go to any category. The projects must be contracted for by December 1958 and completed by December 1959.

Minnesota's share of this supplemental item is $9.5 million. There is excellent opportunity for cities and countries to get allotments from this sum for projects for which plans have been made but which may have been delayed for lack of funds.

Minnesota's regular allotment under the ABC program is about $21 million for the present fiscal year. The 1958 act makes a slightly larger amount available for the following 2 fiscal years.

For fiscal 1959 Minnesota already was scheduled to get $45 million for interstate highways (the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost). This allotment had been expected to drop to about 30 million for fiscal 1960 and thereafter. But under the new act $45 million will be sent the State for both 1960 and 1961.

The Minnesota Highway Department has speeded up planning for the new roads by streamlining its own procedures and by hiring outside firms to help. Thus it expects to contract for $128 million of Federal-aid highways in all categories between January 1, 1958, and July 1, 1959.

Construction contractors are still chafing about the delays in letting contracts. And there are plenty of workers available. It would be fine if all could go to work on the highways tomorrow. But they may be sure that the pace will start to quicken this spring.

The Polaris Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn, director of the Special Projects Office of the Navy's Bureau of Ordnance, addressed a symposium on seapower last Friday, April 11, 1958, on the Polaris missile program.

He presented a forceful, informative discussion of this vital new weapon which can add immeasurable strength to our national defense.

Admiral Raborn declared:

It is not violating any security factors to report that we believe that the basic problems have all passed from the scientific to the engineering stage, so that no new breakthroughs are required to carry this new weapons system into reality.

As if to back up this statement, the Navy announced the successful testing of the pop-up device, which fires the Polaris missile from the submarine hidden "quite deep below the surface," moves it through the water, and gets it into the air where its rocket engines can fire and speed it on to the target.

Mr. President, the progress we are making in the Polaris missile system is one of the most heartening developments in our entire national-defense picture.

But our success with Polaris raises a grave question: Are we going to be ready to use this weapon when its development is complete?

Some of the facts have emerged from the shroud of secrecy which necessarily surrounds an undertaking like this. We will have operational Polaris missiles in 1960, but we are only building three submarines to fire them, despite the clear testimony on the record that we can have nine nuclear-powered missile submarines within the same length of time by stepping up the program.

We cannot afford to waste time with the Polaris submarine. Nine of these unique weapons are a minimum and a must.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Admiral Raborn printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REAR ADM. W. F. RABORN, UNITED STATES NAVY, DIRECTOR, SPECIAL PROJECTS OFFICE, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE, NAVY LEAGUE SYMPOSIUM ON SEAPOWER, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 11, 1958

I am particularly pleased to have this chance to address the members of the Navy League on this occasion because there have been few periods in our history when the Navy League has been in a position to render a greater or more tangible service to the Navy than right now.

As you so fully realize, one of the basic functions of the league is to help keep the American public informed of the Navy's job and responsibilities in times of peace, and of the problems which our Navy faces. The Navy League has been of great help in impressing on the public the need for supporting a strong and vigorous Navy as an instrument of seapower and as an absolutely vital factor in our national security.

There has been so much printed in the press and said over the air about our various missile programs that a substantial amount of public confusion on this subject is hardly surprising. I believe that this is an unusually good opportunity for the Navy League to play an active part in helping to clarify just what the Navy's Polaris missile program is, and where it fits into the broader picture, not only in terms of our various missiles, but also in terms of our defense program as a whole.

Perhaps no program in our defense plans illustrates more forcibly just how much we've had to change our preconceived ideas of what weapons belong where than does the unique marriage of the missile of outer space to the atom-powered submarine.

I am sure that I do not have to tell you, the members of the Navy League, of the basic difference between the various so-called guided missiles being developed by the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, and the several programs concerned with developing rocket weapons which will use outer space as their medium of flight. We have all had to become familiar with a new terminology. ICBM and IRBM have become familiar words in our vocabulary, and the names Atlas, Titan, Thor, and Jupiter have taken on new significance, as have the purely scientific Vanguards and Explorers. We have even had to learn an entirely new word, "sputnik," which has become very familiar.

What many people do not realize, however, is that in the Polaris program we are talking not only of a missile, or "bird" as it is commonly called, but of a wholly new concept of weaponry, the dispatching of this bird from beneath the surface of the sea.

That is the basic difference between the Polaris project and the other ballistic programs under development.

There are really three things that set Polaris apart from the other outer space weapons in the ballistic missile category.

The first, of course, is that the missile itself has had to be designed within the limitations of space and weight which would permit its being carried on board a submarine. That has required some very radical changes in design from the currently developed land launched missiles where these conditions do not apply.

Though it will have the capability to carry a thermonuclear warhead, that is, the H bomb, as its payload, and though it will have about the same 1,500 mile range as the Army's Jupiter and the Air Force's Thor, the "bird" itself will be very substantially smaller than either of these other missiles. It will, in fact, be small enough to permit carrying quite a sizable number of missiles in a single submarine without increasing the size of such a vessel appreciably beyond present nuclear powered submarine dimensions.

More significant, perhaps, is another difference between Polaris and the land-launched "birds." This is in the propellent which will drive the missile far into outer space and build up the speed needed to give it its full range.

The Polaris propellent will be a solid fuel as opposed to the present liquid fuels used to drive both the land-launched weapons and the scientific rockets such as the Navy's Vanguard and the Army's Explorer. It was another case of necessity being the mother of invention for the development of such a solid fuel was a vital factor in making the sea-borne missile possible at all. There was just no practical way to store or handle liquid fuels effectively or safely on board a submerged submarine. The Navy's technicians simply had to come up with a wholly new kind of propellent fuel if the concept of the Polaris system was to be translated into a military reality. In developing such a fuel a real scientific breakthrough was scored.

Leaving the missile itself for a moment, let's look into the wholly naval problem of designing ships to carry it and equipment to launch it from below the surface—in fact, from quite deep below the surface.

Fortunately, we already had in existence, and fully proved out, the ideal naval missile carrier, in terms of the nuclear-powered submarine. Here was a vessel which had already demonstrated that it could operate independently of its land bases for months at a time, that it was free of the shackles of fuel limitation, that it could go where it wanted to go without counting the gallons of fuel left in the tank.

Our nuclear submarines have shown that they can travel fully submerged for thousands of miles and at high speed. I am sure that you all read about the record recently set by the submarine "Skate" in voyaging from a European port to New London in some 7 days * * * under water all the way. You may have read, too, that another one of our nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus*, journeyed more than 1500 miles under the Arctic ice pack during a single voyage.

Our job in the Polaris program was to design stowage, handling, launching, and fire control equipment, which would permit submarines of this type to be used as the launching platforms for the missile.

This involved a whole flock of specialized problems which, I am glad to say, have been very largely solved. I would like to touch on just three of these as typical of them all.

One was to develop equipment which would fire such a missile from below the surface and get it up into the air, where its rocket engines could ignite and take over the job of propelling it hundreds of miles into outer space. This device is now actual hardware, and is under daily test even before the missile carrying submarines are built. In a few minutes you'll see some movies of the test of this launcher—which we've aptly christened pop-up—firing dummy missiles from below the surface of the Pacific. Before building a launcher to use under water, we had made extensive tests with another device, this one being called the peashooter, which fired similar dummy missiles from a land position and taught us much of what we needed to know in designing the underwater device.

The other item I'd like to mention as typical of the specialized problems we've had to resolve is that of navigation. I find quite a few people do not realize that one of the absolute musts in firing a missile at a target fifteen hundred miles away is to know where you are, and very exactly, at the instant of firing. Otherwise, you can make an awfully costly error in your aim.

In terms of the practical value of ballistic missiles as military weapons, the real core of the development problem lies in the effectiveness and dependability of their guidance systems. We know, and the Soviets know, that rockets can attain the speeds and ranges called for that has been proved in actual test. Now the real trick is to make sure that these rockets will actually go where they are directed to go, and do so dependably and within very close limits of accuracy.

Unlike the missile technicians beyond the Iron Curtain, we must make our tests in a goldfish bowl. Reporters, movie cameras, TV and radio carry to our public the details of almost every firing at Cape Canaveral, so that everybody knows when a test has worked and when it hasn't. What they do not know, however, is just what facet of the problem is being tested, what results can be expected, and to what degree each test forms a valuable part of the overall pattern. I'd like to emphasize that we have every reason to be encouraged by the state of our missile guidance as of now. We believe that the tests indicate clearly that guidance development is keeping fully abreast of the development of other components of the program, and that our eventual "birds" will be well trained and dependable. We are constantly narrowing the margin of accuracy which we set in our specifications for the guidance devices.

So we've had to develop new and far more exact methods of determining a ship's position than anything needed for normal navigation. We had to take into account that the firing ship would be submerged, and might have been so submerged for days before the firing took place, so that it had to be able to determine, under water, its exact latitude and longitude. This problem, too, is well in hand. In fact, we converted a Mariner-type merchant ship into a special navigational test ship, the *Compass Island*, which has for more than a year been testing and refining the new navigational devices needed to accomplish our purpose. I'm happy to add that this phase of the project is also very much under control.

The questions which are possibly asked of us most frequently are three in number. They are: "Where do you stand in this program?" "How many missiles will we have when it is completed?" and "How will this new weapons system be used?"

The first of these questions must be answered in two parts. One deals with the performance of the hardware, and the other deals with the timetable.

While we have not fired any complete Polaris missiles to date, we have launched what are called test vehicles, successfully, and have put virtually every component of the entire weapons system to practical test. That includes the new solid propellant fuel.

It is not violating any security factors to report that we believe that the basic problems have all passed from the scientific to the engineering stage, so that no new breakthroughs are required to carry this new weapon system into reality.

We are much farther along, technically, than any of us had dared to hope even a year ago. We have collaborated closely and wholeheartedly with our colleagues of the Army and the Air Force on many elements of the development, and have gained much from such teamwork. We hope that they have profited equally from contact with our technicians.

As to the timetable of the program, I firmly believe that we will have actual operational missiles in 1960. We have moved up the dates of our proposed test schedules time and again, and expect now to be in business with an operational weapons system on about the date we had originally set for the beginning of our actual tests. If there is any way that we can beat the present timetable, you may be sure that this will be done, and without any prodding by anyone.

The question as to "How many?" I will answer this way: For one thing, of course, the exact number of missiles to be carried by each submarine is a classified subject. But I can say that the number is very substantial and very impressive. Suppose we leave it at that. The present number of Polaris-launching submarines actually authorized by Congress stands at three. Funds for another two are included in the 1959 fiscal year supplemental budget request sent to Congress last week. How many we will have in the future, I do not know, as it is my job to turn out a finished and efficient weapon system. The number of these systems which we will require must obviously be determined by national policy.

Now, I'd like to spend the rest of the time allotted to me on the vital subject of the place of this weapons system in our overall defense plans.

In Polaris we have combined the almost limitless cruising range of the nuclear-powered submarine and the vast potential for concealment offered by the ocean depths with the longest range, highest speed, and most lethal weapon ever developed, the H-bomb-armed ballistic missile.

In its purpose this weapon is primarily a deterrent to aggression, for if it is ever actually fired the chips will be down, and the all-out general war will have become a tragic reality.

As a deterrent, however, the Polaris weapons system will fill a needed and entirely unique position on our team of capabilities to retaliate instantly, unpreventably, and with annihilating firepower.

Polaris will add to our network of land bases, both in this country and overseas, a system of mobile, fully concealed missile-launching bases wholly under our own flag and control. They will enable us to shift the weight of our military firepower from one area to another, quickly and secretly, adding strength when it is needed.

Polaris will bring within range of direct attack from the sea virtually all important military targets in the Communist-controlled heartland. It can reach these targets in some 15 minutes from the instant of firing. With a relatively small number of submarines on station, dozens of Polaris missiles, each carrying the H-bomb, can be sped on their way even before the first salvo has landed.

With their worldwide cruising radius, nuclear-powered submarines can patrol for months at a stretch, move submerged at high speed for thousands of miles. They will be almost impossible to locate and trace by even the most advanced methods of surveillance. The very knowledge that they are there, within range and ready to launch their missiles within minutes, would exert a strong and constant deterrent influence on any leadership, no matter how reckless or power crazy.

No one connected with our missile development, least of all those of us who are dedicated wholly to the Polaris program, minimizes the need for our complete defense structure, here and abroad, our bases, our forces overseas, our alerted Strategic Air Command, and our mobile carrier fleets, or for our Navy both on and below the surface charged with keeping the seas open for the free world.

We do feel, however, and very deeply, that in the Polaris project we are developing a weapons system for which the country has a pressing need and without which there would be a serious gap in our overall defense structure. That the potential enemy would exploit such a gap to the utmost is hardly a matter for debate. He is very adept at finding weak spots and at taking full advantage of them.

Now, you of the Navy League can be of highly tangible service to the Navy in passing along the word about the Polaris program to the many groups with whom you come in contact. You can help by clarifying what this project really is, how it fills a place of its own in our defense plans, and how important it is that this place be filled.

The Polaris project is not in competition with any other weapons development, nor a duplication of effort at public expense. It

is not an infringement on the role of any other military service, but stands on its own feet providing a form of potential firepower and a strategic use which, quite obviously, no actual or proposed other weapon system can duplicate.

Possibly most of all, you can serve the Navy by getting across to the public the Navy's daily awareness that so complex and urgent an undertaking as the Polaris program owes much to the know-how and painstaking research of our country's scientists and technicians, to the resourcefulness and collaboration of its industry, and to the countless contributions which have been made all the way up and down the line to help resolve the big problems and the little ones, not only on schedule but many times well ahead of schedule.

Finally, I'd like to leave this thought with you. The Polaris project is not a part of any scientific competition to solve the secrets of outer space, to land a man on the moon, or to develop interplanetary travel.

It is a grimly realistic race to meet and cancel out weapons development beyond the Iron Curtain. It is a race to provide the sobering realization to potential aggressors that no thoroughly staged surprise attack can wipe out at a stroke all sources of immediate retaliation in nuclear dimension.

Polaris is a weapon which will serve its purpose best if by its mere existence and readiness it completes the chain of deterrents needed to enforce all-out peace. To speed the day when that readiness becomes a fact is the purpose to which all of us have dedicated everything that we've got.

I thank you.

Doctor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the acute problems confronting our country at the present time is the shortage of doctors. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 31, 1958:

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Columbia University's president, Dr. Grayson Kirk, has called attention to one aspect of our medical training program that is often overlooked. In an address under the auspices of the National Fund for Medical Education and the Association of American Medical Colleges he pointed out that the number of persons in medical and nursing training is not increasing at a rate proportionate to the increase in population. As a result there are actually fewer doctors per 100,000 population in the United States than there were 20 years ago.

It is also true that the distribution of medical personnel in this country leaves much to be desired. The figure of 130 doctors to each 100,000 of population must average out the urban areas, where there are many more doctors than that, with many regions where the total figure would be so much less as to be ominous. Mere statistics do not tell the whole story.

At the same time, it is observed, the present instruction rate will within a short time, provide only about two-thirds of the persons needed, and supply even that only if there is a complete disregard of the desire to provide better facilities than those which now obtain. The loss, therefore, can be qualitative as well as quantitative.

We are in a period of gigantic medical advances. We know more about disease than we have ever known and are doing more to meet it. But obviously we will need more trained men if we are to maintain our pace. The warning and the plea come at a good time.

Social Security Isn't Broke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a good many sensational stories, promoted by groups fundamentally antagonistic to our social security program, have been in circulation concerning the alleged deficiencies in the social security fund.

In the April 6, 1958, issue of Parade there is an excellent article by Sidney Margolius entitled "Social Security Isn't Broke." In an accompanying statement, Charles I. Schotland, Commissioner of Social Security, had this to say:

The accompanying article should be reassuring to you. To me, it also is a source of pride. Our system of social security, established in 1935, now protects more than 70 million American workers and guarantees them and their families against destitution in later life. This system has not been "in the red"—and, so far as it now is possible to tell, will not be. It is continuing, and will continue, to help you make your old age a secure one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Margolius' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ISN'T BROKE

(By Sidney Margolius)

One recent day in San Antonio, Tex., the local social security office was swamped by more than 350 phone calls and visits. Elderly men and women—and younger widows—jammed the reception room and corridor. Many of them were crying. Over and over, two questions were repeated:

"Are you broke already? Aren't we going to get our checks?"

What had happened? Nothing, except that the social security checks had arrived on a Saturday and, instead of being delivered on the third of the month, were held over the weekend. But on the morning of the third, when the checks failed to appear, people panicked all over town.

The same panic has hit other cities of the Southwest, Kansas City, Birmingham, several Eastern areas. Why? Because of widespread rumors that social security is running out of money. What started the rumors? Reports—in financial publications, magazines, radio broadcasts—that more people than expected have applied for social security in the past 18 months, and that the program is running in the red. But these reports are based on only partial information, and frequently were misinterpreted.

As a result, Congress and the administration have received thousands of letters asking for reassurance that, as one woman put it, "I will get my money at 62." She explained she is now 58, "sick a lot of the time but trying to work and stick it out 4 more years."

Other various citizens reacted variously. A California woman wrote President Eisenhower offering to give up her payments. A 76-year-old Clevelander pleaded with his Congressman that he and his wife would be ruined if they don't get their checks. Even people years from retirement were alarmed, like the couple who asked for guarantees of the payments due them in 15 or 20 years.

What is the truth behind all this? Parade has checked official sources. Following are questions you may be asking—and the answers:

ARE SOCIAL SECURITY FUNDS RUNNING OUT?

No. At the start of 1957 the reserve stood at $22.5 billion. The year saw more claims than expected—that is, they were earlier than expected. Main reason: Some 670,000 workingwomen and wives 62 and over retired early on reduced benefits, as permitted by a 1956 change in the law. The net cost to social security was the same as though they had waited until 65 and retired on full benefits.

Even these unexpected claims hardly dented the reserve. At the end of 1957 it stood at $22.4 billion, a drop of less than half of 1 percent. It was as though you had started the year with a reserve of $310, met some early expenses and ended the year with $308.70—hardly a fatal difference.

WHAT ABOUT THE NEW DISABILITY PAYMENTS?

There's no cause for alarm here. The new benefits for disabled workers of 50 and over are paid not from the social security reserve but from a separate disability trust fund. This fund is financed by a separate tax. In 1957 it actually piled up an unexpectedly big surplus. It took in $709 million, paid out only $60 million, by now has a tidy $649 million cached away.

WILL THE RESERVE CONTINUE TO DROP?

Only slightly—and temporarily. Social security's financial experts expect the reserve to dip this year and in 1959; the 1956 nest egg of $22.5 billion may drop to $21.5 billion. But in 1960 it will start rising again.

There are two reasons for the expected rise, which was anticipated by Congress 2 years ago. First, the outgo will level off as the run of new applicants for benefits dwindles. Second, the income will jump. Congress scheduled the social security tax so it rises every 5 years until 1975. Beginning in 1960, you and your employer each will chip in half of 1 percent more than at present—on the average, about 40 cents a week each.

BUT CAN THE RESERVE MEET ITS LIABILITIES?

The answer to this is a matter of arithmetic. It's true that, to allow for payment of benefits to everyone covered by social security, an accumulated liability of $323 billion has been built up. This is a staggering sum—but, obviously, it will not have to be paid out all at once.

Social security is a compulsory insurance plan. The experts say such a plan can be financed safely on the assumption that it won't quit in the future and will continue to get contributions from your pay. The rates have been worked out so that, over the long run, your contributions plus the interest earned by the reserve will produce the income needed to meet current payments. That's why the $22.4 billion reserve is enough to have on hand now—and why the planned larger reserve should be enough in the future.

A STATEMENT FROM CHARLES I. SCHOTTLAND, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The article should be reassuring to you. To me it also is a source of pride. Our system of social security, established in 1935, now protects more than 70 million American workers and guarantees them and their families against destitution in later life. This system has not been "in the red"—and, so far as it now is possible to tell, will not be. It is continuing, and will continue, to help you make your old age a secure one.

Blackmail in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under a previous consent, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Progressive for April 1958, entitled "Blackmail in Spain," written by Lawrence Fernsworth.

Lawrence Fernsworth is now a Washington correspondent. He has been a Nieman Fellow, has represented the New York Times and the London Times in Spain and other countries of Europe. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Current History, the Fortnightly—London, and the Economist, among others. His books include Nothing But Danger, Dictators and Democrats, and Spain's Struggle for Freedom, published by Beacon Press, Boston, a few weeks ago, which has aroused wide interest in Latin America and has been condemned by the Franco press as the work of a reptile Republican.

The article follows:

BLACKMAIL IN SPAIN

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

"Blackmail" and "double cross" are hard words. They stand for hard facts. And these facts assert themselves with increasing insistence in the course of the United States Government's dealing with the Spanish dictatorship in matters pertaining to what are known as the Spanish bases agreements.

The agreements, three of them, involving construction of bases, military aid, and economic assistance, were concluded in September 1953. As soon as the new Congress convened it began voting money to implement them. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana Democrat, in a recent report on the subject, stated that we have provided Spain with $350 million in military equipment and $721 million in economic assistance—a total of $1,071,000,000. Additional Spanish demands are now being processed. These will bring the total to about $1¼ billion, with more to come in fiscal 1959.

In a matter of months after the first funds became available—the first part of 1955—the Spanish press, which publishes nothing political that is not officially inspired, began to complain that Spain wasn't getting enough. Along with the complaints went thinly veiled threats.

The first of these threats, published in Arriba, the organ of the official Spanish party, Falange, was followed by a succession of others, each more truculent and menacing than the one before. The latest of these, published within a matter of days after the ostentatious and, in Spanish eyes, subservient visit of Foster Dulles, contained a blunt warning which was no less than a threat that NATO faced utter failure, unless—

The "unless" of the matter was that, as to NATO, Franco wanted in, and that Dulles, in failing to open the door, wasn't doing his job. Of this more later.

The Arriba article was full of menacing words of which this is an example: "If, after having squandered fabulous amounts of Marshall plan aid in Europe without notable results, we were to be denied what is indispensable, the great program of aid and mutual cooperation would be in grave danger."

This became the theme song, rendered with variations from that day to this. Having got the pitch, the Spanish press began chorusing that it was now Spain's turn to get a slice of the American melon, that the melon had better be juicy, that the Americans would best start producing in the grand manner or suffer the consequences.

The club in the hands of the Spanish dictator is a simple clause in the agreement regarding the bases which says that their use in wartime shall be by mutual agreement. The Pentagon and Mr. Dulles both know that Franco, or any other Spanish regime, merely has to say "no" at the critical moment to render the four air bases, the naval base, and various forms of military assistance useless.

Money, plenty of it, and deliverance from the stigma of being the outcast of Europe by being admitted to NATO—these are the two great objectives of Franco.

About the same time that Arriba was uttering its warning, La Vanguardia of Barcelona published a violent editorial, It Is Necessary To Fulfill. Its theme was that the United States was not fulfilling its bargain.

The editorial lamented that the West seemed unaware of the fact that "Spain is the keystone of the arch in the defense of the West." It was time, said the article, to ask "concretely and clearly, without euphemism or doubletalk . . . that the United States decisively turn into the pathway of fulfilling the facts." "There is," it explained, "a movement of uneasy wonderment and even of suspicion with respect to the economic pacts signed between our nation and the United States in September 1953." "It is necessary to fulfill the pact," it insisted, "and we are certain that the United States will not fail to do so."

On March 16, 1957, the Monarchist organ, ABC in Madrid, published a scathing criticism by former Commerce Minister Jose Antonio Gimenez of the inadequacy of United States economic aid. He said that "to include American agricultural surplus sales in the context of sales is like writing a letter to a readymade clothing merchant to thank him for condescending to sell you a suit."

Here are some highlights on the way the United States has been pouring out money under various kinds of Spanish pressure, with their connotations of blackmail. The last mutual security appropriation gave Spain $40 million, which was more than was given to any other country of Europe, plus another million for technical assistance. Spain also got $20 million from the President's secret fund. Now it is asking for another $30 million immediately on an emergency basis, with the President's secret fund again indicated as the source. For all Americans know, this may have been given already. Although these facts are known in Spain and reported in dispatches from there, they are kept under cover in Washington.

In addition to these contributions, it was revealed here in January that the United States and Spain were signing a $69 million economic-aid program, that Spain was asking for another $65 million from the Development Loan Fund for power, irrigation, and industrial projects, and $40 to $50 million from the Export-Import Bank. These figures, added to the $1,071,000,000 reported previously by Senator MANSFIELD, reach a grand total of $1,282,000,000 shelled out, in process of being shelled out, or being negotiated, to date. On top of this are more funds due for appropriation and assignment from other sources in the fiscal year just ahead.

The point has been made that Spain is helping to pay for the bases with counterpart—that is, Spanish pesetas obtained by Spain through its sale of surplus commodities bought from the United States. These commodities have cost the American taxpayers their market value. They are sold to Spain below value—largely a paper transaction. Spain resells them, pockets part of the proceeds, gets a loan for another part which it also pockets, and deposits another part to the credit of the United States foreign Operations account. It also gets outright surplus grants.

The latest piece of practically open blackmail appeared in the Spanish press on the heels of Dulles' December visit to Franco—his second. Again it was published in Barcelona's La Vanguardia. It was an inspired page one editorial that said:

"The Paris NATO meeting had hardly terminated when Foster Dulles, bearing a special message from President Eisenhower, hastened to Madrid to make his report to Franco concerning what transpired at Paris. Once again Franco, the great political leader, the grand statesman of the West that is the Caudillo, has not found it necessary to petition or even to suggest his right to participation in the international conferences, because once again the Western World has discovered that without the collaboration, without the assent, and without the alert vigilance of the generalissimo, the Western World would be irreparably condemned to utter failure of its chosen political course.

"And of its entire military apparatus."

This last line is the stinger. The clear announcement that without Franco the entire military apparatus of the West which perforce includes the United States bases in Spain and all that goes with them, will be a failure, is a way of serving notice on the United States that European acceptance of Franco is part of the bases agreements.

Responsible Spaniards in exile who know Franco and his ways also interpret it as an intimation that Franco could make a deal with Russia for the use of the bases.

This editorial and others have made it clear that one of the things Franco expects of the United States is deliverance from its unhappy position of being the shunned nation of Europe—shunned as unclean by all Western countries except the United States and totalitarian Portugal.

To win respectability and recover face is more important to Franco than ever, in view of the fiasco of his pretentious plans for making himself the protector of the Arab world and the dominant Mediterranean power. This ambitious scheme, so painstakingly pursued and so long in the making, was known as "Mediterraneanismo." Its collapse has been ttoal. The Arabs he courted, feted, and flattered have taken Spanish Morocco from him, are in the process of taking from him his other North African enclaves, and are laughing at him. His tactics have been publicly denounced by the King of Morocco. He looks to Dulles to extricate him from this humiliating position. This is the main import of Dulles' visit to him immediately after the NATO conference in Paris.

The Barcelona editorial is arrogant, almost insulting in its treatment of Dulles. Spanish eyes will catch its drift immediately. He is "Foster Dulles," a mere messenger, coming to give an account of himself for his failure at Paris; bearing at the same time a message from President Eisenhower; an almost non-

descript fellow not even mentioned in the terms of respect usual among Spaniards.

The day before Dulles' visit the Spanish press splashed on its front pages the text of a note which the Soviet Government had handed the Spanish delegate to the U. N., warning Spain that, with bases "under foreign control" on its soil, Spain "cannot avoid the disastrous consequences of a modern war." Franco had kept this Soviet note on ice for a week so he could flaunt it when Dulles arrived.

At the same time the Spanish press was printing more warnings that unless Spain got more American money to strengthen the Spanish economy—euphemism for propping up the Franco regime—United States operations in Spain might have to be interrupted. The United States Embassy would, of course, take note of these stories and tell Dulles about them.

About 5 years ago, at the time the bases agreements were signed, the United States was helping Franco attain respectability by easing his way into UNESCO. Next he became a member of the United Nations as the result of a package deal between the United States and the Soviet Union. But he is not yet a member of NATO, the organization in which he aspires to cut a figure as a European power, equal to, if not even more equal than, his European neighbors. It hurts him that countries less powerful than Spain turned thumbs down on him at Paris. As the editorial bluntly suggests, he let Dulles know that Dulles wasn't producing.

Dulles' anxiety to please Franco also accounts for the surreptitious manner in which resolutions were slipped through both the House and Senate in March, 1957, expressing the "unanimous" sense of Congress that Spain be invited to become a member of NATO. In the House the unanimous consent resolution was moved and passed immediately after the prayer. The chamber was virtually empty. Those few Congressmen who had planned to attend early were still walking through the tunnels on the way from their offices. About half an hour after the passage of the NATO resolution, and after a long eulogy for a late Congressman had been pronounced in a deserted Chamber, there was a roll call. With those who had arrived after the NATO resolution had been "unanimously" passed, there were only 26 of the 435 members present.

Dulles' statements to the press in Madrid and his praise of Franco's Spain as one of the ties that held the free world together, when he appeared in a broadcast with the President December 23, shocked that part of the free world that lies outside Spain and across the ocean from us. It asked how praising the most oppressive dictatorship in Europe as one of the ties upon which freedom depended corresponded with inspiring words about the right of all peoples to freedom, uttered by both Mr. Dulles and the President.

For instance, there was the evening of May 18, 1956 when the President, at a dinner for President Sukarno of Indonesia, told his guest that "unless we defend the freedom of the other fellow we are endangering our own."

How is the freedom of the other fellow defended by making a deal to strengthen the hand of his oppressor? That is what some of the critics wanted to know. They also inquired about the morality of this sort of thing and asked how it corresponded with words about political morality which Dulles uttered often. For example:

"There is a school of thought which claims that morality and foreign policy do not mix." That never has been, is not, and I pray never will be the American ideal. Diplomacy which is divorced from morality also divorces the government from the people."

Other angles of the Franco blackmail pattern cannot be set forth in the space of this article, such as evidences of Franco's flirtations with Soviet Russia, his praise for Russian efficiency in a public speech, the praise bestowed on Nasser by the Spanish press at the time he seized the Suez Canal, and so on.

Recently Franco has been making a great show of fighting the common enemy of communism—in a country where communism is almost nonexistent. Correspondent Dick Mowrer, writing in the Christian Science Monitor April 5, 1955, said that a Spanish official told him: "We have no Communist problem. If we did we would probably be getting 3 or 4 times more aid than we are getting now."

According to the publication Iberica, which has Salvador de Madariaga, the eminent Spanish historian, and Norman Thomas as its honorary chairmen, more than 200 university students and workers were arrested in Madrid alone during January as part of a stepped-up campaign of terrorism. They were subjected to violent beatings and tortures, such as being forced to hold their hands or feet on red-hot electric stoves. And of course they were branded as Communists—a kind of accusation that always impresses Washington's Capitol Hill when there is a question of providing more money for Spain.

Washington legislators might well reflect on the warning uttered by Lord Templewood, the former Sir Samuel Hoare, which is as valid as ever: "As long as it [the Franco regime] exists there will always be danger of a treacherous blow."

They would do well to know that Spaniards have a saying, "as gullible as an Englishman," meaning also North Americans because they speak English. Gullible, Spaniards say, because they believe everything. Unlike Spaniards, they don't "use the eye." Spaniards who "use the eye" are convinced we are headed for about the biggest double-cross in history in relying on Franco. It is something to think about.

WCTU Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know that the Women's Christian Temperance Union is extremely active in my district in West Virginia.

Since the first session of the 85th Congress, I have received scores of petitions from various groups of these ladies urging the passage of measures which would forbid, first, the advertisement of alcoholic beverages in various advertising media; and second, prevent the sale of alcoholic beverages on aircraft.

I would like it called to the attention of the House that still another petition has arrived, bearing some 100 names of ladies in Huntington, W. Va.

The body of the petition states:

With juvenile court judges, domestic court judges, and police officials complaining of the part played by alcohol in the deterioration of our homes and in the delinquency of our children, we again most earnestly urge you to pass legislation taking alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce. No civilization can long survive which is destroyed from within by alcohol. The glamorous and deceptive advertising which becomes constantly worse, is drowning out the warnings of the home, the school, and the church with disastrous results.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, Jr., of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, early this year I mailed a questionnaire to every family of registered voters in the California Sixth Congressional District. The response to this questionnaire was the largest that I have ever received. Many constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but sent supplementary letters or wrote detailed comments on the back of the questionnaire. I have spent many hours personally reading all of these comments, and they have been most helpful. I am firmly convinced that a Congressman can better represent his constitutents if he knows the views of all of his constituents, than if he has only heard from pressure groups.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. Do you feel that our expenditures for national defense, including missiles, should be (a) increased, 68.5 percent; (b) remain the same as last year, 24.2 percent; or (c) decreased, 7.3 percent.

2. If you had to choose between an adequate national defense and a balanced budget, which would you prefer? (a) Adequate national defense, 90 percent; (b) balanced budget, 10 percent.

3. If it becomes evident in the coming year that Federal expenditures will exceed Federal revenue, which of the following would you prefer? (a) That the balance be raised by increasing Federal taxes 48.6 percent; (b) that the balance be raised by issuing bonds and thereby increasing our national debt 51.4 percent.

4. Do you feel that we should, or should not, enter into disarmament negotiations with Russia? (a) Should, 49.7 percent; (b) should not, 50.3 percent.

5. There has been much discussion as to the rivalry between the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the missile program and in other defense plans. Which of the following reflects your views? (a) Such rivalry is healthy and should continue, 27.1 percent; (b) such rivalry is harmful and should be eliminated, 72.9 percent.

6. Would you be in favor of a program of Federal scholarships and fellowships to stimulate increased interest by students and potential teachers in the field of science and mathematics? Yes, 72.2 percent; no, 18.9 percent; undecided, 8.9 percent.

7. It has been proposed that Congress pass legislation regulating the administration and control of union trust funds, in order to reduce the possibility of misuse of these funds.

Answer from all constituents: favor, 76.8 percent; oppose, 15 percent; undecided, 8.2 percent.

Answers from union members: favor, 73.1 percent; oppose, 19.9 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

Answers from nonunion members: favor, 79.3 percent; oppose, 12.3 percent; undecided, 8.4 percent.

8. Do you feel that the annual rate of expenditures being made by our Federal Government to support prices of farm products, should be (a) increased, 13.4 percent; (b) remain the same as last year, 29.4 percent; (c) reduced, 57.2 percent.

9. It has been proposed that a constitutional amendment be passed to define more accurately the circumstances under which the Vice President should assume the duties of the Presidency in the event of disability on the part of the elected President. Do you favor or oppose such an amendment? Favor, 82 percent; oppose, 10.8 percent; undecided, 7.2 percent.

10. There has been much discussion as to whether the Federal Government should expand its direct production of electric power (so-called public power), or whether it should encourage the expanded production of such power by private utility companies wherever possible (so-called private power). Which of these principles do you favor? (a) Expansion of public power, 37 percent; (b) encouragement of expanded private power, 51.3 percent; (c) undecided, 11.7 percent.

11. It has been proposed that Congress pass legislation to ban pay television. (Pay TV is a procedure whereby the viewing TV audience must pay a charge in order to view a TV program.) Would you favor or oppose such legislation? Favor, 52.9 percent; oppose, 37.6 percent; undecided, 9.5 percent.

A Look at Profits, Wages, and Productivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article that appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor, one of America's great newspapers. The article discusses in detail what its author, Joe Harsch, and his editors term a "radical idea." This idea could be summed up as a proposal that the wage-profit rise should never outstrip the national productivity. I think the article and the idea merit further study.

The article follows:

A RADICAL IDEA

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Britain's trade balances and gold and dollar reserves have been going up.

The rise is not vast and has not been going on long enough to make a major difference yet, but the trend is upward.

Partly this is simply because the Macmillan government has taken drastic steps to support the pound and has at last convinced bankers and investors that it will not be devalued.

Partly it is because small British motorcars happen to fit the American demand at a moment when Detroit seems to have misjudged both the market and the taste for chrome and multiplied headlights.

But there is a third explanation which can only be described as radical in terms of the economic ideas of this generation.

The British Government is making the first real effort of this generation to break free from one of the major consequencese of the age of mass trade unions, and surprisingly is making some headway and conceivably may even succeed.

The mass trade union possesses enormous bargaining power. For the better part of a generation this power has been used generally throughout the Western World to obtain an annual round of wage rises. No government for a very long time has dared to say where and when the line should be drawn between a justifiable and an excessive wage rise.

The result has been that with monotonous regularity of late years wages have gone up by a margin which exceeded the rise in productivity.

Undoubtedly this is not the only reason we have been living through a period of dangerous inflation. Management shares in the blame. It long since ceased making any real stand against the annual demand. In general it has shown little restraint in profit taking. Governments have shared simply because they lacked the political courage or ability to say either to labor or to management that the sum total of higher wages and higher profits must not exceed the annual rise in productivity.

But in broad general terms the major inflation-building factor over the past few years has been wage inflation—that is, the kind of inflation which results from wages going up faster than the increase in output. Governments have, in effect, been clipping the coinage rather than finding a way of keeping wages and prices in line with productivity. The result has been about 3 percent per year of inflation, which is another way of saying an annual devaluation of the currency by 3 percent.

This has produced a redistribution of wealth. Perhaps this has been in some way a good thing. But it has been at the expense of fixed investment, of savings, of annuities, and of pensions. It has benefited those living on earned income at the expense of all those living on fixed income in a way which never was planned or intended by any government or voted by any legislature.

This redistribution of wealth by wage raises has been imposed by the power of the trade unions exercised for the most part unconsciously and even unintentionally. It is also in the larger sense unconstitutional in that it results from group action, not from governmental action. No legislature ever voted an annual 3-percent devaluation of the currency. The process has involved an abdication by government of control over the currency.

It is this act of effective abdication which the Macmillan government is attempting to reverse. It is trying to reclaim governmental control over the currency. It is not against wage rises. It is against wage rises which impair not only the currency but even the economic survival of the country.

The issue has reached an acute stage in Britain earlier than in other western countries because Britain more than any other must trade to survive. When annual devaluation forces export prices upward, then national survival is threatened. The process has prevented Britain for a generation from building a reserve sufficient to weather any serious economic drop.

The radicalism of the new approach lies in the fact that the Macmillan government is seriously trying to stop the inflation long enough and by enough margin to permit reserves to accumulate. But to do that it must run very grave risks of political unpopularity at home. It must break the long-established assumption that every worker is entitled to the maximum annual wage which the bargaining power of his union can extract from the employer. Even more, it must risk a rise in unemployment figures.

There is now a widespread sense of concern about rising unemployment. It is assumed by politicians to be an entirely undesirable condition. Anyone who dares say there could be a plus factor is vulnerable to the charge of brutality. A serious unemployment condition would, of course, not be tolerated by the voters in any western country.

But a limited degree of unemployment also can stop inflation from wage demands. The half-million figure in Britain today is having that effect. Reserves are going up. There may well be a round of wage rises in Britain this year which will be a little bit less than the rise in productivity leaving a margin of credit for the economy of the country.

This is political daring of the first order. It can be fatal to the Macmillan government. But it might be economic salvation of Britain, and an experiment which other countries some day might find useful in solving their own economic problems.

It would be a pity if communism mastered the world from failure of the capitalist countries to solve the problem of inflation.

The Power To Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an excellent review of the deterrent effects of our present punitive income tax rate structure as it affects the creation of jobs in American industry is contained in the 1957 annual report of the United States Steel Corp. I was particularly impressed with this statement as it shows that our present tax structure penalizes efficient firms and in effect imposes a sales tax on their products. In the last analysis, all corporate income taxes must be recovered in the cost of the products sold or services rendered if any firm is to survive.

This review also develops at some length how our present tax laws foster capital financing either through the retention of earnings or the sale of bonds rather than common stock. Certainly, over the long run, if we are to preserve our system of competitive private enterprise, we cannot single out success for special punishment.

I found this analysis of such interest that, by unanimous consent, I am including it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE POWER TO TAX

All are aware that taxes are a crushing burden on the economy, but few realize the extent and growth of that burden. In America there are over 100,000 taxing authorities. The biggest taxes are those levied by the Federal Government, but the burden of State and local taxes has also mounted.

In the 1920's total taxes were about $9 billion, or 10 percent of net national product; but by 1956 they had risen to over $100 billion, or nearly 30 percent of the net product. Moreover, in this troubled world a mounting proportion of national effort may be needed for defense, while groups at home and abroad increasingly seek, even demand, aid from our Government. Taxes cannot endlessly mount without destroying the productive initiative and strength upon which all must rely both in war and in peace.

Of significance equal to or greater than the total burden itself is the unfortunate manner in which Federal taxation bears upon the efficiency and growth of economic endeavor. Since 1940 the Federal tax (normal plus surtax) on corporate income has risen from less than 25 percent to 52 percent. And over the years the taxes on higher income brackets of individuals have been steepened until they take up to 91 percent of such income.

Inflation has aggravated the situation with the result that to have the same buying power after income tax an individual's $2,000 income earned in 1940 would now have to be nearly 2.3 times as great; but a $10,000 income would have to be 3.2 times and a $50,000 income would have to be a 9.8 times as great.

When taxes are low their injury to progress can be borne in relative disregard of the famous saying, "The power to tax involves the power to destroy." But when, as now, taxes reach confiscatory levels it is time to take heed. In wartime the effort to survive obscures tax deterrents. In postwar decades the big backlog demands also temporarily obscure the tax effects. But it now seems prudent to review the tax structure in broad perspective. The following facts then emerge:

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

United States Steel, together with all enterprises, has an interest in the taxation of individual income because the prosperity of the Nation can be profoundly affected by it. The steep progressive taxation of individual income systematically eliminates a principal source of venture capital upon which progress depends. It should ever be remembered that a new self-sustaining, productive job—of which we will need millions in years to come—can come into existence only when money is risked to purchase tools of production, thus creating the environment in which a man may produce the marketable values to cover his continuing wage and the investor's compensation.

Those best able to risk—and often lose—venture capital are those who earn larger incomes. Some few people are undoubtedly either lucky or unlucky; but the great truth is that, in the absence of fraud or coercion, those of larger income receive it only as they and their property equivalently serve the community at its own competitive prices. The skilled machinist gives more and gets more than the apprentice. Service rendered and income received are two sides of the same coin. Taxing the more skilled and the more productive at ever increasing rates undermines both their incentive and ability to provide the venture capital on which new jobs depend.

It also is profoundly shortsighted because as the sources of new jobs are dried up Government is called upon to support the unemployed and aid many undertakings such as agriculture, housing, shipping, stockpiling, and so on. This we have seen even in the midst of boom. Thus a steeply graduated income tax can energize a spiral into some sort of statism.

CORPORATE INCOME TAX

Taxation of corporate income also unhappily tends to impair productive incentive and to dissipate the seed corn of progress. Thus the higher the rate of tax the greater is the tendency to impede the very growth that has been characteristic of the economy of our country in the past and is particularly important in this present period of international tension. For each dollar of profit for dividends or reinvestment at present tax rates more than $1 must be paid to the Government. The company that operates more efficiently pays a higher tax per unit of production and thus in effect pays a penalty for being more efficient. Taxes levied at high rates against efficiency cannot help but impair that efficiency and it may well be time to ask if this can be in the public interest.

Especially significant is the tax dissipation of receipts vitally needed for reinvestment in the business; for without this "seed corn" income no company can either make good the insufficient depreciation allowed on the existing tools of production or have money to purchase additional job-creating tools. Nor can it readily attract outside capital. This works especially against corporations seeking to grow in periods of inflation when all business, big or little, must seek additional dollars just to finance the same volume of business.

It is not good sense to tax away money otherwise destined to provide new jobs and products at a time when these may be much needed. This is not money to be distributed and dissipated in consumption, to enrich selected groups of people. It is, instead, the very core of growth in corporate America upon which more than three-quarters of all non-Government wages and salaries depend.

PROGRESSIVE TAX ON CORPORATE INCOME

As just noted the corporate income tax already tends to impair productive incentive and growth. Despite this there has been talk of taxing corporate income in progressive fashion, which is to say that the more efficiently a group of people cooperating through a corporation served the community and expanded its operations, the more punitive would be the rate at which the tax was levied.

If this were done it would further undermine the incentive of all corporations to expand their employment and production, and thus retard the Nation's growth in times of peace and its defense in periods of emergency.

EFFECT ON FINANCING

A company possessed of profit margin or prospect, and thus in position to seek outside financing, presumably has the choice of selling new stock or of borrowing. The profit tax weights the scales against equity financing, and the greater the tax rate the heavier the weight, thus encouraging creation of dangerously mounting perpetual indebtedness.

In 1954 United States Steel sold $300 million of debentures, which called for interest payments of $6.8 million in the first year thereafter. This additional cost could have been covered by an increase of about one-fifth of 1 percent in the prices charged customers during 1954. Alternatively to have obtained $300 million new capital, United States Steel could have sold about 6 million shares of new common stock at the then price of about $50 per share. To generate the $3.25 per share dividend of 1954 on the new shares would, in view of the tax on income, have required an increase in prices charged customers of about 1⅛ percent—6 times as much as in the case of the bond interest. From a cost standpoint the choice for United States Steel was obvious.

The great cost disparity is due in good measure, of course, to the differing yields on the bonds and stock; but the fact remains that for each dollar obtained, either in higher prices from customers or by cost reduction, to pay bond interest more than $2 must be so obtained to pay a dollar in dividend.

The tax, furthermore, tends to perpetuate indebtedness. It is true that borrowed money spent for facilities can be paid off out of depreciation recovered, at the end of which process, however, both the debt and the facilities are retired. If by replacement purchases the capacity of facilities is to be perpetuated then so also must the indebtedness, or else it must be paid off by sale of stock or out of earnings. But to pay off out of earnings $1 that has been borrowed, more than $2 additional must be obtained from customers or through cost reduction in order to cover the Government's tax take. In this respect the tax amounts to a more than 100-percent penalty on paying off debt.

It is, however, to the formation and investment of new venture capital—equity money—that the Nation must primarily look for progress in creating new jobs; bond money, indeed, is unobtainable for new enterprises until a cushion of risk capital has first been provided. It surely cannot be considered to be in the public interest heavily to hamper, through taxation, the formation and investment of venture capital and thus encourage creation of dangerous perpetual indebtedness.

EFFECT ON CAPITAL MARKETS

As the corporate income tax rate grows it inevitably and powerfully affects the functioning of the Nation's capital markets. The tax strongly influences corporations to rely to the maximum extent possible upon internal financing—that is, to retain and reinvest a bigger portion of income instead of paying it out in dividends. A tax equal to more than 100 percent of the retained amount has already been paid in the course of acquiring it. To pay it out in more dividends would subject it to further individual income tax dissipation to the extent, in the case of United States Steel's stockholders, of not less than 37 percent. Thus less than two-thirds of such additional dividends could actually get to the capital market and become available for re-use through that market.

Under this tax influence about half of all new capital invested by corporations is represented by direct reinvestment of income. The scope of the capital markets is thus narrowed, as is also the competitive opportunity of new seekers of capital in that market.

TOWARD EXTRAVAGANT GOVERNMENT

The structure of individual and corporate income taxation undoubtedly constitutes a serious temptation for government to engage in extravagance. The majority electorate is persuaded that there is no longer an identity between voting benefits for itself and taxes on itself; whereupon there is general resort to the age-old fallacy of promising abundance for all by robbing selected Peter to pay for collective Paul. But of what avail if in the process the seed corn of progress on which all depend be consumed? And how different it would be, for example, if every voter understood that there could be no added expenditure without a proportional increase in the tax he himself would have to pay. It is perhaps in these attitudes that one may find the hidden key to ever mounting taxing and spending.

TAX EROSION OF CAPITAL

Some companies, because of the nature of their business, must be heavily invested in long-term facilities. The real capital of such companies is eroded away by the present corporate income tax. This is because it takes many more of today's dollars to replace equipment as it wears out than it took originally to purchase the equipment many years ago. But depreciation allowed in computing taxable income is limited to the smaller number of dollars originally expended. The difference between such depreciation and the larger amount needed to recover the purchasing power expended—and so to keep the facilities intact—is arbitrarily called income

and taxed as such. For United States Steel alone such tax erosion of capital as it turned over through depreciation amounted to over $650 million in the years 1940 to 1957 inclusive. Thus the corporate income tax not only hampers the formation of new capital but also erodes away existing capital, and does it in highly inequitable fashion because of the varying importance of depreciation to the businesses taxed.

THE TAX PASSED ON

Neither individuals nor corporations can or do pay taxes of any sort except as they first receive the dollars with which to do so in exchange for products sold or services rendered. The prices of corporate products and services must be higher to cover the taxes corporations pay. In this sense these taxes can be assumed to be sales taxes passed on to consumers, even if done so in highly inequitable fashion because they vary in amount on similar products depending upon the efficiency of the respective producers.

But the tax problem cannot be dismissed on such an assumption, for American hopes for ever more and better living rest squarely upon ever evoking the initiative, the effort, the leadership of its most able and efficient citizens and corporations. It cannot be done by taxing away up to 91 percent of any fruits of the individual's additional effort. Nor can innovation of new products and job-creating investment in facilities be helped by taxing away the corporate funds for their financing.

This brief review of but a few broad aspects of Federal income taxation impels one to wonder if the tax trends in America as they have developed over a long period of war and postwar boom do not point toward making the enterprise system unworkable. The heart of that system is the competitive investment of savings in tools of production thus both multiplying the jobs of operating them and the products that flow from them. Unhappily the taxation of income of both individuals and corporations has now come to bear most heavily upon that vital creation of savings that flow into job-creating investment. It tends to undermine the incentive of everybody to engage in superior effort.

This may not have been of much moment while the Nation was energized by war and postwar reconstruction demands. It may be of considerable moment in the period ahead. The saying, "The power to tax involves the power to destroy," is not an outworn adage; it is a deadly warning to which, at this juncture of our history, heed had best be paid.

Nine-Point Program for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American Association for the United Nations has recently released a nine-point program. It has urged action on the nine points in a statement to the President of the United States.

Many of the recommendations which the AAUN has made are ones which Members of Congress, including myself, have repeatedly endorsed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this nine-point program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Let us save the world from destruction by giving the United Nations strength and support.

At the end of World War II, the statesmen of the world joined in creating the United Nations to preserve a permanent peace.

Surely every thinking citizen will agree that the best hope for savings our world from nuclear destruction is to use the United Nations organization—as it was originally intended.

The American Association for the United Nations urges the following program:

1. NEGOTIATE NOW

In his state of the Union message, the President of the United States said: "In the last analysis, there is only one solution to the grim problems that lie ahead. The world must stop the present plunge toward more and more destructive weapons of war, and turn the corner that will start our steps firmly on the path toward lasting peace."

The conviction is overwhelming that the time has come for "give and take" negotiations between the West and the Soviet Union. Reasonable agreement is the sole alternative to the danger against which the President warns—and which we all know exists. It is the only way to put our feet on the road to lasting peace—no matter how difficult such negotiations may seem at the moment.

2. SUCH NEGOTIATIONS MUST TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations provides a neutral meeting place and the necessary techniques and staff—including the person of the Secretary-General. Eighty-two nations members accept the law and moral principles upon which any agreement should and must be based. The United Nations provides a wide variety of both private and public means for negotiations.

Should a "summit" conference between the heads of the United States and the Soviet Union be deemed desirable—then the Secretary-General of the United Nations should be present. This will give assurance to all nations that no decisions are made that will be prejudicial to the future of all—and to world peace.

It seems to us that if the United Nations is not used fully in the present crisis it will be because its potentialities are not fully appreciated—or that some fear that the United Nations may become too strong—and prefer to keep it weak by not using its negotiating facilities.

3. WE MUST CONTINUE TO PURSUE A SOLUTION TO THE DISARMAMENT PROBLEM

The problem of disarmament will not wait. We must meet this problem and the political questions that seem to hold it back, now.

The United States should advocate the abandonment of nuclear tests for a specific period of time when the principle of inspection is accepted by the United Nations. We should advocate the same treatment of the problem of long-range atomic missile testing.

4. WE SHOULD URGE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TITLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO OUTER SPACE—AND THE COORDINATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OF ALL OUTER SPACE EXPERIMENTS

The United States should present to the United Nations General Assembly the need for the international community to establish its justifiable right to control outer space—and all experiments relative thereto.

Our peace of mind and the peace of the world may well depend upon the acceptance of the principle that outer space is not subject to ownership or control by individual states—but only by the U. N., representing all nations of the world.

5. A PERMANENT U. N. FORCE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED NOW

We should advocate a permanent force, including aircraft, composed partly of contingents earmarked by small states for immediate use, and partly of officers and men enlisting directly and serving continuously. These latter could be used to guard installations of the International Atomic Energy Agency, accompany truce teams or missions, and engage in technical-assistance projects. But overnight, they would be available as an emergency police force under the direction of the Secretary-General.

It is important that the successful experience of the United Nations emergency force not be lost.

6. UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID SHOULD BE GIVEN INCREASINGLY THROUGH THE U. N.—SUCH AID SHOULD BE INCREASED—NOT DECREASED

Nothing is as important in winning the support of the uncommitted nations of the world as an expanded program of economic assistance. Such assistance must be given on the basis of need—and carefully administered.

In order to avoid an economic race comparable to the arms race—we believe that to the greatest possible extent such aid should be given through the United Nations. We believe that an agency similar to the International Atomic Energy Agency should be established for the economic advancement of less-developed nations.

7. WE SHOULD CONTINUE TO HELP DEPENDENT PEOPLES ACHIEVE SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

We, in the United States, should be the first to appreciate the significance of the revolutionary movement which has resulted in 700 million people winning their independence from colonialism since the beginning of the Second World War. We should assist the last vestiges of the colonial system in obtaining self-government of independence and developing an appreciation for the responsibilities of freedom.

The U. N. Charter contains a declaration of freedom for dependent peoples. Wisdom and moderation, however, must be used in applying the principles. In winning their independence, it is important that the colonial peoples do not substitute a new tyranny or retrogression; nor should their newly found freedom result in narrow nationalism.

8. WE SHOULD ADHERE TO OUR ORIGINAL INTENT OF MAKING THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY A BANK OF FISSIONABLE MATERIAL

If nations use atomic energy as an instrument of the cold war—it would defeat the whole idea and purpose that the President of the United States had in mind when he initiated the idea for the agency.

9. THE U. N. BUDGET MUST BE INCREASED IN PROPORTION TO ITS GREATER RESPONSIBILITIES

A comparison of the expenditures of the nations for military preparedness with their expenditures for the U. N. brings graphically to mind the remark of Canada's Lester B. Pearson, "We prepare for war like precocious giants and for peace like retarded pygmies."

We believe that the greater responsibility of the United Nations will require increased budgets. We further believe that an independent source of income must be developed

to supplement the contributions of governments.

These nine points represent the essential elements in the moral and spiritual offensive which we believe the United States should launch in the United Nations at once. The goal of this offensive is not only world peace but the improvement of the dignity of every human being—and the advancement and safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, INC.,
CHARLES W. MAYO, M. D.,
JAMES T. SHOTWELL,
Honorary Presidents.
OSCAR A. DE LIMA,
Executive Vice President.
Mrs. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, Board of Governors.
CLARK M. EICHELBERGER,
Executive Director.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

New Stature for the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Outsider," published in the Boston Herald of Monday, April 7, 1958.

The editorial not only contains some very pertinent comments about the role of the Vice Presidency, and emphasizes a fact, of which most people are aware, that Vice President NIXON's conduct in the office has added much to its dignity and prestige, but it also proves beyond question his capacity to meet any responsibility that may devolve upon him in future years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTSIDER

The Vice Presidency is no longer quite the most insignificant office that its first incumbent found it. RICHARD NIXON is considerably busier and more imposing in the second-in-command post than John Adams or most of his successors were.

But the office is still a problem. It has still not developed into what the Constitution makers hoped for it. And it will not during Mr. NIXON's incumbency.

Mr. Eisenhower made this clear at his press conference Thursday. Despite the great personal confidence he has shown in Mr. NIXON and the opportunities he has made for the Vice President to join in administration policymaking, he has never given him any official status. "I decided as a matter of good governmental organization," he told the newsmen, "that it would not be correct to give him a governmental position in the executive department."

The reason for this is apparently the Vice President's constitutional assignment to the legislative branch. So long as the President lives and he is able to perform his duties Mr. NIXON's main job under the basic law is to serve as Presiding Officer of the Senate and cast a tie-breaking vote when the upper Chamber deadlocks. The doctrine of separation of powers, in Mr. Eisenhower's view, precludes his having a major executive assignment as well.

The President has misgivings on another score. He is deeply aware that the Vice President is elected by the vote of the whole people, just as the Chief Executive is, and cannot be removed except by impeachment. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. NIXON are on the best of terms. But what if they were not? This, the President thinks, would create "an impossible situation." Indeed he feels so strongly about it he once said a presidential nominee should resign rather than accept an uncongenial running-mate from the nominating convention.

These are important considerations and the President certainly cannot be accused of acting capriciously or unfairly toward his Vice Chief. Yet it seems a pity that Mr. NIXON's office, having been brought so far above its former estate, cannot be made more useful still.

Mr. NIXON is now generally recognized to be better prepared to succeed to the top office, in case of need, than almost any of his predecessors. He has grown in the job as few others have. But he is still isolated in his stand-by role. He is neither legislator nor executive. He advises, presides, consults. But he is not allowed to act. He is caught in the impossible design of the vice presidential office.

Congress, while considering various revisions to the Constitution and laws on the subject of presidential succession, should also work out some changes on the Vice Presidency. It is time to free the Vice President of his meaningless legislative duties and make him a functioning part of the executive branch. He should be made an insider instead of an outsider in the governmental framework.

By good luck we now have in the "insignificant office" a man of sufficient stature to take over the great office for which he stands surrogate. But we have not always been so lucky, and we may not be in future, unless we can make the stand-by post more attractive in itself.

Improving Health Standards of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11414 has been reported out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I objected to the committee's action not because I oppose its worthy objective.

No one is more enthusiastic for the cause of public health than one who has spent most of his life promoting and observing its progress.

I opposed it solely on the grounds that the Congress, by piecemeal appropriations, is invading a field where multiplicity of efforts, each directing its resources to the same end but without coordination, need to be studied and correlated to avoid duplication and waste of effort.

Since the beginning of this century I have been a student of health problems and an observer of progress toward improving the health and welfare of our people. During these years I have witnessed the greatest progress toward eradication of epidemic and endemic diseases ever accomplished by any people of any age in history. It is significant that doctors of medicine have fronted in this great movement, but it must be recognized that much of the credit is ascribed to ancillary groups working toward the same end without whose combined efforts the Nation's standards of health as we now know them, could not have been attained.

The development of and the application of sanitary principles, scientific research into the causes, modes of transmission, response to drugs and chemicals, and developments in immunology have made major contributions toward disease control. Pharmaceutical houses, experimental clinics and treatment centers, and research programs, together with the mechanical artisans and designers of therapeutic devices, have made possible the control and cure of many of the disease abnormalities to which the race is subject.

Preventive measures, vaccines, inoculations, isolation of acute contagions, quarantine procedures, and the dissemination of knowledge of personal care through intensive campaigns by health officers, medical practitioners, public and private nurses, and school authorities, have made contributions of great value. When we add to these the combined efforts of voluntary fund-raising organizations, insurance companies, radio, press, and so forth, one wonders at the magnitude of effort made to keep our people well informed about matters pertaining to individual and community health, and the recordbreaking prolongation of the life span. Its worth is beyond measure.

With so many agencies, both private and governmental engaged in promoting better health, a certain amount of overlapping can hardly be prevented. There are listed about 100 foundations that devote their resources toward improving facilities and personnel in medical research and personnel training. Voluntary groups appealing to the public for voluntary contributions abound everywhere. The public responds generously to fund-raising campaigns for polio, heart, crippled children, blind, mental health, and what have you. Local, State, and Federal Governments appropriate funds to encourage greater availability of information and to augment teaching and research programs. Each of the armed services maintains facilities and personnel to develop and to direct an awareness of the importance of the prevention of disease among enlisted men and their families.

The National Health Councils have recently been recipients of appropriated funds to encourage special effort in research in many of the diseases that now baffle us. The financial support so freely given by public and government in the cause of health is an outstanding example of the generous character of a free people.

The medical colleges, institutions, and hospitals for training nurses, health workers, and sanitarians are and have been engaged in studies to determine the anticipated needs of our growing population. Matters such as the nu-

merical relationships of doctors to patients, the number, location, and types of hospitals to provide adequately for the rapidly increasing numbers of older residents are under continuous study. These are among some of the problems to be met in the future. Because such matters have a very important influence on our social and economic welfare, they deserve careful attention and planning. It is quite apparent that if we expect to receive full returns for the money and effort expended in the cause of national health, these endeavors should be coordinated as far as possible by a central advisory agency.

The United States Public Health Service, the arm of our Government that has heretofore trained and assigned public health personnel to areas for specific health problems, and to local units of Government where effective organization of health effort is desired, would seem to be the logical agency to assemble and coordinate information and advice with all institutions offering special training courses for doctors, nurses, sanitarians, and public-health workers.

The Congress in amending title II of the Public Health Act in 1956, gave recognition to this need for coordination of training efforts. It provides for the appointment by the Surgeon General of an expert advisory committee composed of persons representative of the principal health specialties in the fields of public health, administration and training to advise him in connection with the administration of these traineeship programs.

This amendment also authorizes the Surgeon General to provide for similar studies and recommendations regarding traineeships in specialized training in public health for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel.

It is my view that these studies should cover the whole field of health endeavor. They should reveal the extent to which the existing haphazard approaches to our medical problems are unavoidably competing with each other. They should assemble information upon which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through its primary administrative agency, the Public Health Service, can coordinate the resources of voluntary groups, foundations, and Government agencies for more direct and more efficient results. In the absence of a central coordinating agency, we can never realize the full potential of funds derived from private groups, endowments, foundations, and governmental appropriations. A clearer picture of the overall program will enable members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress to understand more clearly the purposes for which Federal funds are to be allocated.

The same holds true for the Bureau of the Budget. Such an agency, empowered by Congress to present a single packaged budget will then be expected to justify its appropriations requests for additional activities as the needs arise, rather than have separate agencies appealing for special legislation year after year.

H. R. 6771, the bill now before the House to authorize an annual appropriation of $1 million per year over a period of 5 years to aid the schools of public health is an example of a long series of uncorrelated Federal authorizations. The schools of public health, both private and public, are separate units of colleges and universities, especially engaged in training health officers and other health personnel. They are performing a grand service with limited financial support. They, like most educational institutions, need assistance, but they are not alone in their fields.

Many of the medical schools and allied institutions devote special attention to the training of personnel for this phase of health work, another indication that there is great need for coordination. The Public Health Service, during the hearings on H. R. 6771, suggested that the Congress delay action on this bill until the findings and the report of the Surgeon General's study committee became available before the end of 1959.

In view of the overall picture I have attempted to present to you, I am inclined to believe we should defer the passage of this bill and remind the Surgeon General that the Congress insists on the selection and activation of his committee at the earliest possible date.

For Those Who Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great newspaper retains it greatness by doing great things.

The Times-Picayune and New Orleans States are two great newspapers. They have done a great thing.

They are published by the Times-Picayune Publishing Co. of which an old and lifelong friend, John F. Tims, Jr., is the president. The editor of the Times-Picayune is an old working reporter colleague of mine, George W. Healy, Jr., and the editor of the New Orleans States is Carl Corbin, whom I knew even before he had graduated from journalism school.

Recently the Times-Picayune Publishing Co. caused to be printed a series of full page advertisements in the interest of the People Who Think.

This series has just come to my attention. They are indeed great pieces designed to stimulate thinking. They are direct, provocative and challenging. They furnish must reading for those who think.

I dare not attempt to elaborate on them. I merely say to you: "read them."

WHO HAS THE ULTIMATE WEAPON

In a sense, it took America 119 days to discover the space age. That was the interval between the launching of Sputnik I and the lofting of Explorer I.

It was a time of profound national embarrassment. It was also a time when we opened our eyes and saw, many of us for the first time clearly, the whole immense scope of the Russian challenge.

We discovered that it would take more than 1 satellite, or 2, or even a sky full of satellites to turn back this sweeping challenge.

We saw it gathering momentum, applying pressures against critical points in the free world's defenses. We cannot measure the precise force of these pressures, but for safety (and reacting neither as Pollyannas nor Jeremiahs) we must assume that they are as real as they seem:

In weapons—a competence in rocketry that has surpassed anything yet demonstrated by any nation.

In science and technology—a forward motion of startling pace, and a training program that provides new manpower faster than our system provides it.

In economics—a campaign than marshals the resources of a billion people in a powerful bid to draw the world's markets into the Russian orbit.

In politics, a relentless drive to win the uncommitted nations and soften up the NATO alliance.

This comprehensive challenge demands answers to these questions:

Can a free way of life provide the strengths for survival in a space-age world where a dictatorship has harnessed the minds and energies of an empire to its purposes?

Can a free people apply its strengths in time and for long enough to get the job done?

Can we define the job so clearly to ourselves that every ounce of our strength will be applied to the real objective?

The driving pace of the Russian effort has set in motion a count-down that measures the very days in which we have to find the answers.

A part of the answer is in full view:

Geared to the needs of our people, freedom has built a productive system of such energy that no accurate measurement has ever been taken of its full potential.

If there is a capacity for momentum in a dictatorship that can throw its whole weight into a crash program, so is there in a democracy that from a standing start built history's mightiest arsenal and at the same time supported a steady in domestic consumption through a 4-year war.

If there is strength in a system that can bend a billion people to its will, so is there strength in a system that can turn out $430 billion worth of goods and services in a year; that can keep its people well fed and to spare, using one-tenth of its manpower in farm production, while Russia, with almost half its manpower in farming, scrapes out a bare subsistence.

There is strength, and the promise of infinitely greater strength to come, in a system that can perform these material prodigies and at the same time afford its people the leisure to contemplate and enjoy life and the means to improve it—that can develop a hydrogen bomb and in the same span arrest the polio virus and bring into sight the conquest of cancer, heart disease, and a dozen other major plagues.

In 1945 the world accepted as manifest that whatever this country decided to do, it could do. Nothing that has happened since—and no danger on the horizon—modifies that assessment of the power of freedom geared to the physical and human resources of America.

Our national ambition remains what it has always been—to help build a durable structure of world peace in which each people has the right to choose its own way of life.

It is an ambition shared overwhelmingly by the world's peoples, and given expression in the charter and day-to-day business of the United Nations.

To achieve it in the space age requires no strength beyond the capacity of freedom to provide. And if the ruggedness of a challenge is measured by the odds involved, this challenge is no tougher than Americans have faced before. By that measurement we were a poor risk to win our freedom at all, or to hold the Union together in the 1860's, or to emerge from the great depression stronger than we entered it.

The whole history of freedom is a testament to this resilient quality. (Even Khrushchev concedes it, doling out freedom by the cupful to speed the work of his scientists and sharpen the initiative of his factory managers.)

Whatever strength and courage we have needed, we have found.

But to realize our ambition, or even to survive, in tomorrow's world requires of the American people a swifter, more discriminating, more comprehensive exercise of commonsense than, quite possibly, has ever been asked of a people before.

We can realize it, not by trying to make the world over in America's image, for the world's peoples are as deeply committed to their own dignity and freedom of choice as we are to ours. And because we must have the help of our neighbors, to earn a living and defend ourselves, they can now insist upon new respect as the price of that help.

We can reach our goal only by building the strength to surpass the best efforts of communism and get on with the positive job of bringing the world's peoples into an understanding in which freedom will flourish as a common right. Communism cannot survive this ultimate onslaught of freedom—but neither can it be overcome by any simpler means.

To build that strength requires a set of positive decisions by the American people:

To provide the confidence and judgment to keep the economy on course, or see it falter in the face of its greatest challenge.

To give the Nation's scientists the respect, support, and freedom they must have to carry on their work, or see their talents frustrated and wasted.

To supply the inspiration and guidance American youth must have to face the space-age job or see a better trained Russian generation surpass it in all critical areas of competence.

One hundred and seventy-three million Americans must make these decisions with the singleness of purpose to match that of one man—and these decisions must be made now, against a need that may only come into full view 5 or 10 years hence. This is what the count-down means.

If the decisions are soundly made, they can link the energies of a new generation to the abundant strengths of freedom and open a door to the age of peace. For no source of power yet discovered can match the energy that freedom can release in the minds and hearts of its people.

Freedom is a force that gives purpose and vitality to every individual, institution, and idea.

Freedom is a tool—the marvelously facile tool which has built the most competent, the most nearly perfect system yet devised by which men and women can live and work together, in dignity and the pursuit of happiness.

And freedom is a weapon, stronger than any gunsmith or nuclear physicist ever invented.

Dr. Wernher von Braun told a Time correspondent the other day: "Man will always seek the ultimate weapon. And you know what this is? The ultimate weapon is what the other fellow doesn't have."

In this struggle, that ultimate weapon is the vigorous practice of freedom.

WILL WE WIN THE PRODUCTION BATTLE?

Khrushchev has put this challenge to the American industrial system: Can it match and finally top the pace of Russia's global military-economic offensive without destroying its own freedom in the effort?

He has put the full force of his empire behind the challenge.

He has harnessed a major part of this force to the weapons job. To extend the power of the world's largest army and a submarine fleet three times greater than our own, he has added tactical and intermediate missiles with nuclear warheads and is pressing us hard in the race to perfect the intercontinental ballistic missile.

He has concentrated another major part of his force on the economic struggle—the effort to install Russia as the economic big brother of the nations still straddling the fence in the cold war. He has brought Russian steel production from 12 million tons in 1945 to more than 50 million tons in 1957. Other programs for weapons, machinery, and factory building have kept pace.

He has spent about $2 billion in foreign aid in the past 2 years, and portioned it out with shrewd talen for getting the most for his money. Nasser's Egypt has had $465 million. Yugoslavia, teetering on the fence, has had the same. Syria—hotbed of anti-Western feeling—has received $280 million plus a regiment of 2,000 Communist technicians. So it has gone around the uncommitted world—even little Iceland is getting five new fishing ships on credit from Communist East Germany.

For his purposes it is of no present consequence that the $2 billion he distributed was taken from the Russian people (in defaulted domestic bonds) and from the United States (in repudiated debts). Or that the goods he sends abroad as well as the weapons he builds are made possible only be restricting his own people to the same living standard that their parents enjoyed, or enduring, 3 decades ago. The Russian people, for the time being, can be handled.

But it may be of some consequence to Khrushchev to take a fresh, hard look at this American economy he has challenged for the championship of the world. There is a fundamental difference between his system and ours:

A controlled economy is an economy of scarcity. A free economy is an economy of abundance.

There's no secret about the source of this strength, it springs naturally from the freedom of the producer to sell, and the freedom of the customer to buy.

From these freedoms flow all the skills and disciplines of the American industrial system—the incentive, the competition, the development of trained managers and skilled craftsmen, the technique of research, of mass-production, mass-transportation, communications, and marketing that weld this economy into the creative force that it is.

If you look at this economy in one way, the Soviet way, you see only the tops of its smokestacks: clusters of huge corporations, with a few in each industry producing the bulk of our steel, automobiles, oil, appliances, or chemicals.

If you look a little closer you see each of these big corporations as the core of a great network of large, small, and middle-sized companies, supplying materials and parts and skills, retailing products, or serving needs created by the basic products, as the automobile brought into being the repair shops, the motels, the tourist, and roadbuilding industries.

If you look still closer, you see people, whose manual skills, creative talents, and organizational genius have put the whole pattern together and made it work, and who all profit by the efficiency of its workings.

This is an economy of unprecedented power.

Overall, we're outproducing Russia by more than 3 to 1. Even in basic industries where Russia has concentrated her full strength, as in steel, we outproduce her by more than 2 to 1.

At the height of World War II, when we were building 300,000 planes and mass-producing the greatest arsenal ever seen, our consumer-purchases climbed steadily year after year and our military production never did top 40 percent of our total output of goods.

Since the beginning of World War II we have doubled our productive power.

And against the Soviets' $2 billion we can range a sum 40 times as great—the $78.5 billion of funds and credits we have distributed to the free world since the war's end. This sum, that helped turn the tide against communism in Europe and elsewhere, is still less than one-fifth of the total wealth produced by the United States in the single year of 1957.

We have done this, not by freezing the American living standard at the level of 30 years ago, but by creating buying power and a standard of living almost double that of 1928.

This might seem on the surface a dangerous kind of self-indulgence.

The truth is just the opposite.

The skills, technology, and productive apparatus that have brought television sets and washing machines into 80 percent of American homes—and cars to virtually all of them—provide as well the main strength to carry us through a cold war of any foreseeable duration.

For our living standards not only demand the very skills needed to build the complicated weapons for space-age defense; they also generate the dollars to buy the tools, to build and staff the laboratories and schools, to carry on the trade and foreign mutual aid programs needed to meet the whole range of space-age challenges.

This is the economic momentum upon which our very survival depends, and the current tapering off provides a sound reason to reexamine the requirements to keep it moving.

An urgent need in this reexamination is to see today's business level in perspective: To keep in mind that the most recent report (for February) showed an economy providing jobs for 61,988,000 civilians—a total that exceeds all but two previous years in our history. And, at the same time, to take every needed step for a turn-around and a strong, renewed climb.

It's up to Government to hold to a tax level that will encourage investment, and will make possible that extra margin of consumer spending that means the difference between prosperity and recession.

It's up to management to hold to a profit level that will support expansion of plants and payrolls and attract investors, and still encourage the consumer's confidence in spending.

It's up to labor to sustain productive efficiency, and hold to a level of wages adequate to its own valid ambitions for a steadily increasing living standard, but prudent enough not to defeat its own purposes by pricing products out of the market.

Public confidence expressed over the past 8 years brought the economy to its highest peak of prosperity and strength.

As it brought more goods and money and better living to the American people, it also doubled the flow of individual and corpo-

rate taxes paid into the National Treasury. That financial strength enabled the Government to project for 1958 a major security program costing $10 billion more than the Government took in from all sources in 1950.

We didn't reach that peak by doubting ourselves.

We got there by working and planning, buying and building, with confidence in ourselves and our future.

We can meet the challenge of the space age in the same way. For the vigorous practice of freedom is the ultimate weapon.

WILL WE DO THE JOB IN SCIENCE?

We Americans have been drawing comfort for years from a plausible proposition:

Freedom is the lifeblood of science. Therefore, as the largest free nation on earth we produced the most and the best in science.

Then Russia, which only yesterday was packing off to Siberia any scientist who upheld natural law against Lenin dogma, shot a missile through our complacency. She beat us into space by 4 months. She served notice that she was ahead of us in certain critical areas of rocket development. She unveiled an education system for scientists and engineers that turns them out much faster than we do.

On the threshold of a space age in which the side that is strongest in science will inherit the earth, or what's left of it, she sent us searching frantically for the proofs of a proposition we had taken for grant, in fact, for the answers to three questions:

Has our system failed us?

Have we failed our system?

In either case, what can we do?

We can thank sputnik for putting the question so plainly. For the challenge had been there all along.

With or without sputnik, with or without Russia, we would still have had to solve the giant problems raised by the massive eruptions of human forces and natural forces in our time.

We would still have had to find a way to harness the energies of the atom to the task of bringing technology, food, and freedom to the hungry three-quarters of the world's people, or been engulfed as these awakening millions reached out for the tools, or the weapons.

We would still have had to discover new sources of energy, in the world around us, in the sun or the stars, or see the conventional reservoirs of fuel dry up.

We would still have had to find the credentials of space-age scientific leadership for which we are searching now, or surrender that leadership.

Sputnik only added the exclamation point to the challenge, and set a deadline for decision.

It wasn't the system that failed us, the proofs are plentiful.

The founders of America did far more than establish a climate for the study of science. They set up the means by which the findings of science could be put to practical use for the benefit of everyone.

They opened the way for whole industries to blossom from the seed of a single scientific discovery, and for those industries to reseed themselves and reseed science itself with profits plowed into research, into foundations and education endowments. There's no reason now to doubt the resiliency of a system that could bring into being the miracles of aviation and automation and electronics that are the trademarks of modern America, and at the same time could produce more than half of the Nobel prizewinners in physics, chemistry, medicine, and physiology between World War II and 1957.

A system that has pioneered the fission and fusion of atoms and at the same time conquered half a dozen of the world's deadliest plagues and plotted the final conquest of polio, malaria, cancer, arthritis and heart disease, gives reasonable assurance of doing any job asked of it in the future.

But it's hardly necessary to labor that point—Khrushchev, himself, has driven it home. He has cut his physical scientists loose from the restraints of Communist dogma, and given them a degree of freedom that would have brought cries of treason from his predecessors. He did this by invoking an even more fundamental Communist axiom, that the end justifies the means, even if they are freedom's own means. He has borrowed another page from freedom's book in broadening the base of his scientific manpower through expanding education. An informed people has long been considered the nemesis of any dictatorship. Khrushchev is willing to take his chances.

We can stop worrying about whether freedom can do the job in science—and start asking ourselves in what respects we have begun to fail freedom. The answer is easy; the cure is not.

Until sputnik, we weren't facing up to the space age—we were backing into it.

Secure, as we imagined, behind our H-bombs and our unmatched industrial power, we ignored a fact that Russia grasped early and clearly:

Progress in weapons and progress in technology—basic requirements for survival in the age we have just entered—both depend upon the scientist in the laboratory, unlocking new secrets of nature.

Russia has not only emancipated her scientists, she has made them princes of the realm, enjoying salaries and status reserved for her top-rung aristocracy. And she has assured a satisfactory flow of reinforcements.

In America we have been going the other way.

As the original proprietors of the incentive system we devised incentives for just about every talent under the sun, from playing a good game of football to recalling Henry VIII's third wife's middle name. But an American scientist engaged in fundamental research has had to scratch to find any token of appreciation. (Nobel, after all, was a Swede.)

A recent study among high-school students established an image of the American scientist as a combination of Svengali and the absent-minded professor. Another study among American adults developed that only 10 percent of those interviewed could call to mind the names of even 2 American scientists.

That we are still ahead in science, that we still have better facilities and greater aggregate scientific competence than Russia, is a tribute to the farsighted programs of the universities, industry and the foundations, and to the scientists themselves and their dedication to their own ideals.

But our margin of superiority is dwindling—and it will disappear unless we move swiftly to bring science into a condition to fulfill its mission in tomorrow's world.

The Federal Government has a responsibility here—to make sure that enough basic research is conducted to meet the minimum needs of national security. It is moving to meet this need, by stepping up the research, scholarship, and teaching-support programs of the National Science Foundation.

But the American people, not Government, control the incentives, the climate, and the training facilities that will finally determine whether we shall have enough science in time, or too little, too late.

They must know their own absolute dependency upon science in the space age, not that science, alone, can make freedom secure, but that the free world cannot survive without that steady flow of scientific discovery that produces new weapons, new technology, new instruments and methods to wage peace.

If this life-and-death dependency upon science is understood, the American people will provide, readily and eagerly, the means for their scientists to do their job.

These are their needs:

Respect and status in keeping with their service. One measure of that status, though by no means the only one, is financial reward, and until now many scientists have had to leave the schools and university laboratories and go out into private industry to get it.

Freedom, to work alone in a laboratory, or to pool ideas and findings, and attack a complicated problem in worldwide concert, as was necessary to split the first atom. Military secrecy can never be thrown to the winds, but secrecy that forecloses a vital new weapon or a revolutionary instrument for peace is a costly self-indulgence in the space-age struggle.

An ample supply of new blood, which can come only by giving prospective young scientists the tough, challenging courses that will whet their minds, the laboratory equipment to train them, and the teachers to inspire them.

These are modest requests for a group of Americans who are prepared to provide, in return, the instruments for a better life for all of us, for security in the space age, and for accelerated progress toward the kind of peace we all seek. Our scientists are ready to prove, if the American people will join them in the effort, that the vigorous practice of freedom is the ultimate weapon.

WILL WE DO THE JOB IN EDUCATION?

No other part of our postsputnik reappraisal has been so painful as our new look at education. We Americans have long accepted as self-evident that freedom provides the most and the best in education. The evidence appeared to bear us out. Freedom in the mid-20th century has brought more education to more people, helped develop more businessmen who have produced more goods, more scientists who have won more Nobel prizes, more engineers who have built bigger bridges, more doctors who have cured more diseases, than any other system.

We felt secure.

Then came sputnik, and with the unarguable proof that Russia's regimented educational system has threatened to surpass our own in momentum, and actually surpassed ours, in point of numbers, in those areas where the first battle for survival in the space age will be won or lost.

Russia last year graduated half again as many scientists and engineers as did the United States.

Every Russian high-school student gets 5 years of physics, 5 of biology, 4 of chemistry, and 10 of mathematics. In the United States, 23 percent of the public high schools offer neither physics nor chemistry, 24 percent offer no geometry.

Russia has 1 teacher for every 17 students. The United States averages 1 for every 27, in some places 1 for every 45, and has a national deficit of 150,000 teachers.

Russia screens her youth at the 7th and 10th grade levels, for ability, desire to learn, and knowledge of Marxism. The best qualified go on to the universities.

The United States experts who examined Russian education left no room for doubt that Russia's training is sound and the product, for Russia's own purposes, good. Unless our reappraisal brings drastic chapges, and fast, we are on the way to surrendering scientific and technological leadership to Russia.

How did we get in the predicament?

We all carry a share of the blame.

Busy exploring the intriguing byways of the machine age, living up the good life we made for ourselves, we were 10 years late in facing up to the space age, and the special skills it would require of our children.

We saw the national birthrate rise sharply in the postwar years, but we didn't bother

to build the new classrooms to meet the inevitable onrush of new school-agers.

We saw 116,000 teachers quit the schools in a single year, one-third of them taking better paying jobs elsewhere, but we didn't vote the bond issues or sanction the higher school taxes necessary to raise teacher salaries above the subsistence level.

We did a great deal about adjusting the child to his environment and his playmates, but we didn't do enough toward adjusting him to the challenge of a rugged future.

A fair number of us forgot that the disciplines of a competent mind are best taught before the age of 7, in the home.

Sputnik set an emergency program in action.

Congress is debating bills providing tens of thousands of new university scholarships.

Government, private, industry, the big foundations, State Boards of Education, and private groups are feeding tens of millions of new dollars into programs to speed the development of scientists and engineers, from the big research laboratories all the way down to the high school science and mathematics departments.

By these means we can hold off the Russian technological threat for a year, or 2 years, or 5 years.

But neither Government, nor private industry, nor the big foundations, can shoulder more than a fraction of the job.

A democracy holds the individual citizen responsible for shaping the minds and building the character of its youth.

That's where the challenge must be sized up, and where the decisions must be made now.

The challenge is not merely to produce the technicians who can turn back the physical threat, but to train the minds that can meet all of the exacting demands imposed upon America in the space age. This is why thoughtful leaders in education are gratified at the increasing number of unrestricted grants, to be applied wherever in the overall program the need appears greatest.

If we are to sustain our basic physical strength there can be no letup in the training of the managers, economists, the specialists in commerce and finance who superintend business and industry.

And if we are to project these economic and technological strengths in the shaping of a world peace secure against all future dictators, we must advance the study of history, languages, literature, and philosophy with equal zeal. For in these areas must be found the clues to the processes by which man can move toward the ultimate breakthrough—the mastery of human nature.

This is a massive challenge, difficult to pose, difficult to grasp.

It was one thing to understand the clear and present danger of a Pearl Harbor. It is another thing to translate the quiet beep of a sputnik into a warning that the survival of the Nation depends mainly upon the individual American, and the thoroughness with which he can help prepare the teenage youngster to become a competent space-age citizen.

We have all the tools we need to get the job done.

We have community leadership skilled in solving problems and in communicating solutions with clarity and force. We have a superb set of instruments ready at hand to transmit their messages into every American home.

We have a Nation of families drawn into close concert by these instruments, who have time and again proved they could make whatever effort was reasonably demanded of them.

We have a community of youngsters, born with the same energies and the same curious minds as every other crop of children, and who know a great deal more about everything than any previous generation ever did.

And we have, now, a clear idea of what must be done, within the community and within the family, to put these youngsters in touch with their space-age destiny.

One part of the job is to quit trying to make life easier for our children than it was for us—for it isn't and it won't be. We can serve them best by teaching them the meaning of responsibility, of finishing what they start; the satisfaction of hard work; the rewards of inquiring, of reasoning, of thinking for themselves.

Another part of the job is to re-evaluate education in terms of its critical importance in the national scene. The end-products of such a reevaluation will certainly be the provision of the 150,000 new classrooms that are needed, the 150,000 new teachers to man them, and a sharply increased scale of pay and a new respect for teachers.

A third part of the job is to overhaul curriculum—throw out the snap courses, measure each subject for its contribution to an authentic need and for its utility in training the child to think, and make a passing grade a reward for credit earned, not a measure of endurance.

A fourth part of the job is to recognize intellectual talent as a national resource, and set up the means to discover it and put it to maximum use. This doesn't mean denying to any child all the education he can absorb. It simply means extending the opportunity to millions of brilliant youngsters who don't have it now, and whose services the country desperately needs.

These are the processes by which a democracy can gear its educational system to meet whatever demands the space age may impose—and to surpass any effort that Khrushchev, for all his concentrated power of decision, can put forth.

For Khrushchev is still the prisoner of a dogma that will grow less tolerable as Russian education progresses. It will be an increasing problem to justify to the newly educated millions why Marxism's agricultural theories still can't provide enough for Russians to eat; or why Biologist Lysenko could be a national hero and a national clown in the same decade; or by what logic the great Soviet Encyclopedia had to clip out 4 full pages devoted to one Beria and replace them with 4 full pages devoted to one Bergholz, an unimportant courtier of Tsar Peter I.

Only a system of education extending the unhampered right to discover truth—and the flexibility to challenge dogma in the light of truth—can be nimble enough to accommodate the swift-rising, swift-changing needs of the space age.

But freedom is of service only as its opportunities are seized and used. In education, as in every arena of the struggle for survival, the vigorous practice of freedom is the ultimate weapon.

How Do We Look in the Space-Age Mirror?

The first space man, looking back through the window of his rocket, will see the earth shrink to the size of a medicine ball.

As it has in fact. Its latest timetable puts New York 24 hours from Tokyo by plane, a few minutes from London by phone, a split-second from Habana by television, and 15 minutes from Moscow by ICBM. The world has dwindled to the size of a village that a man with good lungs can shout across.

Two and a half billion people live in this village, practically all of them touching one another daily in some phase of their workaday lives. They differ in molds and habits of living and thinking. They share the same deep desire for peace.

The space age poses appalling problems to a civilization walled up in a village with enough live bombs to level it. It offers opportunities to match.

Science is now ready to harness new energies powerful enough to lift mankind to undreamed-of levels of well-being. These are some of its promises:

Food, converted from the inexhaustible plantlife of the sea, solving forever the problem of hunger that still plagues three-quarters of the world's people.

Power, released from the atom and drawn from the sun and stars, lifting from the backs of men the burdens they have borne since the beginning of time.

Health, fortified by triumphs over cancer, heart disease, dysentery, pellagra, malaria, mental disease.

Weather, if not made to order, at least forecast for an entire season with an accuracy that will work wonders in farming, transportation, industry, and everyday planning and living.

And off in the dim future are still greater miracles, interplanetary touring, actual control of the world's rainfall, perhaps even the discovery of the secret of life.

As these things come to pass, many of the age-old causes of war, hunger, poverty, and despair can be steadily reduced. And as men gain the leisure and will to learn and the means to exchange ideas they can press the attack on the other causes, ignorance, hatred, and suspicion.

This is the horizon of the space age. This is the challenge that confronts all of us, a challenge with equal parts of danger and of opportunity, presented with an urgency we have never met before. Just as the countdown sets the tasks and measures the minutes before the launching of an intercontinental missile, so the countdown touched off by sputnik sets the tasks and measures the minutes for the free world to complete its readiness.

The free world's main strength today is America. Inescapably, a major share of the challenge is put to us.

We can now see what must be done in each major area of the conflict, and no part of the task is beyond our strength.

We know that the resources to stock our arsenals and support our programs of aid overseas must flow from a thriving economy, and that increasing production of consumer goods is essential to the pace of this economy.

We know we must maintain the pace of scientific research needed for leadership in space-age weapons and technology. This requires the immediate provision of the climate, the incentives, and the facilities for our scientists to apply and pool their creative skills to best effect.

We know we must awaken in our children a new excitement for learning, a new curiosity for the next lesson, a new prestige for high marks. We know this is the basic responsibility of the home and the community, rather than government.

But there is one requirement that comes before all others:

As a people, we must take a fresh, searching look at ourselves and our role in the new kind of world we are entering. We were given more than a century to adjust to the machine age; the months just ahead will tell whether we shall carry our leadership and our freedom intact into the space age, or fall behind in a race that offers no second prize.

We must devise a strategy as clearly drawn as Russia's, but a strategy adapted to our purposes, not merely copied after Khrushchev's plan. For he has set for himself the relatively simple objective of dominating the world. Ours is far more ambitious, to hold back the Soviet threat, but also to fashion a peace that will assure justice and individual liberty to all of the world's peoples, including Russia's.

The strengths and material gifts we have derived from freedom have been so lavish that we sometimes accept freedom's virtues as our own.

We didn't invent freedom. We are not its sole custodians. We can claim no monopoly of bravery, intelligence, or enterprise. These virtues are found in equal degree among many other peoples.

What we have developed that is unique is a way to release and channel the vast energies of free men, by applying the concept of individual choice to every area of human endeavor. By using freedom in this way we have converted the universal discoveries of the machine age into history's greatest industrial structure, and used its productive wealth to advance the well-being of all of our people.

This is the strength and the example we have to offer our allies in the present struggle.

In today's new world we must depend upon global neighbors and they upon us. They can't gain the freedom they seek, or hold their present freedom, without the immense physical help we can provide them. Equally, our own survival depends upon access to their raw materials and their markets—and most of all, in this kind of world, upon their good will. For either we shall have that good will or Russia will gain it if she can. And if Russia has it, and the trade and raw materials and human resources to go with it, she will hold a power advantage to proceed, at her leisure, to the conquest of the rest of the world.

In today's new world we must also give broader application to the function of communication. It is more than a passing irony that the most articulate people on earth have failed, in important respects, to communicate with each other, let alone with our world neighbors.

A major part of this failure has been a lack of clear understanding of just what we had to communicate, and why it was necessary.

Now we have the picture before us.

Sputnik has done us this immense service: It has clarified what we must know, and what we must communicate to our children, our scientists, our economy, our world neighbors, and each other.

It has held up a yardstick to freedom and made us study each of its strengths against space-age demands. In every department, weapons, science, industrial production, education, America has the means of victory. Beyond that, it needs only the will.

Wherever you look there are signs of a people rising to responsibility, of editors reporting the space-age story and spelling out its meaning with fresh urgency; of network directors broadcasting the message with the immense impact of their medium; of private corporations applying thought, and dollars by the tens of millions, to the stimulation of education and science; of community and neighborhood groups coming together earnestly, to talk out the meaning of newly grasped duties in school and home.

Out of such activity, spread throughout the Nation, can come the clear directives that will best apply our strengths and carry us swiftly and safely into the space age.

The challenge is not to win a numbers race in scientists and engineers, nor to destroy Russia, nor to bury Nikita Khrushchev, but to refute a far wiser man named Voltaire, who once said: "History is only the patter of silken slippers descending the stairs to the thunder of hobnailed boots climbing upward from below."

The vigorous practice of freedom can alter that pattern, and provide both the ultimate weapon for survival and the ultimate promise of peace.

The Explosive Problem of Importing Foreign Arms and Ammunition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, explaining in some detail the urgent need for legislation to ban the importation of foreign military arms and ammunition for commercial use in this country.

Besides the unfair competition foisted upon American arms and ammunition industries, the importation of surplus military weapons has proven a definite safety hazard to American sportsmen inasmuch as some foreign-made rifles have a tendency to blow up in the shooter's face.

I have introduced an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to prohibit the importation of these unsafe weapons, a practice which not only jeopardizes life and limb of American citizens, but also is a contributing cause to unemployment and economic decline in our domestic arms industry.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herewith the text of my letter to Mr. MORGAN, and also a press release of today's date which briefly states the problem.

APRIL 15, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Acting Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, I have proposed the attached amendment to section 414 of the Mutual Security Act which would prohibit the importation or reimportation of all military firearms and ammunition for sale in competition with domestic sporting arms and ammunition. I believe this amendment is required to alleviate a situation which has caused widespread unemployment and financial loss among the Nation's sporting arms manufacturers and their distributors and dealers throughout the United States. I believe that testimony now part of the Foreign Affairs Committee's records substantiates the need for relieving the serious threat to a vital defense industry.

In my study of this problem, I have come upon a phase of the matter which has greatly increased my concern above and beyond that which invokes such a hardship upon domestic industry. Among the thousands of military weapons declared surplus by mutual-aid nations and returned to this country to compete against American sporting arms on the commercial market is the Italian Carcano carbine. The Carcano being imported in greatest numbers is an 1891 model modified in 1938 for caliber 7.35 millimeters. The Carcano has been declared by the Italian Government to be unsafe for military use, according to testimony of representatives of our own Department of State, and an internationally recognized American gun authority, writing in an official publication of the National Rifle Asosciation, underscores this finding.

Based on these two sources alone, it would seem to me that there is sufficient reason for all responsible citizens of this country to be alarmed over the distribution of these questionable arms among our Nation's sportsmen.

Robert N. Margrave, deputy director, Office of Munitions Control, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, pointed out in official testimony before our committee: "It is our information that the Italian Government used rifles other than the Carcano during World War II. The Carcano was regarded as an undesirable rifle for military purposes because of the tendency of a portion of the barrel to explode."

Mr. Margrave added, "The only safe way to fire it, I understand, is with American ammunition."

The Carcano carbine is of 7.35 mm. caliber, and I am informed that no American ammunition manufacturer produces this cartridge. Shooters who expect to fire the Carcano must obtain ammunition whose origin is other than domestic. The Department of Commerce reports that in last December alone, 4,482,000 cartridges for this gun were imported from Italy. It is obvious that a gun, declared by the Italian Government to be unsafe for use with this specific ammunition, would be just as hazardous in the hands of an American sportsman.

Furthermore, Mr. Walter H. B. Smith, author of "Rifles, Volume Two of the N. R. A. Book of Small Arms," copublished by the National Rifle Association of America, Washington, D. C., and the Military Service Publishing Co., Harrisburg, Pa., has this to say about the Carcano (p. 246):

"The safety system (of the Carcano) is an Italian design, and is inherently dangerous as shattering or shearing of a fragile holding lug will let the firing pin blow back out of the bolt."

I am informed by reputable gun designers that the shattering of this lug could be caused by a pierced primer in a cartridge. The expected, logical route of travel for the blownback firing pin would be rearward through the shooter's face.

I assure you I make no claims to be technically versed in the field of arms and ammunition, but I am appalled by what is, even to the most uninitiated, an obvious threat to the life and limb of the American sportsman. There is, I am told, no regulatory system by which these and other imports of dubious origin can be examined and tested before they are made available to civilian shooters.

I believe that this, together with the testimony of Mr. E. C. Hadley, demonstrates that it is necessary that Congress adopt my amendment or similar legislation to correct this situation.

I would appreciate it if you will bring the foregoing additional information to the attention of the members of the committee.

Cordially yours,

ALBERT P. MORANO.

APRIL 15, 1958.

WASHINGTON.—United States Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Republican of Connecticut, told Congress today that he is appalled by an obvious threat to the life and limb of the American sportsman stemming from unsafe foreign military rifles imported for commercial sale.

Congressman MORANO, sponsor of an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which would prohibit the importation of all military arms and ammunition, said surplus Italian Army carbines, imported for use by American sportsmen, have a tendency to blow up in the shooter's face.

In a letter to members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which is currently

considering an extension of mutual security legislation, the Congressman said his amendment would automatically prohibit the importation of such firearms.

MORANO, pointing out that such imports also were causing unemployment and severe financial loss within the domestic arms industry, said:

"Among the thousands of military weapons declared surplus by mutual aid nations and returned to this country to compete against American sporting arms on the commercial market is the Italian Carcano carbine. The Carcano being imported in greatest numbers is an 1891 model modified in 1938 for caliber 7.35 mm. The Carcano has been declared by the Italian Government to be unsafe for military use, according to testimony of representatives of our own Department of State, and an internationally recognized American gun authority, writing in an official publication of the National Rifle Association, underscores this finding."

The Connecticut Congressman asserted: "Based on these two sources alone, it would seem to me that there is sufficient reason for all responsible citizens of this country to be alarmed over the distribution of these questionable arms among our Nation's sportsmen."

He quoted Robert N. Margrave, of the State Department's Office of Munitions Control, as saying the Italian Government regards the Carcano as an undesirable rifle for military purposes because of "a tendency of a portion of the barrel to explode." He added that Margrave claimed the only safe way to fire the gun is with American ammunition, but according to Morano, no American company manufactures ammunition of the type used in the Carcano.

The Congressman said: "Shooters who expect to fire the Carcano must obtain ammunition whose origin is other than domestic. The Department of Commerce reports that in last December alone, 4,482,000 cartridges for this gun were imported from Italy. It is obvious that a gun, declared by the Italian Government to be unsafe for use with this specific ammunition, would be just as hazardous in the hands of an American sportsman."

MORANO also pointed out that Walter H. B. Smith, author of a National Rifle Association article on the Carcano, has written that the safety mechanism of the rifle "is inherently dangerous, as shattering or shearing of a fragile holding lug will let the firing pin blow back out of the bolt."

The Congressman added: "I am informed by reputable gun designers that the shattering of this lug could be caused by a pierced primer in a cartridge. The expected logical route of travel for the blownback firing pin would be rearward through the shooter's face."

MORANO said he is "appalled by what is even to the most uninitiated, an obvious threat to the life and limb of the American sportsman. There is, I am told, no regulatory system by which these and other imports of dubious origin can be examined and tested before they are made available to civilian shooters."

Price Cuts Needed To End Tug-of-War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members to an article by J. A. Livingston which appeared in the Washington Post on April 13. The article, entitled "Price Cuts Needed To End Tug-of-War," graphically points out the need for the kind of price cuts needed to get the consumer back in the market and some of the reasons why prices were allowed to go so high in the first place:

PRICE CUTS NEEDED TO END TUG-OF-WAR

(By J. A. Livingston)

On the way to work the other morning, my eye caught a blind man confidently tapping his way toward a street crossing. Suddenly, the driver of a laundry truck, intent on making deliveries, backed into the pedestrian right-of-way. The blind man tapped to a halt, waving his cane, his antenna, questioningly before him.

I dashed to his side and took his arm. "What's wrong here" he said. "Something's in the way."

"A truck pulled into the crossing." I answered, as we walked around it. (Cop ought to hand out tickets to crosswalk hogs.) "What made you stop?" I asked. "How could you tell something was there?"

"I can tell," he answered. "I could hear it."

He thanked me and said goodby, leaving me to sense that blind men have extrasensory perception. They feel sound waves far too delicate for ears with eyes. And I should have thanked him. He helped me to resolve my problem.

BURNS VERSUS ANDERSON

I'd been mulling over the recession: What to do about it?

Arthur F. Burns, former chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has come out for a $5 billion tax cut. This put him in direct opposition to the President, to whom he is fondly loyal. But Burns feels unemployment will get worse if action is not immediate.

Members of the President's present Council of Economic Advisers feel much the same. But the President says, "Not yet."

Mr. Eisenhower is influenced by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson. The Secretary feels that steps already taken—to accelerate defense orders, highway construction, public works, and to make housing credit easier—will soon increase job opportunities.

Anderson, along with Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, hopes that the worst in unemployment is past. Recent data on new claims for unemployment compensation, when adjusted for seasonal and end-of-the-quarter peculiarities, afford some basis for thinking that layoffs have reached a crest. But how much is real, how much is wishthinking?

TUG-OF-WAR RECESSION

If only, I thought to myself, I had the gift of extrasensory foresight. Is this really the floor of the recession? Or just a temporary low plateau leading to another economic stepdown, another drop in production, another rise in unemployment? Is it, in short, the transition from recession to depression?

If I thought it were, I'd urge a tax cut to put more money into the pay envelopes of consumers. That would be a stimulus, but it wouldn't necessarily be the stimulus the economy needs. What would consumers, you and I, spend this increased income on? Automobiles? Homes? Appliances? Those are the doldrum industries.

This is a tug-of-war recession—a tug of war between consumers and producers, between buyers and sellers. I could use a new pair of shoes. I've been watching the store windows. But the prices. Nix. I don't need a pair of shoes that badly.

Last night at a dinner I talked to an automobile dealer in the town of Elmer, N. J. (population 1,500). A customer came in the other day, decided on a car, asked the price.

"Seventy-seven dollars per month."

"Too high," said the customer.

The dealer looked up his records. "But the last time you bought, you paid $96 a month."

"That's just it," said the prospective purchaser. "I just can't swing the difference. I'll wait."

EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

For persons who have lost their jobs, there is no such word as recession. Unemployment is a searing, humiliating experience. An emotional depression. And I'm convinced that as an aftermath of this decline there will be social reform. Executives, who sit in high-up offices, drawing excellent pay, overproduced in 1955 and 1956. Their overrich bargains with labor leaders forced up costs and prices. Result: Recession. Executives often pay themselves bonuses in good times. Maybe, instead, they ought to get bonuses based on the stability of their operations, of employment.

Today, the executives who overproduced have a responsibility to get us out of this recession. President Eisenhower says consumer are "disenchanted" with the goods producers offer. To that, I'd add, and the prices.

On the theory that business men will act sensibly in their own and the country's interest, I'd chance waiting on a tax cut. I'm hopeful that out of adversity, recession, will come sales-stimulating price cuts. But I'm waving my economic antenna ahead of me. I hope I'm not wish-thinking—hoping for some miracle man to take the economy by the arm.

I hope President Eisenhower's not wishthinking, either. His wish-thinking is more influential—more consequential—than mine.

Our Embassies Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we are sometimes very apt to be hypercritical of the money spent for and on our embassies abroad.

As a matter of fact, we are penny wise and pound foolish in these matters. All we do is make it impossible for anyone but a multimillionaire to represent us at any of the more important diplomatic posts. While many multimillionaires represent our country admirably, it seems unfortunate that others, notably career diplomats, can never aspire to the highest honors.

In contrast to our system, the nations of the Old World have always believed in, and paid for, adequate representation. The following article from the London Daily Mail shows what the United Kingdom spends on their embassies, and I would like to call your attention to the fact that these figures are in pounds sterling, which now stand at about $2.50:

MOSCOW ENVOY'S EXPENSES SLASHED

Slashing cuts in allowances to Britains envoys in Russia and the satellite states were revealed yesterday.

Britain's Ambassador to Moscow, Sir Patrick Reilly, has his expenses hacked from £36,580 to £13,335.

The Ambassador to Poland takes a similar cut. So does the Minister to Rumania.

The reason: The rate of exchange for the ruble has improved since last April. Its new valuation is about 8½d. now instead of 1s. 9½d.

BRITAIN SAVES

So the cocktail parties, the dinners, the servants, chauffeurs, and secretaries will all cost Britain less.

Diplomat with the biggest expense account is now Sir Harold Caccia, Ambassador in Washington. He draws £30,470 a year expenses.

Sir Gladwyn Jebb, Ambassador in Paris, is allowed £23,597, and Sir Pierson Dixon, Britain's permanent representative at the United Nations, gets £14,940.

Britain's most expensive embassy is Washington, which will cost almost £1,500,000 this year.

Next comes West Germany, with a bill of £788,400.

Spotlight on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., of March 26, 1958:

SPOTLIGHT ON COMMUNISM

The four-day investigation into New England communism by the House Un-American Activities Committee produced dramatic testimony and made major headlines in most daily newspapers of the six-State area.

The committee operates under a public law passed in 1946, authorizing it to study subversive activities with a view toward aiding Congress to create remedial legislation, but many Americans still do not understand its function.

The committee holds hearings, to which it invites witnesses; if hostile, they may be subpoenaed. Testimony is recorded, and often is published in pamphlets available to the public. The committee also may request that books, papers and documents be produced.

What does it do with the information received?

Most of its published documents, containing testimony and conclusions, are widely distributed, not only to Members of Congress, who may be guided in considering new laws, but also to the general public, with the idea that the citizens may know the nature of communism and thus be better able to combat it.

Here are samples of some of the committee's recent conclusions, based on thousands of words of sworn testimony, by the best-informed authorities on communism available, including former party members:

The Soviet satellite in outer space has presented fresh evidence of Soviet Russia's technological progress—a progress made possible to a large degree by the penetration of United States internal defenses by Soviet conspirators and their theft of some of America's most vital military and scientific secrets.

The circumference of the free world has shrunk further in recent months. The epic propaganda setback dealt the Soviet Union by the Hungarian revolution has been largely overcome. The struggle for power within the Kremlin has brought new strength to Khrushchev; America's allies and the so-called neutral nations of the world confront the Communist challenge irresolute and divided.

Communist political subversion, as disclosed by the Committee on Un-American Activities, presents a danger to the American people equaling that of Soviet satellites and long-range missiles.

The Soviet Union would prefer to achieve its program of world conquest without the physical destruction of its enemies; if the gates can be opened from within by dupes and Communist agents, overt aggression by the Soviet Union will obviously be unnecessary. This would be a fulfillment of Lenin's prophecy made at the inception of the international Communist empire:

"First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

The House committee, in its latest report, finds, "Within the United States, the Communist apparatus has evolved new implements of political conquest. These have found root in, and have, in turn, contributed to, a dangerous climate of complacency which itself presents an acute threat to the very foundations of our security system."

Spotlighting communism, as the Boston hearings did very effectively, is one of the best possible ways to overcome lack of awareness of the Red threat as it exists in this and every other State in the Union.

Economic Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Congress has been working overtime hours since the beginning of the year to head off and turn back the current recession.

From the start, the two parties have differed sharply about the right way to conduct this pincer movement. In the beginning, the Republicans accused the Democrats of gloom-mongering. President Eisenhower assured us that the worst was over. Then as unemployment continued to rise, he repeatedly cautioned us against moving too quickly. Now that March has come and gone without the promised recovery, the President again suggests delay. He implies if only we let the economy alone, the natural forces of supply and demand will right the staggering giant and we can all live happily ever after.

I would have greater confidence in the President's optimism if it were not for the fact that this current recession is traceable to unwise economic policies of the President. It is not long since the Federal Reserve Board initiated the so-called tight-money policy in an effort, we were told, to halt inflation. The President and his advisers supported this policy, and talked of creating a "rolling readjustment."

Let us strip the Madison Avenue cover from this slogan. In plain English, a "rolling readjustment" is a small-scale recession. The purpose behind tight-money policy, then, was to make borrowing unattractive and thereby to cause a short recession. The Eisenhower administration believed that a small recession would cause a price roll back that would "restore the health of the economy."

This sounds plausible in theory and some intelligent people accepted it. But it is bad economics. High interest rates cannot affect prices without first affecting employment and production. We have ample proof of this. It happened in 1920, in 1929, in 1937, in 1953, and it has happened again in 1958. The Eisenhower administration was burnt once by tight money, in 1953, but did not learn the lesson. The economy's thirst for goods and for industrial expansion outlived that first Eisenhower recession. The patient took poison but survived, and somehow the notion was broadcast that poison was good for the system.

In spite of economists' warnings, tight-money advocates again undertook to launch a "rolling readjustment" by jacking up interest rates. But this time the economy was in no shape to take poison. Inventories were at record highs. Capital expansion was at a comparative standstill.

We were cast into this trough by faulty notions; we cannot depend on those same notions to raise us up again.

The theory of "rolling readjustments" or small-scale recessions is directly contrary to the principle of full employment which was written into law by Congress in 1946. Despite the terrible lesson of 1929, some Republicans still talk lovingly about the ideal of a "free market." Yet, except for a few Neanderthals, they now accept the reforms begun by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and promise to apply them—"but not just yet."

Along with most other Democrats, I believe in full employment. I believe it is the Government's duty to maintain full employment. And it is to the concept of full employment and to the means for insuring it that I believe our efforts must now be directed.

Accordingly, since early in the session, Democrats in both Houses of Congress have proposed a number of measures designed to repair the damage which the tight-money advocates have wrought. Some of these would take effect immediately. Some are standby measures designed to equip the Government for more drastic action if the situation does not soon improve.

All would supplement the arsenal of defensive and offensive economic weapons left us by the New Deal. Their purpose is not merely to halt the recession in its tracks but also to return us to the high level of prosperity from which we fell.

Already, certain of these measures have sped through Congress under Democratic sponsorship. A pace quickening of the Federal highway program has been authorized. Likewise, a speedup in defense construction.

An emergency housing bill has been approved, lowering downpayment requirements and increasing the Government's mortgage-buying resources. It was on this bill that the philosophical differences between Democrats and Republicans were most clearly shown. The Senate bill, as reported by committee, contained a provision raising the interest rate on GI home loans from 4.5 to 4.75 percent. Senator MONRONEY offered an amendment to keep the rate at 4.5. The final vote was 48 to 47. Six Democrats voted for higher interest rates; 41 voted against. But on the Republican side the vote was 42 for higher rates and only 6 against, and 1 of the tight-money votes came from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

Congress has also passed two resolutions urging the President to act on powers he already holds. One resolution urged stepped up activity on $4 billion of authorized public-works programs. The other asked the President to hold the line for the present on farm price supports to prevent further farm unemployment. This request the President promptly vetoed. Again the difference in party positions is abundantly clear.

The President suggests that the Democrats are moving too quickly. My sole complaint is that the Democratic Party is not moving swiftly enough. I believe that our task is not just to seek revival of the economy with emergency measures but also to improve our defenses against an extended recession. The danger, alluded to by the President himself, is that we will get only a partial revival, that we will stumble along for an indefinite period with a floating corps of jobless workers. Our job, then, is not solely to prevent the unemployment lists from growing. It is to establish full employment now and forever.

To this end, since the beginning of this Congress, I have introduced a series of integrated proposals aimed at increasing our antirecession firepower. These would supplement the heavy artillery which is our precious legacy from the New Deal.

I have sought an increase in the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and in retirement benefits to civil-service employees. These measures would broaden the base of the economy and provide a needed boost in general purchasing power. I have also introduced a number of measures to liberalize the Social Security Act, and have proposed the creation of a Federal Agency for Handicapped. Similarly I am sponsoring a program of national health insurance and a system for distribution of surplus foods to the needy. All of these measures, if enacted, would reduce the severity of an economic slump and, even more important, protect the unemployed from the hardship and heartache which recession necessarily imposes on low-income groups.

A quarter-century has passed since the New Deal programs first went into effect. Price levels have risen sharply. The squeeze is on. Yet we are warned against moving too quickly to adjust the old programs to current prices. I cannot accept this verdict. It is the view of men who adapt slowly—if at all—to the facts of life. They never did understand the economics of free employment.

To fight unemployment successfully, the Federal Government must have a full kit of tools. Accordingly, I have introduced bills calling for the beginning of substantial urban renewal and public-works programs. I have sponsored legislation giving special consideration to areas where unemployment is most acute. This would mean, among other things, preference for these areas on defense orders. In addition, I have submitted companion bills raising income-tax exemptions from $600 per person to $700 or $800 per person. This would put purchasing power directly into the hands of lower income groups. This method is better than the across-the-board percentage cut which has been suggested by some and infinitely more desirable than the upper income tax cut which the administration is reported considering. Again, the difference in viewpoint is perfectly clear cut. The administration still cherishes the utterly false notion that prosperity can be made to trickle down from the highest to the lowest. Give the rich more money, it is suggested, and they will invest it. Investment will turn the wheels of the economy.

Again and again history has revealed how absurd this theory is. Without the expectation of profit, there will be no investment—regardless of the amount of cash jingling in the pockets of the wealthy. Without general purchasing power, there will be no expectation of profit. Our task is to put money in the hands of those who will spend it, creating demand, creating the expectation of profit and finally creating the urge to invest.

Lastly, our task is to help the disaster victims, the men, women, and children who are the helpless heirs of this economic catastrophe. Had this been a hurricane, a cyclone, or a flood, the Red Cross would long since have been on the scene. A Federal assistance plan would have streaked through Congress with the blessing of the President. We can do no less for the victims of recession. Unemployment is not the fault of the unemployed. It is a defect of the system, with results as terrible as any of nature's accidents.

I have therefore introduced a bill extending the unemployment compensation program to 39 weeks, raising benefits to a decent level and imposing Federal standards in the place of patchwork inadequate State standards. This would be paid for half by the States and half by the Federal Government.

Meanwhile, as his administration's contribution, the President proposes Federal loans to the States in place of grants. I reject this approach. Once more it spotlights the fundamental inability of the Republican Party to cope with economic crisis. Our economy cannot be Balkanized into 48 parts. We are strong only as we pool our substance and share our risks.

Unfortunately, economic logic will not prevail over hesitancy and stubbornness in the White House. The Federal Government can do its part only if it has the equipment. If the President will not furnish the necessary leadership, then it must come from the Congress. The differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties are sharply drawn. I, for one, am prepared to submit the record for the public's judgment.

National Conference on American Political Parties, Under Auspices of Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the survival of democracy in a troubled world depends in great measure upon how well our people understand and appreciate the democratic process. Political parties are the lungs through which American democracy receives the oxygen essential to its continued operation.

I have just attended one of the most inspirational and useful conferences ever held on the functioning, methods and future of American political parties. The locale was Hayden Lake, in the magnificent timbered mountains and hills of northern Idaho. The conference was sponsored by Gonzaga University of nearby Spokane, Wash. The theme of the conference was described by the title, "National Conference on Political Parties."

Participating were 60 to 70 leading political scientists and public figures from throughout the Nation. The Ford Foundation generously granted to Gonzaga University the sum of $16,000 to underwrite the expenses of the conference and to make possible the necessary travel to Hayden Lake by train, airplane and private automobile.

For 3 days, in a scenic realm of outdoor America, the participants evaluated such crucial questions as broadening the base of our major parties, trying to solve the dilemma of huge campaign donations, and coping with the danger of dominance in politics of special-privilege-seeking forces. Guiding light of the conference was a brilliant teacher of political science at Gonzaga, Father Richard E. Twohy, who persuaded officers of the Ford Foundation that such an undertaking was a worthy contribution to maintaining and strengthening our national traditions of self-government.

I consider it a privilege to be on the program of the conference, along with my able and distinguished colleagues, the senior and junior Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. All of my colleagues made most valuable addresses, as did the brilliant young Representative from the State of Missouri, RICHARD BOLLING.

As the conference ended, I heard many of the participants—from academic as well as political spheres—declare emphatically that their own thinking on the role of American parties had been greatly clarified and enlarged.

Mr. President, I should like Members of the Senate to know something further about this impressive meeting at Hayden Lake, near the Washington-Idaho border, which took place from April 10 through April 13. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the formal program of the National Conference on Political Parties; an Associated Press dispatch from the Oregon Daily Journal of April 3, 1958, setting forth some of the colorful details of the meeting; and a summary of my own speech to the conference on April 12, in which I reviewed my sponsorship of legislation modeled after President Theodore Roosevelt's proposal of 1907, for Federal financing of the major expenses of national political campaigns in the United States.

These materials may serve to encourage similar conferences elsewhere in the Nation, a circumstance which I fervently trust may occur.

There being no objection, the program, article, and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONFER UPON THE COMMON CRISIS—THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON POLITICAL PARTIES

Inherent in the term "democracy" is the presumption of individual participation.

Essential to the life of the State is the presumption of its ability to govern.

Lacking either or both of these components, the democratic state confronts ruin.

Political errors compounded since World War I underscore a common crisis: Does America possess the capacity to balance the forces released by science with the political wisdom and skill required to direct those forces to civilized ends?

ORIGIN AND OBJECT

The developing crisis of our political system has been under discussion by an increasing number of business, labor, farm, educational and political leaders of the Northwest. The problem, however, is not regional, but national.

Hence, the Ford Foundation has granted Gonzaga University $16,000 to bring together 60 to 70 leading citizens from private life and public office to study American political parties—the principal agencies supplying personnel and policy direction to government, and the official link between government and the people.

FORM OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference is designed to provide an opportunity for the fullest expression of opinion by each participant.

Five major topics will be initiated by keynote speakers.

Following these brief introductory talks, conferees will divide into three groups for further discussion.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Can our party system, without sacrificing its popular base, achieve a higher integration within the limits of our Constitution and pluralistic society?

The practicality of adjusting our diffused party structure and functions to meet more adequately the demands of national and international policy. The relevance to this problem of alternative methods of supporting party candidates and campaigns.

II. Do political parties realize their full potential in providing Government at once democratic and responsible?

The need of a more precise rationale for the American party system.

The practicality of providing for the national interest in domestic and foreign affairs by a system of party brokerage designed to respond fairly to the accumulative pressures of competing interest groups.

The relation of party leadership to this problem.

The use of communications media by parties and their joint responsibility to the public.

III. What is the role of the opposition party in policy formation?

The function of the "loyal opposition" in providing a strong and definite alternative government.

The role of bipartisanship in foreign affairs.

The opposition's function in building leadership.

IV. What is the role of interest groups in the American political system?

The positive function of interest groups in collaborating with parties and government in formulation of public policy.

Conversely, the conflict between individual and national interests.

The ethical problems involved here.

V. What is the role of universities in furthering the objectives of the American political system?

The responsibility of universities to expound the moral basis of democratic society, citizenship and party government.

How universities can best cooperate with politicians and citizen groups in serving the political needs of the country.

Sponsored by Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

Consultants: Gov. Robert E. Smylie, Idaho; United States Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; United States Senator Frank F. Church, Idaho; United States Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington; United States Senator Henry M. Jackson, Washington.

Advisory committee: Rev. Richard E. Twohy, S. J. Gonzaga University, chairman; Dr. Boyd A. Martin, University of Idaho; Dr. Hugh A. Bone, University of Washington; Dr. Daniel M. Ogden, Jr., Washington State College; Mr. Richard T. Tench, Gonzaga University.

[From the Oregon Journal of April 3, 1958]

UNUSUAL CONFERENCE ORGANIZED BY PRIEST

HAYDEN LAKE, IDAHO.—A Catholic priest with $16,000 and a yen to promote an abstract government study puts his means and extremes together next week for an unusual conference of practical politicians.

Big names in education, labor and social welfare have agreed to meet in the Rev. Richard E. Twohy's first "national conference on political parties" at this secluded lake resort April 10-13.

Such practitioners as Senators NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon; MCNAMARA, Democrat of Michigan; BENNETT, Republican of Utah; JACKSON, Democrat of Washington; Republican Gov. Cecil Underwood of West Virginia; and Democratic Chairman Paul Butler will eat and sleep here, talk and think for 4 days about the state of the democratic process.

Father Twohy, 44, chairman of political science at Gonzaga University in Spokane, conceived the idea. He foresaw great merit in a quiet, informal roundtable of leaders from "the three great organs of our civilization—the stadium (universities), the regnum (civil powers) and the sacrum (churches)."

He switched from the academic to the practical, flew to New York and telephoned Henry Heald, president of the Ford Foundation. He wrote down his proposal in the telephone booth and then spent 20 minutes with Heald..

The Ford Foundation sent a $16,000 check 2 months later to pay expenses for 60 conferees.

Father Twohy then went after the biggest names. At Independence, Mo., Harry Truman showed him through his library, discussed the conference for an hour, then said: "It's a splendid plan. I'd love to come. Nobody knows more about the subject than I do."

But Truman was committed on the dates. The Jesuit priest then buttonholed Adlai Stevenson, Richard Nixon, and Thomas E. Dewey. All indorsed the conference but their schedules were full.

He finally lined up 5 Senators, 4 Congressmen, including Representatives McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota, and Bolling, Democrat of Missouri; at least 2 governors, 2 college presidents, Chairman Jerome Kuykendall, of the Federal Power Commission, noted professors from Yale, the University of Chicago and UCLA, and Industrialist Edgar Kaiser.

Bertha Adkins, assistant chairman of the National Republican Committee, agreed to come along with Vice President James Carey, of the AFL–CIO and top echelon officers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the American Medical Association. Father Twohy's own father James Twohy, a Los Angeles finance executive will represent the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

With Republican Gov. Robert Smylie, of Idaho as consultant, Father Twohy mapped his program and picked this quiet resort area to "provide a coign of contemplation, to offer the harried man of great affairs the chance he often says he wants and needs to separate the urgent from the important, the passing frenzy from the value that endures."

FINANCING OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, NOT OCCASIONAL GIFTS, IS GREATEST PROBLEM OF ETHICS IN DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT NEUBERGER TELLS GONZAGA CONFERENCE ON POLITICAL PARTIES

SPOKANE.—"As long as candidates for the Nation's highest elective offices must regularly seek hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from private donors, it is futile to pursue ethics in Government with conflict-in-interest laws and rules about civil servants accepting small courtesy gifts at Christmas," Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER of Oregon told the Natinal Conference on Political Parties under the auspices of Gonzaga University, Saturday April 12.

Underwritten by the Ford Foundation, the Gonzaga-sponsored conference at Hayden Lake, near Spokane, Wash., covered analyses of many phases of the political party system in modern American politics, with participants drawn from the fields of politics, educaton, labor, the professions, business, religion and communications.

"The recurring fuss over occasional airplane tickets, resort visits, speaking fees or Christmas hams fades into insignificance when compared with $30 million campaign treasuries to elect a President and $1 million exchequers to back a Senator or governor in a big industrial State," said NEUBERGER, who was elected to the Senate in 1954 as the first Democrat from his Pacific Northwest State in 40 years. True elimination of conflicts of interest will remain an elusive goal until an effective method is adopted to free public officials from being virtual prisoners of the huge campaign funds needed to reach the public through modern means of mass communication.

The Oregon Senator proposed that the dilemma be solved by adopting the recommendation first made by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907, for Federal financing of the Federal election campaigns of the major political parties in order to liberate candidates from dependence on large private contributions. Teddy Roosevelt made this recommendation to the Congress half a century ago, long before the era of radio and TV and other costly modern political necessities. Yet even when election costs were only a tiny fraction of what they are today, this great and progressive Republican President spelled out the evil in a system under which officeholders must rely on donors with special interests for the wherewithal of their electors to office.

NEUBERGER described in detail legislation he has proposed in the Senate to put the Teddy Roosevelt plan into law by having the Federal Treasury underwrite certain election expenses as a "necessary cost of democratic government." This would be done by entitling major party candidates in Federal elections to Federal financial support based on a formula of 20 cents for each voter in the district; by Federally-purchased broadcast time made available on equal terms to opposing candidates; by offering a tax credit of up to $10 to every taxpayer for a legitimate individual political contribution made by him to a candidate or party of his choice; and by matching-fund grants to States for voters' pamphlets to make information about candidates and issues available free to all registered voters.

All such Federal support would be subject to two conditions, NEUBERGER explained: (1) That the candidate's campaign keep within legally set limits all its other expenditures from private sources; and (2) that the candidate receive at least 10 percent of the total vote cast, or forfeit a bond he must deposit in the amount of one-half the Federal contribution to his campaign. The 10 percent rule is necessary to rule out splinter-party or self-starting candidates running "for the purse," NEUBERGER said. "Under such a limitation, the Bull Moose candidacy of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 and the Progressives of 'Fighting Bob' La Follette in 1924 would have passed the 10 percent qualifying level; the various Socialist, Communist and Dixiecrat tickets we have had would have forfeited their bonds."

The Oregon Senator said that, in his opinion, present campaign reporting laws are barely worth the paper they are printed on. "Even if they are amended and modernized, they would be useless unless affirmative responsibility for investigation and enforcement of reporting requirements is placed in the hands of an independent agency, removed as far as possible from politics.

"Can politicians, no matter how honest, satisfy the public that they are enforcing the election laws against themselves? I have proposed that the Comptroller General—a nonpolitical long-term official who is also outside of the executive branch—should have authority and responsibility to audit and investigate all spending in election campaigns, not just that which appears on filed reports. Campaign financing should be subject to at least as effective scrutiny as income tax returns are today—then maybe it would be possible to keep check on the size and sources of campaign treasuries.

"Most of the men and women I have met in Congress and in the legislature of my State are honest and trustworthy," NEUBERGER told his luncheon audience. "They would be outraged and shocked at any suggestion of taking money to influence their judgment on any policy issue which might come before them for decision. Yet to reach their own electorate, to influence the public to vote for them over their opponents, our system forces them to accept vast sums in campaign contributions from sources who have a direct stake in those policy issues.

"Moreover, this system invariably gives one candidate greater financial resources than another with which to place his program, or at least his profile, before the public—and thus actually denies the public a fair and equal choice," the Senator stated. "There is hardly an equal, democratic election between one candidate whose name has been heralded in billboards, newspaper ads and TV spectaculars and another who has been speaking from street corner soapboxes. Only if, by equal Federal financing accompanied by limits on private spending, we help all candidates to reach the public, can we eliminate the dollar from politics and speak of '1 man, 1 vote.'

"These are the implications for our philosophy of democracy, when a total of at least $200 million was spent on all the political campaigns—Federal, State and local—in 1956," NEUBERGER said. "The largest blocks of these campaign funds, and these are the ones politicians must largely rely on, came from a relatively small number of people. The implicit dangers to free, democratic government are obvious—and far greater than the danger from lobbying and petty favoritism—yet when election campaign costs have skyrocketed with the use of modern communications techniques, where is a candidate for elective office to get the money? Don't forget that Judge Leibowitz withdrew from a mayoralty race in New York because he said he had been advised that he would need a treasure chest of as much as a million dollars to be elected."

NEUBERGER said that the alternative of grassroots participation in political campaign financing would be encouraged by his proposal to allow each individual taxpayer one $10 tax credit annually for a legitimate contribution to a political party or candidate. "Tax incentives have been suggested by various bills introduced in recent years, but they would have to be in the form of a small tax credit of this kind rather than $100 deductions, as has been proposed," he said. "A credit taken directly against the tax would affect each taxpayer and voter equally. But a $100 tax deduction could mean that the Treasury in effect would put up as much as three-fourths of the $100 contributions of a wealthy industrialist and his wife, while it put up only about 20 percent of the smaller sum contributed by a bus driver or saw-mill worker. Such an unequal policy obviously could not be sustained."

The Red Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle of April 9, 1958:

THE RED MENACE

J. Edgar Hoover's new book, Masters of Deceit, carries the subtitle of "The Story of Communism in America and How To Fight It," and surely no one in America is better equipped to write such a book because no man is more familiar with the story.

Mr. Hoover is particularly concerned with the danger of discounting the menace of communism in the United States. It is true that party membership has declined. It reached its peak of 80,000 in 1944, dropped to 22,600 in 1955, and has gone down farther since then. However, no less an authority than William Z. Foster has said: "We no longer measure the importance of revolutionary organizations by size. In some places where there are only 1 or 2 men more results are obtained than where they have larger organizations. * * *" If conditions are ripe, a comparative handful can take over a nation—and they have done exactly that time and time again. To quote Mr. Hoover: "Under communism, a tiny minority, perhaps 10 to 20 men, would rule the United States. An open dictatorship called the dictatorship of the proletariat would be established." Communist Party henchmen would take over, and opposition would be ruthlessly liquidated.

What can the individual do about the danger? Mr. Hoover's answer is "a lot." He must know the answers to communism's false claims. If what appears to be subversive activity comes to his attention he should report it, sticking to the facts, to the nearest FBI office—and the FBI, incidentally, is as much interested in protecting civil rights, including the right to hold unpopular opinions, as it is in combating those who would destroy us. He should be alert and informed. No one can fight communism if he doesn't know what to look for. In this connection, Masters of Deceit contains a glossary, in which terms frequently used by communists are listed and defined, which will be especially valuable to those whose familiarity with the movement is sketchy.

Nasser's Double Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent happenings in the Middle East and the machinations of Dictator Nasser have been little understood and poorly interpreted in this country. For this reason I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the April 7, 1958, issue of the New Republic entitled "Nasser's Double Victory" wherein the real meaning of recent happenings in the Middle East is set forth. The article follows:

NASSER'S DOUBLE VICTORY

Colonel Nasser has just won a double victory which necessitates a sharp change in United States Middle Eastern policy. Within 24 hours he eliminated two of his most dangerous rivals and brought himself closer still to realizing his dream as the Bismarck of Arab unity.

On March 23 Nasser accepted the resignation of General Bizri, former commander in chief of the Syrian Army and the last survivor of the pro-Communist triumvirate which was steadily increasing its power in Syria before the creation of the United Arab Republic. (The other two, Khalid Baqdash, the brilliant young leader of the Syrian Communist Party, and the Deputy Prime Minister, Khaled al Azm, were removed from their positions just as soon as the Syrian-Egyptian union was formed.)

Bizri's resignation also consolidates Nasser's personal control of the Syrian Army; its other leaders, including the formidable chief of intelligence, Colonel Sarraj, were given civilian jobs in the new administra-

tion. It was Bizri who, during the crisis between Turkey and Syria last autumn, organized the home guard which some western commentators saw as the tool for a Communist coup d'etat. Bizri's resignation now makes Nasser's control of Syria complete. And, at least, until after Nasser's coming visit to Moscow, it is hard to see what can prevent consolidation of Syria into the United Arab Republic.

In Saudi Arabia, however, the United States need not be so impotent. On March 24 King Saud, of Arabia, published a decree handing full power over his kingdom's foreign, internal, and economic affairs to his brother, Crown Prince Emir Faisal, who was already Prime Minister and Foreign Minister.

The reason which has most often been given is King Saud's failure to rebut accusations that he financed an attempt to assassinate Colonel Nasser; thus throughout the Arab world Faisal's rise is seen as a major triumph for Egypt. But this interpretation may be too simple. King Saud's decadent way of life and the corruption of his court have led to growing unrest in recent years. Despite colossal oil revenues, there has been no improvement in the living standards of the average Arabian, and the country has been so far totally unresponsive to the revolutionary social challenge which has begun to transform the other Arab States.

On the death of Saud's venerated father, the unifier of Arabia, a group of young, literate Saudis in the army, the government bureaucracies, and the urban middle class organized an underground—the Saudi Reform Movement. Instead of instituting reforms, Saud called out the tribal levies and gave power to the religious reactionaries. Wholesale expulsion of Palestinians, Syrians, and Lebanese accompanied by numerous executions of Saudis failed to bring to a halt the growth of the reform movement.

However, when Saud's dispute with Britain over the Buraimi Oasis and his southern boundary led him to finance—with his oil dollars—Nasser's political drive against Britain in Jordan and Syria, Nasser's (and the Communists') support of Saud as a loyal and valued ally in the struggle against imperialism persuaded most of the members of the Saudi reform movement to remain silent.

Despite Saud's efforts to save Hussein in Jordan and his flirtations with Iraq, Nasser did not move until Saud's oil dollars could no longer be effective in Syria. When his propaganda machine finally attacked Saud, however, Saud's days of independence were numbered. This fact was recognized in Saudi Arabia if not in Washington and, to appease Nasser, Faisal was given control of the Government. (Whether by prior agreement or not is immaterial; Nasser ceased his attacks on Saud on the same day.)

With full powers over internal (including the army), foreign, and financial policies Prince Faisal has become the only man with whom we can deal. But Faisal cannot, as we asked his brother Saud to do, implement what currently passes for United States Middle East policy. He does not have the necessary support in Saudi Arabia to risk it if he were willing. All our efforts should be to aid and encourage Faisal to institute the reforms that will bring him such support and that will in turn free him from dependence on Nasser.

For Faisal to consolidate his power he must not only eliminate his dependence on his royal brothers and the tribes with whom they are allied through their mothers and wives but also his dependence on the religious fanatics on whom his brother leaned. To rely on them will mean absolute dependence on Nasser. The reform movement and the rich merchants of the Hedjaz can form the basis of sound support for progressive reform. The sympathy and active encouragement of the United States (particularly an open-mindedness to what progressive Saudis feel are inequities in the Arabian-American Oil Co.'s policies and practice) may be the the essential element in persuading Faisal to risk reform and independence rather than the status quo as Nasser's satellite.

More Tax Windfalls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, in this week when millions of Americans will be filing their income-tax returns with the various collectors of internal revenue, I call attention to an editorial More Tax Windfall which appeared in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

These newspapers have been supporting the rewriting of the income-tax laws on the grounds that the more than 10,000 pages of regulations at present in force are making it necessary for more and more citizens to go to experts to fill out tax forms, and that if we had a simpler law and fewer regulations, the taxes of most of us, including businesses, would be reduced.

The efforts of the Scripps-Howard newspapers in this direction, which began with a fine series of articles by Jack Steele, impress me as being a notable public service.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this brief editorial in the RECORD as an example of the efforts of these newspapers to acquaint the public with the growing problems of taxation:

MORE TAX WINDFALLS

Our tax collector, the Internal Revenue Service, has just issued another set of regulations based on the 1954 Internal Revenue Code.

This is a constant process. New interpretations are coming out all the time. They are supposed to clear up misunderstandings but often have a reverse effect.

Among the latest rulings is one dealing with what is called in-service training—and it's retroactive to 1954, by the way. If you require more education to hold your job, you can deduct your expenses from your income-tax payments.

Now you can't deduct anything if you acquire this added learning for the purpose of taking another job, or advancing in your shop, or if you just do it for the general improvement of your mind—or, in the language of IRS, for personal purposes.

The way we read it, it looks like it would depend on what the tax collector believes your intent to be. But we are not so concerned with these specifics as we are with the general proposition.

This is just one of a sea of regulatings, emanating periodically from here in Washington, which keep adding to the mess we call our tax law. As Scripps-Howard writer Jack Steele pointed out in his series of tax articles published in the News last January, the law starts out by saying everybody is to be taxed alike. Then it goes on for 1,000 pages listing exceptions to this wholesome rule.

It is because the law is so loaded with gimmicks, special treatment, exemptions and exceptions that all these interpretations are necessary.

The result is a sieve. And because the law leaks so much, the tax rates necessarily are much higher. And the regulations so complex only a legal bird dog can find his way through them.

The only way we'll ever get a really fair, simple tax system is to cut out all the gimmicks and write a tax law designed only to raise revenue—not for economic, social or political aims, or to satisfy the demands of some pressure group. If that fine day ever comes, most of us will be paying less than now.

American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I call to the attention of the House a rather penetrating report on American policy in the Middle East. This report is filed by a distinguished Southern editor of a great newspaper, the Nashville Tennesseean.

The Honorable Creed C. Black, executive editor of this newspaper, has just returned from a 6-week, 20,000-mile tour of 12 countries in the Middle East and Western Europe.

Black traveled under a grant from the Southern Association of Nieman Fellows and made a study of American policy in the Middle East.

Stories on the individual countries he visited were published while he was abroad. In this article, he summarizes his findings and presents his conclusions.

The article follows:

OUR MOTIVES ARE SUSPECT—UNITED STATES NEEDS AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL OF MIDEAST PROBLEM

(By Creed C. Black)

Like nearly everything else in the turbulent Middle East, the position of the United States there is changing dramatically.

It is not, unfortunately, a change for the better.

Our prestige is sinking, our influence is waning, and even our motives are now suspect.

Once widely respected in this crucial area as the international champion of free peoples everywhere, we now are often lumped with Britain and France in embittered blasts at western imperialists.

And things stand to get worse, much to Russia's delight and benefit, until Washington comes to grips with the major issues that dominate the Middle East today—Arab nationalism and Israel.

As it now stands, our policy for this historic land on conflict and crisis is primarily concerned with one major objective: keeping the area out of Russian hands.

For both the Western World and the Middle East itself, that is unquestionably a legitimate and supremely important goal. Commercially, economically, and strategically, the best interests of both will be served by keeping the sea routes and Suez Canal open, by the continued flow of the area's oil to western markets, and by the independence of the Middle Eastern countries.

WE'RE HELPING REDS

Ironically, however, our preoccupation with the Communist threat and our attempts to commit the Middle East to an alliance with the West are doing the very

thing we are trying to head off—strengthening Russia's position in the area.

This is not true, it should be quickly added, in Greece, Turkey and Iran. For those countries have all had experience with Russia's imperialist aims and are solidly committed, militarily and otherwise, to the West.

But it is a different story in the Arab world. These countries have had little experience with Russian imperialism. They remember instead the years they spent under British and French colonial rule.

They remember, too, the attack Britain, France, and Israel launched on Egypt less than 2 years ago, which certainly must go down as the biggest blunder of the Western World has made in the Middle East since Israel's creation 10 years ago.

They also have an eye cocked toward neighboring north Africa, where even today France is waging a war—in part with American arms—in a last-gasp attempt to hold on to the remnants of its diminishing colonial empire.

And they hold the West—especially the United States—responsible for the creation and preservation of Israel, which is considered not only a mortal enemy bent on expansion but a symbol of Western imperialism.

WHO IS THE WOLF?

When the United States continually emphasizes the Russian threat to the Middle East, therefore, it is talking about danger from a source that the countries there consider far less of a threat than some of our own friends.

Similarly, when we try to get politico-military commitments from these countries, we not only run up against a backlog of antiwestern ill will but arouse suspicions that we want to infringe on the independence they have finally achieved after years of foreign rule.

A Syrian diplomat with whom I talked summed all this up when he said:

"Russian imperialism is discussed only in very narrow circles here because we are tied up with our own problems, brought about by western imperialism. We know nothing about eastern imperialism. And there has been proof of Soviet willingness to help us escape western imperialism.

"What we want most is to keep our independence, and we are ready to resist anybody who tries to infiltrate us, whether from the East or the West. To try to force us to take sides—by joining pacts or accepting United States bases, for example—is not in line with our desire for independence."

And the desire to exercise that independence and regain a place in the sun for the Arab world is the strongest force sweeping the Middle East today.

EVEN MORE URGENT

As a problem for the United States, the question of how to deal with it is now even more urgent than the Israeli issue. And it canot be met successfully by clinging to our current insistence on viewing everything in the Middle East in terms of the cold war with Russia.

It is true that the Arab world itself has now split into two major conflicting blocs and a third group of neutrals. It is also true that the strongest partner in one of these blocs, Iraq, is a member of the Baghdad pact and that the other, Jordan, is dependent on United States economic aid for its survival. And it is further true that one of the neutrals, Lebanon, is oriented westward and that the other, Saudi Arabia, is at least not unfriendly toward the West.

But in none of these countries does the government enjoy the popular support that is accorded the United Arab Republic headed by President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Nasser is undoubtedly the man of the hour in the Middle East, for he has become a symbol of a new order that has captured the imagination of the Arab masses—a new order that represents a break with the past, revives ancient dreams of pan-Arab glory, and promises to deliver the people from the disease, poverty, and ignorance that now engulf them.

The Kings in Iraq, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, symbolize a link with the past, not a look into a better future. And they are currently holding their power only with military force. Lebanon, too, is feeling the pressure of Nasser's popularity, and the democratic government there is finding its neutral role increasing difficult to maintain.

THEY CAN'T AGREE

Perhaps these governments will survive, in one form or another. Time and again I was told that the inability of two Arabs to agree on anything for long makes it unlikely that the dreams of a unified Arab state from Baghdad to Cairo will ever come to pass.

It is a mistake, however, to think that Nasser is just a passing fancy. For he is the product, not the creator, of feelings that run deep. If he passes from the scene, others will rise to take his place and mobilize the emotions of a frustrated people.

In these circumstances, it seems to me that the United States is wrong in trying to isolate Nasser out of a fear that his so-called positive neutralism is actually pro-communism.

He is not, I am convinced, either Communist or pro-Communist. On the contrary, he has cracked down hard on Communists in Egypt and is now doing the same thing in Syria.

Nasser and his spokesmen probably exaggerate their charges that they have been forced to deal with Russia because of repeated rebuffs from the United States and other Western powers. The truth is that they want to work both sides of the street.

But the record is replete with instances in which Nasser has turned to Russia only after the West rejected his requests or stalled indefinitely or attached conditions that he insisted would compromise Arab independence.

EAGER HELPERS

There is a danger, of course, that in trying to play a Titoist role the inexperienced Nasser will be ensnared by the Russians, who have eagerly supplied the weapons, economic aid and markets that the West has chosen to deny the Egyptian leader.

But the best way to avert that danger, I believe, is to accept the Arabs' neutralism, as expounded by Nasser, and encourage their nationalism—with our friendship and help—so that they may develop strong and prosperous countries in which communism will have no appeal.

The alternative is to force Nasser into increasing dependence on the crafty Russians and further alienate the Arab masses who now heroize him.

It is not necessary to choose between the rival Arab blocs. It is necessary only to recognize that at this point the young Arab States want their independence respected as they grapple with vast problems at home and that they do not want to become involved in a bitter struggle between two world giants.

"Young people in the United States," an Egyptian editor told me, "make a mistake in judging the Arab world by your own 1958 mentality. We're about at the same stage you were in the days of George Washington. And remember that he warned your young Nation to avoid entangling alliances and stay out of Europe's quarrels."

While accepting Arab neutralism would require a major shift in American foreign policy, it can be more easily accomplished than a solution to the other major question plaguing us in the Middle East today—Israel.

UNITED DISTASTE

Whatever the state of their current relations with the American Government, all the Arab countries are united in their distaste for our role in trying to turn the clock back 2,000 years, as one Jordanian expressed it.

Although Russia supported the United Nations resolution creating Israel and was one of the first countries to recognize the new state, it has long since cast its lot with the Arabs on this issue and, much to our disadvantage, feeds their hatred of the Jews at every opportunity.

Even in Lebanon, which is probably the most pro-Western of all the Arab countries, a foreign-ministry spokesman called the creation of Israel the major United States blunder in the Middle East.

"From it," he said, "spring all other difficulties in your relations with the Arab world."

It is 10 years too late, of course, to remove this source of friction entirely. For better or for worse, preservation of the state of Israel is a firm commitment of American policy.

NOT TOO LATE

But it is not too late to try to ease the tension by working for a solution of some troublesome issues that time is aggravating, not solving.

Although the extremist Arab press and radio talk belligerently of driving Israel into the sea, my conversations with responsible officials convinced me that they are prepared to settle for something less than that.

The minimum terms would probably have to include:

1. Token repatriation of some of the 900,000 Palestine refugees and compensation for the property of the rest.

2. Border adjustments that would require Israel to give up some, but by no means all, of the area it won in its 1947 war with the Arabs.

3. An outside guaranty against future aggression by either side.

No solution, of course, is going to please both sides. But until the homeless refugees are settled somewhere, the borders fixed, and the mutual fears of aggression allayed, there can be no hope for real stability in the Middle East.

And as long as the United States continues to pour far more money into Israel than into any of the Arab states without actively working for a settlement of the problem, any effort we make to improve our relations with the Middle East will be severely handicapped.

TWO SOLUTIONS NEEDED

Like the nationalism issue, the question of Israel would exist quite apart from the basic East-West conflict. New approaches to both problems are needed if we are to retain the influence and position we desire in the Middle East.

Despite the handicaps we face in the area, I believe that deep down there is a reservoir of good will toward America in the Middle East, thanks largely to our own tradition of independence and anticolonialism.

Our problem now is to bring that good will to the surface by identifying ourselves as friends, not enemies, of Arab nationalism.

And that can be done if Washington will only recognize the fundamental truth of an observation by one of America's top diplomats in the Middle East:

"You can't meet a dynamite situation with static policies."

To Press Economic Assault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial appearing in the April 14 edition

of the Hartford Times, the editors discuss seriously the importance of international economic competition with the Soviet Union for the markets of the world. They point out that Lenin set an important goal in the Soviet policy when he stated "Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

They regard uncontrollable inflation as one of the greatest threats to the welfare of this Nation and the free world.

Because I believe the point here is well taken, I submit this editorial for inclusion in the RECORD.

TO PRESS ECONOMIC ASSAULT

The cold war may be entering into a new phase, at least into a stepped-up activity against the West. Khrushchev has declared that communism will win the struggle against capitalist nations "not by war but by raising labor productivity, increasing the output of goods and building up its economy. Then we shall see who eats better and who has more clothing."

That victory may be in doubt or at least a long way off but there are stern competitive factors involved which present a challenge to the United States bid for the foreign markets. Our home markets are not in jeopardy as they can be protected by tariffs against cheaper Russian goods. But this device is not available to us in foreign markets.

Russia is largely self-contained. It has tremendous natural resources. Its manpower and its brain power have high potential in the new upsurge of the Russian spirit. National pride can go far in promoting export trade even at the cost of self-denial in regard to consumer goods. The British people have been doing this since the war.

In the United States, the competition will challenge us in our strongest sector—mass production at prices and quality that other nations can hardly match. Management and labor may find it necessary to join hands in future effort to compete with Russian competition in foreign markets. This is bound to be a long contest. Probably it will have no foreseeable end.

We should remember that Moscow has an ultimate objective—smash capitalism. One has but to remember a statement from Lenin's writings which points the way for Red policy:

"Someday we shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

Uncontrollable inflation is inherently suited to do that very thing. We are possibly facing more ominous danger to our way of life on the economic front than from Red military conquest.

Having held Russia at bay with our defense program, it may now become a test of strength in the markets of the world whether we can stem the march of communism.

World Peace Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, "there can be no peace without law." In his introduction to World Peace Through World Law, recently published by Harvard University Press, Grenville Clark quotes these words from President Eisenhower's pronouncement of October 31, 1958, as the fundamental premise of this book.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments and summary of contents which appear on the jacket of the book World Peace Through World Law, by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn:

"The proposition 'no peace without law' embodies the conception that peace cannot be insured by a continued arms race, nor by an indefinite 'balance of terror,' nor by diplomatic maneuver, but only by the acceptance of institutions corresponding in the world field to those which maintain 'law and order' in local communities and nations.

"This book sets forth a comprehensive and detailed plan for the maintenance of world peace in the form of a proposed revision of the United Nations Charter. In so doing the purpose is to contribute material for the worldwide discussions which must precede the establishment of truly effective institutions for the prevention of war."

The revision which the authors propose would retain the structure of the charter's 111 articles and supplement those articles, as revised, by 7 annexes. These revisions and annexes would strengthen the United Nations through the establishment of world legislative, executive, and judicial institutions, backed up by a strong world police force.

This practical plan also calls for complete national disarmament by stages under strict inspection, a nuclear energy authority, a world development authority to promote the economic and social development of the underdeveloped areas of the world, a United Nations revenue system, and a Bill of Rights.

In preparation for 7 years, the book represents the first attempt to spell out in explicit detail, rather than in the usual generalities, all the world institutions and basic rules which are required for the effective prevention of war. The plan provides strict limits on the proposed powers of the strengthened United Nations and presents the minimum requirements for peace rather than a utopian scheme for a perfect world community. Since preliminary drafts were widely distributed for criticism, this plan takes into account the views of many qualified persons in many nations. The authors do not purport to have all the final answers to the various thorny problems, but believe that these detailed and specific proposals will aid the necessary worldwide discussion.

The need for a plan such as this must be recognized by anyone in any nation who is interested in the problem of attaining peace—which means almost everyone, everywhere.

THE AUTHORS

The authors of this book are eminently qualified to formulate a workable plan for world peace. Both are distinguished lawyers, well versed in international law and relations. Their collaboration began in 1945.

Grenville Clark was graduated from Harvard Law School in 1906 and served in the United States Army during the First World War. He was the initiator of the Selective Service Act of 1940 and was consultant to Secretary of War Stimson in 1940–44. Since 1939 he has engaged in research and study on the problem of world order and is the author of A Plan for Peace (1950).

Louis B. Sohn was born in Poland, received his bachelor of laws at John Casimir University, Lwow, in 1935, and his master of laws from Harvard in 1940. Professor Sohn was a legal officer in the United States Secretariat and in 1951 joined the faculty of the Harvard Law School, where he now teaches courses in United Nations law and problems in the development of world order.

A SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Proposed Revised Charter: Purposes; Membership; Organs; General Assembly; Executive Council; Settlement of Disputes; Threats to the Peace, Aggression, etc.; Regional Arrangements; Economic and Social Advancement; Economic and Social Council; Non-Self-Governing Territories; Trusteeship System; Trusteeship Council; Judicial System; Secretariat; Miscellaneous; Transitional Security; Amendments; Ratification.

Annex I. Disarmament: Basic Principle; Plan and Procedure; Maintenance of Disarmament; Inspection, Authority, and Limitations; Nuclear Energy Authority; Financial Provisions; Enforcement.

Annex II. U. N. Peace Force: Basic Principles; Organization and Functions; Enlargement in Emergency; Transitional Arrangements.

Annex III. Judicial and Conciliation System: The Statutes of: International Court of Justice, World Equity Tribunal, World Conciliation Board, Regional Courts of the United Nations.

Annex IV. World Development Authority: Outline; Comment.

Annex V. Revenue System of the U. N.: Main Features; Limit on Annual Budgets; Apportionment; Procedures for Preparation, Adoption, etc., of Budgets Limitations on Sources; Need for Large and Reliable Revenue; Borrowing Power; Summary.

Annex VI. Privileges and Immunities: Privileges and Immunities of: United Nations Itself, Representatives in General Assembly, Officials, Permanent Observers, Others Entitled to Attend Meetings; General Provisions; Comment.

Annex VII. Bill of Rights: Outline and Comment.

Appendix A, The 1945 Charter: Text of: Articles 1–111, Statute of the International Court of Justice.

Appendix B, Proposed Revised Charter: Text of: Revised Articles I–III, Proposed Annex I on Disarmament, Proposed Annex II on U. N. Peace Force; Outlines of Proposed Annexes III–VII.

Geneva Convention on the Law of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, if momentarily I might have the attention of the Membership of the House, particularly on my side of the aisle, let me point up the moral responsibility of the administration under the Republican Party platform as adopted in San Francisco in 1956 to protect the rights of American fishermen in the international field. Here, I have reference to the preamble of the platform entitled "Declaration of Faith," and in that connection let me read its clear and unequivocal assurance, and I quote as follows:

We maintain that no treaty or international agreement can deprive any of our citizens of constitutional rights. We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries attempts to deprive our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution.

Is this solemn and binding commitment to be honored by the administra-

tion I fear not. In fact, only a week or so ago the State Department announced that it had instructed the United States delegates to the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea to abandon its original position supporting a 3-mile territorial sea, as pertaining to fishing, and instead to agree to a 12-mile limit. In so many words, our State Department in seeking to reaffirm the historic 3-mile limit under international maritime law offered to forego our fishing rights in compromise for retention of the 3-mile limit for other purposes.

Is that honorable, I ask, in pursuance of what was pledged at the convention at San Francisco? Let me recall to my Republican colleagues how with loud and overwhelming voices our delegates at that convention proclaimed and pledged protection of our fishing industry and now again I quote from the Republican Party platform:

> We advocate protective treaties insuring the United States commercial fishing industry against unfair foreign competition.

Surely the United States official position at the Geneva Conference on the Law of the Seat is a complete contradiction of that solemn assurance.

The international conclave at Geneva, Switzerland, under the auspices of the United Nations has been in session since February 24, 1958, and shortly it is expected to adopt one or more international conventions based on Articles of the United Nations International Law Commission as related to the Law of the Sea. The Geneva discussions have covered maritime limits which affect our United States historic fishing rights and conservation and protection of American spawned stocks of fish in and out of territorial limits.

The fishing industry in this country believed the United States delegation would stand firm for reaffirmation of the 3-mile limit. Indeed our naval authorities insisted in the interest of national security this historical limit must be retained. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has supported a 12-mile limit and on this it seems as usual in United Nations voting it was supported by other neutral nations such as India.

Canada, hoping thereby to gain exclusive fishing rights in the 9-mile contiguous zone outside her 3-mile limit, proposed a so-called compromise under which all coastal nations would enjoy exclusive fishing rights to 12 miles, and for all other purposes the traditionallly recognized 3-mile limit would stand.

Mr. Speaker, there are no finer people on this earth than the Canadians. My remarks today on the floor of this House of Representatives are neither designed to be personal nor to reflect on our friends and neighbors north of the border. We share with them not only common ancestors and a common tongue, but also both peoples generally have the same ideas about domestic and world affairs, and I am not unmindful either that of all nations on earth the men and women of Canada and ourselves have the closed community of interest. However, that does not mean to say that selfishness and greed cannot come between us; that does not mean to say that on either side sharp practice and thievery cannot exist.

In the past, however, fair dealings in fisheries matters have been traditional. Both nations shared the expense, for example, of clearing the Hells Gate slide area of the Frazier River on British Columbia and this jointly restored a salmon run which passes through both Canadian and United States waters and where we have a mutual advantage. We have joint fisheries commissions and over the years have cooperated together in the interest of conservation of resources and sharing them fairly on a basis of equal participation where these interests overlapped.

Recently the Canadian people strongly manifested through their national election a determination to strengthen their economy and to make it independent of American capital. That course of action is quite natural. That is their privilege. However, when their political leaders respond to this popular feeling and seek by international convention to maneuver United States fishermen out of fishing grounds beyond Canada's 3-mile limits they transcend the bounds of what is right. Indeed this move to secure exclusive use to themselves of this fishery is international banditry and I say would be of great disservice to relations between our two nations. And, may I say too, the same is true of Mexico and our source of shrimp—where I believe even without a change in the territorial limit we have been a market for 95 percent of Mexico's shrimp production. Adoption of the Canadian 12-mile proposal could do great harm to all three nations and I am frank to say such a compromise invites economic reprisals as I shall outline.

Of course, it sounds inviting to our neighbors that they might obtain exclusive fishing rights by such an international convention, but I am certain our Senate would never ratify any such treaty and then the trouble would begin, if not before.

Meanwhile, our State Department has informed the United States fishing industry it agrees fully with its claim of historic rights, but says in consideration of security it has had to instruct our representatives in Geneva to support the Canadian proposal. So our Government is officially aiding and abetting our neighbor on the north in a shameful and unlawful scheme. In thus bartering away these fishing rights, and buying status quo for other purposes, as a nation, we not only dishonor the obligation of the administration's political platform but also set an alltime low in our foreign relations. The glorious episodes of the past are forgotten as, for example, when a young nation refused to pay tribute to the Barbary pirates. Now, figuratively speaking, we are offering 20 pieces of silver in the form of fishing rights and the Judas is our own State Department. Fishery problems should be resolved between themselves by the nations involved. If the Geneva agreement goes against us, sooner or later that is the only way it can be finally solved.

Until that decision is made and the news reaches us, let those of us in Congress, who have not forgotten the moral obligation to our fishermen and fishing industry serve notice that we will stand firmly by our pledge or for what is right. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been studying legislation which as a separate bill or an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Act would establish an absolute embargo on the fish and seafood of any nation which acquires through the conference on the law of the sea exclusive fishing rights in zones which heretofore have been open to our fishermen on an equal basis.

Adoption of such a law would be in conformity with long established local domestic laws against receiving stolen property, such as those zones would yield. Legislation of that kind unfortunately is the only answer I can conceive of at this moment to deter the international thievery which is in prospect for us from the Geneva Conference.

In conclusion, let me add that I greatly regret the necessity of speaking out against my own administration. It is the first time I have felt compelled to do so in more than 5 years.

South's Pine Now a Kissin' Cousin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most familiar objects in the southern landscape is the pine tree. Although farmers used to object to it because it grew so fast, the southern pine has long been a mainstay of industry in the South. It produced resins and turpentine. It furnished a very large proportion of our lumber and countless sawmills were based on its abundance.

Now a great new industry, papermaking, has grown up in the South based on the plentitude of this valuable tree.

This week the South is celebrating Pulp and Paper Day. In recognition of this fact the New York Times on April 13 published an article by John J. Abele giving the facts of the growth of the paper industry in the South. For its interest and importance I include the article in full in the RECORD:

SOUTH'S PINE NOW A KISSIN' COUSIN—ONCE-SCORNED TREE PLAYS A MAJOR ROLE IN TODAY'S BIG PULP INDUSTRY

(By John J. Abele)

The South will pay tribute this week to one of the fastest growing segments of its economy, the pulp and paper industry.

Tuesday, Pulp and Paper Day, ceremonies at many mills and woodyards from Virginia to Texas will stress the role the industry has played in the region's past and its potential for the future. Sponsored by the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, the observance will be the first of its kind in the South.

Statistics tell part of what the industry means to the South today:

Sixty-three primary plup and paper mills with a replacement value of $2,870,400,000.

Annual production of 12,126,000 tons of paper and paperboard, almost 40 percent of the national total.

Payment of $351 million a year in salaries and wages to 71,000 plant and office workers and $20,864,000 to 6,000 woodland workers.

Florida, long noted for its sunshine, tourists, and oranges, is one of the best examples of changes in the southern economy from the increasing importance of forest products industries, lumber and naval stores, as well as pulp and paper. These products now account for annual volume of about $400 million, second only to the revenues from the tourist trade.

The State's 10 pulp and paper mills—there was only 1 in 1931—are responsible for the employment of 40,000 workers, almost a fourth of its industrial force. They turn out 2 million tons of wood pulp a year and almost as much paper and paperboard, 3 times the rate of 10 years ago.

Florida now produces about 8 percent of the Nation's wood pulp in contrast to 1930, when the entire South produced only 7 percent. The State also is the leader in tree farm acreage, with 4½ million acres, 10 percent of the national total, devoted to the growing of trees as a regular crop.

The key to all these advances has been the southern pine, which, thanks to a long growing season, warm sunshine, and abundant rainfall grows to maturity in considerably less time than its northern cousins. Other contributing factors are plentiful supplies of labor and water, a year-long operating season, and nearness to major consuming markets.

PINES ONCE A NUISANCE

Ironically, the pines were long regarded as a nuisance by southern farmers because they grew so profusely that fields left idle for short periods were soon overwhelmed by the onrushing pines. As land became less productive for cotton and other crops, the pines became friends instead of enemies, supporting far higher levels of employment and income. In 1956, industrial purchases of pulpwood in the South reached $405,400,000.

Pulp and paper companies made their first appearance in the South in the early 1900's. The introduction from Europe of the kraft, or sulfate process of making woodpulp made possible the cheap pulping of southern pine into strong grades of paper and paperboard for sacks and bags, wrapping paper, shipping containers, and other heavy-duty items.

The industry underwent a major expansion during the 1930's, providing needed jobs and income for the depressed South. With the perfection of methods to remove the resin content of the pine, the way was opened to the production of other grades of paper, particularly newsprint.

BIG CONCERNS MOVE SOUTH

Meanwhile, producers of kraft and other papers thronged to the South. The roster of companies operating in the area represents a veritable Who's Who of the paper industry, with names like International Paper Co., Crown-Zellerbach Corp., St. Regis Paper Co., Champion Paper & Fibre Co., West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., Scott Paper Co., Mead Corp., Union Bag-Camp Paper Co., Bowaters Southern Paper Co., and many others.

Expansion, now slowing somewhat, has been particularly evident in recent years. Within the last year, for example, St. Regis completed a $40 million expansion project at Jacksonville, Fla., that includes one of the largest kraft paper machines in the world. West Virginia Pulp spent $25 million adding a third machine at its Charleston, S. C., plant to make stretchable kraft paper. Container Corporation of America opened a $30 million plant in Brewton, Ala. Rayonier, Inc., completed a $25 million plant in Jesup, Ga., to make pulp for rayon fibers and paper.

All these mills have voracious appetites. In 1956 the industry consumed 20,270,300 cords of wood. In 1939 it used only 4,608,300 cords.

Meeting the increased needs for pulpwood represents a tremendous economic opportunity for the South, according to L. A. Whittle, president of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, but will also require aggressive cooperation for a greater forest future.

The pulp and paper industry is believed to have achieved almost full utilization of its timber resources, but the yield from private woodlands is estimated at only 20 percent of maximum. These woodlands represent 75 percent of the total commercial forest land in the South and supply almost 80 percent of its pulpwood.

To spur reforestation the industry is planting 222 million seedlings a year on its own land and is supplying 56 million more to small landowners. These are supplemented by additional millions from State-owned nurseries.

Forest fires represent a major challenge to the effectiveness of these efforts to increase the wood potential of the region. Despite some improvement in recent years the South still accounts for 80 percent of all forest acreage destroyed by fire. Many of these are set intentionally either to clear land, chase game, destroy insects, or as an expression of plain maliciousness. Increasing awareness of the importance of forest resources to the southern pocketbook has resulted in a number of regional and State conferences to combat this menace.

Results of Ohio 22d District 1958 Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I took a poll of my district requesting opinions on 18 proposed Federal legislative questions which may come before the present session of Congress. The questionnaire was mailed to every household of registered voters in the 22d Congressional District and there were responses from approximately 12,000 families.

I was particularly impressed with the sound reasoning of my constituents. Many hundreds of letters came to me with the questionnaire, explaining the answers given in detail and giving extremely helpful suggestions. It is very reassuring to know that such serious thought is being given by my constituents to the domestic and foreign affairs of our Federal Government.

The Ohio 22d District is an amazing cross section of the economic, racial, political, and religious structures that comprise many large metropolitan areas in the United States. The replies represent a well-balanced composite of the views of these groups.

For the benefit of Members of Congress who may have similar districts, I am inserting the results of the poll as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL OPINION POLL

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Soviet Union is constantly reaffirming its ultimate goal of world domination by either military or nonmilitary means. Consequently the defense of the United States, and the free world, must always be uppermost in our minds.

1. In view of the growing Soviet military threat, do you favor a larger congressional appropriation for defense purposes? Yes, 71.2 percent; no, 22.1 percent; no opinion, 6.7 percent.

TAXES

In spite of the administration's continuing efforts to cut Government expenses and give us a further tax reduction, the inescapable and increasing costs of national defense may prevent lower taxes this year.

2. Are you in favor of postponing any tax cuts in order that additional funds can be made available for defense needs? Yes, 73.1 percent; no, 20.3 percent; no opinion, 6.6 percent.

3. Would you favor increased taxes at this time if our defense and nondefense expenditures should exceed current national income? Yes, 24.2 percent; no, 63.9 percent; no opinion, 11.9 percent.

4. Rather than increasing taxes or increasing our national debt through deficit financing, would you prefer reductions in nondefense spending, even if existing Federal services and benefits were curtailed? Yes, 63.7 percent; no, 23.9 percent; no opinion, 12.4 percent.

If your answer is "Yes," what programs would you suggest cutting? Answers indicate that reductions are recommended in the following priority:

a. Farm subsidies.
b. Public housing.
c. Veterans' benefits.
d. Public-works projects.
e. Mutual-security funds.
f. Slum clearance.
g. Across-the-board cuts for all Federal agencies.

(A great number of answers indicated the desire for enactment of the balance of the Hoover Commission recommendations for more efficiency and economy in Government operation.)

FOREIGN POLICY

Our present foreign policy is based on a philosophy of maintaining peace through strength, and aiding the free nations of the world through a network of alliances (NATO, SEATO, etc.), and by economic and military assistance programs, in combating Soviet efforts at penetration and control.

5. Do you favor continuation of our mutual security (military and economic aid) programs? Yes, 79.4 percent; no, 15.5 percent; no opinion, 5.1 percent.

If your answer is "Yes," should such program be continued at present cost, increased cost, reduced cost?

The answers indicate that more people want program continued at present cost, followed closely by those wanting cost reduced, with approximately 14 percent response favoring increased cost.

6. Would you favor furnishing atomic missile weapons to our NATO allies in western Europe. Yes, 54.8 percent; no, 32.7 percent; no opinion, 12.5 percent.

7. Do you favor legislation authorizing a greater exchange with our NATO allies of classified scientific information? Yes, 63.4 percent; no, 24.9 percent; no opinion, 11.7 percent.

8. Are you in agreement with the Eisenhower Middle East doctrine of military support against Communist aggression when requested by any nation in that area? Yes, 70.8 percent; no, 17.5 percent; no opinion, 11.7 percent.

9. Are you in favor of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? Yes, 66.3 percent; no, 9.3 percent; no opinion, 24.4 percent.

LABOR MANAGEMENT

Several proposals for new labor legislation may be considered by the Congress to

provide greater protection for the rights of individual workers, the public, management, and unions.

10. Do you favor Federal legislation to safeguard union welfare and pension funds? Yes, 85.6 percent; no, 8.9 percent; no opinion, 5.5 percent.

11. Are you in favor of extending the Federal minimum-wage laws to cover most retail and service businesses? Yes, 70 percent; no, 17.9 percent; no opinion, 12.1 percent.

EDUCATION

The administration has submitted a proposal to Congress calling for the expenditure of $1 billion over a 4-year period to provide scholarships for deserving college students primarily in mathematics and science. Other proposals to aid education have been introduced by various Members of Congress.

12. Do you favor Federal aid to education? Yes, 63.7 percent; No, 30.9 percent; no opinion, 5.4 percent.

13. Do you favor the 4-year, billion-dollar program of Federal scholarships primarily for mathematics and science students? Yes, 56.1 percent; No, 34.9 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

14. In your opinion is this program adequate to meet our educational needs? Yes, 27.2 percent; no, 35.3 percent; no opinion, 37.5 percent.

If your answer is "No," what would you propose?

Proposals most frequently made:

a. Federal scholarship loan fund to be established at low interest rate, repayable in 10–15 years.

b. Income tax deduction for parents, or others, who support college students.

c. Income tax deduction for teachers for direct costs of obtaining additional education after receiving teacher certification. (It is to be noted that this suggestion is now being put into effect.)

d. Federal scholarship program should not be limited primarily to mathematics and science students.

e. Brilliant students should be given preference.

f. Grant Federal assistance to educational institutions for increased faculty salaries and educational facilities rather than to student scholarships.

g. No more frills in education.

GENERAL

Do you favor:

15. Legislation to end Federal controls over the production of natural gas at the wellhead, provided that adequate safeguards will guarantee a fair price to the public? Yes, 37.6 percent; no, 44.7 percent; no opinion, 17.7 percent.

16. Allowing experimental pay TV? Yes, 31.8 percent; no, 52.4 percent; no opinion, 15.8 percent.

17. Liberalization of immigration laws? Yes, 28.4 percent; no, 58.9 percent; no opinion, 12.7 percent.

18. Enactment of presidential disability legislation? Yes, 79 percent; no, 10.5 percent; no opinion, 10.5 percent.

If your answer is "Yes," with whom do you feel the power to declare the President disabled should rest? Answers indicate the following preference priority in combination with competent medical advice in all categories:

a. Supreme Court.
b. Congress.
c. President.
d. Cabinet.
e. Separate commission.
f. Vice President.

What's Good for the Breadwinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by William Jackman before the Pennsylvania chapter of the Investors League, March 26, 1958:

WHAT'S GOOD FOR THE BREADWINNER?

(Speech by William Jackman)

The Members of the Congress of the United States are endeavoring to settle this question to the satisfaction of their constituents. Their constituents, other than members of organized leftist pressure groups, have been largely mute. Unless good people tell their representatives in Government what they want, they will get the bad laws asked for by those who make the loudest noise. In this great debate of the age, your voice from home must be heard in Washington over and over and over again.

The threat to freedom itself lies in the apathy of our good people to answer the constant barrage of misinformation dished out by our vociferous socialist planners who deny the ability of free business to serve free people who want to exercise free choice.

FALSE PROPAGANDA

Here are 11 fallacies of the foes of freedom which need constant answering:

Fallacy No. 1: The false claim that the interest of the manager and his employee are opposite, and that the manager and employee are even in some sort of a toe-to-toe economic and class struggle where the manager's success depends on exploiting and belittling the employee.

The fact is that the opposite is not only true but has to be true.

Too many politicians in government and unions have based their careers on trying to keep alive a misunderstanding of the economics and humanities of business, but they are beginning to be recognized as outmoded. The continuance of this false claim today can only exhibit inexcusable ignorance or unusually imprudent deceitfulness.

Fallacy No. 2: The false claim that new or increased buying power can be created artificially or even magically by forced cuts in prices without corresponding cuts in costs or by forced raises in pay without corresponding raises in production.

The fact is that real buying power cannot be raised by manipulating dollar income in relation to dollar prices. It can only be raised by people producing more for each other through better employment of minds, muscles, and machines.

Fallacy No. 3: The false claim that higher pay is needed to bolster the economy (this false claim being made at any time when free and able buyers are being reluctant to buy and are increasing their savings).

The fact is that higher pay—without higher productivity to match—raises costs and prices, damages savings, and does just the opposite of helping the economy to mend.

Fallacy No. 4: The false claim that the higher pay proposed can be taken out of the swollen profits of greedy corporations in order for workers to have their "deserved" share of the current prosperity (this false claim having usually been made in the past when the public was buying freely, jobs were plentiful and good, and profits were going ahead or at least recovering).

Fallacy No. 5: The false claim that the 4-day week can be had now as a great social gain for everybody. The equally false claim that even establishing the shorter workweek in principle—that is, having overtime pay start somewhere below 40 hours a week—would represent some sort of social advance for everybody.

The fact is that just the opposite is true. The shorter workweek means less goods for everybody—a lower level of living.

Fallacy No. 6: The false claim that an individual company's profitability or so-called ability to pay should determine pay increases.

The fact is just the opposite. Employees should be—and in the end, will be—paid the market value of the contributions they make from their inner resources, regardless of whether their employer is earning a profit, suffering a loss, or just breaking even.

Fallacy No. 7: The false claim that employees, employers and the rest of the public should understand and go along in making and supporting pay demands and settlements which have as their chief purpose the meeting of the fancied competitive political needs of one personally ambitious union official over another personally amibtious union official.

Fallacy No. 8: The false claim that steady work and steady buying power can be achieved either by forcing the individual employed to continue work which free buyers do not want him to do or by forcing the individual employed to continue payments to employees for work no longer done.

The fact is that steady work—with more good jobs to boot—comes from individual employers steadily increasing the attractiveness of the performance and value of their products and services.

Fallacy No. 9: The false claim that—while it is proper for a union official—it is improper for a manager to discuss bargaining questions publicly before or during negotiations.

Fallacy No. 10: The false belief or habit of mind that it is still good politics—as well as an excusable breach of sacred trust—for various public officials to give union officials the unbridled license to break laws.

The fact is that this practice is rapidly getting to be bad politics with most everybody but politicians. The voters want the protection of law enforcement. It is no defense that the laws are enforced against everybody else; the public wants the law enforced against everybody.

Fallacy No. 11: The lingering false belief that it is still not good politics for representatives of either party to be identified with Congressional investigations of the sources and misuse of excessive economic and political power by union officials now in good standing in the AFL–CIO, and that it is still not good politics for either party in Congress to be identified as sponsoring or favoring legislation that would go beyond thievery and attack the sources and use of the power with which union officials are now legally dominating employees, employers, consumers and the rest of the public.

The fact is that the revelations of the McClellan committee have suddenly stirred an interest by the public in important abuses far beyond thievery and racketeering. What the public wants to know is where union officials get the power to make it good politics for government to overlook their lawbreaking and the power to force employers to be silent about these illegal activities.

THE BASIC REFORMS NEEDED

These monopolistic powers of labor union bosses stem from two main causes. In an objective study shortly to be published titled "Personal Freedom and Labor Policy," Dr. Sylvester Petro, professor of labor law at New York University, has ably stated the two causes at the root of this evil as follows:

"First, the abandonment of personal freedom as the primary and exclusive goal of labor policy. Embodied for us in the principles of private property and freedom of contract, personal freedom is much more in our tradition than a mere philosophical abstraction or a romantic dream. It is the sturdy product of a heritage rich in experience of other systems and other methods of operating a community. Our civilization developed respect and reverence for personal freedom because it made complete sense; it worked; it brought to pass the things which real, living people wished to have brought to pass. Abandoning it has meant what it had to mean—the frustration of the goals of men. If we wish to resecure our liberties and our well-being, we shall have to make personal freedom—perhaps under the name "free employee choice"—the central and unqualified, principle of labor policy.

"Second, the neglect and distortion of law. This has come about largely as a consequence of wrong ideas which have prevailed now for almost 50 years concerning legal and judicial administration. I shall enlarge upon this point, and suggest remedies, before dealing with the problem of restoring personal freedom in labor relations.

"For a generation more or less, the administration of justice in labor relations has been taken away from the courts. Although our freedom and State constitutions uniformly establish the constitutional courts as the appropriate agencies for the administration of justice, crippling legislation has left them in labor law not much more than figureheads. Their power to deal vigorously and straightforwardly with vicious and unlawful conduct by trade unions has been greatly reduced by anti-injunction legislation. These are Federal and State laws which prevent the courts from ordering unions to cease engaging in unlawful conduct.

"While the anti-injunction legislation did not purport to prevent the courts from continuing to define the meaning of law and thus to direct the development and growth of substantive law, this result was achieved in another way. Congress and a number of State legislatures set up administrative tribunals, usually called labor relations boards, and delegated to them the law-defining and law-developing functions which our constitutions give exclusively to the courts. I have but recently completed an exhaustive study of the way in which the Federal labor board (the NLRB) has interpreted and applied the National Labor Relations (Taft-Hartley) Act. The conclusion of the study is that, although the constitutional courts worked manfully to correct the misinterpretations and distortions of the NLRB, the functional primacy of the board proved too much for them. A purely political agency, the board used political rather than legal criteria in interpreting and applying the Taft-Hartley Act. The results were, first, extreme distortion of the fundamental provisions of the act; and, second, the distortion of the free employee choice policy of the act.

"Proper administration of the law is at least as important as good law. The first thing necessary in order to correct the evils in labor relations, I therefore submit, is the restoration to the constitutional courts of the country the full responsibility for interpreting and applying our labor relations laws. Concretely, this means repealing all anti-injunction legislation and abolishing all labor relations boards."

The reforms in the law urged by Dr. Petro's study call for:

"Unqualified supremacy of the principle of free employee choice. Put generally, this means the total outlawing of every form of physical and economic coercion used by either employers or trade unions to dictate to employees concerning their choice as regards joining or not joining unions, or participating or not participating in concerted union activities. In detail, full implementation of the principle of free employee choice will require:

"1. A broad prohibition of restraint and coercion by employers and unions of the right of employees to make up their own minds on the question of union membership or participation in strikes.

"2. A specific provision of law to the effect that picketing, even when peaceable, is subject to that ban when it has or is intended to have coercive effects, either physical or economic.

"3. A specific declaration that the ban on restraint or coercion applies to the economic coercion implicit in all agreements proposed by unions or employers which make union membership or non-membership a condition of employment.

"4. A general prohibition against inducing any work stoppage by the employee of one employer when a union has a dispute with any other employer. (This is designed to outlaw all secondary boycotts and other monopolistic pressures.)

"5. Emphatic repeal of the exclusive-bargaining, majority-rule principle, including a positive statement that unions shall be the exclusive bargaining representatives of only those workers who expressly delegate such authority to them. The present statutory and doctrinal requirement, imposing a legally enforceable duty upon employers to bargain only with majority unions would need to be deleted."

THE INVESTOR'S STAKE

Occasionally we are asked why we devote so much time and effort to labor union legislation. What bearing does it have on the investor?

The answer is obvious. Walter Reuther urges socialism through regulation of corporate profits and destruction of our profit system. He also urges tax policies that would completely destroy the investor class. And Mr. Reuther and his well-organized allies wield tremendous political power which only can be checked by organizing individual investors and businessmen to take an active part in politics and demand that our labor laws be changed.

This is a formidable undertaking. We are starting at a sadly late date. What can now be done?

First, businessmen and investors must understand that Congress enacts all laws, not the President. In 1956, businessmen were busy electing a President, while the AFL-CIO was electing a Congress. Organized labor was active in 300 or the 435 congressional district elections in 1956. The men of their choice were elected in more than 175.

LABOR'S POLITICAL SPENDING

In addition to direct money contributions, labor-supported candidates received incalculable numbers of free campaign workers, union treasures paid for untold hours of radio and TV time, friends of the candidate inserted expensive full-page ads in local newspapers, wives of union men manned telephone brigades contacting voters, their teenage children did baby-sitting chores while parents went to the polls. Meanwhile the labor press gave full play to the election and the merits of their candidate. Special election editions were distributed. Business organizations do none of this.

Business, as such, is unorganized politically and therefore impotent.

In terms of known reported spending, New York Congressman RALPH GWINN recently stated, "We have already counted more than $2,200,000 spent or contributed by national and international unions exclusive of all State and local unions. One Senator benefited in an amount of $725,000 in 1954 from 1 union local for his campaign. The total for all the States will run high in the millions. From case histories we know that actual expenditures of the political affiliates of organized labor are at least 10 times those required legally to be reported. This means that approximately $10 million was spent in Michigan alone."

Organized business by comparison, spends virtually nothing in time or money to elect Congressmen or Senators. With rare exceptions individual business leaders are just as bad.

That's the sad story of how union leaders get men elected who agree with them and thereby force government into improper and socialistic activities.

Organized labor has supported all legislation passed which has added to the power and authority of the Federal Government and reduced the property and personal freedom of the individual and particularly legislation tending to destroy the investor class.

WHAT BUSINESSMEN CAN DO

Our thousands of business organizations for the most part, merely sit around passing the same resolutions over and over again. Business seems unaware of its own political danger. The average businessman is milkfed by the representatives of business in Washington, including the trade-association lobbyists and the Washington lawyers who have business clients. These lobbyists naturally seek to justify being in business themselves, but must they do this by urging their members and clients to keep out of politics? Why must they help create the businessman's illusion that this Congress, or the next, will do something—or maybe the President will—or somebody other than themselves, to solve their political problems?

Businessmen belong to thousands of business organizations, chambers of commerce, trade associations, management organizations, and the like, adding up to some 30,000 organizations in all. This is impressive and it would seem the businessman would be better informed on some of the political facts of life. It would seem that he should be stirred by fear, anger, or sheer patriotism to take off his coat, loosen his pocketbook, and get into the political battle for business and investment survival.

If only a small portion of the money now being spent by and for these thousands of business organizations—and mind you, gentlemen, this money largely belongs to 9 million corporate investor-shareowners—I repeat, if only a small portion of this money could be spent precisely as the unions spend theirs, and if business personnel might be employed in downright political action, to restore sound government and if business managements would encourage their shareholders to join in the battle as individuals—then, and only then, we might begin to see more than a few rays of hope. Business managements must stop looking for excuses to keep out of politics. Their legal counsels must stop telling them what they can't do. Instead they must tell them what they can do if they really wanted to.

There will be an important battle on in this congressional year—important because it will determine the extent to which we will be driven in the years ahead further and further down the perilous roads of inflation, paternalism, and socialism.

The Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO has fired the opening gun in the battle of 1958 with the brazen announcement that it hopes to spend almost $1 million for liberal candidates in 1958 elections with particular attention being given to United States senatorial contests in 20 States. COPE Director James L. McDevitt said the group will ask the 13,500,000 AFL-CIO members to ante up the tidy sum of $1

each, or $13½ million, to be used for political persuasion this year.

BUSINESSMEN AND INVESTORS—THIS IS A CHALLENGE

I ask you—Where will you be in this battle? Will you lose it without firing a shot? The thousands of members of the Investors League across the Nation will be there! Will you?

Jet Inoculation as a Public Health Tool in the Control of Contagion and Epidemics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney, of the Public Health Service, recently warned that serious outbreaks of polio could occur this summer unless there is a speedup in vaccination programs. Dr. Burney said that revised estimates indicate that 48.5 million persons in the susceptible age group, under 40 years of age, still have not been vaccinated.

A very successful mass polio and influenza inoculation program was carried out by the post office employees of the greater Cleveland area during the period of April 1957 through January 1958 in cooperation with Western Reserve University School of Medicine. During this time 17,061 injections were given. Careful followup studies have revealed that there has not been a single one of the personnel or their families so inoculated who has subsequently developed poliomyelitis. Similarly the instance of absenteeism due to influenza has been held to a low minimum in the inoculated group.

In a scientific paper to be published in the Journal of the World Medical Association, Drs. Robert A. Hingson, Hamilton S. Davis, and Joseph Carlucci, of the division of anesthesia, Western Reserve University School of Medicine, provide vital public health information on jet inoculation as a public health tool in the control of contagion and epidemics. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article herewith:

JET INOCULATION AS A PUBLIC HEALTH TOOL IN THE CONTROL OF CONTAGION AND EPIDEMICS

(By Robert A. Hingson, M. D., Hamilton S. Davis, M. D., and Joseph Carlucci, M. D.[1])

In peace, as well as in war, public health is vital to a nation's strength and is a primary concern of every physician. In 1948 Alton Ochsner, in addressing the officers of the United States Public Health Service in the annual meeting of the United States Marine Hospital organization, placed preventive medicine in the proper perspective in the statement: "If all the surgeons in New Orleans had been permanently removed in 1800, the population of the city today would be within 1 percent of its present census. However, if all the public-health specialists and preventive medicine experts had been eliminated permanently at the same time, New Orleans as a city would have suffered near annihilation six times: from malaria, from yellow fever, from cholera, from bubonic plague, from smallpox, and from influenza."

As rapid communication in our modern jet and rocket age shortens effective distances and increases intercontinental travel, it is literally possible for pandemics to move around the world in 80 days unless checked by mass immunizations, institution of intelligent quarantine, and flexible coordination of effective public-health practice with pharmaceutical manufacture and the distribution of the tools of the trade.

Within 5 years after the development of mediums for the culture of poliomyelitis virus and the subsequent development of effective vaccine by Jonas Salk, more than one-third of the population of the United States had been inoculated with vaccine. The striking fall in number of cases of paralytic poliomyelitis to one-third of the usual endemic incidence is more than a coincident corollary.

Since 1853, when Alexander Wood, of Edinburgh, developed the hollow needle to use with the syringes of Pravaz, LaFarangue, and Ferguson from an earlier decade, immunizations have been developed through mechanical injections into muscle, blood stream and skin through needle and syringe. This required the processes of cleansing, sterilization, aspiration, injection, withdrawal of needle, cleansing and resterilization of each needle and syringe. These eight steps in the procedure of sterilization are costly and time-consuming. All of them require at least 30 minutes per injection of nurse, aid, sterilization and physician time. When tens of thousands of injections are required in a mass immunization program, a tremendous expenditure of funds for needles, syringes, sterilization and cleaning equipment is required. The replacement of broken and lost items also requires considerable budget.

For example, in the recent program of the Academy of Medicine and City Health Administration in Cleveland, Ohio—a city of 1 million population—a team of 75 people working around the clock on 8-hour shifts was required to process, clean, match, replace broken and missing parts, sterilize and package equipment during the 8-week period. More than 300,000 people were inoculated. More than 30,000 syringes were required at costs from $2 to $3.50 each. During this program, almost 6,000 syringes and 12,000 needles were either broken or lost for a net equipment loss of more than $20,000 and a considerably larger initial capital investment likely to add considerably to this figure.

Since 1945 the principle of jet injection has been slowly revived in American medicine. One of the authors has shared in this development through animal, cadaver, and patient experiments and studies in the injections of normal saline, local anesthetics, antibiotics, vaccines, vasopressors, oxytocics, analeptics, vitamins and drugs used in the treatment of diabetes, leprosy, and tuberculosis. It should be remembered, however, that the origins of jet injection can be traced back in the medical literature to 1866 when the French physician H. Galante reported an apparatus using a filaform jet for "aquapuncture." Modifications of his method were reported by M. Guerart of Belgium in 1879, in his writings on douche filaforme and other European physicians between the years 1884 and 1910; by Arnold Sutermeister, a mechanical engineer on Long Island; and by Dr. John F. Roberts, an instructor in surgery at Columbia University in 1933. All of these reports antedated the recent patenting of a device by the New Jersey engineer Lockhart in 1936–38 with his subsequent sale of patents to E. R. Squibb & Sons Co. in New York, the Becton, Dickinson & Co. in New Jersey and the R. P. Scherer Corp., in Detroit.

Unfortunately, from the point of view of the patient, this new development has been delayed and seemingly abandoned on several occasions because of technical difficulties, increased capillary bleeding and trauma at the injection sites, legal patent contests, requirements of a staggering development budget attendant therefrom.

In September of 1947, Hingson and Hughes reported the first series of clinical studies with jet injection. In 1948 F. H. J. Figge reported his extensive anatomical and histologocal studies on the effect of jet injection greatly expanding a preliminary report on the same subject with R. P. Scherer in 1947. In 1951 Hingson and Figge summarized the progress to date with the spring and compressed gas powered jet injectors of the R. P. Scherer Corp. and the Becton, Dickinson & Co., respectively, describing for the first time the work in progress on the multiple dose jet injectors.

Even though the single-dose jet injectors had much to recommend them in eliminating the psychic fear of some patients and the children of the needle, it was not until the multiple-dose jet injectors were developed by the Z. & W. Manufacturing Co. in 1950–58 through electric-powered spring-compression power and the hand-pump serial-stage spring-compression power, that this instrument began to take its place as a public-health instrument. The R. P. Scherer Co. shortly thereafter began researches in this same field. Both companies have now produced effective automatic electric hand-triggered instrument capable of delivering one injection each 4 to 10 seconds, or approximately 500 per hour, through each single instrument by utilizing a postinjection siphon mechanism for refilling. Both instruments deliver within 4 to 5 percent of the calculated dose each injection, which can be easily regulated in one-half or one cubic centimeter quantities. This dosage is delivered through a fine-jet-punctured orifice in the skin that has been found through testing to be best accomplished between 0.03 to 0.05 inch in diameter. Much of this field testing has been performed at the Walter Reed Hospital for the Medical Department of the United States Army and previously reported by Lindberg and Warren and by Ziheri, Kish, and Walren.

With the perfection of the Salk vaccine in 1955, we began a test jet-inspection program with the Cleveland Academy of Medicine in consultation with the United States Public Health Service. With the latter we began the testing of the efficacy of this type of injection at the Communicable Disease Center for the Americas in Montgomery, Ala., and in Atlanta, Ga., in July 1957.

To date we have completed 19,252 injections of both polio and influenzal vaccine.

Our experience in the first 1,797 such injections was reported on May 1957 in GP. Our total experience to date with these 19,252 injections from the standpoint of complications, patient acceptance, organization of the programs in charity hospital clinics, in the suburban PTA groups of metropolitan Cleveland, and with the certain employees of the Cleveland United States post-office system, data from immunological responses, possibilities of inadvertent infections, hepatitis infections, and some studies relating to the efficiency of the injection method from the basis of the present report.

PRINCIPLES AND METHOD[2]

"Since 1936, continued engineering design, manufacture, and testing of three types of

[1] From the division of anesthesia, departments of surgery and obstetrics and gynecology, Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio.

[2] Hingson, Robert A.; Hamilton S. Davis; Richard A. Bloomfield, and Richard F. Brailey: Mass Inoculation of the Salk Polio Vaccine With the Multiple Dose Jet Injector, GP, May 1957, vol. XV, No. 5, pp. 94–96.

jet injector instruments have accomplished such improvements that a new era of parenteral therapy is at hand. The hypo-spray, the velodermic jet, and the multiple dose Press-O-Jet are all capable of providing a safe and readily acceptable means of injecting most drugs subcutaneously.

"The principle of jet injection is based upon the development of a high velocity jet projected through a micro orifice (0.003 to 0.005 inch) from a sterilized metallic ampul. The butt end of the ampul, covered by a specially designed rubber or plastic seal, is acted upon by a plunger that builds up enormous pressure within the ampul. The encapsulated liquid is delivered through the micro orifice at a velocity of 700 miles per hour. However, because of the minute size of the stream, only 11 grams of penetrating force is transmitted through a diameter that is one-thirtieth the size of a 22-gauge needle.

"Previous work has shown by fluoroscopic technique that more than 90 percent of a 1-centimeter jet injection traverses the skin, subcutaneous fat and muscle sheath to distribute itself in the muscle about 0.75 to 1 inch below the surface. In about 5 percent of people, increased thickness of the skin decreases the depth of injection by about one-half but does not interfere with the efficiency of most drugs injected in present-day parenteral therapy. To date, amounts of penicillin, streptomycin, sulfones, promin, insulin, typhoid vaccine, diphtheria toxoid, ad tetanus toxoid in the blood have been found to be comparable to amounts found with a needle injection technique.

"The multiple dose Press-O-Jet, developed by Ziherl, Kish and Warren, produces the same results as those achieved by the hypo-spray and the velodermic single dose injectors. The Press-O-Jet has the added advantage that a large number of injections can be delivered as rapidly as every 4 to 6 seconds. This multiple dose injector uses a metalic stainless steel ampul of 1 centimeter capacity, similar in design to that used by the single injection units. The disassembled part of the multiple-dose injector are cleaned with distilled water, are dried and are then placed in towel packs for a steam pressure sterilization or in aluminum containers for sterilization by boiling.

"After sterilization, the assembly before inoculation is best performed using aseptic technique with the operator gloved. Following sterilization, only 15 minutes is required to ready the instrument for mass inoculations.

"In view of the fact that many municipalities are spending from $30,000 to $100,000 for syringes and needles alone, just for a poliomyelitis immunization program, the Press-O-Jet is not an expensive instrument."

ADVANTAGES

"1. Since a needle is not used, it is unlikely that the instrument can be contaminated by such blood borne agents as the malaria parasite or the virus of serum hepatitis. Preliminary trials in which typhoid vaccine was administered by an instrument employing the jet injection principle suggested that the procedure was safe and satisfactory for immunizing against typhoid fever. Work reported in this paper also supports this.

"2. Sterilization is not required between cases and there is no need to sharpen or replace needles.

"3. Jet injection is relatively safe. Intravenous injection is extremely unlikely as determined by intentional aiming at a distended vein with epinephrine in the intact laboratory animal and as determined from many thousand injections revealing no pharmacologic evidence of intravenous injection. There is no needle to break.

"4. Because the ampul is not exposed to the operator or to the external environment, it is impossible to contaminate the properly assembled instrument or the injected solutions.

"5. Pain is reduced. The jet is so fine that it strikes far fewer pain fibers than the finest needle. Trauma to the skin is thereby reduced to a minimum. More than 50 percent of the first thousand patients injected with the polio vaccine reported that the injections were painless.

"6. The fear of the needle is eliminated. Patients with apprehension concerning the needle injection welcome the change to the jet injector.

"7. Time is saved; the number of personnel preparing equipment and injecting is greatly reduced. With the Pres-O-Jet a team of 2 physicians have injected 200 patients within a 1-hour period."

DISADVANTAGES

"1. There is at least a 10-percent incidence of bleeding, whether the injections be made with medication in solution or in suspension as particles. In this study of 1,000 cases, 12 to 15 percent of the patients had a tiny drop of blood appear at the site of puncture. Three percent of the patients developed a fine trickle of blood unless the injected site was compressed with dry cotton or gauze.

"2. There is greater incidence of ecchymosis following injection with the Press-O-Jet which shows up in 24 to 36 hours because of the capillary damage within the muscle. This complication is only temporary since some of our test subjects have had thousands of triceps, biceps, and femoris injections without significant muscle damage. Because of the need for readjustment by the tissues which so suddenly receive the 1 cubic centimeter injection, we recommend keeping the injector nozzle compressed tightly against the injected site for 2 to 4 seconds after injecting.

"3. An occasional patient will experience considerable momentary pain from the injection when a nerve fibril is hit directly by the jet.

"4. Movement by the patient or the operator or muscle tremors will produce a superficial intradermal cut or a zig-zag ecchymosis."

Results

"All of the first 1,000 patients injected with the Salk vaccine were coded for evaluation against a group of simultaneously selected controls. Eight operators (2 with previous experience and 6 who had never seen the instrument before) were selected for the study. All of the operators expressed a preference for the Press-O-Jet method of injection from the point of view of time, convenience, and favorable patient response."

Table I, reproduced from the original paper, records the results observed in 1,797 of the first 2,700 injections carried out.

Since the early experience in Press-O-Jet inoculation of Salk vaccine, we have listed in table II an additional 6,538 injections documenting the efficiency of injection, pain response, and immediate complications in this group. These injections were carried out on United States post office employees and their families in Cleveland, Ohio, during six separate periods between April 22, 1957, and January 11, 1958. These data were collected by examination and questioning each person during the 5 minutes following injection. In those instances of children crying before injection, or extreme youth, interpretation was deemed impossible and is so indicated. It is also to be noted that through clerical oversight no data on efficiency of injection delivery were recorded for the periods of January 11 and 12, 1958.

The total injection team consisted of 6 anesthesiologists, 8 anesthesia residents, 2 medical students, and 2 anesthesia orderlies. The numbers of persons injected in each period varied between 650 and 1,572. It was customary to assign groups of 3 to 5 physicians, 1 orderly, and 1 medical student for each session. Usually at least two physicians at each session had had previous experience with the method. Two new physicians in training attended and assisted after about 15 minutes of instruction and observation. The medical students handled the clerical work. The orderlies were experienced in operating-room technics and assisted in refilling the hand instruments and assembling the motor unit with sterile technic.

The average session can be handled easily by means of two lines; larger programs were conducted through three lines. Post office employees assisted in paper work, in organizing the lines, in cleansing the arms for injection with alcohol sponges and in cocking and priming the hand units. Two such instruments were used by each line so that as the physician performed the injection with one instrument, the other was being cocked.

Letter Concerning the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading in the newspapers of pronouncements of confidence by the administration that the recession is either bottoming out or will shortly improve. The frightening thing is we have been hearing these same pronouncements since January, and each month the unemployment statistics have gotten worse.

We now have 248,000 unemployed in Detroit and 415,000 in the State of Michigan. This is at the rate of 14.3 percent for the State and almost 17 percent for the city of Detroit. This does not include the great number of people working 1 or 2 days a week. When the unemployment figures are adjusted to reflect the closing of a number of automobile plants to balance the ratio of inventories to sales, the situation in Detroit and Michigan will be even blacker.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a letter I received from Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, expressing his concern over the economy of this country.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
LABOR AND CONGRESS OF
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington D. C., April 14, 1958.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: America today stands on the brink of depression.

This stark fact America must face with honesty and determination. America has shown its greatness—in war and peace—only when it has been willing to face the truth—and to take whatever action may be necessary. Confidence in America's basic economic strength can only be maintained by the knowledge that corrective steps are being taken.

On March 11, I publicly warned that unless the March unemployment figures show a seasonal drop of at least 200,000 jobs, we are in trouble. Instead of this drop, however, there has been an actual increase in March unemployment.

Today more than 5,200,000 Americans are jobless. Today more than 3½ million Americans are working far less than a full work week, adding the economic equivalent of 1.3 million to the unemployment figure. As a practical matter then, nearly 9½ percent of our labor force is jobless.

Close to 45,000 workers are exhausting their unemployment compensation benefits every week.

It is on behalf of these people—these millions of American workers that I am writing you today. Many of them are members of our unions. All of them are members of the great human family that is America. Their suffering cannot be measured statistically. There are no statistics which can measure the fears of a worker and his family at a time like this.

Unless America acts now to stop this suffering, inevitably additional millions will soon join the ranks of the unemployed. Every important indicator continues to point downward. There isn't a single ray of sunshine on the economic scene.

The Congress of the United States thus faces a grave challenge. The country is looking to you for the swift, meaningful action which the Congress has demonstrated in past crises.

I am aware of the antirecession measures adopted to date by the Congress and the measures which the administration is supporting. The economists of the AFL–CIO, after careful and thorough study, have concluded that these measures might pump up to a total of a billion dollars into the economy this year. But at a time when the United States is losing $25 billion a year in national production, this puny economic blood transfusion cannot possibly restore the economy to good health.

Clearly Congress must take bolder action.

First priority must be given to relieving the plight of the unemployed themselves. This can be done by the adoption of an unemployment compensation bill which will require larger benefits and longer duration. The McCarthy-Kennedy bill deserves your full support. Substantial increases in unemployment compensation payments will not only help the recipients but will increase general purchasing power which will in turn help the entire economy.

In order to relieve the plight of the economy itself, we renew our recommendation for a substantial tax cut which will affect primarily the lower and middle income groups. A $6 to $8 billion tax reduction in both personal income taxes and excise taxes could be decisive in the present situation.

The AFL–CIO has called for other antirecession measures. These include a real public works program, school construction, a much bigger housing program, an increase and extension of the Federal minimum wage, improvements in the social security program, and depressed areas legislation.

Clearly, now is the time for America to act before confidence in the bedrock soundness of our economy becomes undermined. To wait further weeks or months will only add to the suffering of millions and the need for more drastic and costly measures later.

Only last week a spokesman for the Soviet Union predicted that American would not be able to get out of its economic difficulties.

We can prove these Communist spokesmen wrong. We can end the economic recession. We can move on to further economic growth. But we must be willing to face the facts. America has shown in the past that free enterprise can meet any challenge, from any source. We believe it can again—if we get on with the job at once.

All America is looking to the Congress for action to end this recession.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Public Service and the Mails in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following as an example of public service by the Post Office Department:

[From the Post Office Department Information Service]

MARCH 9, 1958.—The last of the great Alaskan dog sled mail routes is now operating on remote St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield noted today.

Reports from postal officials in Alaska show only one remaining regular dog sled route on the once-considerable "mush mush" mail circuit.

Chester Noonwook, 22, of Savoonga, an Eskimo village about 50 miles southeast of Gambell (the island's main community, about 200 miles southwest of Nome) is the sole remaining dog sled mail carrier in Alaska.

Noonwook and his 10 huskies—Spotty, Brownie, Lassy, Boy, Mil-ko-buk, Frisky, Whitey, Doneky, Blackie, and Camel—cover the 100-mile mail route between Savoonga and Gambell about twice a week.

The dogs are used usually from November through May. In June through October, Noonwook uses a skin boat to carry the mails.

The dog route follows the northern coastline of St. Lawrence Island between the two points, rather than moving directly over the frozen Bering Sea where the "sea ice" is extremely rough and dangerous.

The skin boat route goes directly over open sea from Savoonga to Gambell, located on the extreme northern tip of the island. (The island itself is located out in the Bering Sea, 120 miles distant, at the closest point, from the Alaska mainland.)

Noonwook, who is a contract carrier for the Post Office Department, is paid $40 a round trip.

Starting out on his trip from Savoonga—a typical Eskimo settlement consisting of framehouses where the Eskimos live, a church, a Bureau of Indian Affairs School and a native store—the young carrier usually requires a day to reach Gambell, unless he runs into one of the frequent howling storms or has trouble on a "soft" trail.

These, incidentally, appear to be the principal dangers of the 100-mile round-trip run, because Postmaster John Waghiyi, of Savoonga, reports "No wolves on island."

After taking the mail from Savoonga into Gambell, Noonwook usually picks up a full load of 300 pounds or more of mail for Savoonga. The return trip usually requires about 2 days, because the load is heavier going back.

In addition to letters, newspapers, and the like, Noonwook usually has a heavy mail consignment of parcel post, which affords a real service bargain at low-cost rates in transporting goods in Alaska. Almost anything that can qualify as parcel post going between Gambell and Savoonga is, in fact, carried by Noonwook and his dogs.

Shortly after he began carrying the route in 1956 when he was 20, he had one of his heaviest mail jobs.

A new missionary at Savoonga had more than 5,000 pounds of parcel post sent in from the "outside," and it had to be hauled in—in December weather—by Noonwook and his dogs.

He took it all in safely, although it required many extra trips.

"Star Route Carrier Noonwook has never had an accident," Postmaster Waghiyi reported, "although he has had trouble at times. Some times he has to stop overnight on the way between here and Gambell in cabins due to the snowstorm and soft trail."

The virtual demise of the dog sled United States mail route in Alaska, where it was once employed by the Post Office Department in large numbers of open Alaskan frontiers to the mails, is due to factors such as greatly increased use of air facilities and other transportation.

"However," Mr. Summerfield commented, "it still symbolizes the spirit of dedication to duty in the face of adverse conditions, and is typical of the great tradition of service of our own people and of the star-route carriers who operate under private contract to help the United States Government in the huge task of moving the United States mails."

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 18, 1958]

THE CASE AGAINST THE 5-CENT NONLOCAL STAMP AS STATED BY POSTMASTER GENERAL SUMMERFIELD HIMSELF

"Any rate differential between local and nonlocal first-class letter mail would be discriminatory, costly, and extremely difficult to administer * * * Public confusion would be widespread."—Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, April 25, 1956, in testimony before House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

No one has ever made a better case against the hybrid, 5-cent, 4-cent split rate for first-class letters than Mr. Summerfield himself. No one has ever done a better job of pointing out the injustice, the expense, and the unworkability of a rate differential between local and nonlocal mail.

Here is Postmaster General Summerfield's statement in full:

"A DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN LOCAL AND NONLOCAL LETTERS

"Certain Members of the Congress have emphasized to this committee the operating difficulties and inequities in a rate differential between local and nonlocal first-class letter mail.

"Any rate differential between local and nonlocal first-class letter mail would be discriminatory, costly, and extremely difficult to administer.

"The term 'local mail' is difficult to define. In Memphis, Tenn., it means 100 square miles, while in Kingsport, Tenn., it means 5.5 square miles. In Chicago, Ill., it embraces 207.5 square miles; in Aurora, Ill, only 8.1 square miles.

"In terms of population, 'local mail' is equally confusing. In Saybrook, Ill., it reaches 485 families; in Los Angeles, over a half million.

"The boundaries of local mail seldom coincide with those of the community. In New York only 2 of the 5 boroughs can be reached at the local rate, while in Boston, local includes the entire city as well as the nearby cities of Cambridge, Chelsea, Newton, and Medford.

"A local rate clearly discriminates in favor of large cities. The smaller the community, the less significant is the local rate. Such a rate would be clearly discriminatory since it provides a wide difference in service to patrons paying the same rate of postage.

"The post office in New York City would serve at the local rate more people than could be reached at the nonlocal rate in Nevada, Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, and Utah combined.

"Public confusion would be widespread. In Long Island, for example, Kew Gardens and Queens Village are stations of Jamaica, while Elmhurst, Forest Hills, and Jackson

Heights are stations of Flushing. These are all large independent communities in close proximity in a very congested part of Long Island. People address mail to the community—not to its parent post office. Few people would know the difference between local and nonlocal mail in this area.

"As a result of public confusion, there would be a sharp increase in postage-due mail, which costs the post office an additional 5 cents to deliver and is extremely annoying to the recipient.

"In many areas mobile highway units are replacing local post offices. One such highway post office in the South covers 300 miles and numerous communities. What will be the meaning of local mail under such a distribution scheme?

"Furthermore, a rate differential is not justified by differences in cost between local and nonlocal letters since transportation charges are an inconsequential share of the cost of delivering a single letter. The main costs in mail distribution are for collecting, sorting and delivering operations which must be performed regardless of the destination of the letters. (Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, April 25, 1956, before House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.)

Lately, in his strong desire to get more and more revenue out of American citizens and business firms, Mr. Summerfield has tried to gloss over the objections he himself raised less than 2 years ago. But the fact remains: "Any rate differential between local and nonlocal first-class letter mail would be discriminatory, costly, and extremely difficult to administer * * * public confusion would be widespread." We urge Congress defeat the 5-cent stamp.

THE ASSOCIATION OF FIRST-CLASS MAILERS.

America Is Still Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1958, at a dinner sponsored by the Committee for the Betterment of Altoona, Pa., Mr. Ira T. Ellis, economist for the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., delivered the following address on the subject America Is Still Growing:

AMERICA IS STILL GROWING

(Talk before the Committee for the Betterment of Altoona, April 7, 1958, Ira T. Ellis, economist, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.)

It is a pleasure to be in Altoona and to discuss with you some of the current business changes and trends in your community and in the Nation.

You have been affected in Altoona by the current decline in business activity, particularly by the decline in heavy industry and in railroad equipment, but you are meeting the problem in a realistic way—by diversification of industry. It is often difficult to accomplish. It usually means starting with small units and waiting for them to grow, but that is the way a community, a State, or a nation grows. And America is still a growing economy.

Our population is rising about 3 million persons per year. Every 6 years we add a population equal to that of Canada. Merely providing the present standard of living for these newcomers will require substantial production of goods and services over the years.

And the standard of living of all of us must be kept rising—through increasing income of employees as output per worker is increased, through increasing income of proprietors—including farm proprietors—and through increased income of the ownership of property. But note that income must be increased by increasing production, not merely by raising prices.

Now let us look at the current business decline, the business boom which preceded it, how serious it is, and what the future may hold.

The previous business decline in this country occurred in 1953, due largely to reduction of military spending and the supporting inventories. Business activity remained low in the first three quarters of 1954, but it then turned up sharply because of a rising rate of residential construction and increased automobile sales. The high and rising rate of business activity in the spring of 1955 caused many businessmen to begin expansion programs. The high rate of business activity in 1955, therefore, was supported importantly by a high rate of residential construction, a peak rate of automobile production, and a rising rate of business spending for new plant and equipment.

Business spending for plant and equipment rose further in 1956, but automobile production and residential construction declined. A new factor added in 1956 was that investment in the country began to outrun our savings rate. Many businessmen favored financing further expansion by means of commercial bank credit, that is, by creating credit. The Federal Reserve Board, charged with responsibility for determining the desirable size of the money supply of the country, properly opposed the use of commercial bank credit for investment purposes. This was the tight-money policy we heard about. The Federal Reserve Board did not reduce the volume of commercial bank credit, they merely prevented it from rising rapidly. The demand for loanable funds, however, rose substantially from mid-1955 to mid-1957 and interest rates also rose.

The year 1957 was the best business year the country has ever seen. We employed more people last year than ever before in history. They earned more and spent more than in any other year. Personal income and farm income last year were up 5 percent above the year before, and retail sales rose by a similar percentage. Business investment in plant and equipment also made a new record last year. The year began with business activity at an alltime peak, but it declined during the year.

The decline is occurring principally because pressure is off the substantial investment boom of the past 2 years. Manufacturing capacity has temporarily outrun the demand for goods. Business inventories are somewhat high in relation to the expected output rate of the year 1958. New orders of durable goods manufacturers are declining, and inventories are being reduced.

There will be some further weakness in business activity over the next few months. Business spending for plant and equipment will probably be declining all this year. Inventories will be falling during the first three quarters of this year.

But there are also some elements of strength in the outlook. Residential construction has been falling during the past 2 years, largely because other outlets for loanable funds were more attractive. Residential construction is now rising. Its value this year will exceed that of 1957. Residential mortgages are now more attractive than they were in 1957. Spending by State and local governments is also rising, importantly for schools and roads—facilities that depend on the number and location of people, and on the number of motor vehicles in the country. Our population is rising steadily and people are moving from the farm to the city and from State to State. Federal Government spending is also rising, particularly for defense.

Consumer spending is also expected to hold up well in 1958. Employment is declining in manufacturing, mining, and transportation. It is rising in trade, finance, services, and government. And unemployment compensation, social security payments, private pensions, and personal savings will help to support consumer spending. The inventory change is expected to shift from minus to plus before the year end.

Spending in retail food stores is running at a high level. Sales of these stores in the first 2 months of 1958 were up about 10 percent from the same period a year ago—perhaps at the expense of automobiles and household appliances. The quantity of food sold this year will be about 3 percent above 1957, and the dollar value may be up 5 percent or more.

The outlook for food sales is good because of the composition of our population as well as because of our rising personal income. The 10- to 19-year age group—an important consumer of food—will rise from 24.5 million persons in 1955—little change from 1940—to 30.5 million in 1960 and to 36.5 million in 1965, or a rise of about 50 percent in 10 years.

Employment in February was down only 1.9 percent from a year ago—from the peak of the boom. Remember that there are 62 million people now working, in spite of this decline. Employment has declined over the past year among manufacturing wage workers and the related supervisory staff. Employment has risen among professional workers, particularly teachers and clerical workers, private household workers and workers in the service industries. A massive employment shift is occuring.

Another factor affecting the present employment situation is the very large increase in the number of married women working. From 1947 to 1956, the number of male workers in the labor force rose 6 percent, but the number of married women in the labor force rose 68 percent. As of February 1958, 30 percent of all married women in the country were in the labor force.

We must hold down costs to maintain or stimulate sales. Rising prices restrain sales. Labor negotiations now going on in the automobile industry are most significant. The hope is for a settlement that will not result in increased prices.

There is some probability of a tax cut July 1—with personal income taxes probably reduced by 5 to 10 percent. It would give the economy a shot in the arm if the reduction were as much as $5 billion, but it would not restore business activity to the level of December 1956. It would, however, help to cushion the decline.

But remember that a tax cut which increases the deficit of the Federal Government would be highly inflationary. It is almost equal to printing money. It may be desirable if business activity is still declining by midsummer, which is unlikely.

Instead of a tax cut, we should work for cost reduction and for other employment for laid-off workers. We should stimulate the construction of roads, schools, and homes. Two years ago we needed more saving and less spending by individuals. Today we need more spending and less saving.

If taxes are cut to stimulate the economy, the deficit should be cut as business activity and Federal receipts rise by reducing Federal expenditures.

In summary, we are experiencing a business cycle somewhat more severe than that of 1948–49 and 1953–54. The country was pressing against its capacity in skilled labor, the production of plant and equipment, and in savings in 1956 and early 1957. We

are now coming down from a rate of expansion that could not be sustained to a more nearly normal growth rate.

Looking beyond 1958, and assuming no further increase in international tension, the trend of business activity should be upward. This outlook is based on our rising population, technological advances, expected high rates of business investment in new plant and equipment and personal investment in new homes, and on an expected high level of construction of roads, schools, etc. The years 1959 and 1960 will see a rising trend of business activity after the readjustment of 1958, and after we absorb some of the current excess of manufacturing capacity. We snapped back quickly after the decline of 1954, and we can do it again.

The years 1961–65 could be years of normal growth, on the average—about 3.25 percent per year in industrial production: The output of our factories and mines. These years are not likely to be boom years for residential construction because the rate of family formation will still be held down by the low birthrate of the early 1930's.

The rate of growth will not be steady from year to year. There will be business readjustments from time to time. We have not eliminated the business cycle, but perhaps we have learned to moderate it by restraining the excesses of credit creation, expansion of business capacity, and inventory accumulation characteristic of booms. In short, while we are experiencing some difficulty in maintaining a high growth rate in economic activity at the moment, we have weathered periods like this in the past. I think the long-term outlook for growth in this country is excellent.

Nuclear Tests Compilation Reveals Hypocrisy of Reds' Propaganda To End Blasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the American Committee for Liberation:

NUCLEAR TESTS COMPILATION REVEALS HYPOCRISY OF REDS' PROPAGANDA TO END BLASTS

NEW YORK.—The hypocrisy of Soviet leaders in demanding a cessation of nuclear-weapons tests in the West is disclosed in a compilation of Soviet tests released by the American Committee for Liberation.

The compilation is based on press announcements of the Atomic Energy Commission from August 23, 1957 to March 22, 1958. It disclosed that while Soviet anti-testing propaganda has reached new highs the past 2 months, the Soviet Union itself exploded 3 nuclear weapons within a period of 5 days (February 23–February 27) and 6 more nuclear weapons in a period of 9 days (March 14–March 22). These were in addition to 5 other Soviet test explosions in the August-December period, making a total of 14 since August 1957.

"Significantly, while the United States has publicly announced all its test in advance, the Soviet Union has never announced one," according to an analysis prepared by the American Committee for Liberation.

"The incredible performance of Soviet leaders in championing an end to nuclear weapons tests while intensively conducting such tests themselves constitutes a vivid example of Soviet insincerity, bad faith, and perfidy."

The American committee, a group of private American citizens headed by Howland H. Sargeant, supports Radio Liberation's round-the-clock broadcasts to the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 languages of the U. S. S. R.

The American committee's analysis also pointed out that while the United States has officially invited members of the United Nations, including the U. S. S. R., to observe forthcoming nuclear tests in the Pacific, the Soviet Union has never done so.

"Moreover, while the United States Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy conducted extensive public hearings last fall on the problem of radioactive fallout, the Soviets have never done so and are not likely to do so," the analysis contended.

Summary of AEC announcements on Soviet nuclear weapons tests, Aug. 23, 1957–Mar. 22, 1958

Date of AEC Press release	Date of Soviet tests	Range of yield
Aug. 23, 1957	Aug. 22, 1957	Detonation of substantial size.
Sept. 9, 1957	Within the past 2 days	Nuclear weapons test of moderate intensity. This appears to be the 2d test in a series which began Aug. 22.
Sept. 25, 1957	Sept. 24, 1957	Detonation in the megaton range. 3d nuclear explosion in the USSR announced by the United States since Aug. 22.
Oct. 11, 1957	Oct. 10, 1957	Another test conducted in Soviet series. Latest test was a small explosion.
Dec. 30, 1957	Dec. 28, 1957	Soviet Union is continuing its testing of nuclear weapons. Most recent nuclear explosion occurred Dec. 28. (No announcement re yield.)
Feb. 23, 1958	Feb. 23, 1958	Soviets conducted weapons test today. The yield was in the megaton range.
Feb. 28, 1958	Feb. 27, 1958 (2 tests)	Soviets have conducted 2 more large-yield explosions in current series. Today's test explosions were both in the megaton range, and brought to 3 the number of Soviet large-yield nuclear explosions in the past 5 days.
Mar. 14, 1958	Mar. 14, 1958 (2 tests)	United States has detected 2 Soviet nuclear weapons tests today. Neither test was in the megaton range.
Mar. 15, 1958	Mar. 15, 1958	Soviets today conducted another nuclear weapons test. The yield of the detonation was below the megaton range.
Mar. 21, 1958	Mar. 20, 21, 1958	Detection of 2 further nuclear tests by the Soviet Government. The first occurred Mar. 20 and the energy yield was small. The second occurred Mar. 21 and the energy yield was in a larger range.
Mar. 22, 1958	Mar. 22, 1958	The test of another weapon by the Soviet Government was detected today. This detonation, which appears to have been in the medium range, is the third in the past 3 days and the sixth in the past 9 days.

The Farmers Suffer From Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I notice that today's Washington Post and Times Herald, April 15, 1958, carries a story entitled, "Rise for Farm Income Noted." The article reports that yesterday, April 14, 1958, while announcing that prices received by farmers are running substantially higher than a year ago, Agriculture Secretary Benson said that agriculture has been a source of strength in the current recession.

I should like to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, several news items which I think strongly dispute Mr. Benson's claim of agricultural muscle; particularly economic strength, measured in terms of hard dollars and cents.

Surely, I find no justification for Mr. Benson's statement that agriculture has been a source of strength in the current recession when I read expressions of economic plight from the people of my area such as:

He—

President Eisenhower—

has turned his back on those people in our economy who already suffered a severe decline in income through being compelled to subsidize the rest of the economy because of administration cuts in farm income on the one hand and having to pay record high prices for the things they must buy.

And:

Now history may well record that 5 years of declining purchasing power on American farms is the direct cause of the recession in which the whole Nation finds itself during these early months of 1958.

And:

When the Republicans took over, the support rate [on wheat] was $2.09 a bushel. It has been reduced to $1.78.

Mr. Benson's glowing praise of agriculture's strength during the current recession appears to dim rapidly when shadowed by economic realities on the farm, reported by the people on the farm.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News of April 6, 1958]

FARM VETO HIT

Ike's veto of the farm freeze bill is an unjustified and devastating blow to farmers, as well as a dangerous jolt to the economy of the country in general. If there was anything that needed to be lowered, it certainly was not farm prices.

The President's action in vetoing the bill is not one of statesmanship, but is instead a demonstration of this administration's subservience to processor groups and other big business interests.

Benson, in urging the veto before the measure was ever passed by Congress again proved that he is no friend of the farmer, as one would expect a true Secretary of Agriculture to be, but is instead a vassal of the processors and big business groups with which he has so liberally staffed his department.

These interests would enslave the farmer to a lower standard of living and in addition endanger the whole economy in order to profit from a depressed agriculture.

By forcing lower prices on the farmer, they can pocket the difference, since they would charge the consumer the same as before. This is exactly what they have done each time the administration has shoved farm prices down.

Ike's veto is simply a demonstration of the depths to which he has sunk in becoming the errand boy of the selfish special interest groups. He has turned his back on those people in our economy who already suffered a sever decline in income through being compelled to subsidize the rest of the econ-

omy because of administration cuts in farm income on the one hand and having to pay record high prices for the things they must buy.

ARVID MATTSON, *Inman.*

IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE IN AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. Benson's failure has been pointed out to him time and time again. In the operation of his farm program we know he is responsible in large measure for the way the country as a whole accepts and understands the needs and problems of farm people.

But he has fallen down. He has been more of an apologist for farmers than a champion of them and their institutions, including our cooperatives. Indeed, he has set back agriculture's public relations a whole generation.

Does he really think he is justified in shaping his farm policies that way? He has condemned the farmers not only 1 year but ever since he has been in office. He is now, and now history may well record that 5 years of declining purchasing power on American farms is the direct cause of the recession in which the whole Nation finds itself during these early months of 1958. Certainly, the time has come to make a change. A new Secretary of Agriculture is a must.

JAKE MOHR.

McCRACKEN.

[From the Great Bend (Kans.) Daily Tribune, April 6, 1958]

ADMINISTRATION BURIED DEEPER UNDER GROWING WHEAT SURPLUS

(By Ovid A. Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration has lost ground during its years of trying to reduce the Nation's big wheat surplus.

Furthermore, the way things are going, no improvement is in sight.

This situation exists even though the Government has employed production-control measures on five wheat crops and proposes controls for the sixth, and has spent more than $2½ billion in trying to bring supplies into balance with markets.

Just why this should be is a matter for argument. The administration contends the tools Congress has given it are inadequate to do the job. Its critics reply that the tools it wants wouldn't succeed, either.

When the administration took over in 1953, the Nation's wheat supply totaled about 1¾ billion bushels—the largest of record to that date. At that time there was an annual market for about 978 million bushels.

The supply for 1958 has been forecast at more than 2 billion bushels, or 13 percent larger than when President Eisenhower entered the White House. Given unusually favorable weather during the growing season, this year's supply could easily exceed the present estimate.

This situation will be one of the matters wheatgrowers must weigh before going to polls June 20 to vote yes or no on continuation of marketing quotas on the 1959 wheat crop. Approval by at least two-thirds of those voting is required to make the quotas operative.

In a similar referendum a year ago on quotas for the 1958 crop, the vote was 86 percent in favor of the controls.

Many farm leaders say the fact that no progress has been made in getting wheat production and supplies in line with market requirements points up the need for a new approach to the wheat problem.

The continued existence of a big wheat surplus does not mean Eisenhower and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, have not tried to remedy the situation.

The administration has searched the corners of the earth for new markets. It did succeed in moving a record quantity of the grain into export markets 1 year. In fact, foreign shipments during the Eisenhower years have been the highest of record of an equivalent peacetime period.

In opening up markets, it cut prices on its grain and offered subsidies to encourage export of commercial supplies into lower priced foreign markets.

It has cut price supports on the grain in an effort to discourage over production. When the Republicans took over, the support rate was $2.09 a bushel. It has been reduced to $1.78.

The administration has cut acreages under the control program to the lowest level permitted by law. But production continues to outstrip markets.

Boost the Rates—End the Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert M. Hammes, editor of the Minidoka County News, Rupert, Idaho, is certainly to be commended on his analysis of the postal-rate situation, contained in the editorial below, which he wrote for the April 7, 1958, edition of the countywide paper:

BOOST THE RATES—END THE DEFICITS

A million and a half dollars a day.

Wouldn't that be a nice income to have?

But it's not income as far as the United States Post Office is concerned, because that's the daily deficit.

Right now the question of postage rates is being thrashed out by Congress. The biggest noise is coming from the argument on the 4-cent or 5-cent letter rate, but the biggest part of the deficit comes from second- and third-class mail. (Second class is magazines and newspapers; third class is catalogs, advertising fliers, boxholders, etc.)

Now the raise in letter postage has merit. It was way back in 1932 that the rate was raised from 2 cents to 3 cents. It is certainly important that those who use the mails pay for them (and about 85 percent of the first-class mail is originated by business). So it only seems proper that first class should take some increase.

But the biggest deficit makers, second- and third-class mail, are not getting the ballyhoo and publicity that the debate about first class is receiving. Both classes need substantial increases. True enough, the rates on these classes of mail have taken increases in recent years. Second class is now paying 60 percent more than it did a few years ago. But this increase is still not enough to wipe out the deficit it causes.

The Post Office Department claims that one of the largest circulation magazines in the country is delivered at a deficit of over 3 cents for every one of the millions of copies issued every month. Another magazine, a weekly, contributes 1 to 3 cents per copy deficit on every one of millions of copies issued every week. The deficit is a direct subsidy to the publishers of these magazines—both of whom are violently opposed to subsidies for others.

Newspapers, too, contribute to this second-class deficit. However, most dailies are delivered by carrier boy and the circulation of most weeklies is closely confined to the city of publication. Over 60 percent of the circulation of the Minidoka County News, for example, goes to homes within 15 miles of Rupert. But, in spite of this limit of transportation, the newspapers also contribute to the second-class deficit. They, too, are enjoying a direct subsidy from the post office—and the taxpayers.

Third class mail, the circulars, advertising letters, catalogs, fliers, etc., also contribute heavily to the postal deficit. No one, in my hearing, has ever welcomed this stuff that always clutters up the mailboxes, and the postal employees dislike the stuff, too. This is also subsidized, a subsidy to the firms that use direct mail and to the printing plants that produce the stuff. Third class, along with second class, should be increased.

What this whole thing boils down to is this, the general taxpayer is paying a portion of his tax money to magazines, newspapers, advertisers using third class, a class of business that certainly should be able to stand on its own feet without subsidy.

This is wrong. The postal rates should be increased and the postal deficit eliminated. Write your Senators and Congressmen now, and tell them what you think.

Outstanding American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on an outstanding American, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the House majority leader, which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News on April 6, 1958:

OUTSTANDING AMERICAN

One of the greatest of all living Americans was recognized recently when the National Conference of Christians and Jews cited Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader in Washington, for his distinguished service in the field of human realtions.

For more than 30 years now, the name of JOHN MCCORMACK has been synonymous with justice and decency in Washington. No group has ever been too small or insignificant to merit his help or sympathy.

The powerful voice of Congressman MCCORMACK has seen to it time and again that the people of Ireland, Israel, and other small nations have been accorded their true diplomatic rights. One wonders just how these small nations would be treated in the absence of a man of MCCORMACK'S stature.

During the long years of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations, Congressman MCCORMACK unquestionably could have had any job within the gift of the party. But it is a matter of record that on many occasions he turned them down, even an offer of appointment to the United States Supreme Court bench.

"I prefer to stay in the Congress where I feel I can do the most good for the people of America and particularly for those who cannot come here to speak for themselves," he has often stated.

The hundreds who attended the recent 30th anniversary banquet of the Conference of Christians and Jews, at which Congressman MCCORMACK was honored, were privileged to be present at ceremonies honoring a great American.

Not only is Congressman MCCORMACK to be congratulated on his new honor which has been bestowed upon him, recognition is also due his devoted and talented wife, Mrs. Harriett McCormack. Mrs. McCormack has been a tower of strength in her husband's life. She deservedly stands at his side in his newest hour of praise and tribute.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate received President's veto of flood control bill, and again took up community facilities bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5663–5707

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3616–3623; and S. Res. 288.

Pages 5669–5670

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: S. Con. Res. 77, to extend greetings to the Federal Legislature of the West Indies (S. Rept. 1435). Page 5669

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee. Page 5663

President's Communication—Civil Defense: Communication was received from President transmitting amendment to budget for fiscal year 1959 involving increase of $2,915,000 for Federal Civil Defense Administration—referred to Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 89. Page 5663

Veto Message—Flood Control: Message from President vetoing S. 497, Flood Control Act of 1958, was received, read, and ordered to lie on table and be printed as S. Doc. 88. Page 5721

Community Facilities: Senate again took up (following its postponement on April 1) S. 3497, Community Facilities Act of 1958, taking the following additional actions on amendments thereto:

Adopted: Javits amendment to add civil defense facilities to type of projects included in the bill; and by 54 yeas to 25 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), modified Case (New Jersey) amendment providing that on projects under bill the prevailing wage rate and 40-hour week or time and a half for hours in excess thereof shall apply; and

Rejected: By 40 yeas to 41 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Fulbright amendment to limit interest rates on authorized loans to 3 percent instead of 3½ percent.

Pending at adjournment was Thurmond amendment to declaration of policy in bill so as to provide for extension of credit on reasonable terms rather than where such credit is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms or conditions. Pages 5707–5708, 5723–5760

D. C. Births: Senate concurred in House amendment to S. 1708, relating to children born out of wedlock in the District of Columbia. This action cleared the bill for the White House. Page 5760

Program for Wednesday: Senate adjourned at 7:58 p. m. until noon Wednesday, April 16, when it will continue on S. 3497, community facilities bill.

Pages 5760, 5762, 5768

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

SUBCOMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation, in executive session, ordered reported to the full committee (1) S. 1497, to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate and foreign commerce (amended by substituting the language of H. R. 8308, a related House-passed bill), (2) S. 1939, to amend in several respects the Federal Seed Act of 1939, (3) a clean bill in lieu of S. 672 and S. 2490, to control noxious plants on Federal lands, and (4) S. 3076, authorizing transportation in the U. S. of live foot-and-mouth disease virus for research purposes.

Subcommittee will hold hearings at 2 p. m. tomorrow to hear out-of-town witnesses with respect to S. 3538, to amend the Packers and Stockyard Act relative to practices in the marketing of livestock.

Subcommittee agreed to hold hearings on S. 724 and S. 2306, bills to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS—HEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H. R. 11645, fiscal 1959 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, with testimony from Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General; Dr. David E. Price, Chief, Bureau of State Services; Dr. James K. Shafer, Division of General Health Services; Drs. Robert J. Anderson and C. A. Smith, both of the Communicable

Appendix

The Veto of the Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are now beginning to hear from the people regarding the Presidential veto, on yesterday, of the rivers and harbors authorization bill. The people in our States who have close knowledge of the need for the water-development projects provided for by the bill do not understand the reasons advanced for the veto. Neither do I.

This measure could have been followed quickly by the necessary funding legislation. It would have put people to work building projects that are important to the future of the Nation.

I deeply regret that the President saw fit to veto what I believe to be a constructive bill.

Mr. President, this morning I have received telegrams from city officials and other citizens of Texas who protest the veto. The bill authorizes a navigation project of vital and urgent importance to the city of Port Lavaca. The people of Port Lavaca are understandably distressed, as the mayor of the city states in his telegram. Their distress and amazement are shared, I am confident, by many, many persons throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams I have received from citizens of Texas be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT LAVACA, TEX., *April 15, 1958.*
Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The city of Port Lavaca, Tex., through its city council expresses the amazement and distress of its citizens at the President's action in vetoing the public works bill thus blocking recommended and approved public works at a time when the community is fast feeling not only the effects of the depressed general economy but the throttling effect on its local fishing industry by the holding up of navigation improvements that have met all the tests for approval. We strongly urge you not only to vote to override this veto but to use all your influence with other Members to do so.

JOHN H. CLEGG, JR.,
Mayor of Port Lavaca, Tex.

PORT LAVACA, TEX., *April 15, 1958.*
Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of the Democrat Leader,
Washington, D. C.:

LYNDON, we are sick over the veto. Is there a chance to override it?

CARROLL HARTZOG.

PORT LAVACA, TEX., *April 15, 1958.*
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of Democratic Leader,
Washington, D. C.:

The presidential veto of rivers and harbors bill will drastically effect our continued rising unemployment in Port Lavaca, Point Comfort, Victoria area. Attempt override if possible.

L. L. FROELICH,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

PORT LAVACA, TEX., *April 15, 1958.*
Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of the Democratic Leader,
Washington, D. C.:

Deeply shocked President veto river-harbors bill. Urge you to exhaust all possible means to completely assure us that this veto will be overridden.

CLEGG SHRIMP CO.,
JOHN CLEGG, *President.*
R. E. CLEGG TRAWLERS,
R. E. CLEGG, *Owner.*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the comments made by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in protesting the veto message of the President on the rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, I wish to enter my protest. Later in the day, I shall give facts and figures in regard to what the veto message actually means to the people of the United States.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, with today's supersonic jet aircraft being operated by our military forces, there is no area of our country that can escape the phenomena of the sonic boom or its impact.

The boom, which creates a tremendous blast followed by terrific repercussion, is caused by jet aircraft crashing the sound barrier.

The sonic boom is becoming a fairly common but still frightening and damaging occurrence in California, where there is a large concentration of supersonic military aircraft.

We know supersonic aircraft is needed for our defense and security, we are going to have to learn to live with the sonic boom, even though it is an extremely unpleasane experience.

However, since the Government alone operates this type of equipment in the continental United States, it is time for Congress to fix the responsibility for damages caused by the sonic boom, which is capable of breaking dishes, cracking plaster, shattering windows, and causing other damage.

The extent of the damage which can be caused by this phenomena is documented in a story appearing in the April 11, 1958, issue of the San Francisco Examiner reporting clearly and precisely the result of a recent sonic boom experience in the Bay region.

I intend to press for early action by the House Judiciary Committee on any one of four bills now before a subcommittee to fix the Government's liability for damages and to place a ceiling on the amounts that can be paid when a claim is found to be legitimate by the appropriate Government authority.

In checking with the subcommittee, I have found that required reports from the executive agencies still have not been submitted with respect to some of the pending sonic boom bills. I have urged these agencies to expedite their reports.

The four measures now pending have been introduced by myself and my colleagues Mr. SISK, of California; Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; and Mr. SIMPSON, of Illinois.

I believe the time is overdue when we must resolve the question of responsibility for the sonic boom. The article from the San Francisco Examiner follows:

Window-shattering sonic booms rocked the entire East Bay area yesterday morning at 10:39 a. m. at the height of a full-dress defense exercise by Air Force and Navy supersonic jet fighters against a simulated enemy attacking force.

As the jet interceptors roared in the skies 7 miles above the San Francisco Bay area, with scores of planes participating in the war games, the sonic booms were felt with explosive force in Oakland, Alameda, Richmond, Emeryville, Orinda, Berkeley, and San Pablo. San Francisco police reported only two telephone complaints here, from residents of the outer Mission district.

In virtually every community in the East Bay, police switchboards were jammed with complaints of broken windows, pictures knocked from walls, and loosened plaster in homes. Emeryville police reported that the

city hall in that community was shaken by the sonic blasts.

At the time the booms occurred, 23 Navy Skyray jets and 2 Air Force Delta Dagger F–102 jets, capable of speeds over 1,000 miles per hour, were directly over the San Francisco Bay area, both Navy and Air Force officials conceded.

They added that it was impossible to determine whether the sonic booms had been created by Air Force or Navy jets. The Navy planes over the area at the time were from Moffett Field, and the two Air Force jets were from Travis Air Force Base in Solano County.

In addition to the 2 Air Force jets overhead when the booms occurred, another 11 Delta Daggers were participating in the same exercise, but were engaged over the ocean.

Divided We Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 29, before the Servicemen's Republican Club, at Topeka, Kans., the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives, delivered a speech entitled "Divided We Fall." I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVIDED WE FALL

I appreciate the honor of speaking at this luncheon of the Republican Servicemen of Kansas. It is an organization of which I am proud to be a member. I do not recall exactly when these meetings began, but whatever the date, I have been present at almost every luncheon since that time. A very few times, as I recall it, my work in Washington prevented me from attending.

No one could want a finer audience than this. All of you have proven your devotion to your country by defending it in time of war, and by stanchly and effectively working for good government in time of peace.

I am happy to be here today, not as an officeholder or as a candidate for office, but as one of those in the ranks, ready and willing to do my humble part in winning victory next November. I have been a private citizen now for a little more than a year, and I am convinced that there is no individual in the world who bears a title any prouder than that of American citizen. And it's good to be a Kansan too. Never have I appreciated more the fundamental goodness of our State and its people than I have during the last 12 months.

But I did not come here simply to congratulate you on being Kansans or a brag about being one myself. We have serious business ahead of us during the next 9 months, and everything I say this afternoon will be spoken directly or indirectly on the subject of how we Republicans can win the election next November.

I am not going to talk to you about party issues—either State or national. The subject I want to talk about today is the Republican Party in the State of Kansas, what it has done for us in the past, and how important it is for us to be able to look to it for leadership in the serious and trying times which are head.

I want to begin by saying something of our two-party system of government, because I believe that it has contributed more to the success of our great experiment in government than any other thing. And this is rather ironic, because the founders of our government did not contemplate political parties as we know them today. George Washington warned against them. And these warnings might have been justified had we developed a party system composed of minority groups, as has been the case in many other nations which have attempted to set up government by the people. But here in the very beginning it was realized that popular government could be a success only if a majority of the people could determine and carry out governmental policy. That could only be done under a two-party system. That is the system we have followed. It is true, of course, that we have at times had third parties or even fourth or fifth parties, but these minor political groups have never become important. They have come and they have gone—sometimes flashing like a meteor across the sky—and usually lasting little longer.

And we realize especially how fortunate we have been in this country when we see what has happened in other nations where a multiplicity of parties developed. We saw Hitlerism rise in Germany because the large number of parties prevented a majority of the people from establishing a responsible government. We have seen what has happened in France since the end of World War II. That great nation, which has made real progress in many ways since World War II, is today impotent and slowly bleeding to death because its 20 or more parties prevent a government from being formed which has the confidence and support of a majority of the people.

Contrast this with postwar Germany. It was utterly prostrated in 1945—I saw it then, as did many of you. You saw the shattered cities, the desolate countryside, the chaos that prevailed everywhere, and yet Western Germany has risen from its ashes and debris in just a few years to become one of the great powers of modern civilization. And it has done so at least in part because it has had a two-party system, where a majority of the people have been able to express their wishes and the nation has had effective leadership.

Now why do I dwell on this matter of a two-party system? Primarily because I want to point out that under a two-party system of government each party must include people who have a wide range and variety of views and ideas. And yet ever so often we run into someone who expresses the idea that any Republican who believes differently, even a little differently than he does, should be read out of the party. That's where we get into trouble. The Republican Party contains men and women of many ideas and viewpoints but it has endured for more than a hundred years because we have learned that all of us don't have to think exactly alike in order to work effectively for good government.

No greater example of that was even shown than after the 1952 Republican convention when two of the greatest men that this Nation has ever known—Dwight Eisenhower and Bob Taft—men who sincerely differed on some important things—sat down, reconciled their viewpoints, and went on together to win a tremendous victory at the polls.

And we all remember how well things went during the early months of the Eisenhower administration when these two great men had a chance to work with each other—one as President, the other as leader of his party in Congress, in dealing with the great problems that confronted the Nation. If Bob Taft and Dwight Eisenhower could iron out their differences of opinion—could put aside personal feelings and work together for the good of America—then certainly every one of us in the Republican Party can and should do the same thing.

Now does that mean that ideals and principles do not amount to anything? And that people should give up their convictions and depend upon expediency? Certainly that is the furthest thing from what I am trying to say. But what I do say—and the one thought above all others that I want to leave with you today—is that if government and politics are to operate effectively there must be compromise and reconciliation. The American Constitution is the result of compromise in almost every section. No political party ever wrote a platform that wasn't based upon compromise piled upon compromise.

That's the only way that we can have a 2-party system, because if individuals are going to insist upon their individual ideas on every issue—major or minor—which may come up, then there can be no such thing as party government or a 2-party system.

We have had important differences in our party—important enough back in 1912 to split the party temporarily. We have them now—we have them nationally—we have them in Kansas—but don't forget the Democrats have their big differences too, and yet they have kept their party together for over 150 years or since the days of Thomas Jefferson, and the fact is that even with all their dissension now, they are still doing a good job of keeping together—maybe too good a job from our standpoint.

Sometimes we develop party splits on the basis of personalities. We don't like somebody in the party. Then we say they've got to get out or we're going to get out. Well, that may be all right in a social club, but if we are going to have just two parties in the country, you and I have got to associate with a lot of people that we may not agree with on everything. We have got to be tolerant of personalities. We could apply the same thing to our church—there are a few people in my church that I don't care for particularly; and if I ever get to heaven I will probably find some there that I haven't cared for down below. But I don't expect to ask St. Peter to open up the pearly gates and let me walk out of the place.

If the Republican Party is going to continue to be a successful party, and if we are going to maintain a two-party system in this State and country, then we can't have an exclusive membership. It's got to be open to all. No person and no political party or party leader can be the keeper of another's political conscience. No Republican has any right to say that he is a better Republican than any other Republican. The acid test of whether a man is a Republican is whether he works for and votes with the party.

I am proud of the Republican Party in Kansas and the record which it has made. The Republican Party and Kansas started out together. They had one great purpose—to promote the cause of human freedom. That's one of the reasons why we Republicans have a peculiar right to celebrate the birthday of our State. Kansas started out as basically Republican. It still is. I don't need to tell you that throughout the years the great majority of the officials in the court houses of Kansas have been Republican; that 99 percent of the elective State executive and judicial officers have been Republican; that at least 75 percent of all men and women elected to the Kansas Legislature in the almost 100 years of our history have been Republican. Even last year, when some people seem to think the Republican Party was practically wiped out, we elected all State executive and judicial officers except governor and lieutenant governor; we elected 83 out of 125 members in the house of representatives; we elected 32 State senators out of 40; we elected FRANK CARLSON to the

United States Senate; we elected 5 out of 6 congressional candidates, and we gave Dwight Eisenhower a majority of 270,000 votes.

Now all of us will have to admit that the Republican Party in Kansas is not as big as the Eisenhower vote. A lot of independents and Democrats crossed the line on that one. But let's look at the vote for justices of the supreme court. I think that's the best test of the essential Republicanism of the State because whether we like to admit it or not, very few people personally know who they are voting for when they cast their ballot for a justice of the supreme court. They follow the party line there more strongly than anywhere else. If a Republican is in doubt, he votes for a Republican. If a Democrat is in doubt he votes for a Democrat. And yet in 1956—when according to a lot of the talk we were just about sunk without a trace—the majorities for Republican candidates for the supreme court ranged from 65,000 to 90,000.

Does that sound like the Republican Party is dead? Anyone who believes that would believe in fairies. And I want to say that anybody who starts kicking the Republican Party of Kansas around under the impression that it is a corpse is due for the surprise of his life.

Now I think it is a good thing for Republicans in Kansas to be worried. We took a licking the last time, but the fact is that if I were a Democrat in Kansas today I would be worried a lot more than I am as a Republican.

After all, 1956 lacks a lot of being the worst year that the Republicans ever had in Kansas. Let's go back to 1912. Then we lost the President, a United States Senator, a governor, 5 out of 8 Congressmen, and the legislature. The party was split. Some people said the two factions would never get together, and yet the party came back in 2 years and elected a Senator, a governor, a lieutenant governor, and all of its candidates for the supreme court and the minor State offices. We still did not get back our Congressmen—that took a little longer.

How did we do it? Simply because the Republicans buried the hatchet, and most of them marched side by side and shoulder to shoulder to victory. We did it then—we have done it since under similar circumstances—and in 1958 we can and will do it again.

I have said it already, but I want to repeat that I am proud of the Republican Party of Kansas. The fact that for nearly 100 years the Republicans have elected governors five-sixths of the time proves not only that a majority of the people in Kansas are Republicans, but that the men we have elected to office in Kansas have done a good job. That has kept the State Republican.

I don't know whether you think the fact that no Democratic governor has ever been reelected proves anything or not, but it proves a lot to me. In the first place it confirms the fact that our Democratic governors were elected in the first place solely because we had a division in the Republican Party. In the second place it proves that after 2 years of Democratic rule, the people were more-than-anxious to return to a Republican administration. And we have had some pretty good Democratic governors, but the people of Kansas just couldn't stand for them for more than one term.

I'm reminded of what I heard that great Kansan and great Republican, Arthur Capper, say on more than one occasion. It was to the effect that our form of government is based on the idea of having one party take the responsibility for government, and the other party take the responsibility of watching it and seeing that it does a good job; and then he always added that the Democrats made the better watchers. That evidently has also been the view of the people of Kansas throughout the years.

Some of you go back farther than I do, but I have been well acquainted with all of the Republican governors of Kansas from Arthur Capper on down. You or I may not have agreed with all of them or with everything they did, but every one of them made a real contribution to the growth, welfare, and prosperity of Kansas. I doubt if any State can look back over any 40-year period and bring up a list of governors who will, on the average, compare in ability and integrity with the governors of Kansas during that period. I don't care where you make your comparison, but a good place to start would be among our neighbors. During most of this same period of time Missouri and Oklahoma have had Democratic governors and Democratic legislatures—in fact Oklahoma has had them all the time, and Missouri most of the time. Maybe both States have improved a little bit in recent years, but I can recall that for quite a period of time the standard way of ending a governor's term in Oklahoma was by impeachment. And when we think of what Pendergast and his lieutenants did in Missouri, it makes our Kansas political history shine out brighter than ever before.

And what I have said about Kansas Republican Governors applies to the Republican United States Senators and Representatives whom I have known. During my time there have been Curtis, Capper, Allen, Reed, Darby, and our present able and distinguished Senators ANDY SCHOEPPEL and FRANK CARLSON, all of whom have added luster to the Senate during their period of service. And I have been proud of the Kansas Republicans with whom I have served in the House of Representatives.

I am not going to quarrel with the people of Kansas for kicking the Republicans out occasionally. Believing as I do in the two-party system, I want to see a strong Democratic Party—and a party has to win once in a while if it is going to hang together. A one-party State makes for poor government, as has been demonstrated in some of the Southern States and elsewhere. But while I want the Democrats to be strong, I don't want them to be too strong.

The first time I ran for Congress I had the pleasure of campaigning for a week with Charlie Curtis, and I learned a lot. It was the best experience in campaigning I ever had. We made a lot of speeches—that was back in the days when people would come out to hear a political speech instead of sitting by the fireside and waiting for the television to come on. And I remember very well what Charles Curtis always said about the Republican candidates. He said, "I have been campaigning with your Republican candidates today. I have talked with people about them, and I know that all of them are worthy and well qualified for the positions which they seek. They are worthy of the vote of every Republican," and then he added, "and if they receive the vote of every Republican, they will be elected."

That is as true now as it was then. Here in Kansas any candidate who receives the votes of every Republican will be elected to State or Federal office, and in most counties that holds true as to county candidates.

That is because the Republican Party in Kansas, on the basis of its record, is trusted by the people. And we must see that it continues to merit this trust and confidence. I want the Republican Party and the Republican candidates to win, but I want them to win because they deserve to do so.

As far as political activity is concerned, we are beginning today the campaign to elect a Republican governor, a Republican legislature, Republican State and county officials, and a solid Republican congressional delegation. If we are wise, we will not let up in that battle until the last vote is cast on election day.

President Eisenhower in his speech at Chicago earlier this month called on the Republicans to get busy and nominate the strongest possible candidates on the Republican ticket. That's sound advice—that's good politics. But nominating strong candidates is only the first step, or more properly the second. The first step is up to the candidates in the primary—that is, the candidates and their friends. How well the winners will run in the general election depends a lot on the nature of the primary campaign. If it is clean and constructive—if it avoids bitterness—if it is conducted on the basis of the merits of each candidate rather than his opponent's alleged faults and deficiencies—we can start the general election campaign from scratch. We will be in a position to get that rock bottom sixty-five to ninety thousand Republican majority which was represented in the vote for supreme court justices in 1956.

But that is not enough. We must write a platform which is not only constructive but one which avoids extremes—one which is neither reactionary nor radical but realistically conservative—by which I mean conserving the advances in government which have been tried and found acceptable, and subjecting new ideas and proposals to the tests of need, soundness, practicability, and timeliness.

But good candidates and good platforms do not win elections automatically. I don't want anything I have said so far to give the impression that there is going to be anything easy about the coming campaign. It is going to require the hardest kind of work on the part of all of us, given in the spirit that government is the biggest and most important business we have in this country and requires the best efforts of all of us.

And finally, to be sure of winning, we have got to conduct the campaign with that mixture of confidence and fear which is known as running scared.

To do this takes leadership, it takes organization, and most of all, it takes interest and hard work on the part of every Republican. But that, my friends, is a small price to pay for good government.

Government Should Postpone Liquidating Surplus War Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject of surplus property disposals for the Federal Government. The editorial was published in the Waste Trade Journal on April 12, 1958.

I am confident that the information and ideas set forth in the editorial will be very useful to the Members of this body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT SHOULD POSTPONE LIQUIDATING SURPLUS WAR EQUIPMENT

There is hardly an industry that has not been hit by the business recession but few

are as depressed as the scrap iron industry. With steel mills operating at less than 50 percent of capacity, the consumption of scrap has fallen off and prices have dropped to so low a level that in some instances it no longer pays to collect, prepare and pay the freight on certain grades of scrap. The simple fact is that scrap is in oversupply at the present time and even more disturbing are the prospects that there is a potential danger that the Government may increase that surplus supply by several hundredfold.

The tremendous supply of implements of war that the Government has been making and accumulating for years has suddenly been made obsolete by the nuclear weapons with which future wars will be fought. Planes and tanks and guns and ships which in years gone by were the standard weapons with which nations sought to destroy each other, have suddenly become obsolete. In this atomic age they have no place as a means of offense or defense. Our Government has billions of dollars worth of such outmoded war equipment on hand and which the War Department is anxious to get rid it. To some nations we will refuse to sell these outmoded weapons and others do not want them. Hence the only solution would be to scrap them, and therein lies the danger not only to the scrap iron industry but to others as well, if they should be thrown on the market during the present demoralized market conditions.

Many industries are very much concerned with the present plan of dumping Government surplus, which would compete with the products that they manufacture. The machine tool industry for example, which is wracked by a serious slump in sales and which finds itself in a depressed state, has already voiced its alarm over the tremendous volume of surplus tool sales by the various military services. Coming at a time when this industry's operations have been greatly curtailed, such sales by the Government are likely to put a still more serious crimp into their business and the industry hasn't forgotten what happened to it after World War II when the Government dumped hundreds of millions of dollars worth of idle military-owned machine tools on the market. It took the industry a long time to recover from that blow. With that sad experience still a vivid memory, the Metalworking Equipment Division in Commerce's Business and Defense Services Administration is reported to be exerting its influence in the proper channels in Washington in an effort to prevent indiscriminate dumping at present of surplus military tools.

We simply cite this as an instance of how some industries are taking precautionary measures now before it is too late to counteract the incalculable harm that might be done by a hasty liquidating program. Government dumping of surplus today would affect machinery, hardware, textiles, and many other industries.

For the scrap-iron industry, the danger of the Government's potential disposal program is infinitely greater. The Government has billions of dollars worth of obsolete military equipment that is stored in United States warehouses and that is piling up in European depots. The easiest way to dispose of it is to sell it for scrap. Under normal business conditions there would be little opposition or objections to such liquidation. But these are not normal times. The market has been unable to absorb the scrap that is being generated by industrial plants, and the scrap that comes form obsolescence and that is collected by dealers. That is why scrap prices are so depressed. That is why so many scrap yards have laid off workers thereby swelling the ranks of the unemployed.

Not only should the Government postpone the liquidation of this potential scrap that is located in the United States, but also the surpluses that are located abroad. The domestic scrap market would be in an even more depressed state were it not for the exports of domestic scrap to foreign countries. The Government could easily saturate the foreign markets with a scrap surplus by a hasty liquidation of its obsolete military equipment and thereby put an end to exports from this side.

There is no doubt that if the Government were to dump its surplus war equipment and sell it for scrap at the present time, that the material could probably be picked up at bargain prices. But in times like these what is best for the greatest number is the right policy to follow, and if that be true, then the Government should continue to hold on to its surplus supplies and equipment until business conditions improve and the time is more opportune for its disposal. The net return to the Government will be greater, and the various industries that produce machinery, steel, metals hardware, textiles as well as the scrap-iron industry will be spared an even worse depression than they are experiencing today.

Some Aspects of the Soviet Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last evening the Honorable Gabriel Hauge, special assistant to the President, delivered an address entitled "Some Aspects of the Soviet Economy," before the Economic Club of Worcester, at Worcester, Mass.

Mr. Hauge in this address analyzed the Russian economy on the basis of its technology, its politics, its society, and its economy. It is one of the most complete and informative discussions of the Soviet economy I have read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 3¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $263.25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS ON SOME ASPECTS OF THE SOVIET ECONOMY DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE GABRIEL HAUGE, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF WORCESTER, WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 14, 1958

The sputniks have brought in their wake a good deal of second-looking at the Soviet Union; its technology, its politics, its society, its economy. Out of this range of topics, I would like to talk economics with you tonight.

My purpose in coming here is neither to bury the Russian economy nor to praise it. Rather, I would like to look at some of its strengths and weaknesses, and to speculate with you a bit on some implications for the Russians, for the newly developing countries of the world, and for the American people. Needless to say, time will necessarily limit us to the broadest brush strokes, with little opportunity for qualifying detail.

I

Since the first 5-year plan of 1928, the Soviet Union has developed rapidly from the predominantly agricultural economy of the czars. Forced-draft industrialization, with its accent on heavy industry, was carried out by Stalin to prevent, as he put it, another beating of backward Russia by the more advanced capitalist countries. This was his justification for brutally holding down living standards to the barebones minimum. Now Khrushchev has announced the goal of catching up and surpassing the United States in production within the shortest possible time.

While the Russian economy was the sixth largest in the world under the last czar, it now ranks second and it continues to grow. Total Soviet output equaled a third of our own in 1950. By 1956, with a population 20 percent larger than ours, Soviet production had increase to about 40 percent of United States gross national product.

In the uneven development of the Soviet economy, industrial production, especially heavy industry and military equipment, has been favored. Overall industrial production in 1956 approximated 40 percent of ours. The distribution of that production among the several industries, of course, differs from our own. Russian output, for example, of automobiles, washing machines, and refrigerators, ranges between 2 and 4 percent of United States production of these goods. By contrast, the Soviets devote a far higher proportion of industrial output than we do to weapons production, which is their most efficient industry. They also concentrate more than we do on the products of heavy industry in general.

The output of some products approaches our own. Though lower for other fuels, Soviet coal output equals about 70 percent of ours. Steel output is about half that in this country. Since annual additions to steel capacity are now running about equal in tonnage in the two countries, the output of steel mill equipment must be about the same. The number of machine tools being produced is about twice that of the United States. Naturally the pattern is not uniform. Soviet output is much lower than ours in many essential industries such as petroleum, copper, aluminum, rubber, most chemicals, and electric power.

In a word, Soviet production has expanded considerably. Although its overall growth rate between 1928 and 1955 was not much higher than our own, the Soviet economy has been growing since 1950 at a rate roughly twice that of the United States. Since 1950 its average growth rate has been 6 to 7 percent. Its industrial production in this period has been expanding at about 10 percent a year. However adjusted to take into account the various qualifications scholars find necessary, the Soviet growth experience is substantial. It is a significant fact of today's world. It is a fact Americans should understand.

II

The Soviets have been able to achieve this expansion by tapping their wealth of natural resources and by ruthlessly shifting more than 25 million peasants out of agriculture between 1926 and 1955. During the same period, the nonagricultural labor force increased by an average of more than a million workers a year. In addition to its own natural and manpower resources, the Russians borrowed advanced Western technology and were aided by Western technical assistance. For example, General Electric built the Dnepropetrovsk power generators, Ford designed the Gorky auto plant, and International Harvester set up the Stalingrad tractor facilities. The results of all of this can be seen in the large amounts of American, as well as British and German,

equipment still used in many Soviet factories.

The key element of their expansion, however, has been purely domestic. It has been a matter of exploiting the people in order to devote every possible ruble of production to investment. This emphasis continues. In 1956 total Soviet investment in industry and public utilities amounted to 80 or 85 percent of plant and equipment expenditures in the United States.

Per capita consumption, on the other hand, is only one-fifth of ours. The mass of the Soviet people, especially the farmers, have been the underprivileged Cinderellas of the Communist community.

Changing patterns and emerging difficulties are somewhat slowing down the growth rate. Consider Soviet agriculture. Stalin sought to control the peasants and force a movement to the factories. These efforts helped make Soviet agriculture an economic flop. Since 1928 farm output per capita in Russia shows very little gain. Soviet agriculture is grossly inefficient. We produce agricultural superabundance with one-tenth of our labor force. Russian agriculture just manages to produce a grain, potato, and cabbage diet for the Russian people. In the process it utilizes about half the Soviet Union's working population.

Nature is somewhat to blame. Much of the sown land is not as rich as ours. The growing season is shorter, and does not allow much room for the vagaries of climate and rainfall. Most observers conclude, however, that much of the blame falls upon the Communist leaders themselves. Soviet peasants bore the brunt of the cruel burden of forced industrialization, especially in its early years. They were squeezed until there was little left to recompense their drudgery. They were overorganized. Their labors were directed by distant planners unfamiliar with local conditions. Investment in fertilizer and equipment until recent years was meager.

Now the Soviet leaders have promised their people a better diet than in 1956, including 40 percent more milk this year and 3½ times more meat by 1961. Khrushchev has announced that Soviet agriculture will overtake American per capita output of milk in 1958 and of meat by 1960 or 1961. That his own economists thought such goals visionary, Khrushchev himself rebukingly disclosed. Maybe the purpose behind the Russian chieftain's boast is to cast the American farmer in the role of Stakhanovist pacemaker to spur his Russian counterpart to greater efforts. Be that as it may, he could have challenged no more formidable American representatives in the game of productivity than our livestock and dairy farmers. I can only hope for the Russian people that in the future, Russian cows produce as much milk in Russian milk pails as they do in Khrushchev's propaganda speeches.

The Kremlin is also under pressure to raise industrial productivity to compensate for the slowing down in additions to the industrial labor force. Over the next 5 years, the movement of war-reduced age groups into jobs will add about 1.1 million workers to the labor force annually. This is about a third fewer than in each of the last 7 years. While the Soviet leaders hope that the flow of farm labor into industry will be resumed before too long, the immediate goal of more food is likely to require increased agricultural labor during the next 5 years.

The slower expansion of the labor force will, to some extent, be offset by increased efficiency. In this vital area, the Soviet managers seek to raise productivity to that of this country where industrial output per worker is between 2 and 3 times greater. Intensive research and development, both Russian and Western, hold the promise of continued or even accelerated general technological advance. In Soviet industry, furthermore, there are many unexploited opportunities for increasing productivity through the application of existing technology. This is true not only in the capital-starved consumer goods and service industries, but in heavy industry as well. The modernization and reequipment of industrial plants, now underway, will certainly raise productivity, but probably by less than the high expectations of the Kremlin.

To increase productivity by another means, great stress has been placed on industrial management. Russian journals frequently complain of bungling, ineptness, and even irrational behavior by managers and planners. To ease the rigidities, there has developed what one observer calls "blat." This is the function of wangling an allocation, an overplan credit or spare tire by give-and-take, tacit bribery, or a friendly pat on the back here and there. A sort of salaried 5-percenter sets up blat for his factory or supply depot. The big-city practitioner, running blat for a whole string of provincial factories, apparently deserves much of the credit for the fact that things do get done. All of this, of course, is not quite according to Marx.

Management and planning must have been deficient, indeed, to justify the wholesale shakeup of Soviet industrial organization announced by Khrushchev last May. The great industrial ministries centered in Moscow were wiped out and the operational supervision of most state enterprises shifted to 102 regional economic councils. Through this decentralization, the Communists hope to mobilize local resources and local initiative more effectively, to free the central planners from detailed operations, and to reduce the bureaucracy.

Perhaps the bureaucracy will be reduced. Some unwritten laws, including Parkinson's suggest it will increase. The prospect of administrators in 102 regions, each with the usual complex of deputies and staff assistants with which a Soviet bureaucrat surrounds himself, points rather to a burgeoning apparatus, not a streamlined administration.

Perhaps the Kremlin may be more successful in gaining greater productivity from local management with local incentives. Moscow is not, however, surrendering its formidable tools for central control, the apparatus of the Communist party, its inspectors, the financial organs and, most importantly, central control over planning.

We can reasonably speculate that the decentralization of Soviet industry may tend to regionalize the pattern of industrial self-sufficiency and development. It may improve efficiency somewhat. It may well complicate administration and planning initially with uncertain ultimate results. Perhaps it will also make the economy more responsive to its consumers.

The Soviet leaders have already come, for various reasons, to place greater emphasis on improved consumption: to stimulate labor productivity through the material incentives of improved living standards, to help remove the stigma of poverty from communism and thus increase its attractiveness at home and abroad, and to help generate more active support among the Soviet population, and to meet the sweeping pledges made by Khrushchev during the Presidium struggle of last year and reiterated when he recently displaced Bulganin as premier.

While the consumer goals set by Malenkov in 1953 were abandoned and have not yet been attained, the Krushchev program is both more ambitious and more specific. It puts special emphasis on lessening the very severe deficiencies in housing and agriculture, which are probably to receive almost a third of the total State investment provided under the proposed 7-year plan.

If Khrushchev's standard-of-living goals are to be reached, the share of resources available for the military or for investment in the expansion of basic industries must be lower than in the past. At the same time, a larger share of industrial investment will have to be devoted to programs with a relatively low payoff of new production. This will be true, for example, of the development of the eastern regions where initial investment requirements are high. It will be true also for the expansion of the fuel and raw materials base. In this area a chronic lag in new construction produced severe shortages in 1956 as the more easily extracted materials approached exhaustion. Obviously, total output will grow less rapidly under such a distribution of investment than when the minerals base was neglected to allow maximum investment in such high payoff sectors as machine building.

Faced with the political necessity of devoting added resources to improving living standards, of supplying economic aid to Communist China and the European satellites as well as to some other countries, of maintaining a huge and costly military establishment, the Kremlin has had to reduce capital investment plans. This fact has meant scaling down previous growth rates of heavy industry. Accordingly, the sixth 5-year plan of 1956 contemplated 25 percent less industrial expansion than claimed for the preceding plan. Even this target is apparently being lowered in the proposed 7-year plan now being designed to replace its defunct predecessor which had to be scrapped last September. This confession of failure recognized that the 1960 goals could not be attained on schedule because the cumulative shortfalls in several basic industries during 1956 were not remedied in 1957. Last year saw other failures to build new capacity planned for coal, iron ore, rolled steel, and electric power.

Nevertheless, the Soviet planners continue to devote a higher portion of their resources to investment than we do. This emphasis will help assure a continuing high rate of growth for the Soviet Union as long as rapid growth remains a major national objective. If Khrushchev's innovations achieve sufficient success to prevent a further decline in the rate of growth, by 1972 the Soviet steel output would double and the energy base would about triple. Also, with no reapportionment of priorities, consumption for the estimated 260 million Soviet citizens at that time would have increased, on a per capita basis, by more than 60 percent under the plan. The diet would be markedly improved and the present 13- by 13-foot living space for the average Russian family of four would be replaced by at least a 2-room apartment with kitchen and bath.

This is the plan. It may or may not come to pass, for, as it has been said, to plan is human; to fulfill, divine—or nearly so.

III

Whether or not these goals are achieved, perhaps an acceleration in the trend of improvement from World War II levels of individual welfare would be enough for the Kremlin's purpose. Without substantial progress toward these goals, however, the damage to worker morale might limit economic growth and weaken popular support for the regime. At the very least, such a failure would undermine the image coveted by Khrushchev of a government dedicated to popular welfare and determined to fulfill its promises to the people.

Perhaps the first major implication of recent developments for the Russian people is this: The Government's freedom of action relative to the population has, to some extent, been diminished. For even a complete dictatorship is inevitably influenced by the atmosphere in which it operates. It is conditioned by the needs and aspirations of its administrators, the society's professionals, and, at least to a limited degree, the popu-

lation at large. The heavier emphasis upon incentives in directing the activities of the Soviet citizen cannot easily be withdrawn. Presumably, Stalinist techniques could be reasserted only at great cost in terms of popular morale and internal stability. Moreover, the steps away from coercion and terror are mutually reinforcing. A reversal in direction, therefore, is becoming increasingly difficult.

Beyond this is a second major implication: The possibility of a spiraling emphasis on the production of consumer goods. Consumer desires may gain a new champion in the local economic officials who, under the decentralization scheme, will be in a position to have a real influence on investment planning. A greater production of consumer goods, moreover, will be required in order to apply existing pay scales to the increasing number of more highly trained workers and professionals. The larger number of scientists, technicians, and other professionals will have to be provided for in a manner befitting their station, even as the members of the Presidium and other high officials are today. This will require enlarged production of consumer goods and especially better housing. There must be something for higher ruble rewards to command. As the Kremlin faces up to the realities of this problem of human nature, its leaders may sense the point in Paul Henri Spaak's remark that it is harder to provide all members of the community with a roof, shoes, and meat than it is to launch an artificial satellite.

Third, the rising technical and professional level could itself profoundly influence the long-run development of the Russian society, both economically and politically. While specific prediction would be unwise, one can at least note several tendencies. There is, for example, the difficult job of running a complex modern industrial state under a totalitarian form of government. The Kremlin needs, in effect, the despised bourgeoisie. Such people, even in Communist Russia, may well be more interested in bettering the lot of their children than in doctrinaire socialism. Moreover, even directed education tends to stimulate some independent curiosity and thought. The skepticism of science, for example, cannot be confined to watertight laboratories. Some of it is bound to flow out. Similarly, the new generation of economic managers and planners who didn't experience czarist Russia or the rigorous discipline of the revolution may be more flexible than their predecessors. These tendencies toward a more liberal outlook on the part of the intellectuals, the managers, and the technicians have probably been reinforced by the trauma of the de-Stalinization campaign together with the constant revisions of Soviet dogma.

Fourth, Communist doctrine is being forced to yield to the impact of history. Soviet leaders have now openly abandoned the notion that the study of capitalistic accomplishment is unnecessary and even unpatriotic. In early 1956, at the 20th party congress, Anastos Mikoyan, now First Deputy Premier, criticized Soviet economists as deficient in the study of the present phase of capitalism. He went on to complain that they frequently limited themselves to picking out isolated facts for propaganda purposes and thus failed to make a real evaluation of economic activity abroad. Even at home, Mikoyan grumbled, Soviet economists frequently only skim the surface, functioning as dogmatists and purveyors of old formulas and old data.

If the Communist Party leaders mean what they seem to be saying, they are opening an even wider area to reexamination. The dogmatists are giving ground to the pragmatists, like Khrushchev, who face facts and adopt new measures. Even formal State ownership was apparently modified by his recent transfer of equipment from state-owned machine tractor stations to the collective farms which are nominally owned by their members, though very closely controlled by the Government.

Although Khrushchev is hailed in the Soviet press as a leader of Marxist theory, he has been the chief sponsor of the recent sweeping modifications of Soviet institutions. We do not know what will be the next move in his search for economic efficiency. It is clear, however, that nearly all of the institutional features and managerial practices of the Soviet economy will be subject to critical review.

Soviet leaders have already scrapped the long-held concept that machinery and equipment become obsolete only in capitalistic economies. In view of the crudeness of their yardsticks for measuring economic efficiency, they might even adopt a pricing system, including interest rates, that reflects both cost and relative scarcity of factors of production. Some Soviet writers almost seem to recommend the market mechanism of hated capitalism for setting prices. In an era of drastic change within the Soviet Union, even this heresy might be accepted.

In noting Khrushchev's pragmatic approach to economics, one is reminded of his remark at the height of the de-Stalinization drive. He said then that if the capitalist West expected Russia to abandon communism, it would have to wait until the shrimp learned to whistle. Some observers of Khrushchev's Russia today think they detect what could be the first faint sound of a shrimp trying to whistle.

Will Soviet economic development and technological advance continue to dilute doctrinaire Marxist ideology? Is it possible that economic growth and scientific development within the Soviet Union will consume the roots of Russian communism? Is it possible that the stubborn facts of economics will help guide its evolution toward a society with peaceful aims?

The speculation is interesting. Such remote possibilities, however, cannot dissolve our immediate concerns.

IV

Aside from its military implications, perhaps our primary concern over the Soviet advance in production lies in the international political arena: the appeal of communism to the developing and uncommitted nations of the world. Soviet bloc production is increasingly available to forge economic and political ties with these countries through expanded trade and aid.

The last few years have seen rapidly growing Russian trade with its satellites, its traditional trading partners of Western Europe, and with the underdeveloped countries. From both the satellites and the industrial West, the Soviet Union imports, on balance, manufactured goods and exports raw materials.

At times its sales affect world prices, as apparently recently happened with tin and aluminum. Their bargain prices could, of course, reflect conscious malice. More likely, the Russians cut prices in order to sell in competition with the established suppliers of western markets. These operations were in all probability designed to supplement their occasional gold sales in financing their external trade. This does not, however, imply a great reliance upon world trade. Autarchy is a long-held Soviet dogma that insists upon avoiding undue dependence upon imports from other countries.

But neither autarchy nor heavy domestic requirements for manufactured goods has prevented the Soviets from expanding substantially their trade with the developing countries. For their policy rests not on the economic benefits of trade but in Communist international politics. Where influence is to be had, where normal trade channels are obstructed, or where market prices are considered low, the Soviet bloc has eagerly stepped in. The Communists will buy anything or sell anything if it feathers their political nest. A ready example is their appearance as a major buyer of fish in Iceland, a land where that product is vitally important in overseas trade.

The Communist bloc has employed a second and related device to influence and penetrate the developing countries: military and economic aid totaling nearly $2 billion since 1954. About one-fourth of this total represents military equipment, for the most part already delivered. The remainder is economic development assistance, mainly in the form of easy credits partially repayable in commodities over a 12-year period.

As part of this aid, the Communists have undertaken substantial technical assistance. During the last half of 1957, for example, about 2,300 Soviet bloc technicians worked for 1 month or longer in 19 developing countries of the free world. Simultaneously, the number of foreign students and technicians studying in bloc countries is increasing.

The hazards of economic and technical dealings with the Communists have not entirely escaped the free countries. Perhaps Syria's recent merger with Egypt received a push from Syrian second thoughts on the dangers of being held too closely within the Russian bear's embrace.

Some countries have been wary of accepting large numbers of Soviet personnel, fearing the risk of subversive activities. Moreover, for a nation to export heavily to the bloc is to withdraw from customary cash markets. If long continued, such withdrawals imply a progressive dependence upon Communist outlets which are governed by political, and therefore unstable, considerations. In addition to these major problems, imports from the bloc are limited in variety, sometimes deficient in quality, and inadequately serviced and repaired. Under the circumstances, producing countries were somewhat distressed when the Communists resold Syrian wheat, Burmese rice, and Egyptian cotton in the world market. By and large, however, we should not overestimate these difficulties.

Both Soviet aid and trade are growing. Though still relatively small in amount, with actual aid expenditures so far amounting only to 10 or 15 percent of commitments, the concentration upon a few sensitive countries magnifies the significance of these endeavors. In aid as well as trade, moreover, the impact lies less in the size of Communist assistance than in the manner of its execution. They emphasize visible and tangible improvements, such as the steel mill in India. They also stress appealing projects, such as nuclear laboratories in Egypt and Yugoslavia and technical institutes in Burma and India. They scatter shotgun offers around the globe, including South America, fully confident that they will not have to make good on all of them. They make agreements rapidly in a blaze of publicity after top-level meetings. They masquerade as the unselfish and disinterested supporter of nationalism and seek to exploit with dramatic malevolence the frictions within the non-Communist world.

By these activities in trade and aid, the Communists seek to influence both the course of development and the international political attitudes of the developing countries. Their economic offensive will probably continue to be directed primarily toward the countries in which the bloc hopes that its political objectives can be advanced. Subversion may be their goal in some cases. Perhaps more frequently, they seek to sway the international policies of these countries, to create ties of economic and political dependency, and to pave the way for the acceptance of communism in the years ahead. Khrushchev has made it clear that the So-

viet Union values trade least for economic reasons.

The Soviet state trading monopoly, controlled propaganda and internal dictatorship comprise effective machinery for pursuing these ends. Increasing production permits the increasing employment of this machinery. The Soviet leaders are no doubt pleased with what they regard as their success with this policy. They will almost certainly intensify their efforts, relentlessly waging the economic cold war. At the same time, they seek to create an image of the Soviet Union as a morally respectable and economically advanced member of the world community.

On the basis of their own development, the Soviets preach the doctrine of communism as the only true way of economic progress. It is in this connection that their propagandists constantly emphasize the recent rise in unemployment in the United States. Khrushchev, in a recent interview with a French journalist, was quoted as saying about the unemployed in our present recession that they can die from need and privation and lead a dismal existence. Needless to say, temporary unemployment is of great concern to all Americans and to their Government. This concern has led to vigorous efforts to minimize its impact and to foster a resurgence of the economy. However, if Khrushchev is concerned about the well-being of the individual American, he should know that the average industrial worker in this country, temporarily out of work, can buy more with his unemployment compensation benefits than the average employed Soviet work can buy with his wages. In human terms, moreover, the substantial underemployment of many Soviet workers means low productivity, low incomes, and thus a low living standard. It would be no trick for us to abolish unemployment in the Soviet fashion by abolishing free enterprise and chaining every worker to a state-controlled job. You don't have to ask free American labor why they reject that solution with the virtual serfdom and accompanying low wages it would entail.

Business ups and downs around a growth curve create problems in a free economy, some of which we are now experiencing. But they do not compare with the political struggles and abrupt party-line changes of a totalitarian economy. Nothing in our experience compares with the economic and social disruptions and human tragedies resulting from the forced collectivization of the Russian peasants. Even the relatively minor shifting of gears of the controlled society doubtless impairs economic efficiency, when, for example, Malenkov assumed power and shifted emphasis to consumer goods, when he was deposed and emphasis shifted once more, and again when Khrushchev's policies took hold. Obviously, dictatorships with their regimented economies have serious problems of their own in trying to achieve stable progress.

The appeal of communism to the underdeveloped countries is heavily grounded in anti-colonialism, which sometimes become anti-capitalism. Moreover, the most modern scientific achievements are linked to the image of the undeveloped Russian economy of 1917. The Communist Party line was fully spelled out at the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference held in Cairo last December. The familiar distortions were all paraded: that Soviet Russia had become a great industrial power in 40 years without any outside help, that history shows the fastest way to industrialize is to nationalize the means of production, and that this course is best for the masses of the people in raising living standards. Let's consider these claims.

First, did Russian development take place without external aid? The Soviet propagandists conveniently forget that they started with the czarist economy which was then the sixth largest in the world with production per capita substantially greater than any of today's underdeveloped countries. The Communists also forget that their subsequent development was helped by vast infusions of foreign technical assistance in the 1930's, by the wealth of machinery and equipment that the West poured in under wartime lend-lease, and by the capital windfalls resulting from the Soviet looting of countries occupied during and after World War II.

As far as economic growth is concerned, it must be remembered that an advanced economy such as our own takes much of its progress in the form of an improved quality and variety of output, more services, and more leisure. Such growth in breadth and depth inevitably shows a lower statistical growth rate than the developing economy's expansion in basic and standardized commodities. During the 40 years, 1880–1920, which some experts consider to be the period most comparable to the 40 years of communism in Russia, the American economy grew as rapidly as has the Soviet economy over its history. But there seems to be a disposition among some in the underdeveloped areas to discount our experience as a special case, now distant in time.

During the 20th century, however, there has been a parallel development in Canada. The comparison of very different economies cannot, of course, be precise, but over the same 40 years which encompass the Soviet experience, Canada grew at least as rapidly as the Russian economy. Indeed, her gross national product from 1920 through 1952 increased at an annual rate of over 7 percent, measured in constant dollars. This growth, moreover, was far better balanced between agriculture and industry than Russia's. One should hesitate, therefore, to find in the Russian experience any clear solution to the economic development problem.

But the cruelest hoax of all is the claim that communism is best for the people and their living standards. Presumably this relates to those basic elements—clothing, food, and shelter. With regard to clothing, there has been a noticeable improvement under communism. The Soviet's own published figures, however, show that the average Soviet diet in 1955 and 1956 could not have been much better, than under the czar in 1913. In both periods, it was the same uninspiring grain and potatoes diet, with very little meat and other quality foods. In the matter of housing, a recent United Nations study showed urban housing standards in the Soviet Union to be the lowest in Europe. Russian city dwellers, after 40 years of sacrifice under communism, have no more living space than they did under the czar. Housing remains the most depressing aspect of pictorial reports from present day Russia.

The Canadian experience, parallel in time, reflects in striking contrast sharply increased living standards for her people with no sacrifice of personal liberties. The Canadians have done this by providing an economic climate in which individual enterprise could flourish. They were thus able to supplement their own development capacity through a massive inflow of private capital from abroad. Our own progress and growth at a comparable stage of development was aided in a similar way from Europe. That was a key to economic development in the United States as well as in Canada.

At the Cairo Afro-Asian Conference, the Russians characterized Soviet history as a lesson in economic development. It is a lesson worth studying, a lesson in wringing capital out of a regimented people. Rapid industrial growth can be achieved under communism, but only by sacrificing the economic interests of the people. At the risk of some oversimplification which does no violence to the facts, we can say that 40 years of communism have given the average Russian citizen one more shirt in return for his sacrifices. The loss of liberty, the liquidation of friends and relatives, the long hours of labor, the terrible famines, all have been paid for with a few yards of cloth and a handful of social services. This is the true lesson of the history of Soviet economic development. It is a lesson that the developing nations should carefully read.

V

This review of some aspects of the Soviet economy will be useful if it helps us see a few things more clearly.

First, the Soviet rulers, at great cost to the Russian people, have created an industrial machine of considerable strength. They have done so, however, not by slavishly following Communist theory but by steadily modifying its original doctrinaire concepts. They have abandoned egalitarianism and have built a society of great and growing inequalities and discrimination. But the Soviet economy is a fact today. We should nurture no illusions about it. We should know its strengths and its weaknesses and its capacity to change regardless of doctrine.

Second, fostering rapid and healthy economic growth in our own country must continue to be a major goal of private and public policy. We prize economic growth, not for its own sake, but for the well-being it is capable of bringing to the individual. To allow a competition with the Soviets motive to overshadow the sound reasons for what we have long been doing would demean the will and intelligence of this Nation. It might do more. It might produce efforts toward an unhealthy, inflationary puffing up of our economy in the name of growth. It might lead to aping the forced-draft methods of the Soviets with all the damage that could produce in our kind of society. It might jeopardize the future of America's plenty in freedom.

Third, we must recognize the fact that Soviet economic expansion provides the Communist bloc with new resources for economic penetration among new and developing nations of the world. Our resolute response should be a vigorous support of reciprocal trade, adequate and imaginative economic and technical cooperation among friendly nations, practical reemphasis on spurring an increased flow of private investment. It means, too, telling the true story of the economy of the American people—what it is and what it has produced for us and for others. In the unforgettable language of the Declaration of Independence, "Let facts be submitted to a candid world."

The economy of the American people has served this Nation and others well. It has brought a material complement to the dignity inherent in freemen. It has provided the essential strength for the defense of our way of life and for those who share it. It lies within the power of this generation and those that will follow after to renew constantly this lifegiving strength. That we can do by the imaginative and vigorous practice of freedom. And in so doing, we can hasten the day when the whole world becomes a neighborhood of nations.

Agatha Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Butte and Montana have lost one of

their most capable teachers, in the person of Miss Agatha Kelly, who passed away a few weeks ago.

I ask unanimous consent that a fine tribute to Miss Kelly, which indicates the esteem in which she is held by her colleagues, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial was published in the Montana Standard on March 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGATHA KELLY

This community lost a first-class citizen in the death last week of Agatha Kelly who had been a teacher in its public schools for more than 40 years. Miss Kelly was a teacher of the old school. She left a lasting impression on the minds of thousands of students who had passed through her classrooms.

In her devotion to her profession she had attended summer school during 27 seasons, and at the time of her death was near the achievement of a doctorate in education at the University of Wisconsin. She knew 8 or 9 languages intimately and had traveled in Europe during 2 summers in the interest of extending her knowledge.

Miss Kelly's memory is enshrined in the hearts and minds of her countless students not only as an excellent teacher but as a kind and generous person and a sympathetic and understanding friend.

She was also held in the highest esteem by the members of her profession, 68 of whom signed a glowing tribute to her after she was stricken by what proved to be her fatal illness. Because it reveals the nobility of character of Miss Kelly we are herewith reproducing the document which was signed by "Your Loving Friends and Colleagues":

"There are certain lessons that we have learned from our long and treasured association with you, not the least being that in the midst of the excessively active life of a high-school teacher it is possible for one to be a saintly scholar. It is natural that we should think of you as a true and faithful friend. How can we help but be grateful for your kindness through the years spent in your stimulating company when we were so often aware of your quick and keen mind and of the astonishing combination of your learning and of your lightness! How well we know the hallmarks of your character, your honesty, your diligence, your integrity. Blessed with a clear insight you were perfectly straightforward and transparently truthful in your lines of thought and action.

"Your versatility amazed us. So graciously you shared your musical accomplishments in piano, organ, and voice. The same was true with dancing, skating, swimming.

"Your charity has been an inspiration to us. God's unfortunate children know well the generosity in your heart. You never turned from the needy. You sought occasions to give your service and to share your worldly goods.

"Noble is the name for you, Agatha. Every action of your life mirrors your own beautiful appellations of 'Love of God.'

"A teacher in the Butte schools for years, you are best known, of course, for your expert and cultural knowledge of classical, oriental, and romance languages. In your teaching particularly we have observed your loving interest in encouraging your students. How fortunate were those who benefited from your shining example of total dedication.

"Many of us also recall other phases of your teaching career when your early experience in the elementary schools was recognized by appointments as music supervisor and as principal of the junior high school. You achieved excellence in every endeavor.

"Teaching, of course, was your life. For it was a full-time occupation. If you paid the penalty of excluding other attractions and pursuits in order to mature as a scholar and conscientiously to discharge your duties as a teacher, you acted wisely. The fulfillment of your gifts could have been realized only in the career you chose; for your work of imbuing immortal minds with the just fear of God and love of fellowman has engraved something which will brighten to all eternity."

We can add nothing to this except to say that it was most fortunate that Miss Kelly knew during her lifetime the kindly sentiments of her associates and friends.

Address by Hon. Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota, Before Kansas Convention of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on December 7 of last year, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], delivered a speech before the young Republicans of my State, at Topeka, Kans. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT OF SOUTH DAKOTA, BEFORE STATE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, TOPEKA, KANS., DECEMBER 7, 1957

Thank you very much indeed, BILL AVERY, for that very generous introduction. I'm mighty glad that you stopped when you did or I wouldn't have recognized myself sufficiently to have gotten up at all. At least part of what you said is correct. I am a Member of the United States Senate. Beyond that, you were on your own.

But, former Governor Hall, Congressman Ed Rees, Congressman Bill Avery, and distinguished guests at the head table, leaders of young Republicanism here in Congress and nationally, and ladies and gentlemen of the Republican persuasion, it's good to be back in Kansas and good to be back here on another occasion of Kansas Republicanism.

I remember very vividly my experiences a few years ago talking there on Kansas Day, the fine turnout of very hard working Republicans who attended that meeting, and it's thrilling to stand here and see this great aggregation gathered together on a football Saturday, looking around for something to do to help save America. I'm just as much of a football fan as you are, and I'm glad that there aren't many games left, although I am going to have some fun driving back north this afternoon listening to the Notre Dame-SMU game, I'm sure, and I suspect I like football for the same reasons you like it.

I am delighted to see in this Republican company such a fine gathering of young women, such a fine gathering of Republican women of every age and of every era, because I have a prevailing conviction that the safety of this country is going to be protected ultimately by the sound judgment and the good sense and the hard work of the women of America who work in politics. I'm just glad to see so many of you here.

You know, if I didn't already know what wonderful folks Kansans are and what wonderful Republicans you are, I could sort of express myself, I suppose, by perverting a toast which I one time heard that goes something like this: "Its easy enough to smile, with a girl and a glass and a song. But the man worthwhile is the guy who can smile, when he's brought the old woman along." As far as I'm concerned, there isn't an old woman in the crowd, you're all young. The poet said there is no such thing as an old or ugly woman. I think he's exactly right. And I agree with another thing the poet said. The poet said that women are the masterpiece of the Creator, the edition is unlimited, and no man should be without his copy. That adds it up pretty well. Like a lot of you, I agree that the Roosevelt boys tried to carry that to excess, however, in trying to accumulate a whole library.

Kansas and South Dakota, you know, are a great deal alike in a great many ways and one of them is politically. I know your fine Republican Congressmen, I have worked with most of them in the House and in the Senate. I have worked long and hard and in teamwork with your 2 fine and illustrious Senators, FRANK CARLSON and ANDY SCHOEPPEL, 2 of the best Senators of the United States to work as a team and strike together, who are a credit to any State, and both of whom are doing a terrific job, and I know that Kansas and South Dakota are part of this great Republican Cherokee strip that starts at the Canadian line and runs down as far as Oklahoma and then stops. But here is a totem pole of freedom; here is a Republican Cherokee strip, and come good times or bad, we refuse to be bought or bribed or bullied. We're just too independent to sell out to the other side.

I can remember in 1952 when I was serving as chairman of the speakers bureau for the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign, and a great Kansan was doing a terrific job managing the campaign, Wes Roberts. Wes and I made a minor wager as to whether Kansas or South Dakota would carry the greatest percentage of Republican victory for Ike. We both knew Ike was going to win, we knew our States were going to come in right, but we made a minor wager, and I bet, of course, on South Dakota; he bet on Kansas, and we had to carry it out to the fifth decimal point in order to determine who won. It was that close. I'm glad to tell you South Dakota won. But it was pretty close. And we've both slipped a little bit since then, I'm sorry to say. You've elected a Democratic Congressman, we've elected a Democratic Congressman; we've done a little better than you, we've kept a Republican governor, but we're both slipped a little. And believe me, we're going to both work hard together to pick up that slip come 1958.

I thought I would ask and answer four questions in the course of my discussion about republicanism with you fine coworkers here this noon, and I've got enough notes here so I'm going to try to remember to say something that I told the press I would say. But I want to talk to you pretty much from the heart and off the cuff.

I want to ask and answer these four questions: No. 1, what does it mean to be a Republican in 1957? No. 2, what are our current responsibilities as Republicans in 1957? No. 3, what is our record? What's the story that we have to tell? And No. 4, why should we win in 1958 and 1960?

We're here as people interested in the business of good government. You're here because you expect to do something to help bring about the kind of decisions that you want to have happen in 1958 and 1960. And I think its good on occasion for us to reflect

a little bit as to what it means to be a Republican. Why are we Republicans? There is another party. Or, you could be an independent. Why are we Republicans? I think its a good mental exercise sometimes to take a sheet of paper and write down the reasons why we believe in the Republican cause.

I had a most interesting discussion early in the campaign of 1952 with then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now the President of the United States. In the course of the conversation, I said to him, "Tell me, Ike, how do you happen to be a Republican?" He said, "Let me tell you something. While I was in charge of NATO, and starting about in 1950, delegations started coming to Paris from both of the political parties urging me to run for President. I didn't take any of them very seriously for a while. I didn't have any intention of becoming a politician. I was looking forward to retirement. But when they continued to come and continued to present arguments why they believed that there was a service I could render as President of the United States, or at least as a candidate for the President of the United States, I started giving it some serious reflection, and the first thing I had to do was this: I had to ask myself if I agreed to become a candidate for President, on which party would I run? Because I had been in the military services so long, I had not been identified actively with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, so I had to decide for myself, if I'm going to get interested in this thing, obviously I'll either have to let my name be submitted as a Democrat or as a Republican. So I sat down in my office at NATO there in Paris with a sheet of paper and I wrote down on one side of the sheet of paper the Republican principles and the Republican personalities that I knew something about. On the other side I wrote Democrat, New Deal, or Fair Deal (or call it what you want) and listed the principles and the personalities of the other party that I knew." And, Ike said, "I knew a lot of good people in both parties. I knew something about what had been going on, because I had been in and out of Washington in my official capacity a great many times. When I had put down the best analysis I could on those pieces of paper, I concluded that I felt more at home with Republicans; that I found myself in agreement with more things that Republicans stood for than I could agree with from the people on the other party. I believed that those Republican concepts, those principles, and those personalities were better for America and the world than those on the other side. So I said to Mamie, 'If by any chance I agree to run for President, it's going to be as a Republican, because that's the party in which I believe. That's the party which holds the most hope for America.'"

I kind of like that approach, because this business of deciding what party you belong to isn't all black or all white. It isn't just a matter of geographical environment or hereditary conviction. It's a mental exercise and we can't expect ourselves to be in 100 percent agreement with every other Republican or with every concept and every principle and every policy that any Republican convention, State or National, may happen to adopt. It's a question of relativity. It's a question of keeping things in their proper perspective.

It's a question of looking at the situation in balance, because we wouldn't have just two parties in America of importance if each of us were going to follow the inclination of his own nose. We'd have a half a hundred parties, because Republicans disagree with each other on various aspects of the farm program, various aspects of foreign policy, various aspects as far as reciprocal trade treaties are concerned. Why not? We're Americans—we should be disagreeing. The question is, on balance, where are you the happiest? On balance, where do you feel the most comfortable? On balance, which set of principles, which set of people do you think are best for America? And I'm sure every man and woman in this room, if he would do that, or if she would do that, would come up, as Ike came up, with an honest answer to the effect that you feel more at home with Republicans. That there are more things that you believe in that are Republican and that you uphold. And that there are fewer things you agree with which are found on the other party's piece of paper or on the other political team, so you can't find yourself happy with a very great many of them.

Let me suggest just a few. To me, what does it mean to be a Republican? Why am I a Republican? In the first place, I think that Republicans are dedicated to individual freedom, just a little bit more than the other team. I'm not trying to say the other team believes in communism or tyranny or totalitarianism, but on balance, I think you can prove demonstratively the Republican Party believes more definitely in individual freedom than the other side. Take for example our attitude toward private property, toward private ownership. We just don't believe in national socialism. We don't believe in communizing or socializing or nationalizing any of the great industries of this country. The other people do. Sometimes they want to nationalize the doctors. Sometimes it's the bankers. Presently it's the private power companies. But they are always trying to put the clammy hand of Washington and of the Federal Government on some particular private ownership enterprise in this country. As Republicans, we resist that. We believe in opportunity for the individual as against the other fellow believing in opportunity for the state. So that helps make me a Republican.

We believe in expanding individual opportunities. We support the chance for a young man to get ahead. We believe in security, too, but we don't make that a fetish. We're not happy when everybody has the security of a cow in a barn or a hog in a pigpen. We're not happy when people have warmth, clothing, food, shelter, and nothing more. We're happy only when people have an opportunity to forge ahead as far as they can go respectably without interfering with the liberties or opportunities of other people. Our appeal is to the people. The other party appeals primarily to the politicians. I'm proud as a Republican to be living in an era when we haven't got a single big political boss working in the Republican Party. If you're talking about political machines, if you're talking about political bossism, you've got to talk about Hudson County in New Jersey; you've got to talk about Tammany Hall; you've got to talk about the Kelly-Nash machine and the people that ran and run Chicago; you've got to talk about what Crump did down in Memphis. The big politicians, the big political machines, are all Democratic in this country. The Republican Party believes in the people, and we make our appeal to them. I think from Abe to Ike we have stayed pretty consistent in our concept by supporting the idea that the Federal Government should do only those things which need to be done and which the individual State and the individual people cannot so well do, or cannot do at all, for themselves. So that also helps me be a Republican. That doesn't mean that there aren't any Democrats who believe in those things, but by and large on the record—this is as easy to prove mathematically as 2 times 2 equals 4—you find more people, and you find more policies supporting individual opportunity when you talk about Republicans than you do when you talk about New Dealers or Fair Dealers. It is one of the characteristic qualities of Republicanism.

Why else am I a Republican? Republicans by and large believe a little bit more in constitutional Americanism than does the other party. I am not saying that the other party is un-American. I am not saying that they don't believe in American concepts; but I am saying that on the historic record, the Republican records, the Republican personalities, the Republican policies are more faithfully dedicated to our constitutional concepts than are those of the other party. Let me prove it to you. We believe, by and large, by the separation of powers, maintaining that constitutional concept of checks and balances. On the record, the other team, for 20 years, exalted and magnified and expanded the powers of the Executive, and made a rubber stamp out of the American Congress. On the record, the other side wanted to break down the independent stature of the Supreme Court and tried to pack it with political hacks. The Congress of the United States, with some fine help by Southern Democrats and with the leadership of Republicans, stopped that Supreme Court purge.

We Republicans believe in decentralization of government. We don't believe in gathering up in the Capitol of our country all of the authority, all of the power, all of the economic prowess of the people. We believe in keeping those great bastions of freedom out in the hands of the people. The Republican Party, much more than the other party, believes in the most significant of the 10 amendments called our Bill of Rights. We believe in the 10th amendment, the keystone to the whole business. That one that says that those powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government shall be retained by the States and by the people. The 10th amendment is uniquely and exclusively an American contribution to the concept of self-government. There isn't any other country in the world that has that amendment. A lot of other countries have free speech, have freedom of the press, have trial by jury. But you search futilely to find any other country that has established a commonwealth of 48 States, each with its own legislature, each with its own court system, each with its own governor, each with its own built-in sovereignties and rights. Forty-eight great bastions protecting the freedoms of us all. We believe in that as Republicans. For 20 years the other party led a studied and steady attack on the 10th amendment and on the rights of individuals, and on the individual rights of States. On December 15 we commemorate as Americans the 166th birthday of the Bill of Rights. When Virginia ratified it on December 15, 1791, it became part of the Constitution. It became part of this great body of law, constitutional law, we call our charter of freedom—our American Constitution. As a Republican, I am glad that my party, to a greater degree than the other party, remains faithful to the constitutional American concepts.

Third, I'm happy to be a Republican because I think my party is dedicated to economic, efficient government to a greater degree than the other party. I think that's easy to prove. In the history of the American economy you can make some pretty strong and startling statements. The superlatives are so great, you're almost afraid to utter them. Actually, a lot of Republicans haven't even whispered them to a Democratic neighbor for a long time. But we should be shouting them from the house tops. Look at the record. All of the important reductions of income taxes in the history of America have been made by your party and mine. By the Republican Party. And all of the big increases in public spending, all of the big, new ideas when the hand of government reaches into the pocketbooks

of individual citizens and takes out a bigger bundle of bills, those have been made by the other party. Obviously, we must believe more in efficient and effective and economical government to have established a record like that. All of the important steps in the direction of debt reductions by the Federal Government have been made by your party and mine. The other party talks about it a whole lot. They talk about what they would do about cutting down taxes. They talk about what they would do about cutting down debts. They don't even know. They've never had an experience in it. They've been building them up all the time. You can turn the pancake either side up. All of the important increases in expenditures by the Federal Government have been done by the other party. All of the important reductions by ours. I think we ought to tell that to our fellow Americans. It makes me proud to be a Republican. Obviously we have to believe more in economic government than the other party, because we practice it. Sometimes the other party doesn't even preach it. It doesn't practice it, that is certain. All of the important payroll decreases in government have taken place under Republican leadership. It makes me proud to be a Republican, because I think that record stands for good government. I think it is an important demonstration of Republican soundness.

I think you could add one more distinction. What does it mean to be a Republican in 1957? It means that if you belong to the Republican Party, you belong to the party of peace. That doesn't mean that the other party is the war party. But in politics you can't escape an examination of the records, and you can't get any place campaigning for office if you try always to compare your party with par, or with perfection. You don't deserve to call yourself a political worker unless you're realistic enough to know that you have to compare what your party has done with what the other party has done. You can never get anyplace comparing your record with the other fellow's promises. Promises are too elastic. They're too ethereal. But the record is there for man to read for all time. I'm proud of the Republican record in the field of peace. I'm proud of the fact that no war in the 20th century has been started under Republican leadership. I think Americans, who crave peace now, who worry about sputniks, who worry about satellites, who worry about the growing menace of the Communist threat (and anybody who's wide-awake these days must worry about that); Americans, by the tens of millions are ready to be told that what the Republicans have done in the past they will do in the future, and that is to exert their best and their successful efforts for the maintenance of peace. That record is something we should all be proud to talk about.

Now, I won't discuss what it means to be a Democrat. Even the Democrats don't know the answer to that question; why should I get into that? I can't even tell you the answer to the question, "Why they should be Democrats?" to say nothing of what it means to be a Democrat. I'll leave that up to them. But as a Republican I think we ought to be telling the world what it means to be a Republican and go out and invite other people to join up with our party. This is our faith, this is our creed, this is our club. Out there in radioland, let me say to all who are listening, if you like what we've done, if you like what we stand for, we need recruits. We welcome you to come over to our side. We don't even have to rebaptize you. We'll take you where you are and put you to work. We won't ask you any embarrassing questions about why it took you 20 years to get to be a Republican, or 30 years, or why you wasted half your life in the Democratic Party. Come on over. We're glad to have you join if you believe in the book of accomplishments and the book of principles that identifies you as a Republican.

Now, what are our current responsibilities as we face up to 1958 and 1960? I think primarily our current responsibilities are to tell the story of Republicanism across the length and breadth of America. I think that we ought to quit dividing ourselves over minor irritations. I'm not concerned whether a fellow is a McKinley Republican or an Abraham Lincoln Republican or an Eisenhower Republican or a Tom Dewey Republican, or a Taft Republican. I don't care whether he's a modern Republican, or a souped-up sputnik Republican, or whether he's an old-fashioned hoop-skirt Republican. I can only say this—that I like Republicans.

I expect Republicans to disagree. I wouldn't want to belong to a party that operated like an iron lung where nobody could move and nobody could differentiate and nobody could deviate. I think it's wonderful that we've got different ideas about Republicans, but we ought to quit trying to pin labels on each other. I think the time is long past when we should take off the road the Republican quiz show and quit asking each other what kind of Republican we are. If you believe in the basic concepts we've been discussing, let's get united. Let's work as a team to tell our story. You don't expect everybody on a football team to be the quarterback, or a halfback, or a guard, or a tackle. Each has a little different concept of the game, and you ought to have that in the Republican Party. There is, in this great catalog of our creed, enough things with which all of us can agree certainly to make us good and active Republicans, and so I think one of our current responsibilities is to unite. To become a team. To recognize the right to disagree a little bit within the family. But to unite on the basic principles that have motivated Republicans for 100 years, from Abe to Ike, and to recognize what would happen if the other side should come back in authority. If we do that, I'm convinced that we're going to be successful.

What is our Republican record? What is our story? What do we have to tell to the American people? Here we haven't any choice but to look at the record of accomplishment of our party in 5 years, and compare it with the record of accomplishment that the other party made in the preceding 20 years. That's honest, that's fair, that's courageous, and there isn't any other basis on which we deserve to win except by comparing the record, and trying to convince our fellow citizens that our record is better for them than the other. And what a record it is when you look at the facts. What a wonderful theme of success we Republicans can play, once we stop trying to play the music on the basis of the flyspecks on the sheet music and start looking at the notes and sharps again. Then we look at what really was written on there as a symphony. Now let me give you another superlative. I believe that the 5 Republican years of the Eisenhower-Nixon era, of your Republican era and mine, can probably be identified as the most fabulous and productive 5 years in American history. Now that's putting it high enough. That's inviting comparison. That's challenging the other fellow to put up or shut up. I believe that our 5 years, the past 5 years starting in January of 1953, are the most productive and the most fabulous half decade in the history of the United States.

Let's take a look at our record. Is that political hyperbole? Is that something the Democrats can disprove? If it is, let them try. Let them pick out any 5 years that the Democrats have ever had. Let them pick out any 5 Democratic years of consecutive peace if they can find them, or let them select their years of war. Let them come up against the stern reality of some hard-boiled statistics. Let me point out that so many Americans have become accustomed in the last 5 years to peace and to plenty and to prosperity under our Republican administration that they fail to remember the wars, the chaos, the deficit spending, the corruption, and the communistic infiltration that took place just before we came into power in 1953. Lots of us have been guilty of magnifying the things on which we disagree and forgetting to point out the great achievements which have taken place in this Republican era of today.

Let's look at the statistics in this connection. Let's look at the facts. No. 1, never in the history of America have so many people been so profitably employed for so long in an era of peace as in these last 5 Republican years. If that's wrong, defy the Democrats to disprove it. Never have so many Americans for so long earned so much and kept so much for themselves as in the past 5 years of American history. Government spending in this era has been reduced despite the need to continue high costs in the areas of foreign relations and national security. In spite of that we have reduced the Truman rate of spending which was $78 billion a year by at least $6 billion a year, even including the money we have to spend for scientific weapons and supersonic weapons and all the other responsibilities of reluctantly becoming the leader; the acknowledged leader of the free world.

Taxes have been substantially reduced during these 5 years. About $25 billion have been saved the American taxpayer since the Republican Congress under the Republican administration in 1953 cut the taxes down by a rate of $7½ billion a year. Sixty-eight percent of the cut went to the people. Thirty-two percent of the cut went to the corporations. For the first time in a quarter of a century the Federal Government is operating for the third year with a balanced budget.

Strikes and work stoppages have been sharply reduced while union membership is at an alltime high. Certainly the members of labor, organized and unorganized, as they look at their records and paychecks, can find nothing but praise for the Republican record if they look at it objectively and not as the captives of some particular labor boss who's trying to tell them how to vote.

Next, the Federal payroll in the last 5 years has been decreased by more than 200,000 employees. Next, the Republican Party has stopped socialism cold in America. More than 700 business enterprises which 5 years ago were operated by politicians in the Communist-Socialist pattern have either been entirely liquidated or sold back to private owners and operators.

Next, scandals and corruption have disappeared from the Federal Government to such an extent that you don't even hear it discussed in the headlines of the papers anymore. Not a single instance has developed of an Eisenhower appointee who has been shown to be in the service of the Communist cause. What a contrast with the snake's nest of disloyal agents we had to force out of Government with the FBI and with committee investigations during the preceding 20 years. What a wonderful record for you and me to talk about to our people. What abundant cause to make us proud to be Republicans.

And above all, there hasn't been a single wartime casualty under our Republican administration since our Republican President and Secretary of State brought an end to the war in Korea, which we inherited from Harry Truman's Democratic administration. What a contrast this is with the record of preceding administrations of the Fair Deal and the New Deal. What a record of achievement during 5 short years. What a demonstration to the people of America about what we might have been able to do were it not for the fact that in 3 of those

5 years we had to work against the opposition of a Congress controlled by the other party. We didn't even have a Congress on our side. Both Houses controlled by the other party. In addition, the administration inherited a great army of Fair Deal and New Deal appointees in Federal positions which are protected under the law by civil service regulations. Consequently men sympathetic with Republican ideals could not be put in to replace them.

I want to be fair and say to some of these partisan holdovers, some of these New Dealers and Fair Dealers who were put in by politicians and nominated by precinct committeemen, cleared by political clearance committees, put in the Federal payroll, and then after they were in they changed the law to make them civil service—I want to be fair and say that some of them have served the country well. Some of them have put public policy above partisan advantage. Some of them have caught the vision of good government under the leadership of the Republicans. But I think it's equally true to point out that some of them have served as roadblocks in the path of Republican progress. Some have dragged their heels. Some of them have stopped and prevented and bored from within to keep necessary reforms and revisions from taking place. And of that particular group of holdovers, of which there are many of that particular group, I think we might well compare them with yesterday's unfortunate experience with our Vanguard and our satellite. It could be said of both they will not work and it's impossible to fire them.

Even the deadly threat of inflation—even the threat of inflation has been successfully attacked by our Republican Party. Throughout American history the other party has always had a habit of tinkering with the currency, tampering with the dollar, playing with inflation. Economist after economist in this country has written objectively, most recently Henry Hazelitt in Newsweek, that the Democratic Party should be called the party of inflationists. Well, while our critics cry out against existing interest rates and say they're too high, and complain about the cost of living and say it continues to go up, the mathematical facts bear testimony to the situation that the Democratic Party of today continues to preach doctrines that would provide inflation.

As always in American history, the Republican Party is the party of the honest dollar. And we can prove that. Under the Truman administration the cost of living increased by 34 percent in the first 4½ years. Under Harry Truman's entire administration the cost of living increased 50 percent prior to 1953, and the value of the American dollar was reduced from a hundred cents to the dollar to 52 cents on the dollar. Under the Eisenhower administration there has been an increase of only 6 percent in the cost of living in the nearly 5 years that we have been in power. In addition to that, this constant sneaking up of the cost of living which is so detrimental to the elderly citizens of our country, so detrimental to everybody on a salary or with a fixed income, this increase in the cost of living has virtually been brought to a succesaful stop because of the wise fiscal policies and the budget balancing of the Republican Party. I'm proud to belong to a party that is mature enough and has courage enough to do something about inflation, and we've had a tremendous degree of success considering the momentum behind the whole 20-year New Deal drive toward decreasing the purchasing power of the dollar and inflating the living costs of the people.

Now what more can you ask of an administration? What more can you ask, than that it restores peace when you're at war; that it replaces corruption with honest government; that it reduces your taxes; that it provides more jobs for more people with greater take-home pay than ever before in American history? What more can you ask? What can your neighbors ask? What can anybody ask? What do they expect from government? Well, if they want more, we can give them more. The record provides more. We have evidence that more has been achieved. As I've said, we've quit tinkering with the currency of the people, we've stopped decreasing the value of the dollar, we've put a complete end to national socialism, we've provided the leadership which gave this country its first great advance in civil rights in 82 years—all Republican achievements. We've replaced the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which, operated by the Democrats, operated exclusively for the financing and assistance of big corporations and big-business men. These Democrats shed big crocodile tears for the little fellow, and increased the size of the checks earned by the big fellows. We replaced the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with which they were playing favoritism and helping big corporations. We abolished it and put in the Small Business Administration instead, which is exclusively interested in financing and assisting small-business men in this country. What's more, in our short 5 years we launched and have well along the road to initiation and construction the world's largest highway construction program, and we did that during a period when much of the time we had to induce a Democratic majority in Congress to bring our bills out of committee. When we did have a Republican Congress it moved much more rapidly. And it was then that we gave the country the world's largest cut in income taxes. Even with this record of achievement there is much that time does not permit me to mention. But even so short an examination of the record, in my opinion, pretty clearly demonstrates the nature of your responsibility and mine for 1958 and 1960. We must tell America what we have done. We must start answering the slanders. We must start reciting the record. We must reiterate the facts. We must invite comparison with the record of the other party on any level, at any time, and we challenge them to come up with 5 years anywhere that can compare with your 5 years and mine as Republican. We challenge them to compare the records.

I have a sneaking feeling that, for the first time in a quarter of a century, in 1960 the American voters will have a new experience. I think it's the first time in the memory of many of you, the first time in a quarter of a century, that the American voter is going to have an opportunity to vote for a President on the basis of issues and principles, instead of the comparison of individuals and personalities. Think back. Since the early 1930's voters in the main have been called upon to vote for or against a dominant or an attractive personality, rather than deciding between governmental policies and principles. However, in 1960 neither party, ours or the other fellows', neither party can come up with a dominant figure, a great majestic figure of a man with a tremendous personality. Neither party can come up with a man like F. D. R. or like Ike Eisenhower. Neither will even come up with a candidate with all the supporters and critics to the extent that Harry Truman had, and divided the country in 1948. People didn't vote for or against what Harry Truman stood for; they voted for him or against him because they liked him or they didn't like him. Both parties in 1960, I'm sure, will nominate vigorous, able candidates, but neither is going to be able to trust his cause and his claim for victory this time to the strength of the popular or compelling personality of its nominee. We're not going to be able to come up, on our side, with another great household word and a national hero, and a wonderful, humble, personal individual like Dwight D. Eisenhower. We're not going to get another candidate called Ike. And they're not going to come up with a fellow who is able, almost, to hypnotize the populace on the radio, who can say one thing and do the other thing, and still make people like it, as was the phenomenal career of F. D. R. This time, for the first time in a quarter of a century, people are going to ask each other and themselves, "What kind of government do I want?" instead of asking the question, "Who is the man I want for President?"

As a Republican, I welcome that. I think it's long overdue. I think in the long run if self-determination and self-government are going to work, you've got to make it work by dividing voters up according to principles, and policies, and concepts, and not by a great popularity contest between different individuals. And I'm glad to belong to a team that knows where it stands, that's united on the basic tenets and the basic concepts, and I'm glad that in 1960 we're not going to have the issues clouded up by these great personalities, by deep-seated passions, and sharp prejudices. I think we ought to welcome the opportunity to ask the American people to compare our record with the other fellows'. I'm glad we're going to have a chance once again to tell the world what GOP stands for, because it is proved by the record that GOP stands for government of the people, as against the other fellows' program of government of the politicians. Republicanism stands for the opportunity state, and I think Americans generally believe in an opportunity state, and will vote to protect and expand it.

Now, there's one other question I promised to answer. Why should we win? Why should we win in 1958 and 1960? We ought to win in 1958 because that's the preliminary of a contest for President which in 1960 is pretty well going to determine the direction America takes for the next half a century. And the direction that America takes in 1960 is going to determine the fate of the world. Because if we start slipping back into the abyss of national socialism again, as we inevitably will if the other party wins, its going to pull down the fluttering flags of freedom from the mastheads of every country in the world. We have become the sole remaining strong, spectacularly successful practitioner of individual freedoms and private ownership. If we start tampering with the economy by taking first this segment, and then the next segment and socializing it or crippling it or directing it, we're going to be in serious difficulty. I think we should win in the interests of good government. I think we should win because I think the people of America are going to feel a little better about individual opportunities under Republicans than under the other party. I think we should win because the people of America are going to feel a little better about the opportunity of getting good government at low cost, and with reduced taxes, with Republicans in authority rather than with the other fellow in control. I think we should win because Republicans are going to provide for a continuation of constitutionalism in America.

I think we should win because there's a better chance to produce and sustain an honest dollar under Republicans. And without an honest dollar all our alleged economic successes can disappear and be dissipated. I think we should win because there is obviously a much better chance to sustain and hold the peace under patient, persuasive, farsighted, able Republican leadership than under the capricious, temperamental, impetuous kind of leadership which under Democrats three times in the 20th century has failed to hold the peace they had when they took over the White House and the State Department.

So I think we've got a story to tell. Your job and mine, as I see it, let me say in conclusion, is to get on the offensive; it's to organize together as a team; and start talking about what we've done, and quit quarreling about the little differences we have among ourselves. Quit worrying about the fact that we haven't produced a panacea in 5 years. The record is so amazing when you look at what Republicans have achieved, that in my opinion we deserve to win by a landslide if, as, and when we tell John American and Mary American on every farm lot and in every household the full true story about what Republicanism stands for and what it means. Let's back the attack with facts from the records. Let's familiarize ourselves with the documentation of achievements which are ours. And among other things, let's once and for all nail down for the lie that it is, the slander that the Republican Party is the party of privilege and vested interests. Let's prove from the record that the Republican Party, that the GOP is government of the people; that we're not a party pushed around by politicians, or one beholden to political bosses or pressure groups. In our party, the people are the politicians. We don't have any big machines, we don't have bosses. Ideas spring up from the grassroots in our Republican Party.

Let's put an end to the Democratic double-talk and let's answer their slander like you'd answer an attack on your individual honesty or on your personal honor. We invite comparison as Republicans. If they insist, let's call the roll of the Democratic presidential hopefuls, and ask them where they find anybody there indicating that theirs is a party of the people. Averell Harriman, who inherited untold millions of dollars from his ancestors, wants to be the Democratic president. My colleague, Senator KENNEDY, nice fellow that he is, inherited millions of dollars from his father and his family is among the richest families in the country. But neither Harriman or KENNEDY ever had to work for a living. Is this what we mean by government of the people? Soapy Williams, the recipietn of inherited millions from the soap factories owned by his predecessors and his ancestors. I submit to you that no racing stable in American history ever had a card of millionaire entries such as the Democrats have as candidates for President. The only average American they offer in their whole stable is my old friend, ESTES KEFAUVER. They push him around, and kick him around, and build him up till he gets close, and then tear him down at their conventions because he doesn't have a hundred million dollars. It's about time you and I began answering these slanders when they call us the party of the privileged, the party of the rich. I don't know who's going to be the Republican candidate for President, but I'm pretty sure he's going to be somebody who's built himself up in the American way. A fellow who's got an American background of hard work and of having achieved success by his own efforts—a man whose sole claim to prominence is not the fact that his father had a few hundred million dollars. I submit that you and I have a responsibility to compare our Republican team with these solid gold Cadillac candidates that the other side is bringing up.

So I say in conclusion, its wonderful to be a Republican. What a record. What a background. What a present series of achievements we're able to produce. And what fine, wonderful candidates available to us. We invite comparison. We challenge the other party to look at the records and compare them. And if we will just get smart enough to use arithmetic and comparison, and not let ourselves be frightened away by the adjectives thrown at us by the other party, we'll begin to recognize our responsibilities and our opportunities, and what it means to be a Republican. I'm convinced if we do that, we'll deserve to win. I am sure you can win in Kansas in 1958, because people will be proud to be Republicans. You'll have a loyalty to the party, which people should have, as they have a loyalty to their family, to their church, and to their God and their country. You should be loyal to your party. Let us invite in other people who want to loyally subscribe to these principles and concepts, and make them feel welcome as Republicans. In that way, we can win in 1958 and we can win in 1960, because we shall deserve the victory which is ours. Good luck to our common cause.

Self-Restraint in the Use of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on March 31 last Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in a dissenting opinion concurred in by Justices Burton, Clark, and Harlan, made this encouraging gesture to those who believe in maintaining the constitutional division of powers among the executive, the judicial and the legislative branches of the Government:

Self-restraint is of the essence in the observance of the judicial oath, for the Constitution has not authorized the Judges to sit in judgment on the wisdom of what Congress and the executive branch do.

That same self-restraint applies, of course, to Members of Congress who have taken the same oath, and is just as vital to the perpetuity of a constitutional democracy, such as ours, as is self-restraint on the part of the judiciary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Richmond News Leader entitled "Self-Restraint and the Court."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELF-RESTRAINT AND THE COURT

On March 31, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down opinions in five cases. Two of these dealt with the law of criminal contempt; three dealth with the power of Congress to take away the citizenship of native-born Americans.

Two points stand out. The first goes to the division on the Court itself. The second goes to the woeful inconsistency of the justices, and especially of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in their views of the Court's responsibility.

With these opinions, the critical division within the Court becomes apparent for all the world to see. That amiable spirit of unanimity which Mr. Warren was able to induce when he first joined the Court in 1953 has banished utterly. Members of the Court are now quarreling openly, publicly, and they are not quarreling on matters of petty detail; they are quarreling on fundamentals. Plainly, the bloc led by Frankfurter and Harlan is increasingly disturbed and concerned at the Court's tendency to upset long-established law and to act as a super-legislature.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter made this dispute eloquently clear in 3 of his opinions here under review. In the day's first case, the Court upheld the 3-year prison terms imposed by a New York district judge upon 2 convicted Communists charged with criminal contempt. The crux of the issue rested in the defendants' insistence that they were entitled to jury trials. The Supreme Court denied this.

Speaking for the 5-man majority, Mr. Justice Harlan reviewed at great length the law of criminal contempt. He concluded that "a long and unbroken line" of Supreme Court decisions had established beyond peradventure that criminal contempts are not subject to jury trial as a matter of constitutional right. This principle, he said, "is firmly rooted in our traditions." It was not for the Court to toss it aside.

Frankfurter buttressed Harlan's argument in a concurring opinion.

The first of the day's nationalization cases found Mr. Justice Frankfurter again upholding established precedent and again defending the powers of Congress. Here the questions were whether Congress has the broad power to deprive any citizen of his citizenship; and, if so, whether an American national's action in voting in a foreign election is a reasonable ground on which to revoke it. Frankfurter said the first question had been disposed of as far back as 1913, in *Mackenzie* v. *Hare;* the second question, he felt, was answered in the fact that Congress has power to regulate all foreign affairs: "To deny the power of Congress to enact the legislation challenged here would be to disregard the constitutional allocation of governmental functions that it is this Court's solemn duty to guard."

But the expression by Mr. Justice Frankfurter that struck closest to the South's position came in his dissenting opinion in the case of a soldier, born in Ohio, whose citizenship had been revoked upon his conviction for desertion. A majority of the Court, led by Warren, held that such punishment was cruel and unusual. They then voided a section of the Nationality Act. Frankfurter read his colleagues a lecture on judicial restraint:

All power is, in Madison's phrase, "of an encroaching nature." Judicial power is not immune against this human weakness. It also must be on guard against encroaching beyond its proper bounds, and not the less so since the only restraint upon it is self-restraint.

Rigorous observance of the difference between limits of power and wise exercise of power—between questions of authority and questions of prudence—requires the most alert appreciation of this decisive but subtle relationship of two concepts that too easily coalesce. No less does it require a disciplined will to adhere to the difference. It is not easy to stand aloof and allow want of wisdom to prevail, to disregard one's own strongly held view of what is wise in the conduct of affairs. But it is not the business of this Court to pronounce policy. It must observe a fastidious regard for limitations on its own power, and this precludes the Court's giving effect to its own notions of what is wise or politic. That self-restraint is of the essence in the observance of the judicial oath, for the Constitution has not authorized the judges to sit in judgment on the wisdom of what Congress and the executive branch do.

And amazingly enough, Justices Burton, Clark, and Harlan joined in that expression by Frankfurter.

It is amazing, because three of these judges—Frankfurter, Burton, and Clark—signed the Court's school segregation decision of May 17, 1954, and all four of them joined in the second school decision of May 31, 1955. How is it possible, one inquires in bewilderment, for presumptively intelligent men not to recognize that they accepted in

the school decisions precisely what they denounced in the paragraphs quoted above?

In the school cases, the Supreme Court did pronounce policy. The judges did, in fact, give effect to their own notions of what is wise or politic. Abandoning all self-restraint, they did indeed sit in judgment on the wisdom of what the States had agreed to in 1868. Beginning in 1870, a host of judges had launched a long unbroken line of opinions asserting that the States had not been prohibited by the 14th amendment from operating separate schools, but this mass of precedent did not matter to the Court on May 17, 1954. What price consistency? And what price self-restraint?

The South may draw some faint, feeble hope from the pronouncements that split the High Court on March 31. If 4 or 5 members of the Court have begun to think some hard thoughts on the Court's abuse of power, they may yet reconsider their flagrant usurpation of authority in the school cases and seek to undo the monstrous damage they have done.

Centennial of Oregon Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, 1959 will mark the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon to the Union. As a part of the preparation for our centennial celebration, which 8 million people from the 48 States will enjoy, a special supplement to the New York Times of April 6, 1958, entitled "Oregon Welcomes Tourists and Industry," was prepared by the Oregon State Department of Planning and Development. Realizing how fortunate they are to live in a State so richly endowed with nature's blessings, the people of Oregon want their neighbors across our land to visit their centennial celebration and to share their zest for life in a land for "real" living.

The New York Times supplement introduces its reader not only to a vacation land abundant with streams, mountains, and forests, but also to a land of opportunity. A rich agricultural economy, with rural families enjoying comfortable and dependable lives and incomes, and a timber crop of 30 million acres which, by the way, makes Oregon first in the Nation in the production of timber, provide stable foundations for rapidly expanding manufacturing. A population which has increased 40 percent since 1940, and the present and potential sources for inexpensive power have drawn the attention of America's leading industrial lists.

Yet nature's gifts have not implanted a spirit of smug satisfaction in the people of my State, but instead have endowed them with the necessary spirit to be a part of an expanding area of our Nation. Illustrating this is our supplement, which indicates the unique atmosphere of cooperation which exists between the State of Oregon and business, industry, and labor. Combining their resources to describe the industrial opportunities and vocational attractions of the State of Oregon, they have produced an informative advertising section which is a real credit to the State of Oregon. Recognizing the need for a healthy industrial climate, labor leadership took an active part in establishing the Oregon Development and Planning Department and is presently represented on the department's advisory council.

Just as labor and industry are able to cooperate in the promotion of Oregon, trade unions also have made a record in favorable relations with management which speaks for itself. In 1956, time lost from strike idleness in Oregon was two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total estimated work time as compared with a higher national average of twenty-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent.

A message from the Governor of Oregon, Robert D. Holmes, introduces the special New York Times section, which I feel will be of particular interest to my colleagues with whom I hope to share our scenic attractions during the Oregon centennial celebration. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Holmes' invitation on behalf of the people of Oregon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that a list of the public-spirited advertisers who have made the Oregon rotogravure section possible, and who share my faith in our State, be printed in the RECORD. It is significant that these advertisers include not only leading private industries and business, but also the Oregon State Labor Council of the AFL–CIO, as well as many chambers of commerce and port commissions.

There being no objection, the invitation and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A century ago, Americans with pioneer imagination and courage turned their eyes and their wagon wheels toward the Oregon country. There they found a land of great resource: Rich soil for their plowshares, giant timber for their saws, abundant waterpower for their mills, scenic beauty for their souls.

Today, on the eve of Oregon's 100th anniversary as a State, men with the same imagination and courage are again turning their eyes toward the great Northwest. The great resources still remain; the soil enriched by new agricultural processes, great stand of timber for the leading industry, pure water for power and processing, scenery and recreational facilities to contribute to the inner spirits of a happy and energetic people.

This describes a majestic section of our great Nation * * * an area won by the vision of men like Thomas Jefferson, Lewis and Clark, and all the venturers who rolled over the Oregon Trail in wagon trains, or braved the long sea voyage "round the Horn." In the years that followed new pioneers in trains and automobiles took the trail to Oregon with the same spirit.

In recent months we have seen a rebirth of the bold, pioneer spirit and energy here in Oregon. In these months we have watched the mighty Columbia's first surge over newly completed dams; we have stood on the rim of the dramatic canyon of the Snake and realized its great potential of waterpower and storage; we have watched harvesters sweep through fields of wheat and peas in the Umatilla country, and watched the fruit harvests in our green, clean valleys; we have watched the giant fir trees on their way to the mills to become lumber and plywood; and we saw the beginnings of new plants for processing uranium, lime, zirconium, woodpulp, electronic devices, frozen foods, and aluminum.

Oregonians realize that it takes pioneering yet to give greater education to its resource of people, to protect and preserve its resources of power and timber and mineral and scenery, and to pass new laws extending the rights of all men. Oregonians realize as well the advantages of labor and management working in friendly cooperation; the advantages of a shared prosperity and the reasonable hope for better things to come; the advantages of hundreds of miles of public beaches, of millions of acres of public-owned recreation areas, of accessible fishing streams and hunting grounds; the advantages of leadership in literacy and the advantages of unsegregated schools and busses and homes.

These are some of our assets. We face the happy prospects of sharing them in the years to come, and of having them multiply like the loaves and the fishes to feed the multitudes. This is our invitation to share them with you.

ROBERT O. HOLMES,
Governor of Oregon.

(Blitz-Weinhard Co., California Oregon Power Co., Columbia River Packers Association, Inc., Coos County Chamber of Commerce, First National Bank of Portland, Harvey Aluminum Co., Jantzen, Inc., Lane County, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce, Meier & Frank Co., Multnomah County, State of Oregon, Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, Pacific Power & Light, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., Pendleton Woolen Mills, Port of Portland, Port of St. Helens, Portland Chamber of Commerce, City of Portland, Portland Gas & Coke Co., Portland General Electric Co., Southern Pacific, United States National Bank of Portland, White Stag Manufacturing Co.)

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, two more newspapers in South Carolina have come out with editorials supporting my position regarding postal rate increases and have highly criticized the Postmaster General for his attempts to tie the 5-cent stamp and new post-office buildings together.

The Orangeburg Times and Democrat, in an editorial entitled "Summerfield's Curve," calls the Postmaster General's hand for his attempt to buy off support for a 5-cent stamp with empty promises of new post-office buildings.

The Orangeburg newspaper says in forceful terms that Mr. Summerfield has thrown Congress a curve and in an expert manner has brought to light the underlying fact that the Post Office Department and the postal service is a service and is not a business.

The Times and Democrat also brings out the extravagance of our overseas propaganda and giveaway programs and states that if we can afford these programs for foreign countries then "we can certainly afford to provide taxpaying citizens with low-cost mailing of newspapers, news magazines, and books."

I agree thoroughly with the Orangeburg Times and Democrat and ask that its editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of all Members of the Senate and House.

In an editorial entitled "Lure May Have Failed," the State points out that Mr. Summerfield's proposal is simply a "rob Peter to pay Paul" scheme and should be junked.

The State appropriately labels Mr. Summerfield's proposal as being "simply another form of indirect taxation" and concludes its criticism of the Postmaster General by saying "Americans have never been particularly fond of stamp taxes." A stamp tax is just what Mr. Summerfield has proposed.

I ask that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am happy to say that practically all the leading newspapers in South Carolina have seen through Mr. Summerfield's trap and support me in this matter.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orangeburg Times and Democrat of April 10, 1958]

SUMMERFIELD'S CURVE

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield has thrown a curve at the United States public. Summerfield recently announced that if Congress voted a 5-cent postage rate for first-class mail (out-of-town mail), the prospect for new post offices in more than 300 cities in the United States would be very good.

In brief, Summerfield was attempting to stir sentiment in these communities, and create enthusiasm among citizens in general, for the 5-cent stamp.

We agree with Senate Post Office Committee Chairman OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, who replied immediately that construction of any post office or any Federal building has no connection with the 5-cent stamp. That is true because all the money taken in by the post office goes into the general Government Treasury. Add to that the fact that every penny spent by the Post Office Department must be appropriated by Congress, and you can readily see JOHNSTON'S position.

Chairman JOHNSTON does not favor the 5-cent first-class stamp, nor do we. It is not because we oppose the 5-cent first-class stamp that we are critical of Summerfield's promotion, or propaganda campaign. Such a campaign on the part of a Cabinet officer is certainly a highly questionable approach to the situation.

If every Cabinet officer adopted the procedure of promising the public plums in the form of public construction, and new buildings, in an effort to build up pressure on Congress to vote more money for his department, then the results would certainly be undesirable. As we see it, Congress has the responsibility to decide on the expenditures of the Post Office Department, and while the Postmaster General may disagree with Congress, and while he may testify to anything he wishes, we do not think it is exactly cricket for him to conduct a public appropriations campaign of his own.

We are as much in favor of new post offices as anyone else. The basic question of whether the Post Office Department should be a profit-making department, should pay its own way, or should be subsidized, is the real question involved. As long as we are going to have postal rates which enable the great majority of Americans to receive books and newspapers at a very low rate, then we think the post office must expect a deficit and Congress must expect to appropriate funds for that purpose. However, we do not think that these special rates should necessarily apply to entertainment magazines.

News magazines, newspapers, and all books (which can hardly be accurately classified) have, and should, enjoy preferential mailing privileges. They disseminate news, education, and information, and produce a better informed electorate, and therefore a better government.

As long as we are appropriating money to send flute players and jazz bands over the world, for the benefit of this country, we can certainly afford to provide tax-paying citizens with low-cost mailing of newspapers, news magazines, and books, even if a deficit is incurred.

[From the State, Columbia, S. C., of April 14, 1958]

LURE MAY HAVE FAILED

By attempting to induce Congressmen to vote for the 5-cent letter rate by posing the possibility of 365 new post office buildings, Postmaster General Summerfield may have killed the bill.

Its future was uncertain at best, but the only sound argument for such a proposal was that the post office has been operating at a sizable deficit. If the increased postage rates are merely to rob Peter to pay Paul, then the 5-cent letter measure should be sent back to the source—with a 3-cent stamp.

Five-cent stamps on letters may be desirable from one point of view, but it might not bring in any more revenue. There is such a thing as pricing a product or service out of the market—which is one explanation for some developments in the present so-called recession.

Actually, the Post Office Department cannot live up to the trade suggested by Mr. Summerfield. Congress appropriates the money for operation of the post offices, and would have to authorize construction of the new post office buildings.

However, if construction of new buildings is dependent on the jump in letter rates, then the 5-cent stamp act will become simply another form of indirect taxation. Americans have never been particularly fond of stamp taxes.

Lawmaking Isn't the Supreme Court's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWMAKING ISN'T THE SUPREME COURT'S JOB

Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, was doubtless right in feeling that Congress ought to do a lot of thinking before adopting anything like Senator WILLIAM JENNER'S bill to restrict the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over certain selected matters. However, it ought not to require too much study to convince Congress that some action is necessary if it is to retain its position as a supposedly equal partner in our tripartite Federal system. The reason why congressional action to curb the Court is even mentioned is that the Court is setting itself up as a sort of third legislative chamber, and, as such, has felt free to impose its ideas upon the other branches of the Government.

Judge Learned Hand, formerly of the United States court of appeals, in his recent lectures at Harvard, declared that "If we do need a third chamber is should appear for what it is, and not as the interpreter of inscrutable principles." He added that for him "it would be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians, even if I knew how to select them, which I assuredly do not. If they were in charge I should miss the stimulus of living in a society where I have, at least theoretically, some part in the direction of public affairs."

The platonic guardians have attempted to tell a committee of Congress how it may not interrogate a witness, a ruling which has seriously hampered necessary investigatory procedure. They have decreed that a State may not pass a law to deal with subversives because the Federal Government is presumed to have a monopoly in the field. According to them, a State must admit to the practice of law an applicant who refuses to tell the bar examiners whether or not he is or has been a member of a Communist conspiracy. And they have turned loose convicted Reds on narrow technical grounds.

Surely the legislature is bound to consider how to restore balance to the Federal system of checks and balances. For, as Abraham Lincoln warned in his first inaugural address, "If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court * * * the people will have ceased to be their own rulers."

To limit the Court's jurisdiction may not be the way to restore Congress to its rightful and constitutional authority, but there can be no doubt of the right of Congress to do so if it pleases. The late Justice Owen Roberts many years ago raised the question: "What is there to prevent Congress taking away, bit by bit, all the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States? I can see nothing * * * in view of the language of the third article of the Constitution."

The third article of the Constitution defines the jurisdiction of the Court, both original and appellate, and adds this very important qualification: "With such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." If any branch of the Government yearns for the role of platonic guardian, the Constitution says it should be Congress.

This is a constitutional question which should—but probably won't—be debated without reference to one's feelings about investigations or civil rights. Judge Hand hesitates to prescribe a remedy for the trouble. He rightly dreads the confusion that would arise if a final decision on the constitutionality of statutes could not be made by anybody. But the learned judge, who might well be on the Higher Court himself, plainly regards the errors of lawmakers and of the people as less menacing than the rise of judicial dictatorship, however benign. So should we all."

Foreign Language Training in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President, in his January 27 education

message to the Congress, rightly stressed the importance of knowledge of foreign languages in the light of our free world leadership responsibilities and to our national security and noted a deficiency in the knowledge of languages, particularly those of the emerging nations in Asia, Africa, and the Near East. It has often been stated that American servicemen and their families abroad are our country's best ambassadors; it is needless to add that these men and women can be better ambassadors if they are fluent in the language of the people to whom they are addressing our Nation's message of friendship and freedom. In response to a recent inquiry which I made, the Department of Defense has advised me of the language training opportunities offered servicemen and their families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter on foreign language training available to the Armed Forces of the United States, which I think is extremeley important, because I believe we have to come to the point where we should have a bilingual approach in all our schools. We are world leaders. It is high time our young people began to speak foreign languages and to learn them from the ground up, beginning in the lowest grades in primary school, as is done in many countries abroad.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1958.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Reference is made to your letter of January 8, 1958, to the Secretary of Defense requesting information about language courses open to service personnel and their families stationed abroad, and to the interim reply made by Brig. Gen. S. F. Giffin, Director, Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, dated January 24, 1958. I am now in a position to offer a definitive reply to your query.

While there is variation from service to service and among different commands of each service in the language opportunities available, there are nevertheless generalizations which can be safely made about these opportunities. The most important, I believe, is that virtually every serviceman has foreign language instruction available in some form. In most cases, foreign language insiruction is also available to his dependents if they are with him overseas.

Foreign language courses are generally taught in group study classes conducted during off-duty time for military personnel overseas, and for dependents on a space-available basis. The language emphasized is that of the host country, but other languages are frequently available, too. The languages most often taught in Europe are French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Russian. In the Far East, Korean, Chinese, and Japanese are offered. Participation in on-duty classes is mandatory in some commands.

The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) offers instruction by correspondence (supplemented by phonograph records) in 21 languages. All military personnel are eligible to take these courses.

Language courses are offered through civilian college classes—for example, by the University of Maryland in Europe and the Far East—on a tuition-fee basis. Assistance in paying tuition is given to military personnel.

Foreign language courses are available to all high-school students and many elementary school students in the dependents' schools. In Europe, for example, 65 percent of all Air Force dependents in high school take French and German, and 35 percent of the elementary students take these courses. The languages most frequently offered are French, Spanish and German, in conformance with United States civilian educational policies.

In only one instance has there been a reduction in language programs attributable to a lack of funds. Educational activities are financed from the operation and maintenance funds which are allotted to commanders for the performance of their missions. Faced with a general reduction of such funds last year, the commander of the United States Air Force in Europe elected to curtail certain programs, which in the language field consisted of a 30-hour mandatory language program for military personnel and mandatory instruction for pupils in the dependents' schools. At the same time, greater tuition assistance was continued for members of that command taking college courses than in other commands. This reduction did not result in denying language instruction to anyone who wanted it.

All of the Armed Forces recognize the importance of instruction in foreign languages and place great emphasis upon it. Your interest in this worthwhile activity is indeed appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
STEPHEN S. JACKSON,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

Grain Terminal Association Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusually interesting report of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF APRIL 10, 1958

Many big city newspapers and magazines, when they are at a loss to explain inflation and high prices, try to lay the blame on farmers and agriculture. They are teeing off now on the jump that farm prices took in mid-March. That climb was 4 percent, and now farmers are receiving 87 percent of parity, mainly because of a temporary livestock shortage and freezes in fruit and vegetable areas. That compares with 100 percent of parity that farmers were getting when the present administration moved to Washington in late 1952.

Some publications have gone so far as blaming the business recession on food prices. They point out that when people have to spend so much on food, they have less money for cars and freezers and hi-fi sets. Of course, there are people in other parts of the world who are spending much less for food, because they can't get it, and they are hungry all the time.

But here's an example of what we mean. Newsweek magazine, in its latest issue, comments that "Never before in United States history has the American family spent so much of its income for food." And we might add that never before has the American farmer received a smaller share of what the consumer spends. The United States food bill is about $75 billion a year, and farm net income is only about $12 billion. Who gets the other $63 billion? Newsweek says the American family now spends 26 percent of its income for food, compared with 25 percent a month ago. This 1 percent difference, it claims, costs consumers more than $3 billion a year—money no longer available for clothes, cars, and refrigerators.

Here's another word-for-word quote from Newsweek: "As the harassed United States housewife saw it, the family couldn't go without food, whatever it cost, but they could cut down on other things. Many experts saw the record high food prices as a big factor in the recession."

Is there merit in this argument? Perhaps a little—but not very much. The fact is that consumers want luxury on their dinner tables, and as long as they are willing to pay for it, they'll get it. Pretty packages cost money, and supermarket shelves are lined with expensive pretty packages full of the same old basic foods that are low priced when they leave the farm. Heat-and-serve goodies, up to and including the entire meals, are outright luxuries, yet consumers are gobbling them up at luxury prices.

But this is the new way of life—the push-button and can-opener age, and we don't think it is going to change short of a brutal depression that forces people to eat crusts where they used to eat cake. Not a one of us truly wants that to happen. Here are two facts all consumers ought to consider:

No. 1: Food prices have not climbed as rapidly as other prices. The official United States consumer price charts show food prices going up far slower than rents and transportation and medical care and personal services—to name a few.

No. 2: Farmers are still getting low prices for most of their products, despite recent price rises in meats and fruits and vegetables. President Eisenhower himself recently said that farmers have outpaced all other industries in efficiency of production. Retail food price increases are rightly laid at the doors of processors, handlers, and distributors, and that is where more efficiency is needed.

These are some facts that newspapers and magazines all over the Nation should be pointing out to consumers, instead of blindly directing the finger of blame at farmers. The thousands of grain farmers who make this program possible thank you for listening to GTA, the co-op way.

Ireland and the Hospitality of the Irish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, recently one of New Hampshire's outstanding reporters, Mr. James P. Lynch, of the Exeter News Letter, traveled to Great Britain and Europe to cover some of the overseas activities of our Strategic Air Command.

While on this trip, he had the opportunity to visit in Ireland and to learn something of the attitude of the people of Ireland toward our country and its representatives stationed there. Returning, he wrote a column covering these impressions, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I hope that each Member of the Senate will take the time to read this fine article, for Mr. Lynch has recorded the results of his rather searching inquiries of the Irish people toward our present Ambassador, Scott McLeod.

All of us will recall, I am sure, the extended and penetrating interrogation of Scott McLeod by some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he was nominated by the White House. We can remember, too, the lengthy debate when his nomination was before the Senate. I considered it a privilege then to endorse him for this important post, and I am happy to report today that my confidence in him and that of the majority of the Members of the United States Senate was well placed.

Ambassador McLeod is representing the United States in Ireland with distinction. His selection was indeed a wise one and it has brought great credit to this administration and the Department of State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN IN OUR CORNER

(By James P. Lynch)

You're never a stranger in Ireland. For regardless of how far away from home you are the people of that nation make you feel as if you belong in the Emerald Isle. No matter what your nationality, creed, or color, in Ireland you are always welcomed as a friend.

Perhaps this explains why people all over the world will be celebrating St. Patrick's Day next week. The good will and good nature of these people have spread everywhere and the world has been made richer in a moral sense by this contribution.

Talk to an Irishman this weekend and he is sympathetic. He will tell you there are only two kinds of people. Those who are Irish, and those who wish they were Irish.

With a twinkle in his eye he will proceed to trace your ancestors back to some beautiful county of Erin and, by heavens, he will try to assure you he is right. This unsolicited contribution is made not to convince himself but rather to save you from disappointment.

UNTOUCHED BEAUTY

The greatness of the Irish people has spread throughout the world but the beauty of the nation is confined within Ireland itself. Its manmade structures cannot compare with those in many other countries but Ireland stands out in glamour with its richly carved mountains and lakes. These God-given possessions never lose their splendor regardless of the hardships suffered down through the centuries by the people of this nation.

The grass of the land of St. Patrick goes unchallenged in its claim of green radiance even during the cold winter months. No artist can depict the brilliancy of this natural beauty.

All this is matched by the good nature of the people of that country. If ever a nation was deserving of the title, "A Land of Philosophers," then Ireland is the claimant.

GREAT HOSPITALITY

The hospitality of the people is immeasurable. Willingness to be helpful is not an effort but a desire. They feel proud that you came to visit them and they want you to enjoy your stay.

Perhaps you never met these people before. That doesn't matter for no one is a stranger in Ireland.

We sensed this friendship as soon as our plane was in the sky. It was an Aer Lingus Viscount. Within a few minutes we were served a light meal by one of the three colleens who are serving as stewardesses. The passengers began to talk about Ireland. Many of them had only been in London for a few weeks, others had been away for a long period.

At the air terminal, Paddy Keays turned out to be a self-appointed guide. Paddy was in his fifties but he ran around the place like a track star. He was more than helpful. His yarns sounded rather fantastic and when we started to ask questions he began to tell us more. You could listen all night to Paddy and enjoy every moment for he is a true Irishman who wants everyone to feel at home.

Like many more, Paddy has great respect for the United States. Paddy did his utmost to try and convince us that President Eisenhower's ancestors came from Ireland but we refused to accept that tale.

SCOTTY'S IRISH

Paddy didn't argue, instead he admitted that he got the names upset. It was the ambassador to Ireland who was Irish. Paddy by now had a real gleam in his eye but we weren't accepting these shenanigans for we happened to know something about Scott McLeod.

Even Scotty would have appreciated hearing about his "Irish" ancestors from these people who admire him so much. Indeed, much of Ambassador McLeod's success in the Emerald Isle can be attributed to the great faith the people of that nation have for the former aid to Senator STYLES BRIDGES.

People of Ireland pray and they pray fervently. Scott McLeod can be certain they pray for him too for America can be proud of the lasting impression Scotty has made on the people of Erin.

ADMIRED BY ALL

The name Scott McLeod is not limited to certain circles within the great capital city of Dublin. Throughout Ireland Scotty McLeod is admired and respected by all the people.

On the way down from Dublin to Cork we talked to some Irishmen on the train about Ireland and the people. Many of them were interested in the United States. All of them praised the Ambassador.

When Scott McLeod was first mentioned as the possible ambassador there was some opposition, but fortunately Scotty won the appointment. Fortunately, too, for this Nation as he instilled a friendly feeling between both countries.

Scott McLeod was not a stranger to Ireland for the people of that nation were well aware of Scotty's continuous fight for justice. They knew of his respect for the late Senator Joe McCarthy.

VIGOROUS LEADERSHIP

The Ambassador's background reflects the qualities of leadership. The people of Ireland do not know of his contribution toward the creation of Pease Air Force Base. During the early days of planning Scott was administrative assistant to Senator STYLES BRIDGES and fought hard with his former boss to secure this installation for New Hampshire.

Frequently the Ambassador is called upon to address leading organisations in Ireland. The impression he makes is lasting.

At dinner in Dublin's leading hotel we were discussing world conditions with an Irishman who has traveled extensively. He mentioned several leading politicial figures throughout the world. He felt the United States was extremely fortunate in having many capable leaders including Ambassador McLeod.

Those who can't claim Irish blood, even though it may be centuries away, will be tolerant this week, and perhaps not envious, for they will share in the spirit of St. Patrick's Day.

Undoubtedly they would be even more tolerant if they were able to visit that country and see how the people of Ireland treat those from the United States. For in Ireland you are no stranger.

And if you stay long they will convince you that your family tree started in Ireland. They are rather convincing, although they didn't have any trouble here.

New Post Offices To Fight Slump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Post Offices To Fight Slump," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW POST OFFICES TO FIGHT SLUMP

(By Gould Lincoln)

In the midst of debate over tax reductions and big Federal spending for various kinds of public works, the Post Office Department, under its so-called leasing program, is continuing to make jobs for many industries and manufacturers, particularly the building and related industries, when jobs are needed to fight the economic recession. The leasing program, in operation now for five years, derives from the Lease-Purchase Act. Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield reported last week that 918 new post office buildings have already been started or will be under construction by fall, costing an estimated $49,245,000. The program has been used to provide nearly 2,200 new postal buildings. It is also the basis of President Eisenhower's recently proposed $2 billion post office construction program—with $1.5 billion provided by private investors. It is the kind of building program which will not require great sums of money raised by taxation. It is also the kind of program which will pay off in better service to the public.

Thirteen of the new buildings to be constructed, costing $9,100,000, will be bought by the Government, which will pay for them over a period of years, as a private citizen pays for a home under the Federal housing regulations. The 905 other postal structures will be built by private investors according to the department's specifications and leased by the Government for a period of years. These leased buildings are uniformly small in size, serving many communities. The funds needed to equip these buildings already are available in appropriations authorized for the department by Congress.

BETTER SERVICE TO RESULT

The value of the building and leasing programs of the Department will be found in greatly improved postal service, Mr. Summerfield insists. "These 905 new leased post office buildings," he said, "represent less than 10 percent of the Department's need for new facilities. The big bottlenecks to faster mail service is in the larger post offices where mail

is still sorted and distributed by essentially the same slow and costly hand methods used in Ben Franklin's day."

Obviously, if the President's new proposal for a $2 billion lease-purchase program goes through, it would serve the twofold purpose of stimulating private industry and providing great improvements in the handling of the public's mail. Postmaster General Summerfield has pointed to the benefits which will derive under the present program. Much, he says, is bound up in the fate of the postal rate bill, now pending before Congress and expected to pass during the present session. If it goes through without amendment, the extra 1 cent of the proposed temporary 5-cent rate for out-of-town letters will provide $175 million a year for a 3-year period to buy new equipment for thousands of badly needed new post office buildings and for modernizing presently occupied Federal buildings. Other rate increases carried in the bill—the increase from 3 cents to 4 cents on letter mail, and an approximate increase of 50 percent on second-class mail (magazines and newspapers) and third-class mail (advertising circulars) will bring in about $525 million a year. This will be used to reduce the current huge postal deficit, which now exceeds $2 million each working day.

PLACES TO GET BUILDINGS

Among the 13 new post offices which the Government will obtain under the Lease-Purchase Act are buildings to be erected in Denver, Colo.; Newark, N. J.; Brooklyn, N. Y.; and Scranton, Pa. Bids for these buildings are now being solicited. The 905 buildings which will be constructed under the Department's leasing program are scattered through the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories. The District of Columbia buildings will be for the Connecticut Avenue station and the Benning station. North Dakota, among the States, will get 5 of these new buildings, estimated to cost $105,000—at Fessenden, Grand Forks (University Station), Parshall, Rola, and Walhalla. Another example is Ohio, which will get 41 of these new buildings, to cost $1,778,000. New branch stations will be constructed in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Dayton. A third State, Massachusetts, also gets 41 buildings, including 8 in the Boston area, estimated to cost $1,820,000.

Not only does the post-office program provide jobs without an immediate great outlay of capital by the Federal Government, but it aids local communities, pays local real-estate taxes on new buildings, and gives investors safe opportunities. Also, it helps to keep the mail service in step with the rapid growth of the country.

Exploring the Secrets of the Universe—The New Astronomic Telescope at the University of Wisconsin

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Special Senate Committee on Space and Astronautics I have, naturally, been especially deeply interested in American scientific leadership in exploring the mysteries of the sky, of the worlds beyond the reach of our most high-powered telescopes.

Stargazing used to be thought of as an interesting scientific hobby; but no more than that. Today the astronomer, like the physicist with whom he works, especially in the person of the astrophysicist, has become a key man in America's defenses—yes, in America's very survival.

It is important, therefore, that there come from the universities of the land increasing numbers of scientists who are skilled in unraveling the secrets far beyond the Milky Way, invisible to the naked eye. Accordingly, I am most pleased that there will soon be in operation, at the University of Wisconsin, a new telescope which will gather over 20,000 times as much light as the unaided eye.

I may recall, incidentally, that one of the most memorable experiences in my lifetime was a visit to Mount Palomar, in your State of California, Mr. Vice President, where I had the privilege of gazing at the mammoth 200-inch telescope which has played so prominent a part in new discoveries in the cosmos.

It is essential that there be an intensified effort to advance American astronomy.

It is essential that every possible encouragement be given to the scientists in the various observatories and laboratories, the masters of the telescope, the camera, and the spectograph, and all of the other optical and related instruments, who will provide indispensable information toward that day in the not-too-distant future when a manned missile will head for the moon, and possibly beyond.

From the astronomers of this land, and from their professional associates in related skills, we need the most expert suggestions on ways and means by which the legislative and executive branches can give them the tools and the impetus to meet the challenges which are theirs.

Of this we can be certain: The U. S. S. R. will spare no effort in its race to reach the moon. But man will not reach the moon until man knows far more than he now knows about cosmic rays, and a thousand other phenomena, which still pose so much of a problem.

Toward the solution of this and other problems, I know that the Department of Astronomy, of the College of Letters and Science, of the University of Wisconsin, will play its role.

I congratulate Prof. Charles M. Huffer, Professor Emeritus Joel Stebbins, and Chairman Albert Whitford, and all those associated in the development of the new telescope at Pine Bluff, west of Madison, in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Sunday, March 9, issue of the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTRONOMERS AT UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PREPARING NEW ASSAULT ON SKY MYSTERIES

(By Harry S. Pease)

PINE BLUFF, WIS.—From the top of a rugged knob in this fringe of country the glacier missed, University of Wisconsin astronomers will shortly begin a new assault on the mysteries of the sky.

Their tool will be a new, $200,000 telescope whose principal mirror is 36 inches across. It will enable them to study stars only a millionth as bright as the pole star. Its purpose is gathering light—over 20,000 times as much light as the unaided eye—but magnification is a byproduct. The moon's image in this instrument would be as big as a saucer.

By comparison with such giants as the 200-inch telescope at Mount Palomar and the 120-inch at Lick Observatory near San Francisco, the new Wisconsin instrument at Pine Bluff, west of Madison in Dane County, is modest. But the special use to which it will be put will make it a highly significant research implement.

HOW MUCH OF WHAT?

The colors which form starlight can be fanned out into a rainbow by an instrument called a spectrograph. By examining the resulting bands of color, specialists can determine what materials are emitting energy from the star, what temperature they sustain, whether they are moving or rotating, and a variety of other basic informtaion.

Such a spectograph, which weighs about 300 pounds, is to be mounted on the Wisconsin telescope. Behind it—and this is the feature which makes the assembly a rarity—will be mounted electronic equipment to measure the brightness of narrow bands of color in the starlight.

Where other methods have answered the question, "What's up there?" the UW machine will answer, "How much of what?" It will also supply new information about pairs and trios of stars which revolve as systems, eclipsing one another at intervals.

A MARVEL OF PRECISION

The new telescope will carry forward a project which Prof. C. M. Huffer has pursued for years. He and his associates have been handicapped by limited equipment and by Madison's growth, which has spread more and more smoke, haze, and light in the sky above Washburn observatory on the Madison campus.

The old 16-inch telescope there had a pretty limited grasp of light, but with it the means of photoelectronic measurement were worked out. Much of the equipment will be moved from the old observatory to the new.

The new instrument is a marvel of precision. It weighs as much as a buildozer, but has controls more delicate than those of a microscope. Its moving parts alone weigh as much as a station wagon, but are so finely balanced that a 1 pound weight will set the telescope turning.

The electric motor which turns it to follow stars from rising to setting develops one-fiftieth of a horsepower, about one-third of the power needed for a sewing machine.

FORTY INCHES ACROSS

The main driving gear is 40 inches in diameter, but its great teeth are polished so exactly that no set of three depart enough from perfection to total one ten-thousandth of an inch of error.

The main mirror of the telescope is a 492-pound lump of glass polished to a shallow spherical curve. Its biggest irregularity is somewhat less than a millionth of an inch high.

The optical system, known to astronomers as a Cassegrainian, folds light back and forth in an openwork cage to give the effect of a 40-foot-long instrument within a 10-foot length. Starlight strikes the main mirror's aluminized surface, rebounds to an eliptical convex mirror at the skyward end of the telescope, and bounces again through an eight-inch hole in the main mirror to the observing point.

What can you see with the telescope? Well, if the bird watchers took it over, they could tell the difference between a sparrow and a robin at 100 miles.

Senators Hit Criticism of High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story by Willard Edwards, from the Chicago Tribune of April 10, 1958.

This story deals with appendix IV of part 2 of the hearings on S. 2646, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

This report was printed at the request of the organization, as is the usual practice in committee hearings. It was printed as a separate appendix, because it contained a map, and to print it with the rest of the hearings would have meant delaying publication of the entire record.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS HIT CRITICISM OF HIGH COURT—REPORT CALLS TRIBUNAL RED INSTRUMENT

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—The Senate Judiciary Committee was torn by dissension today over the printing of a report attacking the Supreme Court as an instrument of Communist global conquest.

The attack on the High Court was issued as an appendix to hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on a bill by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER (Republican, of Indiana), to limit the Court's appellate jurisdiction.

An organization known as SPX Research Associates, composed of former military intelligence officers who had contact with Russian officers during World War II, sent the Court study to the subcommittee which was ordered by the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on the Jenner bill.

FORMER EDITOR HEADS GROUP

Head of the organization is Thomas R. Hutton, an Air Force reserve colonel of Stanwood, Wash., formerly an editor of the Binghamton, N. Y., Press. He said "SPX" stands for "Soviet principle 10th," which he described as a Soviet plan to break the enemy's resistance without resort to war.

"Since 1943, we've been documenting Russia's application of this principle," he said. "Some of the Supreme Court report has been in preparation for 12 years. I sent it to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND (Democrat of Mississippi), chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, when we received notice of the hearings."

The report declared that "in the paralytic effect of its pro-Communist decisions on State and Federal agencies of internal security, the United States Supreme Court is the most colorful and potentially determinative instrument of the Communist global conquest by paralysis."

CHARGE AID TO ENEMY

The report also said that the Supreme Court's recent decisions "assumed a pattern of aid and comfort to the enemy."

The ire of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. (Democrat of Missouri), leading foe of the Jenner bill, was aroused when he learned that the "SPX" report had been printed as a separate document and attached to the volume of hearings as an appendix.

"This separate printing highlights this one item of the hearings," he said in a statement. "It would permit separate distribution and might make possible the printing of a large number of copies which would give the impression that the Senate was placing its seal of approval on a document which attempts to paint the Supreme court as a tool of communism."

SUGGEST MONEY PROBE

HENNINGS noted that the organization's letter head states that it has offices in New York, Berlin, and Hong Kong.

"Colonel Hutton says that it is not endowed and does not solicit funds but it must spend a considerable amount of money to have offices in three cities scattered around the world," HENNINGS declared. "I think we should find out where the money comes from."

Subcommittee spokesman said the report was printed separately because it came in at the last moment and could not be included in the main body of the hearings. The hearings contain a great volume of testimony and statements for and against the Jenner bill.

The Judiciary Committee is reported split down the middle on the Jenner measure, now substantially amended in a version offered by Senator JOHN M. BUTLER (Republican, Maryland). The storm over the SPX report indicates the intensity of feeling on the legislation. A vote is scheduled for April 21.

The Tennessee Press Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Editors of Many Lands Pass on TPA's Slogan to Readers," published in the Tennessee Press of April 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORS OF MANY LANDS PASS ON TPA'S SLOGAN TO READERS

The Tennessee Press Association slogan, "What the people don't know will hurt them," is being translated throughout the world—but not without some trouble.

In fact, according to an international news letter of the United States Information Service, the editor of a Spanish language publication insists that as a means of clearing things up for the translator the slogan should first be written:

"What the people do not know will hurt the people."

In the language of the Spanish editor, Carlos Camins of Zamboanga's "Del Sur," the slogan would thus read, "Lo que gente no sabe, les danara."

In Korean, according to Han ki uk, of Radio Seoul, the slogan is "Kuk min num, mo ru nun de so, hae rul, bat nun da."

The USIS news letter, National Conference Weekly Newspaper Editors, is edited by Dr. Howard R. Long, whose foreign address is Taiwan. Mr. Long is head of the journalism department of the University of Illinois but is on leave with the USIS.

"Am gripped by a growing preoccupation with the Tennessee Press Association slogan * * *," Dr. Long wrote. "I find my enthusiasm shared by editors who write in many languages."

He reported these other translations:

In Tagalog, according to G. P. Eustaquio, editor of the Zamboanga City Inquirer, the wording is "Ang makakasakit sa tao ay ang hindi nila, nalalaman."

H. P. Tseng, director of the Central News Agency of China, and Milton Shieh, publisher of the Hsin Sheng Pao, say this is the version in Mandarin: "Pu chih che, pu an."

In Pangasinan dialect, according to Hugo S. Estrada, editor of Pangasinan Courier, the slogan reads "Say Ag-Amtag Karaklan Panirapan."

Dr. Long also showed what the slogan looks like in Korean and Mandarin characters—but the printer of the Tennessee Press refused to try to copy them.

Oregon Beef Candy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Joe Bianco, agriculture editor of the Portland Oregonian, tells a story of interest to my colleagues in the April 1, 1958, issue of that newspaper. It reports the ingenuity and enterprise of Mr. and Mrs. Ed Coles of Prineville, Oreg., in developing the delicious beef candy, boxes of which were recently presented to each Senate office.

Mr. Coles, who is secretary-treasurer of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association and is devoted to his work, enlisted his wife's able assistance to make wider use of the incomparable Oregon beef his members produce. This news story tells the details of their success in developing a high-protein confection known as beef-sweet steaks.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of April 1, 1958]

RANCHER TURNS DRIED BEEF TO SWEETS AS HIGH PROTEIN SNACK FOR CHILDREN

(By Joe Bianco)

An idea, several old washing machines, some used car parts, a dilapidated oil heater and high choice Oregon beef have been used to create a revolutionary product in the candy industry.

The product is beef candy, developed by Mr. and Mrs. Ed Coles, of Prineville.

The candy doesn't look like beef, smell like beef or taste like beef. It has an honest-to-goodness candy flavor, said Cole.

The difference between beef candy and other candy, according to its manufacturer, is that it contains animal protein.

SOLON MAKES TEST

Last month Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER sponsored the distribution of beef candy to his colleagues in the Senate dining room.

It was also reported that the Army Quartermaster Corps is interested in the candy and has in fact made some suggestions on ingredients and formulations for its improvement.

Cole said a search for new uses for beef led to the candy.

"As beef supplies are put on the market the beef is all consumed, but many times at a price that leaves the producer little if any return for the labor and capital he has invested," explained Cole. "Large supplies of beef that have been forced onto the market the past few years have caused economic distress to many cattle producers."

NEW MARKET SOUGHT

Cole, who is secretary-treasurer of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, said he set out to develop a new market for surplus beef.

After months of study he decided that the only way to reduce the surplus was to preserve beef through dehydration.

But then Cole was faced with the problem of what to do with dried (dehydrated) beef. At one time dried beef was used by explorers, hunters, trappers, and others who had to have concentrated foods, light in weight and which would keep. But, today, there is no longer a demand for such foods, he said.

"So, we were right back where we started. It would be useless to dry beef unless there could be developed some new method of using it," said Cole.

CHILDREN LACK PROTEINS

One day, while leafing through some material on foods, Cole said he read an article which revealed that teen-aged children today were undernourished from the standpoint that their diet lacked sufficient proteins. The children, he added, were reported eating an average of 15 to 20 pounds of candy per year.

Why not make it convenient for children to get beef the same way they do candy—through a vending machine, thought Cole.

"Well, the problem now was how to keep beef refrigerated in a vending machine," added Cole. "We did not want to dry it, because children would not eat it. Then, we got the idea of mixing it with candy."

For weeks, the Coles worked in their kitchen attempting to mix dried beef with marshmallow. Result—horrible.

Night after night, new and varied ideas and mixtures were tried in their kitchen—all horrible, he said.

FIRM ACCEPTS CANDY

Finally, they tried mixing the dehydrated beef with chocolate. Success. The product was introduced to the Brown & Haley Candy Manufacturers at Tacoma, Wash. It was accepted.

Today, with a makeshift dehydrator made from old washing machines, used car parts, and an oil heater, the Coles are drying beef for candy. The prepared beef is shipped to Tacoma, where it is made into candy.

In a year, the Coles have used more than 3 tons of beef and sold their product to stores in 22 States.

Assisting in the promotion of beef candy is the auxiliary organization of the cattlemen's group, the Cow Belles.

Plans to enlarge their Prineville operations are under way.

Cole said they included new ideas, modern equipment, but no old washing machines, used car parts, or oil heaters.

Government Responsibility in the Current Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there seems to be a real difference of opinion between the two sides in the Senate, and between the majority in the Congress and the President of the United States, as to how serious the current recession is, and how much responsibility the Government of the United States has for stopping it, and when action should be taken, if at all.

The reason I am sure that the problem is serious, and the responsibility of the Government is great, and the time to act is now, is that every time I talk with the people of my State about our economic plight, in person or by letter, they tell me so. They are not bothered about theories as to how the economy ought to work. They just know, in the most urgent and firsthand way possible, what is happening to them.

I have a letter from Mr. George W. Herbst, secretary-treasurer of the Herbst Shoe Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee, which is a case in point. Mr. Herbst's letter is conservative, constructive, and responsible. But it makes clear what is happening to business after business in this country as purchasing power declines and the philosophy of fear gains ground. It makes clear that the time to act is now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Herbst's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBST SHOE MANUFACTURING CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 4, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator, Madison, Wis.

DEAR SIR: We are a medium size company engaged in the manufacture of juvenile shoes. Our products are sold on a national basis directly to the retailer. Because we are making a consumer product used by a high percentage of families, we must direct all of our efforts to keeping in touch with the American family—to know their buying habits, what styles appeal to them, what price range they can afford, etc., etc.

Therefore, we are taking the privilege of passing on to you, our observations on the present buying power of our customers. We have just finished up the Easter season, a period in which the juvenile shoe business usually reaches 1 of the 2 sales peaks during the year. However, our dealers and salesmen have reported to us that people are more cautious, more inclined to hold back and see what's going to happen. We are not trying to convey the impression of being alarmists but the trend seems to be getting stronger in this direction.

It is not necessary to remind you that sometimes a fear philosophy can develop to serious proportions. People are waiting for something reassuring to happen—perhaps a reduction on the individual income tax is one answer. Immediate action on such a step might give the consumer the impetus he needs to get back into a more normal buying routine.

Technological progress in new manufacturing equipment has been considerable, yet the purchase of this equipment has been hampered by the present depreciation structure. Immediate attention to the revision of these may provide a secondary source of creating employment, etc.

We have presented the above comments with the thought in mind that you might find them of some value in appraising current economic needs.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE W. HERBST,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The Truth About the Indian Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, many friends of the American Indian were both shocked and disappointed by an article which appeared in the March issue of Reader's Digest, on the subject of Indian claims now being considered by an agency of our Government, the Indian Claims Commission.

While the article contained some factual information and made brief mention of the background and reasons for the Indian Claims Commission Act, it also contained a great many half-truths, inaccuracies, and exaggerations.

The effect of the article was not only to hold up the majority of Indian claims to ridicule, but also to undermine a justified American pride in a piece of legislation which is one of the brightest and most honorable pages in our Nation's history.

The Indian Claims Commission Act was a statutory recognition by the Congress of a long and sordid series of broken treaties, contracts, and agreements with the Indian people of the Nation—a chronicle of mistreatment, misrepresentation, and misfeasance of which every right-thinking American is properly ashamed.

In 1946, under this act, we set out to right this sorry record, to the best of our ability.

Obviously, it was not possible to set things right with many of the Indians who were the victims of our Government's broken promises; the bones of many of them have long been mouldering in their graves. Whenever possible, however, we resolved under this new law to set things right with the children, grandchildren, and other descendants

of the victims of injustice, and to this end the act suspended all limitations upon time for redress and provided as follows:

The Commission shall hear and determine the following claims against the United States on behalf of any Indian tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States or Alaska: (1) claims in law or equity arising under the Constitution, laws, treaties of the United States, and Executive orders of the President; (2) all other claims in law or equity, including those sounding in tort, with respect to which the claimant would have been entitled to sue in a court of the United States if the United States was subject to suit; (3) claims which would result if the treaties, contracts and agreements between the claimant and the United States were revised on the ground of fraud, duress, unconscionable consideration, mutual or unilateral mistake, whether of law or fact, or any other ground cognizable by a court of equity; (4) claims arising from the taking by the United States, whether as the result of a treaty of cession or otherwise, of lands owned or occupied by the claimant without the payment for such lands of compensation agreed to by the claimant; and (5) claims based upon fair and honorable dealings that are not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity. No claim accruing after August 13, 1946, shall be considered by the Commission.

The jurisdiction conferred upon the three Commissioners appointed by the President to hear these claims is undoubtedly unique—and it is doubtful if the annals of any nation's history contain a more genuine and honest attempt by a legislative body to establish a forum and a procedure to do justice toward a mistreated people within the nation's borders.

With unique procedures, and unique jurisdiction, it is small wonder that some unique and surprising claims have been filed.

In the first place, it should be noted that attorneys and legal forms are not required in the filing of claims: "any claim within the provisions of this chapter may be presented to the Commission by any member of an Indian tribe, band or other identifiable group of Indians."

One of the claims ridiculed in the Digest article was the claim for Manhattan Island, filed for the Kent Tribe. Commission records show that this claim was filed by an individual, without an attorney. The Government's motion to dismiss is on the legal grounds that the island was ceded to the Dutch by the tribe, thereafter transferred to the British, and thereafter transferred by the British to the United States—therefore avoiding any liability.

Had these facts been set forth in the magazine article, a fairer picture of both the claim and its prospects would have been presented—but such a policy would probably not sell so many magazines.

A great deal of fuss was made in the article about the Otoe and Missouria claim—which originally sought compensation for 14,599,908 acres of land. Five of the seven causes of action brought by the Otoes and Missourias were dismissed by the Commission, and the award of approximately $1,156,000 was made on 1,879,892 acres of land.

This award was appealed to the Court of Claims, which affirmed the award and dismissed causes 2, 5, and 7, but remanded cause 1, which is still pending.

Inaccurately, the article states that the Kaw Indians asked compensation for Kansas lands and the Government, on the basis of the Otoe and Missouria judgment, "bought back" the Kansas lands for $2,493,688. Actually, the Kaw award of $2,398,220 (after offsets of $95,468) was made on September 17, 1951—a year and a half before the so-called precedent of the Otoe and Missouria award. Furthermore, to set the Kaw record completely straight, a further Kaw claim for 18,314,240 acres claimed under Indian title was dismissed by the Commission.

Let the record also be set straight with regard to the Quapaw claim, mentioned in the Digest article. This claim sought compensation for 44,703,892 acres of land, invoking the Treaty of August 24, 1818, in which the Quapaw Reservation was set aside as a permanent home by the Government.

An award based upon only 1,163,004 acres was allowed by the Commission, which denied the claim as to 43,520,889 acres. After offsets, the Quapaw judgment amounted to $927,668—which does not make very sensational reading.

The plain fact is that the Indian Claims Commission, in its tedious and difficult job of weeding out the good claims from the bad, has dismissed a great many more cases than it has satisfied with awards.

Many cases have been withdrawn, and most cases in which awards have been made have been for amounts much, much smaller than claimed.

Of the 131 cases completed before the Commission, by final action of award, dismissal or withdrawal, the total amount awarded to this date is $34,199,912—of which more than half is subject to some offsets in varying amounts, not all yet determined.

While more than $34 million is a lot of money—it is less than 4 percent of the total amount claimed in these cases, which amounted to more than $926 million.

That does not indicate that the Indian Claims Commission is being reckless in its decisions, or with Uncle Sam's money.

On the contrary, the evidence supports the view that this Commission is doing a good job in a very difficult and unprecedented mission, which was assigned to it by the Congress, and which has turned out to be a much bigger job than was anticipated.

Because of widespread interest in this subject, and to complete the record to the best of my ability, I am submitting for the RECORD the most recent compilation of claims filed with the Indian Claims Commission, as provided very recently, showing not only the amount claimed, but action taken as of March 20, 1958. The list follows:

Claims filed with Indian Claims Commission

[Figures in parentheses show number of claims in status given. *Indicates any offsets ascertained will be deducted]

Docket No.	Claimant	Claims	Principal claimed	Filed	Action (as of Mar. 20, 1958)
1	Loyal Creeks	1	$690,000	Dec. 30, 1947	Oct. 19, 1951, award $600,000.
2	Western and Eastern Cherokees	1	14,675,000	Feb. 3, 1948	Feb. 19, 1952, dismissed.
3	Western Cherokees	1	348,502	Jan. 27, 1948	Nov. 15, 1948, dismissed.
4	Michigan Ottawas and Chippewas	1	(1)	Apr. 29, 1947	Mar. 25, 1949, withdrawn.
5	Eastern Cherokees	1	2,653,996	Jan. 23, 1948	Nov. 15, 1948, dismissed.
6	Henry Jackson et al (Canadian Pottawtomies)	1	1,517,227	May 15, 1947	Feb. 15, 1949, withdrawn.
7	Minnesota Chippewas	1	5,194,328	May 22, 1947	Jan. 24, 1949, Withdrawn.
8	Fond du Lac and other Chippewas	1	143,786	....do....	Jan. 14, 1949, withdrawn.
9	Osage Nation	1	3,480,627	July 16, 1947	Mar. 1, 1955, award $864,107.55.
10	Pawnee Tribe	8	30,503,697	Aug. 5, 1947	Feb. 3, 1953, award $297.45 (3); June 17, 1957, liability (5) amount not fixed.
11	Otoe and Missouria	7	9,726,920	Sept. 2, 1947	Dec. 11, 1953, award $1,156,034.35 (6); July 31, 1957, liability (1), amount not fixed.
12	Federated Indians of California	1	(1)	Sept. 22, 1947	Apr. 28, 1949, withdrawn.
13	Saginaw Chippewas	23	49,549,283	Aug. 22, 1949	1953-56, dismissed (5); Mar. 9, 1950, withdrawn (9), pending (9).
14	Quapaw Tribe	2	86,724,320	Nov. 3, 1947	May 7, 1954, award $927,668.04.
15	Pottawatomie Tribe	21	155,878,424	Sept. 23, 1949	Aug. 8, 1955, award $126,306.24 (2); Sept. 19, 1956, liability $3,290,217 (1)* (includes 2 claims D. 71); 1952-57, dismissed (4), pending (14).
16	Choctaw Nation	1	7,067,024	May 16, 1948	July 14, 1950, award $2,587,835.47.
17	Snake or Piute Indians	2	3,500,000	Dec. 8, 1947	Dec. 28, 1956, liability, amount not fixed (1); for dismissal (1).
18	Red Lake and other Chippewas	17	448,500,590	Aug. 16, 1949	June 2, 1957, dismissed (1), pending (16).
19	Minnesota Chippewas	1	2,033,201	Jan. 22, 1948	
20	....do....	1	2,750,147	....do....	
21	Creek Nation	1	29,084,500	Jan. 29, 1948	Dec. 29, 1955, liability, amount not fixed.
22	Apache Nation et al	11	(1)	Feb. 3, 1948	
23	Chickasaw Nation	1	2,355,674	Feb. 4, 1948	July 14, 1950, award $902,008.11.
24	Western Cherokees	1	10,000,000	Mar. 1, 1948	Apr. 3, 1952, dismissed.
25	Creek Freedmen Association	1	(1)	Apr. 14, 1948	Aug. 4, 1949, dismissed.
26	Texas Cherokees et al	1	5,000,000	Apr. 6, 1948	Dec. 28, 1953, dismissed.
27	Delaware Tribe	6	14,801,709	Apr. 26, 1948	Aug. 31, 1954, withdrawn (1), pending (5); 1 on remand; liability, no amount fixed.

See footnotes at end of table.

Claims filed with Indian Claims Commission—Continued

[Figures in parentheses show number of claims in status given. *Indicates any offsets ascertained will be deducted]

Docket No.	Claimant	Claims	Principal claimed	Filed	Action (as of Mar. 20, 1958)
28	Hannahville and Forest County communities	1	$166,408	May 4, 1948	
29	do	17	84,265,346	Mar. 14, 1950	June 4, 1957, dismissed (2), pending (15).
30	Fort Sill Apaches	2	(1)	May 26, 1948	May 6, 1949, dismissed (1), pending (1).
31	Indians of California	1	126,240,800	Apr. 28, 1949	Pending on remand.
32	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes	1	14,268,664	Aug. 9, 1948	July 18, 1957, award $2,067,166 on appeal.
33	Kaw Tribe	1	10,930,180	Sept. 10, 1948	May 15, 1952, award $1,600,220.02.
34	do	1	29,877,800	do	May 15, 1952, dismissed.
35	do	1	2,298,000	Sept. 13, 1948	May 15, 1952, award $798,000.
36	do	1	5,000,000	do	Feb. 12, 1952, withdrawn.
37	Indians of California	1	(3)	Mar. 24, 1949	Pending on remand.
38	Kaw Tribe	2	18,233,000	Sept. 29, 1948	Dec. 19, 1955, dismissed.
39	Choctaws and Chickasaws (Underwood-Holder)	1	(1)	do	Oct. 28, 1949, dismissed.
40	Ottawa Tribe	11	22,064,385	Aug. 22, 1949	Sept. 19, 1956, dismissed (1); Mar. 9, 1950, withdrawn (3) pending (7).
41	Western Cherokees	1	278,672	Oct. 18, 1948	Dec. 28, 1950, dismissed.
42	Eastern Cherokees	1	992,550	do	Do.
43	Western Cherokees	1	113,046	Nov. 1, 1948	June 11, 1951, withdrawn.
44	Uinfah Utes	1	(1)	Dec. 12, 1949	Feb. 21, 1957, liability, amount not fixed.
45	Do	1	(1)	do	Feb. 21, 1957, liability, half of 1,243,737 acres, amount not fixed
46	Nooksack Tribe	1	3,375,600	Apr. 26, 1949	May 9, 1955, liability, amount not fixed.
47	Yakima Tribe	1	244,625	June 21, 1949	Nov. 29, 1957, $91,205.66 plus interest.*
48	Chiricahua and Warm Springs Apaches	1	(1)	Aug. 15, 1949	
49	Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs Apaches	1	(1)	Oct. 3, 1949	
50	Choctaw Nation	1	2,014,061	Oct. 25, 1949	Apr. 10, 1951, withdrawn.
51	Do	1	41,000	do	Mar. 2, 1950, dismissed.
52	Mission Band of Choctaws	1	90,307,749	Dec. 2, 1949	Jan. 31, 1956, dismissed on appeal.
53	Seminole Nation	1	500,000	Nov. 3, 1949	Apr. 22, 1952, dismissed.
54	Crow Tribe	1	29,530,764	Feb. 3, 1950	Feb. 12, 1958, liability $10,567,720.*
55	Choctaw Nation	1	753,701	Feb. 6, 1950	June 11, 1951, dismissed.
56	do	1	63,423	do	July 14, 1950, dismissed.
57	Saginaw Chippewas	1	5,401,500	Mar. 9, 1950	
58	Ottawa Chippewas	1	17,287,500	do	
59	Saginaw Chippewas	1	3,276,000	do	
60	Makah Tribe	1	10,000,000	Mar. 17, 1950	
61	Salish and Kootenai Tribes	1	18,445,039	Mar. 29, 1950	
62	Assiniboine Tribe	3	11,681,355	Dec. 12, 1950	Dec. 12, 1952, dismissed.
63	Shoshone Tribe	3	6,118,840	May 22, 1950	Aug. 20, 1954, award $433,013.60; withdrawn (2).
64	Shawnee Tribe	2	3,617,000	June 12, 1950	
65	Peoria Nation	13	(3)	June 30, 1950	
66	do	1	8,120,208	do	May 6, 1957, withdrawn (in docket 313).
67	Miami Tribe	1	13,400,000	July 5, 1950	Sept. 17, 1956, award $2,930,867.67 (on appeal) (includes 1 claim, docket 124).
68	Ottawa Tribe	1	(1)	July 11, 1950	
69	Navaho Tribe	8	(1)	do	
70	Hualapai	1	(1)	July 24, 1950	
71	Citizen Potawatomis, Potawatomi Nation, et al	4	14,599,289	Aug. 1, 1950	Sept. 19, 1956, liability with D. 15-J (1); May 8, 1953, dismissed (1), pending (2).
72	Absentee Delawares	1	(1)	Aug. 7, 1950	
73	Seminoles, Florida	4	49,782,975	Aug. 14, 1950	
74	Sioux Tribe	1	35,350,001	Aug. 15, 1950	Apr. 5, 1954, dismissed.
75	Emigrant New York	3	(1)	Aug. 17, 1950	Nov. 1, 1957, liability, amount not fixed.
76	Miami Tribe	1	(1)	Aug. 22, 1950	
77	Seneca Nation	3	377,926,000	Sept. 1, 1950	June 12, 1951, dismissed.
78	Sioux Tribe	1	38,793	Oct. 19, 1950	Apr. 26, 1956, award $19,476.18.*
79	Iowa Tribe or Nation	1	(1)	Oct. 30, 1950	
80	Mission Indians, California	3	(1)	Nov. 6, 1950	
81	Coeur D'Alene Tribe	1	4,250,000	Nov. 15, 1950	Dec. 3, 1957, liability $4,427,778.03.*
82	Northern Arapaho Tribe	1	56,250,000	Nov. 24, 1950	Aug. 15, 1951, withdrawn.
83	Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	6	30,000,000	Nov. 28, 1950	
84	Six Nations, et al	6	(1)	Dec. 11, 1950	
85	Josephine P. Mitchell et al. (of Omaha Tribe of Nebraska)	1	(1)	Dec. 14, 1950	Dec. 19, 1951, dismissed.
86	Quechan Tribe	1	(1)	Dec. 15, 1950	
87	Northern Paiutes	2	(1)	Dec. 26, 1950	
88	Southern Paiutes	1	(1)	Jan. 10, 1951	
89	Six Nations, et al	4	(1)	Jan. 18, 1951	
90	Hualapai Tribe	4	(1)	Jan. 22, 1951	
91	Havasupai Tribe	4	(1)	do	
92	Skagit Tribe	1	(1)	Jan. 29, 1951	
93	Snoqualmie Tribe	1	(1)	do	
94	Lower Pend D'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe	1	(1)	do	
95	Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	1	(1)	Feb. 5, 1951	
96	Citizens Potawatomis	5	(1)	Feb. 19, 1951	
97	Suiattle-Sauk Tribe	1	15,000,000	Feb. 21, 1951	Dec. 18, 1952, dismissed.
98	Muckleshoot Tribe	1	3,500,000	Mar. 7, 1951	Aug. 25, 1955, liability; amount not fixed.
99	Piankeshaw Nation	2	(1)	Mar. 8, 1951	
100	Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Snakes	2	(1)	Mar. 9, 1951	
101	Citizen Potawatomis	1	(1)	Mar. 27, 1951	
102	Papago Tribe	1	(1)	Mar. 29, 1951	
103	Choctaw Nation	1	1,647,250	Apr. 5, 1951	Mar. 6, 1954, dismissed.
104	Santee Sioux Indians	1	1,903,023	Apr. 27, 1951	Oct. 17, 1952, dismissed.
105	Osage Nation	1	(1)	May 14, 1951	
106	do	1	(1)	do	
107	do	1	(1)	do	
108	do	1	70,000	do	
109	Duwamish Tribe	1	30,000,000	do	Mar. 25, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
110	Lummi Tribe	1	30,000,000	do	Oct. 30, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
111	Citizen Potawatomis and Potawatomi Nation	5	(1)	do	August 8, 1952, award, $233,154.86.
112	Kent Tribe Schagthticoke	1		May 16, 1951	
113	Turtle Mount Chippewas	1	(1)	May 23, 1951	
114	Cheyenne River Sioux	1	(1)	May 24, 1951	
115	Crow Creek Sioux	1	(1)	do	
116	Lower Brule Sioux	1	(1)	do	
117	Pine Ridge Sioux	1	(1)	do	
118	Rosebud Sioux	1	(1)	do	
119	Standing Rock Sioux	1	(1)	do	
120	Wyandotte Tribe and Nation	1	(1)	May 28, 1951	
121	Loyal Seminole Group	1	(1)	May 29, 1951	Feb. 27, 1958, dismissed.
122	Hualapai Tribe	1	(1)	June 6, 1951	
123	Cherokee Freedman	1	(1)	June 13, 1951	
124	Miami Tribe of Indiana et al	8	(1)	do	Sept. 17, 1956, liability with D. 67 (1), pending (7).
125	Snohomish Tribe	1	30,000,000	June 18, 1951	Nov. 21, 1956, liability; amount not fixed.
126	Osage Nation	1	(1)	June 20, 1951	
127	do	1	(1)	do	
128	Citizen Potawatomis and Potawatomi Nation	7	(1)	June 25, 1951	
129	Menominee Tribe	3	(1)	do	Apr. 24, 1952, withdrawn.

See footnotes at end of table.

Claims filed with Indian Claims Commission—Continued

[Figures in parentheses show number of claims in status given. *Indicates any offsets ascertained will be deducted]

Docket No.	Claimant	Claims	Principal claimed	Filed	Action (as of Mar. 20, 1958)
130	Miami Tribe, et al	1	(1)	July 2, 1951	
131	do	2	(1)	do	June 4, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
132	Suquamish Tribe	1	$30,000,000	July 3, 1951	Mar. 25, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
133	Ottawa Tribe	3	(1)	July 6, 1951	
134	S'Klallam Tribe	1	60,000,000	July 9, 1951	Dec. 2, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
135	Iowa Tribe et al. and Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al.	5	(1)	do	
136	Pueblo de Cochiti	1	(1)	do	
137	Pueblo de Zia, et al	1	(1)	do	
138	Iowa Tribe, et al., Omaha Tribe, Nebraska, and Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al.	5	(1)	July 10, 1951	July 31, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
139	Wyandotte Tribe and Nation	1	(1)	July 11, 1951	
140	do	1	(1)	do	
141	do	1	(1)	do	
142	Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux	1	(1)	do	
143	Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	5	(1)	July 12, 1951	
144	Pillager Chippewas, Minnesota	1	864,000	do	
145	Kickapoo Tribes, Kansas and Oklahoma	1	(1)	July 17, 1951	
146	Citizen Potawatomis and Potawatomi Nation	3	(1)	do	
147	Yakima Tribe	1	19,400,000	July 18, 1951	
148	Cabazon Band, Mission Indians, California	1	(1)	July 19, 1951	
149	Twentynine Palms Band, Mission Indians, California	1	(1)	do	
150	Seminole Nation	1	1,050,000	July 23, 1951	Dec. 5, 1955, liability $34,213.66.*
151	do	1	(1)	do	
152	do	1	(1)	do	
153	Iowa Tribe et al., and Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	5	(1)	do	
154	Kootenai Tribe, Idaho	1	(1)	do	Aug. 9, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
155	Quileute Tribe	1	(1)	do	
156	Salish and Kootenai Tribe	8	(1)	July 24, 1951	
157	Shoshone Tribe	2	2,643,130	do	Nov. 8, 1954, dismissed (1), pending (1).
158	Sac and Fox Tribe, Oklahoma, et al., and Iowa Tribe, et al.	7	(1)	do	Aug. 2, 1957, liability; amount not fixed.
159	Oneida Tribe, Wisconsin	2	(1)	July 25, 1951	
160	Yakima Tribe, et al	1	1,173,300	July 24, 1951	
161	Yakima Tribe	1	(1)	do	
162	do	1	(1)	do	June 5, 1956, liability, $69,000.*
163	do	1	(1)	do	
164	do	1	(1)	do	
165	Yakima Tribe (Wish-ham Band)	1	(1)	do	
166	Creek Nation	1	(1)	do	
167	do	1	(1)	do	
168	do	1	(1)	do	
169	do	1	(1)	do	
170	Pascagoula, Biloxi and Mobilian Consolidated Band	1	(1)	July 25, 1951	
171	Tee-hit-ton Indians	5	(1)	July 27, 1951	
172	Yuchi (Euchee) Tribe	1	22,400,000	do	May 16, 1955, dismissed.
173	Cherokee Nation	1	(1)	July 30, 1951	
174	Pueblo de Pecos	1	(1)	do	
175	Nez Perce Tribe	1	(1)	do	
176	Yokiah Tribe	1	(1)	July 31, 1951	
177	Colville Reservation Tribes	1	(1)	do	
178	do	1	(1)	do	
179	Colville Reservation Tribes et al., for Joseph Band, Nez Perce Tribe.	1	(1)	do	
180	Nez Perce Tribe	2	(1)	do	Aug. 10, 1955, liability, amount not fixed (1), pending (1).
181	Colville, Lake, San Poells, Nespelem, Okanogan, and Methow Tribes.	4	(1)	do	Feb. 29, 1956, liability, amount not fixed (1), pending (3).
182	Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs Apaches	1	(1)	do	
183	Fort Peck Indians	1	(1)	do	June 8, 1954, dismissed.
184	do	1	(1)	do	
185	Colorado River Tribes	1	(1)	Aug. 1, 1951	
186	Colville Reservation Tribes et al. for Joseph Band, Nez Perce Tribe.	3	(1)	do	
187	Natives of Chitina, Alaska	1	(1)	do	
188	Minnesota Chippewa Tribe et al	3	(1)	Aug. 2, 1951	
189	Red Lake Band et al	3	(1)	do	
190	Cherokee Nation	8	4,734,071	do	
191	Little Shell Band of Chippewa	2	(1)	do	
192	Cheyenne River Sioux	1	(1)	do	Mar. 29, 1957, dismissed.
193	Kickapoo Tribes, Kansas and Oklahoma, and Kickapoo Nation.	2	(1)	Aug. 3, 1951	
194	Kickapoo Tribes, Kansas and Oklahoma, and Kickapoo Nation.	2	(1)	do	Mar. 25, 1957, withdrawn (in D. 313).
195	Sac and Fox Tribe, Missouri	3	(1)		
196	Hopi Tribe and villages of First Mesa et al	1	(1)	Aug. 8, 1951	
197	Nisqually et al. Tribes	1	37,900,000	Aug. 6, 1951	
198	Confederated Tribes, Warm Springs Reservation, Oreg	2	6,000,000	do	
199	Athabaska Indians, Stevens Village, Alaska	1	(1)	do	June 4, 1957, withdrawn.
200	Natives of Tatitlek Village, Alaska	1	(1)	do	
201	McGahey Band (of Choctaws)	1	405,640	do	Feb. 2, 1957, dismissed.
202	Absentee Delaware Tribe, Oklahoma, Delaware Nation	2	(1)	do	
203	Puyallup Tribe	1	37,900,000	do	
204	Seminole Nation	1	(1)	do	
205	do	1	(1)	do	
206	Squaxim Tribe	1	37,900,000	do	
207	Stillaguamish Tribe	1	(1)	do	
208	Steilacoom Tribe	1	37,900,000	do	
209	Iowa Tribe et al., Sac and Fox Tribe et al	6	(1)	do	
210	Hopi Village of Shungopovi	1	(1)	do	
211	Pueblo de Isleta	2	(1)	Aug. 7, 1951	
212	Wyandotte Tribe and Nation	2	(1)	do	
213	Wyandotte Tribe and Nation	2	(1)	do	
214	San Juan Tribe	1	4,000,000	do	Oct. 30, 1957, dismissed.
215	Yana Tribe	1	(1)	do	
216	Citizen Potawatomis and Potawatomi Nation	3	(1)	do	
217	do	4	(1)	do	
218	Cowlitz Tribe	1	60,000,000	Aug. 8, 1951	
219	Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi et al	6	(1)	do	
220	Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma et al	6	(1)	do	
221	Chippewa Cree Tribe et al	5	(1)	do	
222	Colville Reservation Tribes and Palouse Band	3	(1)	do	
223	San Carlos Tribe, Arizona, et al	1	(1)	do	
224	Colville Reservation Tribes and Moses Band	2	(1)	do	
225	Omaha Tribe, Nebraska, et al	5	(1)	do	Jan. 18, 1957, liability for 4,953,305 acres, amount not fixed (1), pending (4).
226	Caddo Tribe et al	6	(1)	do	Mar. 8, 1956, liability, amount not fixed (1); Mar. 1, 1955, dismissed (2), pending (3).
227	Pueblo of Laguna	5	(1)	do	

See footnotes at end of table.

Claims filed with Indian Claims Commission—Continued

[Figures in parentheses show number of claims in status given. *Indicates any offsets ascertained will be deducted]

Docket No.	Claimant	Claims	Principal claimed	Filed	Action (as of Mar. 20, 1958)
228	Pima-Maricopa-Ak Chin Indians	1	(1)	Aug. 8, 1951	
229	Navajo Tribe	3	(1)	do	
230	Cayuga Nation, Oklahoma	1	$700,000	do	
231	Sac and Fox, Oklahoma, et al., Iowa Tribe, et al	7	(1)	do	
232	Sac and Fox, Oklahoma, et al	1	(1)	do	
233	Swinomish Tribe	1	41,500,000	do	
234	Chinook Tribe	1	30,000,000	do	
235	Maricopa-Ak Chin Indians	6	(1)	do	
236	Pima-Maricopa Indians	14	(1)	do	
237	Upper Chehalis Tribe et al	2	45,658,000	do	June 25, 1956, dismissed; remanded.
238	Kalapuya Tribe et al., and Grand Ronde community	1	671,500	do	Nov. 17, 1954, dismissed.
239	Tillamook Tribe et al. and Confederated Siletz Indians	1	8,000,000	do	Nov. 23, 1955, liability $432,796.40.*
240	Tillamook Band et al., Grand Ronde community, and Confederated Siletz Indians.	1	50,000,000	do	June 10, 1955, liability, amount not fixed.
241	Absentee Delaware	3	(1)	do	Aug. 23, 1955, liability, amount not fixed (pending on remand).
242	Quinaielt Tribe	1	(1)	Aug. 9, 1951	
243	Winnebago Tribe et al	3	(1)	do	
244	do	2	(1)	do	
245	do	2	(1)	do	
246	Red Lake Band et al	1	(1)	do	
247	Seminole Nation	1	(1)	do	
248	do	1	(1)	do	
249	Choctaw Nation	4	1,939,000	do	
250	Fort Belknap Indian community (Gros Ventre-Assiniboine)	7	(1)	do	
251	Miami Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	1	(1)	do	
252	do	1	(1)	do	
253	do	1	(1)	do	June 4, 1957, liability, amount not fixed.
254	do	1	(1)	do	
255	do	1	(1)	do	
256	do	1	(1)	do	
257	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes	1	(1)	do	
258	do	1	(1)	do	
259	do	1	(1)	do	
260	Skokomish et al. Tribes	1	(1)	do	Mar. 30, 1953, dismissed.
261	Samish Tribe	1	41,500,000	do	Mar. 11, 1958, liability, amount not fixed.
262	Tulalip Tribes, Inc	1	2,545,000	do	Jan. 13, 1958, dismissed.
263	Kikiallus Tribe	1	41,500,000	do	
264	Umatilla Reservation Tribes	4	20,200,000	do	
265	Coos Bay et al. Tribes	1	(1)	do	July 11, 1952, dismissed.
266	Pueblo de Acoma	3	(1)	do	
267	Chickasaw Nation	1	(1)	do	Sept. 16, 1957, dismissed.
268	do	1	42,798	do	
269	do	1	190,000	do	Pending on remand.
270	do	1	(1)	do	
271	Cherokee Nation	1	(1)	do	
272	Creek Nation	1	(1)	do	
273	do	1	(1)	do	
274	do	2	(1)	do	
275	do	1	(1)	do	
276	do	1	(1)	do	
277	do	1	(1)	do	
278	Tlingit and Haida Indians, Alaska, et al	1	(1)	do	
279	Blackfeet and Gros Ventre	4	(1)	do	Dec. 17, 1952, dismissed (1), pending (3).
280	Creek Nation East of the Mississippi	1	10,771,200	do	
281	do	1	29,084,500	do	
282	Eastern Band of Cherokees	3	(1)	Aug. 10, 1951	
283	Colorado River Tribes et al	5	(1)	do	
284	Gambell and St. Lawrence Island Eskimos	1	(1)	do	
285	Unalakleet and Unaligmut-Malemut Eskimos	1	(1)	do	
286	Shungnak and Kowagmut Eskimos	1	(1)	do	
287	Nisgah Tribe	1	(1)	do	
288	Washoe Tribe, Nevada and California	3	42,811,986	do	
289	Peoria and Absentee Delaware Tribes, Oklahoma	3	(1)	do	
290	Oneida Tribe, Wisconsin, et al	1	(1)	do	
291	Pima-Maricopa Indians	2	(1)	do	
292	Creek Nation	1	(1)	do	
293	Swinomish tribal community	1	176,000,000	do	
294	Skagit Tribe, et al	1	41,500,000	do	
295	Mohave Tribe	4	(1)	do	
296	Skokomish Tribe	1	(1)	do	Mar. 6, 1958, liability, amount not fixed.
297	Cherokee Nation	1	175,254	do	
298	Delaware Tribe	1	(1)	do	
299	Navajo Tribe	4	(1)	do	
300	Stockbridge Munsee community and tribes	2	(1)	do	
301	Oneida Nation, New York, et al	8	(1)	do	
302	Ottawa Tribe	1	(1)	do	
303	do	3	(1)	do	
304	do	2	(1)	do	
305	do	3	(1)	do	
306	Citizen Potawatomis and Potawatomi Nation	3	(1)	do	
307	do	3	(1)	do	
308	do	3	(1)	do	
309	do	5	(1)	do	
310	do	4	(1)	do	
311	do	3	(1)	do	
312	do	1	(1)	do	
313	Peoria Tribe, Oklahoma, Peoria Nation and Kaskaskia Nation	1	(1)	do	
314	Peoria Tribe, Oklahoma, and Wea Nation	3	(1)	do	July 4, 1957, liability; amount not fixed (1), pending (2).
315	Kickapoo Tribes, Kansas and Oklahoma, and Kickapoo Nation.	3	(1)	do	
316	do	3	(1)	do	
317	do	1	(1)	do	
318	Kickapoo Tribe, Oklahoma	1	(1)	do	
319	Quechan Tribe, Fort Yuma	3	(1)	do	
320	do	4	(1)	do	
321	Tuscarora Nation	1	(1)	do	
322	Ponca Tribe, Oklahoma, and Ponca Tribe	1	(1)	do	
323	do	2	(1)	do	
324	do	2	(1)	do	
325	Morongo Mission Indians, California	1	(1)	do	March 28, 1955, dismissed.
326	Shoshone Tribe (Wind River) et al	12	(1)		
327	Confederated Ute Bands	1	(1)	do	
328	Southern Ute Tribe or Band	1	(1)	do	
329	Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes, Oklahoma, et al	12	(1)	do	November, 1, 1956, title found.
330	Southern Paiute Nation et al	1	(1)	do	
331	Spokane Tribe et al	1	(1)	do	
332	Yankton Sioux Tribe or Band	1	(1)	do	

See footnotes at end of table.

Claims filed with Indian Claims Commission—Continued

[Figures in parentheses show number of claims in status given. *Indicates any offsets ascertained will be deducted]

Docket No.	Claimant	Claims	Principal claimed	Filed	Action (as of Mar. 20, 1958)
333	Shasta Tribe, California Indians	1	(1)	Aug. 11, 1951	
334	Absentee Shawnee Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	5	(1)	do	
335	Eastern Shawnee Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	2	(1)	do	
336	do	2	(1)	do	
337	Absentee Delaware Tribe, Oklahoma, et al	1	(1)	do	Sept. 17, 1956, contingent liability.
338	Delaware Tribe, Oaklahoma, et al	1	(1)	do	
339	Iowa Tribes, Kansas and Nebraska, et al	1	(1)	do	
340	Tuscarora Nation	1	(1)	do	
341	Seneca-Cayuga Tribe, Oklahoma	6	(1)	do	
342	Seneca Nation	12	(1)	do	
343	Cayuga Nation and Seneca-Cayuga Tribe, Oklahoma	3	(1)	do	
344	Six Nations et al	3	(1)	do	
345	Papago Tribe	4	(1)	do	
346	Ridaught Band (Choctaw)	1	$2,188,800	do	
347	Pitt River Indians, California	1	(1)	do	
348	Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes et al	3	(1)	do	November 1, 1955, title found.
349	Ute Tribe, Uintah and Ouray Reservation, for Uncompahgre Ute Band.	1	(1)	do	
350	3 Fort Berthold Tribes (Arikara, Mandan, and Gros Ventre)	1	(1)	do	
351	Chemehuevi Tribe	2	(1)	do	
352	Aleut community, St. Paul Island	3	(1)	do	
353	Navaho Tribe	2	(1)	do	
354	Pueblo of San Ildefonso et al	2	(1)	do	
355	Pueblo of Santo Domingo	1	(1)	do	
356	Pueblo of Santa Clara	1	(1)	do	
357	Pueblo of Taos	1	(1)	do	
358	Pueblo of Nambe	1	(1)	do	
359	Lower Sioux Indian community in Minnesota, et al	1	(1)	do	
360	do	1	(1)	do	
361	do	1	(1)	do	
362	do	3	(1)	do	
363	do	2	(1)	do	
364	Ottawa-Chippewa Tribe, Michigan	5	(1)	Aug. 13, 1951	
365	Natchez Tribe	1	(1)	do	Feb. 24, 1954, dismissed.
366	Bannack Tribe	1	(1)	do	
367	Shoshone Nation or Tribe	1	(1)	do	
368	Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians	5	5,987,664	do	
369	Aleut Tribe et al	1	(1)	do	
370	Natives of Palmer, Alaska	1	(1)	do	

[1] Not shown.

[2] See docket 31.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in regard to Byelorussian Independence Day be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The year 1958 marks the 40th anniversary of 2 significant events in the history of mankind, both occurring with the breakup of the Russian Czarist Empire.

One of those events has been widely heralded, with all the fanfare possible through the media of mass communication. That is the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia and the establishment of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic. Last October leaders of the international Commmunist movement from most of the countries of the world gathered in Moscow to commemorate that unhappy event.

All during this year the people of the free world will be reminded of this anniversary through the vast propaganda machine the Kremlin has built up to advertise the devious and misleading wares of communism. As usual, this propaganda campaign will seek to hide the tragic stories which lie behind the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics while presenting a distorted version of history as seen through the eyes of the new elite class who are the aristocracy of communism.

Unfortunately, large segments of the people of the free world will not be told the full story of the origin of Communist power. I say this because the free world in general, and the United States in particular, has not mastered the art of using the potent weapon of truth to combat the big lie of the Communists.

The second of these events marks an historic epic in human freedom, a period when the spirit of national independence and individual liberty burst forth from the ruins of the Russian Czarist Empire. It was during the period 1917–18 that no less than 12 nations, once a part of the Russian Empire, threw off the chains of imperialism, declared their national independence, established representative forms of government, and sought admission to the family of free nations. Most of these newly independent governments patterned their constitutions after that of the United States and many of them carried word for word excerpts from our own Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. Seldom in history has the United States enjoyed such prestige and emulation in world affairs as that which attended the breakup of the old European empires.

It was during this historic epic that the Byelorussian nation officially declared its national independence on March 25, 1958.

This action was taken by the Rada, a provisional but representative body which had been established on December 5, 1917. It is significant to note in this connection that the Rada had representation of all the Byelorussian political parties, including the two Jewish parties, Poalej Syon and Bund; the Polish Socialist Party; the Russian Constitutional Democrats (Radets); and the Russian Socialist Revolutionists (Essers). The only votes cast against the declaration of independence which established the Byelorussian National Republic came from the Russian Constitutional Democrats and the Russian Socialist Revolutionists, who, though representing a very small minority of the population of the country, insisted upon a maintenance of the authority of the Russian Empire.

After the overwhelming majority vote by the Rada, the representatives of the two small dissenting parties withdrew and then engaged in activities calculated to destroy the newly won independence of the Byelorussian nation.

The Byelorussian Government lost no time in giving leadership to all phases of national life except the military. This phase of national life was denied them by the German army which then held military control over the country. Nevertheless the newly established government made significant progress in the fields of education, advancement of native culture, laws to protect the rights of the individual and social security.

It gained de jure recognition from Czechoslovakia, Austria, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine and Georgia. De facto recognition of the status of this newly independent nation was extended by France, Denmark, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.

After the signing of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, an act which signaled the defeat of the Russian Tzarist Empire, the Germany army began its withdrawal from Byelorussia. By November 1918, the German army had withdrawn all its forces from the newly independent country.

Immediately thereafter the Red army under the command of Commisar Trotsky, who had acted as Russian signatory to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, invaded Byelorussia with the intention of destroying the newly independent government. From that date until March 18, 1921, Byelorussia was the theater of war between the Red army and the military forces of Poland. Thereafter the historic lands of Byelorussia were occupied by the Russian Communists, with the exception of that period during World War II when the armies of Hitler marched to the gates of Moscow and Stalingrad.

But during this period of 40 years, marked by war and foreign occupation, the Byelorussian people have not lost their hope, their faith in human freedom or their aspirations for national independence. The programs of mass deportation, economic depression, cultural spoliation and oppression of indi-

vidual liberties since carried on by the Russian Communists stand as an undeniable tribute to the Byelorussian people in their aspirations to be free and independent.

As we commemorate this 40th anniversary of Byelorussian national independence we remind the people of the world, including the Russian Communists, that the American people have not forgotten and shall not forget the heroic efforts of the people of Byelorussia to gain their rightful place among the free nations of the world.

It would be fitting on this historic occasion that the Voice of America reestablish a regular broadcasting program in the Byelorussian language, carrying the message of hope from the hearts of the American people that this once free and independent nation will soon be released from the chains of Communist imperialism.

This, in a very practical sense, is the best answer we, as a Nation, can give to the torrent of false propaganda which the Russian Communists are offering the world as they celebrate the 40th anniversary of their seizure of power in Russia.

I would, therefore, appeal to the President of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to reinstate a regular Voice of America broadcast program to Byelorussia which has unfortunately been discontinued during the tenure of his administration. The hopes of freedom should surely be kept alive for the Byelorussians, as well as for the other captive peoples.

Money Matters and World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a talk by Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, before the World Affairs Council of Northern California on February 5, 1958:

MONEY MATTERS AND WORLD AFFAIRS

I come to you with no news or views on travel in outer space, no word of missiles of any range or power, and no committee estimates of the strength of our national defenses nor of what we must do to improve our military posture. This naturally leads to a feeling of inferiority when appearing on a public platform today. My first impulse, in the face of this depressing fact, was to try to lift my morale and attract your attention with some high blown language to cover the relative dullness of my subject. At that point, however, I remembered the advice of a teacher of English: "Read over your composition, and whenever you meet with a passage you think is particularly fine, strike it out." That advice seemed good, and I decided to pursue my subject at a walk rather than a gallop.

The topic I have chosen, with the help of your president, however, leaves me with a pretty big field in which to exercise my talents. I could not cover all aspects of the subject, even if I had the time and you had the patience. And so I have decided to sketch in a little background, touch on some current events and, perhaps, suggest a few conclusions, all within the realm and span of my own experience. This will necessarily mean that much of what I have to say will relate particularly to the United States and Western Europe, although it has a wider application. Money problems are not peculiar to the older nations of the world. The new nations, with their driving urge toward too rapid industrial development, have already enmeshed themselves in financial difficulties.

It is close enough to accuracy, for our purposes, to say that the United States backed into international monetary affairs, and backed in reluctantly. Before World War I we were content to allow Western Europe, in general, and Great Britain, in particular, to act as bankers for the world and to dominate international financial dealings. They had the machinery and the experience, and their markets were used to investing abroad as well as at home. The balance of payments between countries and the stability of currency units were kept in line, fairly well, by the underlying trade position and by the international gold standard, which centered on London and the pound sterling, and with which our connection was more passive than active.

The First World War precipitated an abrupt change in this situation, although it was some time before we really woke up to what had happened. At the end of that war we had a large part of the monetary gold stock of the world, we were the only principal trading Nation which had stayed on the gold standard, we were a net creditor of other nations after years of having been a net debtor. And, if investment at home did not seem too attractive, we might have some funds for investment abroad.

There was a tremendous job of monetary reconstruction to be done in the world and, since the task was complicated by the existence of a tangled skein of war debts, and of disrupted trading relations, it might have commanded a great deal of Government attention. Our Government, however, had little interest at that time in the role of financial leadership which was being thrust upon it. It and other governments were still clinging, more or less, to the idea that money should manage itself. The people who picked up the loose ball were the central bankers and, particularly, the Governor of the Bank of England, Montague Norman, and the Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Benjamin Strong.

These two men embarked on a program of international central bank cooperation, which had as its primary objectives the rehabilitation of the principal national currencies weakened by war, and the restoration of fixed exchange rates based on an international gold standard. They considered the achievement of these objectives to be necessary to the resumption of international trade on a multilateral basis, to the free flow of capital from the more developed industrial countries to the less developed raw material countries, and to the existence of commercial and financial relations between countries which would ease rather than create or accentuate friction and tension. They labored with enormous energy, great skill, and brilliant invention to reach their goals, and they were successful in the short run. No matter what happened later, it can be said of both of them, as was said in a recent biography of Lord Norman: "He was a man of such stamp and stature that any country may deem itself fortunate if it is served by more than one in the course of a single generation."

Unfortunately for their work, new forces within the body politic and economic were to provide new goals of national economic and monetary endeavor, which eventually helped to destroy most of the structure they had restored in the years between 1919 and 1929. With the onset of the great depression of the thirties, the international gold standard went into a decline, fixed and stable exchange rates gave way to managed currencies and exchange controls, multilateral trade was cross-hatched with special bilateral arrangements, the flow of capital between countries tended to dry up, and liquid funds moved over national borders driven by speculation and fear rather than being drawn by the relative attractiveness of money rates and by the needs of trade.

The difficulties of this situation were heightened greatly by the dislocations of World War II. This time, however, there were new people in government and new concepts of economic and financial policy, and of the role of governments in the formulation of such policies. Central bankers were pretty much relegated to the bench, and spent a lot of their time watching the play. At Washington we had an administration suspicious of New York, of Wall Street, and of bankers. In Great Britain we had a government which increasingly was finding economic and monetary guidance in the views of that brilliant economist, Maynard Keynes. And the Western European countries were pretty much willing to follow the lead of the leaders.

There was a great surge of enthusiasm for formal international financial organization. Problems which had proved to be thorny or intractable, when left to private initiative or the informal cooperative efforts of central bankers, were expected to succumb to the ministrations of complex international bodies controlled by governments. In order to temper the discipline of the international gold standard, while promoting stable exchange rates, the International Monetary Fund was created. And, as an afterthought, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was organized to catalyze the flow of capital between nations and to increase the volume of that flow.

In this country, one of the most concentrated public-relations campaigns ever organized was set in motion to sell the idea of the International Monetary Fund to the public and to the Congress. No group or gathering was too small, nor too remote from knowledge of what was involved, to have its sympathies played upon and its support solicited. International organization was to be the cure of our ills, and I had the dubious distinction of being one of the few who opposed the creation of the fund immediately after World War II. I also had the negative satisfaction of watching it wallow in impotence for several years, largely because it was not designed to function in the immediate postwar world. It is only recently that it has begun to find much actual business to do, and then only in ways considerably removed from the original blueprint. This may hold promise of desirable evolution. The World Bank, on the other hand, has had a successful career almost from the start, because of the quality of its management and because it had a job to do which was not inconsistent with the tattered postwar world of trade and finance.

These are cold ashes, however, and I apologize for raking them over, except to point the moral that an international organization is not necessarily a solvent of international problems; it does not make obsolete negotiations, in private, by negotiators more intent on reaching agreement than on audience reaction.

For our present purposes the most important economic development following World War II was the crystallization and general acceptance of the politico-economic idea, which was given statutory form in this country by the Employment Act of 1946. It became national policy in most industrial countries to promote maximum production, employment, and income, with stability of the purchasing power of the currency unit, and balance in foreign trade and finance, as secondary objectives, to the extent that they remained as objectives. No longer were the nations willing to endure the purges of an automatic gold standard, which might subject the economy to a period of substan-

tially reduced production and employment, in order to cleanse the economic blood stream of impurities generated by overblown prosperity.

It has been the difficulty of combining a full employment policy, as it has come to be known, with stability of the purchasing power of national currency units, and with balance in foreign economic relations, which has caused many of the economic headaches of the postwar years. In this country the international implications of the problem have been muted, because the strength of our international economic position has allowed us to pursue domestic goals without too much regard for the state of our monetary reserves or the fluctuations in our balance of payments. We have become increasingly argumentative about the alleged virtues and the patent dangers of creeping inflation, but we haven't been plagued with international financial crises. Most foreign treasuries and central banks, on the other hand, must have before them at all times—on their desks every morningt—the state of their balance of payments and of their monetary reserves. They cannot ignore the all too visible evidence, often found there, of domestic policies which are at odds with their international position.

In this sphere the trials and tribulations of Great Britain and France, particularly, have hovered around all of our postwar international political and military arrangements, as well as delaying, from year to year, the hoped for achievement of freely convertible currencies and complete renunciation of the more serious obstacles to free moving multilateral trade. Great Britain has suffered a series of currency crises during the past decade, each one weakening her international position and affecting her ability to participate in the military and economic defense of the free world. France has had to have massive support from us, through grants, loans and military aid funds, while pursuing a wobbly course toward currency debacle, and international economic weakness.

As the inheritors of some of the disciplinary functions of the international gold standard, the monetary authorities of these and other countries might have been expected to cope, more actively than they did, with problems of national and international monetary stability. But monetary management was under restraint, particularly in combating the inflationary pressures which dominated most of the period, and the area of operations of monetary controls had been changed and circumscribed since the good old days.

Monetary management was under restraint because the corrective measures it is supposed to use in checking domestic inflationary pressures, and foreign payments imbalance, have come to be associated with the reduced production, increased unemployment, and widespread human distress of the thirties. To be effective in the role of Jack, the Inflation Killer, monetary measures were supposed to involve, or to risk, a repetition of these troubled times, and there was understandable reluctance to run the risk. The area of operations of monetary controls was changed and circumscribed by the increasing role of government in economic affairs and the increased proportion of the national product taken by the tax collector. If monetary policy could not, or would not, reach through to government budgets and government expenditures, or if monetary and fiscal policy could not be coordinated, the chances of success in promoting economic stability, through monetary measures, was lessened and limited. And overlaying all other considerations was the continued drain of military expenditures on the economic resources of the world, which made nice monetary calculations particularly hazardous.

There are lights and shadows in the picture of monetary developments during the postwar period, of course. In 1948 a comprehensive monetary reform program in West Germany helped to bring about a sharp economic upturn in that country, and gave a boost to confidence in monetary measures as a means to economic health. In 1949, because of persisting currency and trade imbalances, 31 countries accounting for more than two-thirds of the world's trade, devalued their currencies, and established what it was hoped would be a more realistic basis for currency stability than had previously existed. In 1951 and 1952, and since, this country and many other countries have participated in a renaissance of flexible monetary policy, which has shown that monetary action can be important, even under present conditions, in restraining the twin evils of inflation and deflation.

It is clear, nevertheless, as recent developments in Great Britain and France have emphasized, and as recent experience in this country has intimated, that we have not yet found a way to overcome monetary difficulties as a recurring cause of world unsettlement. We have not yet found the point of equilibrium between continuous high-level production and employment and currency stability; we have not yet found the optimum mixture of fiscal and credit policy for use in a period of enormous military expenditure and increasing social outlays by governments.

During the early fall of 1957, Great Britain faced the latest in its series of postwar financial crises. The pound sterling was under severe pressure, partly because of imbalances in the trade of the sterling area rather than in the trade of Britain itself, partly because of speculative movements of funds (movements which fed on actual weakness as well as rumors of changes in currency parities), and partly because Britain had not been able to gain control of inflation and budgetary deficits in an economy of overfull employment. Early in September 1957, in order to stem the tide which had reduced Britain's gold and dollar assets below the theoretical danger point—$2 billion—the British Treasury and the Bank of England took several steps to increase the cost and availability of sterling credits, and to curtail public and private expenditures. The then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Peter Thorneycroft, buttressed these actions with a statement that the British Government intended to maintain the existing value of the pound. He went on to say that: "So long as it is generally believed that the Government is prepared to see the necessary finance produced to match the upward spiral of costs, inflation will continue and prices will go up. What is needed to bring it to a halt is for the Government to be prepared to deny the extra cash, whatever other painful consequences may follow. Thus we have put ourselves in a position effectively to restrict the money supply over a wide field. Against this background, if an attempt were made to take out of the system in money income more than is put in by new effort and production, the only result would be a reduction in activity and the employment of fewer men."

This was the first open avowal by a major country that monetary stability, at times, could take first place in government thinking. It was an assertion, also, of what should be the obvious fact that no people have a right to live beyond their means indefinitely. It gave confidence that, at last, Great Britain was going to face up, sternly, to the weaknesses in her economic situation.

The measures taken and the statements made last September achieved an immediate success, but it was recognized that the testing time would come this year when the new British budget was presented and new wage demands of British workers were considered. It has now become evident that the principle enunciated by Mr. Thorneycroft last September is being questioned in the light of political, economic, and fiscal problems facing the government in power in London. During the first week of 1958 all three of the treasury ministers in the government resigned, an almost unprecedented happening in British politics. Chancellor Thorneycroft said he resigned because he was not prepared to approve estimates for higher government expenditures during the next fiscal year than during the past fiscal year, something which the government, last September, had pledged would not happen. Mr. Birch, 1 of the 2 ministers of the treasury who resigned, said: "The treasury ministers were out to win the battle against inflation, and the other ministers were not. We were fighting to win and they were not."

It remains to be seen whether this split was the result of a clash of personalities or whether there had been a real weakening of resolve to curb inflation and defend the pound sterling at all costs. The new chancellor, Mr. Heathcoat Amory says that "the strengthening of sterling and a stable internal price level are the dominating aims of the government's economic policies, and nothing whatever will take precedence over them." We shall see. If there has been a weakening of resolve, the position of the pound will again become precarious.

Great Britain has been trying to do too much with too little. She has been trying to act as banker for a large part of the world and to carry on a large part of the trade of the world in her currency, without adequate reserves. At least her reserves have proved to be inadequate in the face of something less than full confidence in sterling. Therefore, she has had to borrow abroad from time to time to supplement her reserves, while invoking clauses in previous loan agreements which permit her to postpone payments of principal and interest on earlier loans. As a consequence of such financial weakness, she has been continuously hampered in fulfilling her role as one of the principals in a political, military, and economic alliance.

The French, with less reason perhaps, are in an even worse state than the British at the moment. Their government continues to walk the tightrope of uncertain coalition, although there are signs that younger and more vigorous men are coming to power. Their substance is being wasted in an indecisive war in Algeria, as it was earlier in Indochina. There has been a high level of domestic investment, employment, and income, but the pace of development has exceeded her available capital resources. The franc was long overvalued and distrusted, and inflationary pressures were in the ascendant. Last November the country's available international reserves hit bottom. In fact they went through the bottom.

This latest crisis was no sudden development. An extended investment boom in France, aided by deficit financing largely through the central bank, had pushed up costs and prices. This defective situation undermined the currency but, until last year, it did not result in a worsening of the French international reserve position, largely because of the dollars made available to France by American aid, loans, and military disbursements in French territory. When this support was sharply reduced in 1956 the French quickly ran through their free reserves and, late in 1957, these reserves were exhausted. France had to have help from the International Monetary Fund, and had to tap some unusual sources of foreign exchange * * * now the French have sought and obtained new loans from the Fund, and the Export-Import Bank, a further credit from the European Payments Union and a moratorium on payments of some earlier loans. Premier Gaillard has said that France is on the razor's edge between economic recovery and insolvency. It is, because short of insolvency there is only one way to go,

and that is up. If that is to be the outcome of the present crisis, the French will have to do a better job of putting their fiscal affairs in order, than they have heretofore been able to do * * * they will have to stop using credit for capital purposes. They will have to take stiffer measures than they have found possible in the past to defeat or restrain those groups of citizens who have stymied political and economic reform for so long.

The outcome will determine whether France will be able to assume her proper place in the European common market, on which so many high hopes have been built for the economic and political well-being of Western Europe. It will determine whether France will be able to play her proper part in the North Atlantic community of nations on which so much of her security has been staked. It will determine whether there will be reasonable balance between France and Germany at the center of Western Europe. A country which has to go begging from door to door for financial help, disgusts itself and disturbs its friends, particularly when it is a country so well endowed as France.

In our own case, the relations between money matters and world affairs have recently become more clear than they sometimes are. The repercussions of new and public evidence of Russian advances in the field of rocketry and missiles, and of Russian guile in economic competition, have shaken our financial calculations. A Federal budget which was supposed to be in surplus in fiscal 1958, ending June 30, has already gone into deficit. The budget for fiscal 1959, beginning July 1, will probably be born in red ink, despite present prayers that increased military expenditures may be offset by a decrease in expenditures for civilian purposes. Administration hopes of a tax cut in fiscal 1959, within a balanced budget, have given way to the suggestion that a budgetary deficit will be accepted, rather than an increase in taxes to keep the budget in balance. And those outside as well as inside government, who have been alarmed by the sharpness of the present business recession, have begun arguing for a tax cut, now, to increase consumer purchasing power. In their lexicon, we can have new model autos and missiles, too, and balancing the budget will take care of itself.

We have been spared immediate conflicts between world events and credit policy because recent developments abroad have taken place at a time of recession in production and employment at home, which had already brought about a move toward credit ease. We are usually spared the cruder manifestations of balance of payment and reserve difficulties, because we are so well heeled. We are, perhaps, the least sensitive of the nations which live under a system of democratic capitalism, to the interrelations between money matters and world affairs, but we are not immune.

I might try to broaden this presentation of my subject by reviewing other phases of the problem, but it would only serve to reinforce what I have already said. Let us see, therefore, if a few conclusions may be drawn from this selective excursion into some aspects of the relations between money matters and world affairs.

1. I think we can say that although money troubles are, as often as not, a symptom of deeper rooted political and economic imbalance, laxness in monetary and fiscal affairs can have a causative effect in undermining economic health which, in turn, affects political and military power. Those who argue for a balance between military spending and fiscal probity and monetary discipline have a real case, even though the emotional advantages are on the other side. In time of war the role of money may be to get out of the way of production. In the longer night of a cold war, no such easy decision is possible.

2. The rise of the theory that the first responsibility of government in economic affairs is to foster and promote high level employment and maximum production and purchasing ower at all times, has made it difficult to gain and hold support for measures which have as their purpose the maintenance of stability of currency units and international economic solvency. Yet neglect of this part of a complex problem may undermine the power and influence of nations and of groups of nations. We must find a way to strike a balance between these sometime conflicting objectives, or a way to remove the conflicts, if we and our friends are to stay strong.

3. In this country we shall have to be vigilantly alert in opposing those who would use the admitted difficulties of composing our fiscal and monetary troubles, and maintaining our military power, to sabotage our trade program. We have had a policy of promoting reciprocal trade, and we have been seeking to participate in the development of an administrative organism which will further promote the functioning of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. If this great Nation now backtracks on the efforts it has made to accommodate its trading practices to its creditor position, and to strengthen the economies of the free world through multilateral trade, it would be a serious blow to our prestige, to our friends abroad, and to our own best interests. The fiscal and monetary difficulties of our allies and friends demand much of them, but they also demand a trading world in which the rule of comparative advantage in production holds reasonable sway.

4. In our absorption with the power of the physical sciences in our world, and in our attempts to develop further our scientific resources, we should not lose sight of the fact that our knowledge of the social sciences is something less than perfect. We should stiffen our educational standards and improve access to educational opportunities in this area also. The free nations cannot hope to pursue advantageous fiscal and monetary policies unless practitioners in these fields are numerous and well trained and unless public understanding of their importance is greatly increased.

5. In submitting ourselves to the disciplines of a money economy, we of the free nations must pursue different and, perhaps, more difficult ways of achieving our world goals than those which are open to a Communist society in which repudiation of government debts is an accepted practice, the currency unit has little meaning, and barter is a way to international trading and political advantage. But we should not abandon the field by chopping out our programs of aid to uncommitted and underdeveloped countries.

Undoubtedly, there are other conclusions which you could draw from these remarks of mine, or from a more thorough examination of the many facets of the problem I have been discussing. These will suffice, however, to underline the importance of money matters in world affairs. If we cannot take literally the biblical statement 'Wine maketh merry; but money answereth all things," we can at least give money its due.

Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the crucial national debate over how best to carry out the constitutional principles of equal protection of the laws, as declared by the Supreme Court in its historic desegregation decisions, the quiet eloquence of Mr. Roy Wilkins, able and responsible executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in his article entitled "Integration Must Move" in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly deserves the widest possible reading. The calm reasonableness and determination of the appeal he makes for positive action in public school desegregation contrast markedly with the charges often hurled at the NAACP by its opponents.

I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION MUST MOVE

(By Roy Wilkins)

(Executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Roy Wilkins, who graduated from the University of Minnesota, was for 15 years editor of the Crisis and prior to that, from 1923 to 1931, managing editor of the Call, the Negro weekly of Kansas City. In this article he carries forth the discusison initiated by Agnes Meyer in her January article, Race and the Schools.)

A good deal of nonsense has been written and spoken upon the public school desegregation question. With some notable exceptions, we have exhibited little honesty, ingenuity, common sense, and courage in approaching it. The Atlantic recognized the significance of the problem by featuring the sincere article, Race and the Schools, by Agnes E. Meyer, in its January issue. Yet Mrs. Meyer, for all her knowledge of and devotion to the public-school system and her sincerity as an American liberal, has repeated some of the interpretations that have placed the situation on dead center and kept it there.

Hardly anyone sits down to a typewriter on this question without cautioning the Negro to abjure haste. William Faulkner used the columns of a multimillion-circulation weekly magazine to shout "Go slow" to the NAACP. As the final caution Mrs. Meyer in the January Atlantic counsels, "Make haste slowly."

Those who read and run might gather from all this that Negroes had been knocking down school doors, browbeating administrators and boards of education, or throwing picket lines around the schools from which they are barred. Nothing could be further from the truth. The majority of Negroes are mild and forebearing, much to the irritation of a growing number among them who wish for a program of more action.

There has been no pellmell rush toward desegregation, no demand for instantaneous change. Certainly the NAACP has not advocated overnight alteration of school patterns. However, both the NAACP and Negro citizens generally have insisted that school boards come to grips with the question and that beginnings in good faith be made. Five days after the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, Dr. Channing H. Tobias, NAACP board chairman, set the tone for the organization's procedure in a message to its southern leaders meeting in Atlanta:

"It is important that calm reasonableness prevail, that the difficulties of adjustment be realized, and that, without any sacrifice of basic principles, the spirit of give and take characterize the discussions. Let it not be said of us that we took advantage of a sweeping victory to drive hard bargains or impose unnecessary hardships upon those respon-

sible for working out the details of adjustment."

Here was the calm deliberation which since then has been urged so insistently upon Negro citizens. Here was consideration for school administrators and others upon whom would fall the burden of planning desegregation. But here, also, was quiet determination upon basic principles, upon change in the old order, upon access to light and opportunity after 57 years in the semidarkness of the separate-but-never-equal doctrine.

It is this determination that the opponents of the Negro's aspiration are trying to break with their repeated cries of "Slow down." They are shadowboxing over speed; the real target is any change at all.

The handwriting regarding segregated schools was on the wall as early as 1935, when Donald Gaines Murray won his way, via the Maryland Supreme Court, into the Law School of the University of Maryland. The picture became clearer through United States Supreme Court decisions in 1938, 1948, and 1950, together with other Federal court decisions in this period forbidding a racial differential in teachers' salaries.

With the principle unmistakably stated in the University of Texas case in 1950, it was only a matter of time before a challenge on the elementary and secondary levels would be before the courts. No governor, or attorney general, or State board of education, or mayor, or local school board, or responsible school administrator, can claim today that the 1954 decision on public schools was sudden. All of them had had a maximum notice of 19 years and a minimum one of 4 years (from the Texas case). That they understood what was foreshadowed is demonstrated by the frantic building programs for Negro schools into which the Southern States plunged from 1949 to 1954 in a desperate effort to stave off the inevitable.

No, the Negro is not "pushing too fast"; he spent nearly two decades making his moves in a slow, orderly manner through the courts. Today he is proceeding with moderation and behaving with dignity under an intense fire of falsehood, intimidation, and persecution. Politically shackled and economically harassed, he has endured the persecution of State governments in which he has no voice and the ruthlessness of power structures in which he has no influence.

While he does not rant, he remains determined. A Gallup poll last December revealed that 69 percent of southern Negroes want the Supreme Court decision enforced, as against 53 percent nearly 2 years before. Only 13 percent were recorded as opposed. A survey published in the Catholic Digest in August 1957, showed that 93 percent of the southern Negroes supported the policies of the NAACP.

All this would indicate that the Negro American is neither wild-eyed and obstreperous nor divided on this issue. He believes that the way to begin is to begin. He cannot be expected to cheer a beginning such as that in Winston-Salem, N. C., where 1 Negro child has been integrated in the entire city system, nor that in Little Rock, where 9 Negroes are distributed among 1,991 whites in Central High School. If he greets these and similar efforts with something less than enthusiasm, it does not mean that he wants to go too fast; it means merely that he does not want to stand still.

Another favorite myth is that the Negro by insisting on some movement in good faith toward desegration is seeking to destroy the public school system and the standards of public education. Governor Luther Hodges of North Carolina used this as a theme in a statewide radio and television talk in 1956.

The only people who have threatened to destroy the public schools in certain States are white people, mostly politicians in high and low offices. The Negro wants more and better schools, not fewer.

Nor does the Negro seek to lower educational standards. Who knows better than he on how great a scale his children have been cheated of a decent education over all these years? He knows that a frightening number of them are lagging behind whites at certain levels. But he does not follow the "logic" which says that the way to cure this condition is to maintain the segregation which produced it.

Allowing for the 350,000 Negro children who have been integrated since 1954, there are still slightly more than 2 million Negroes remaining in segregated schools. Some commentators seek comfort by concentrating on the 350,000, but most Negroes and fair-minded whites, while welcoming this beginning, keep their sights on the present immobile 2 million. Negroes know that not all these 2 million children are below par, that some of them can equal or surpass their grade levels in any test. They know, too, that still more could pass easily if given brief, intensive, and sympathetic remedial attention.

Assuming that a mere 10 percent of the 2 million could pass their tests tomorrow, would their integration ruin public education standards? Obviously not, and the integration total would jump more than 50 percent. If those who can quickly be brought to standard were added, the total would be still more satisfying—and no white child would be retarded thereby.

And, speaking of retardation, what of the present plight of average and superior children now attending all-white schools in company with a not negligible number of children who are below average, even poor? Recent figures from a Texas city purport to show that 59 percent of whites in the fourth grade were at or above their grade level as compared with only 13.5 percent of Negroes. But, aside from the contrast with Negroes, this survey reveals that more than 40 percent of the white children are below average. Excluding a few experts, is anyone complaining that the presence of of this two-fifths is ruining the education of the three-fifths?

If this argument is valid with respect to Negroes, it is valid with respect to the substantial number of substandard white children. It becomes, therefore, a problem of education rather than one of race.

As the Negro views the present situation, there would seem to be certain requisites to a beginning toward reducing tensions and getting on with desegregation. The segregation problem is not the same in the North as it is in the South. The difference is apparent to even a casual observer of trolleys, buses, city halls, State legislatures, parks, theaters, restaurants, hotels, factories, and white-collar employment. As for schools, despite defacto segregation there are Negro teachers and students in mixed situations, with Negro honor students, class presidents, and athletes. In New York City the desegregation principle has been recognized, the Supreme Court respected, proposals drawn up, and debate encouraged. There is movement. The same cannot be said for Richmond, Savannah, Jacksonville, Mobile, Shreveport, or Hattiesburg.

Further, the segregationists must face, sooner or later, the fact that the soothing doubletalk handed to Aunt Mandy and Uncle Jim falls on the deaf and scornful ears of today's Tom, Dick, and Harry. These latter have traveled far from the home county; tens of thousands have been off to war and seen far places; thousands more have gone to school under the GI bill; they have radios and television sets; they read newspapers, magazines, and books. That is why the Montgomery bus protest lasted 1 year instead of 5 days, as predicted by local whites who knew "their" Negroes. That is why the time-tested formula of dividing the good Negroes from the radical ones has failed on the school desegregation issue.

Next, there should be, among those genuinely desirous of getting something done, an end to the characterization of court action and political pressure as force. This perversion reduces legal action in accordance with a decree of the Nation's highest Court to the same level as mob action stirred by a John Kasper. The same reasoning lumps together as extremists the NAACP, which supports the Supreme Court, and the white citizens' councils, organized specifically to defy the Court. Inveighing against the employment of political action by Negro citizens is asking them to forgo an instrument which is the very backbone of a democratic society, one that is used for everything from cutting a curbstone to, say, fixing the rate for interstate natural gas. They cannot be expected to acquiesce.

Equally pointless are the running references to the era of good feeling that is alleged to have existed in the years prior to the 1954 decision of the Court. It is true that southern whites experienced few racial tensions, for they found that a segregated society, rigidly controlled through political disfranchisement, economic ceilings, and social customs, was comfortable and relaxing. But for the Negro it was an era of frustration.

While we were making the world safe for democracy in one war and destroying Hitler's master race theory in another, the Negro rode in the back of the bus, lived in a ghetto across the railroad tracks, sent his children to Jim Crow schools, worked at restricted jobs, enjoyed either inferior or no public recreation, endured daily humiliation and insult, received uneven justice in the courts, and was the victim of violence. He is not overcome with nostalgia for the pre-1954 days; he has bid them a grim and tearless good-by.

The Negro wants to be a partner in this great social change. He has offered his cooperation from the very beginning, but his peaceful petitions offering aid in drawing up desegregation plans were rejected, filed away, or turned over to local segregationists so that the signers could be fired from their jobs. The Negro is still deeply interested in building better schools for all children. He believes segregated schools have hurt white children as he knows full well they have hurt his. But partnership implies mutual respect and consultation, leading to cooperative movement. Where these necessary conditions have been met, he has been a willing collaborator.

If Mrs. Meyer's admonition, "The chief responsibility for leadership is still that of the white population," is to be meaningful in the light of present-day urgencies, there must be the sharing of responsibility for plans and results which is inherent in the partnership concept.

Hungary and the Revival of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of an article entitled "Hungary and the

Revival of Europe." This article, which appeared in the September 1957 issue of The Link magazine, was written by Stuart L. Hannon, deputy program director of Radio Free Europe.

The article follows:

HUNGARY AND THE REVIVAL OF EUROPE

(By Stuart L. Hannon)

The Hungarian revolution will live again this month, not on the barricades but on the conscience of the free world. For with the emergence of the U. N. Special Hungarian Report, already well circulated, on the stage of the General Assembly, all men—free, bond and criminal—will be confronted with the reenactment of a three act tragedy which is in many ways without parallel in modern history. And if the live drama itself was a startling depiction of unofficial heroism and official failure, the reenactment must not be permitted to fail. It must become a tocsin, a beacon, a continuing fourth act which will regenerate the sources of human fellowship, courage and principled determination, as have been woefully lacking in western man since the Soviet aggressors first began striking him in June 1953. "What is needed," wrote Thomas Mann before he died, "is a militant humanism."

As the fourth act begins, let us review the first three. In act I, the entire Hungarian people, united as never before in their history, rose up against the misery and domination of Soviet-Hungarian communism and AVH bestiality. Certainly the rising was Homeric, one of the purest examples of classic revolution in history, a jubilant levee en masse which was determined, in Actonian revolutionary pattern, to shake off the past and rescue the world from the reign of the dead. Act II, let us say, began with the pronouncements of Hungarian revolutionary leadership, calling for withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact, neutrality for Hungary, free elections, recognition by the United Nations and negotiations with Russia for withdrawal of all Soviet troops. This act ended with another example of that practiced Russian treachery, about which Kossuth wrote so precisely in his time, followed by the unprecedented brutality of Soviet mechanized hordes, which engulfed and ground out all resistance. Act III began and ended with an incredible pantomime of pusillanimity among western nations. All founded upon and dedicated—more or less—to historic concepts of freedom, to the preservation of the dignity of man, to the support of world organizations and governments supposedly in charge of implementing or protecting these great ideals, to the recitation of millions of words about freedom and liberation for mankind from all tyranny—these nations could arouse themselves to little more than words of consternation, commiseration, admiration and fatalism. Gradually, as the paralysis wore off, the sparse initiative took the form of mutual recrimination, a spasmodic search for scapegoats and even a conscience stricken suggestion that the U. S. S. R. had legitimate rights under the Warsaw Pact. Finally, there was a comfortable conversion of the greatest political issue of our time into a humanitarian issue, in which the West salved its conscience and felt rather noble about admitting substantial numbers of Magyar stock into its free society.

But let us now be grateful for U. N. report of small nations[1] which thrusts the case of Hungary, like a flaming faggot, into our camp again. We of Europe and the Atlantic community have a second chance. It must not fail. The Hungarian revolution is not dead and it was not a failure. On the contrary it was a success which grows each day in stature to haunt the Soviets, for it was an act full of faith and honor, of heroic dimensions, of proof to a western body politic, terrorized and bullied by Soviet communism, that in one of its veins, the Magyar vein, there was still a fresh flow of courage. Out of the quivering ranks of western peoples a Hungarian David stepped forth to challenge the Russian Goliath. But more like Samson he shook the pagan edifice severely and the tremors continue. Milovan Djilas, most eloquent apostate of communism and now in a Yugoslav prison, wrote prophetically, "The Hungarian revolution means the beginning of the end of communism."

The question before the free world today is no longer the whimpering or defensively belligerent demand, what could have been done? The fact is that many things could have been done. Some actions would have left for history, without any risk to Western comfort and security, a more charitable picture of democratic convictions and courage. Others might have redeemed the situation with just as much probability as they might have led to the risk of war. Far greater calculated risks have been taken since 1936. But these issues are dead now and will only be usefully revived by intelligent historians who will not be honorbound to prove that failure is success, or that foreign policy, wisdom, and morality are always identical.

The question today is what can be done, now.

The message to Europeans, adopted at the close of the Hague Congress in May 1948, suggests an attitude worthy of free men and outraged humanity. "The hour has come," according to the message, "to take action commensurate with the danger."

What can be done? No European should be less sanguine, certainly, than Mr. Nehru in his recommendation that the Russians should best leave Hungary. Minoo Masani, the founder and joint secretary of the All-India Congress Socialist Party, is even more outspoken. "Soviet communism," he writes, "has today turned its back on every single generous and progressive impulse of the October revolution," and its expansion would be "the worst of all possible inflictions on humanity." (In fact, so long as Soviet troops remain in Hungary, West Europeans should consider the potentialities of an all-European boycott of the 40th anniversary as a grotesque and meaningless puppet play for the retarded.)

The near 400-page U. N. report is a crushing indictment of the Soviet Government, all the more so for the restraint of cold narration. It came to the conclusions, inter alia, that the revolution was spontaneous, nationwide, and unplanned, led by students, workers, intelligentsia, and soldiers, many of them Communists. While the revolution was not planned, evidence found that the Soviets had taken steps prior to the outbreak to make armed intervention possible. (This fact gave support to the belief that the uprising was deliberately provoked as the least costly way to reduce pressure in an explosive Soviet orbit, but above all to make Hungary an example to discourage Poland.) The report also established conclusively that the peaceful demonstrators of October 23 carried no weapons; and that by the Soviet's own definition of aggression, they stand accused. And while it showed clearly that Imre Nagy threw in his lot with the insurgents, no evidence was available to show any popular support for Kadar. Regarding inhuman torture, especially by the AVH, the report observed: "The verbatim record of the committee's meetings contain appalling descriptions which the committee would have hesitated to publish in their entirety" under any circumstances.

The chronology of events in Hungary since the end of the revolution has been marked by prosecution and deportation, suppression, and execution. The workers' councils were first stripped of their political power, then outlawed. Strikes and any real opposition have been made subject to the death penalty. Young girls have been executed. Meanwhile, in Moscow (where international youth festivals and diplomatic garden parties are also held) Kadar found occasion to praise the historic Soviet troop action in Hungary, and Bulganin in turn found it faithful and heroic. The Kallay ministry early in August announced a total campaign to break intellectual resistance in Hungary, to annihilate all counter-revolutionary remnants and to liquidate bourgeois views. Compulsory courses in the Russian language and Marx-Leninism are back again.

Europe and the free world must face the fact that whatever the Communists call freedom—intellectual deviation, opportunism, factionalism, bourgeois liberalism, thought anarchism or nationalist bias, ad infinitum—they are determined on its destruction in Hungary, particularly as an object lesson to the West. The essential conflict is unchanged, and remains the struggle of humanism versus Leninism, man as an end versus mass as means, individual choice versus class will. Ultimately, it is Soviet hegemony versus national sovereignty. One may, if he wishes, discount the antics and threats of a Krushchev, but the Red army in Hungary gave a somber emphasis to the admonition "we will bury you." Jean-Paul Sartre might still cherish the queer notion that the cult of humanism leads to fascism. But he can never claim that the cult of communism leads to humanism.

Madariaga has stated somewhere the moral point that if we want peace with the people of Russia, we cannot at the same time make peace agreements with their Soviet masters. Still less, one must add, can we make such arrangements when they are in open contradiction and opposition to the independence of peoples having nothing to do with Russia. This is the sort of immorality which M. Spaak once properly charged as effecting "the very authority of the Assembly." And last October, just a few days before the Hungarian tragedy, the distinguished Belgian statesman, Paul van Zeeland, addressed the Congress of European-American Associations in Vienna. Commenting on the implications of the rule of law in society, he cautioned against inaction in the face of "brutal infringements on well-established rights in the world." Then he added "We do not have the right to tolerate them and to let events take their course as if they were in conformity to the rule." This is a moral position which must be inviolate. Retreat from this position has hurt the West grievously during the past 20 years, and has advanced the course of despotism significantly.

A distinguished group of men and women drew up for the CEAA Vienna meeting a Declaration on Western Civilization. It was a good human document, the kind of humanist credo which comes out frequently in the Western World. Among other restatements, it said that "liberty and justice are inseparable," that "the right to political opposition and respect for political opponents" is basic to western progress and freedom; and that "the citizen's physical liberty must be protected, if necessary against government itself." The letter and spirit of this declaration has been hideously violated. What shall be done about it?

Soviet diplomats and intellectuals are now endeavoring to expand cultural and other exchanges with countries in the free world. This confronts us all with a new test of integrity and casuistry, for between us and any legitimate "coexistence" stands not only Hungary—her dead, her slave deported, her

[1] The special committee on Hungary was composed of representatives of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay and established January 10, 1957, by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

homeless exiles—but all other captive nations. The late Karl Jaspers once wrote that "Liberty exists to the extent that communication is profound and honest." We might apply this measurement to our relations with the Soviet Union and the suppressed peoples. And whenever the Soviets or their Pavlovian creations chant "peace," the response of all freemen should be "freedom."

What can be done? Every civilized institution should express its moral position, as did the University of Zurich, on Soviet aggression in Hungary, the continued occupation, the ban on free elections. Every intellectual should activate himself as a committee of one, as well as in company with his confreres, to exert whatever influence he can for the cause of Hungary. He need not die for freedom as many Hungarians did. He need not suffer imprisonment. He need not even run the risks of an Emile Zola or the Seven of Göttingen. He need only summon his thoughts, his initiative and communicate with the forces involved, on both sides of the frontier which divides freedom and tyranny. Let him pay homage to the opportunity to speak freely and to assemble which is the foundation of freedom. Let him confront Soviet students with the new meaning of this opportunity which, we know from many sources, they are beginning to explore. They are concerned about Hungary and not so content merely to repeat, as Silone has accused Amissomov, "the scandalous thesis of your government."

The Soviet Union and unregenerate Communists everywhere will resort to every diversion, every blandishment, every petition, and countercharge, to kill the divided interest and responsibility of the United Nations regarding Hungary. Not only must they fail in their invidious efforts, but the West must use this historic document as a fighting banner under which to join the crusade for freedom which the Hungarian patriots, in desperation, began last October.

Radio Free Europe will do all in its power to support and publicize the U. N. report on Hungary. And assaults on this organization will be appropriately intensified. Few organizations, governments or individuals have been so vigorously and consistently attacked by the Soviet Union and Communists as Radio Free Europe. During the Hungarian crisis and afterward, as was to be expected, Radio Free Europe also was attacked by certain elements in the West, some irresponsible, some ignorant and others simply malicious. The record has been long since corrected by responsible Europeans. It is well to remember that whole Radio Free Europe is an American enterprise, financed by millions of Americans, it is composed in vast majority of Europeans working for the benefit of a reunited and wiser Europe. By keeping contact with 70 million east Europeans when the Iron Curtain came down, Radio Free Europe helped considerably to offset the imbalance of power which otherwise would have tipped in Russia's favor. There are times when real power does not rest in weapons but in moral action. Our collective duty is to work for a moment when all weapons, actions and words may be able to serve, decisively, the same united purpose.

With the gigantic strides in western European integration—economically, politically, scientifically—with the solution of old contentions such as the Saar, Europe is on the march to repair the ravages of internecine warfare over the past 40 years. During these years of dissension, unfortunately, Soviet imperialism together with atheistic communism * * * "Christian heresy" according to Toynbee, have caused much suffering, corruption and confusion. It is time now to cut down the alien corn so that the ideals of western civilization may again have a chance to grow and flourish. There are many places to begin the recovery, for Europe is divided in many places. One such is the separation of Hungary from her European genre.

There are two specters haunting Europe today. One is in Eastern Europe, the specter of freedom. Under its obsession, the Communist leaders dance to the torments of uncertainty; threatening, denouncing, purging, pleading, and cajoling. They whistle loudly as they walk through the graveyards, listening fearfully at intervals for Khrushchev's shrimp. They are in deep trouble. In Western Europe the specter is still the ghost of Hamlet, and all its conflicting agonies of conscience and resolution, intellect and action. The dilemma of which Paul Valéry wrote 30 years ago still exists: "Today the European Hamlet stares at millions of ghosts * * * but he is an intellectual Hamlet. He meditates on the life and death of truths. He wavers between one abyss and the other, for two dangers still threaten the world: order and disorder." Valéry carried the analogy much further, but for our time the dilemma is carried far enough. The respective dangers are no longer so delicately balanced and far greater tragedies have been played out—outside the theater. Both literature and death have been given deep and ample reverence. It is time to show a new and deeper reverence for liberty and life. The Hungarian people, all people who have suffered and who have been denied, are waiting for humanity to joint in this action.

Comment by Edward P. Morgan on Current Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we all know that the strength of our free society is enhanced by those citizens who accept responsibilities individually and in countless voluntary groups to work for the solution of our most complex and pressing problems.

Not only because he calls attention to one such effective group in Chicago, the Illinois division of the American Civil Liberties Union, and another in Washington, the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, but also because he reminds us all of our opportunities and duties wherever we are to work for freedom and the rights of the individual, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Edward P. Morgan's comment on the news given on the American Broadcasting Network, March 10, 1958.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sometimes, even when spring is whispering a teasing promise just around the corner of the calendar, it is easy to become discouraged about the state of the Nation.

People are nervous about the recession. People are disheartened or bored, or both, by tensions on the international scene. Citizens of good will become depressed and frustrated by the vast number of things that badly need fixing here at home, and which seem to respond so slowly to treatment. The attitude of extremists, especially but not entirely in the South, is hardening against the country's legal and moral commitment to put an end to second-class citizenship for Negroes. Senator JENNER doesn't like certain decisions of the Supreme Court and so he is pushing a bill that would simply not let it review cases in certain fields such as congressional investigation of security risks and State laws against subversion.

The list of discouraging developments is long and, especially here in Washington, the feeling grows that government at the top level is still not providing the leadership needed to summon our best efforts to define and grapple with the problems. But there is, I think, in this anxiety, the danger of selling the resilient strength and intelligent concern of Americans short.

We can make ourselves look callow as a cream puff or outrageously silly but there is a steady devotion to the country's welfare on the part of countless citizens which never makes a news item. I had to fly to Chicago last week and on the way up Cicero Avenue from the airport to the center of town I encountered a phenomenon that still has me somewhat baffled: a drive-in movie in operation with the temperature registering 33 degrees. Maybe it was a torrid film—I only got a fleeting glimpse of the technicolor screen—but it struck me as a shivering example of the extremes to which some Americans are willing to go in the pursuit of pleasure or in the flight from monotony or care. Still, a day later, several hundred Chicagoans sacrificed their Saturday of leisure to hold a meeting about some of the major problems besetting their community and their country. All afternoon the Illinois division of the American Civil Liberties Union held seminars and workshops on such items as what segregation patterns persist in the schools and why; what are a person's rights when he gets arrested? Where do we put the limits on police interrogation of suspects in a criminal case? And so forth.

And last week in Washington a whole galaxy of civic groups, labor unions, veterans organizations and church councils participated in the 10th annual conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House. Why all this emphasis on civil rights and civil liberties? Aren't these the things the Communists have taken advantage of, making it so exasperating for the rest of us that we should consider permanent curbs on them? People who embrace this thoughtless argument have lost sight of the core of the struggle, or so it seems to me The basis of our whole system is supposed to be the rights of the individual and his liberty, within the flexible framework of a free society, to enjoy those rights.

There are people all over the country—like these Civil Liberties members in Chicago—who believe deeply in these things, deeply enough to assert themselves even without the stimulus of dynamic leadership from Washington. There are people who are vastly concerned about the position of the United States, not just in terms of how many satellites we are juggling in outer space, or how many missile-launching platforms we will be able to build on friendly territory, but in terms of the very fabric of the American civilization: is it really strong and tightly knit or it is showing dangerous signs of fraying and pulling loose at the seams?

There is no census to show the number of these dedicated citizens. It is reassuring to know, as a look beyond the Washington horizon now and then will show, that they are there. It would be more reassuring if they and their good works—the incessant vigilance needed in a democracy—got the recognition and support they deserve.

This is Edward Morgan, saying good night from Washington.

The Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a salient and timely dissertation by Hon. Ross A. Collins appearing in the March edition of the Mississippi Law Journal.

Mr. Collins was for many years a Member of the House and was one of the ablest and most brilliant men ever to sit in this body. He is an outstanding member of the Mississippi Bar, and the accompanying article is a transcript of a speech delivered by him to the student body of the Mississippi School of Law on May 9, 1957:

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Ross A. Collins)

A speech on the Supreme Court of the United States is a subject so all-encompassing that it must be left to the one making it to decide his approach to its discussion.

The Court has been in existence more than 165 years and nearly 100 men have served as its judges, and these men have written thousand of opinions on practically every subject about which the Nation, the States and their people have ben concerned from the foundation of this country to the present time.

Since my remarks must be limited, the ideas that I will present to you will fall within two categories—both of which I consider political:

First, the Supreme Court of the United States is a policymaking body.

Second, how does this fact influence us, or how should it influence us, in deciding the type of men best qualified to be Justices of the Court, and how they should be chosen for that Court. The approach here will include a brief analysis of the careers of several of the outstanding Justices.

I. THE SUPREME COURT IS A POLICYMAKING BODY

Unfortunately, most Americans have little knowledge of the Court—the mixed reasons for and against its creation, its far-reaching powers both given and assumed, its decisions as divergent as the thinking of the citizens of the Republic, the individuals who have been its members, their political and economic views, their qualifications, their spites and prejudices, and the other qualities that are found in men occupying high public office.

Their opinions give us a clue to them as individuals or as to their thinking. But they are not generally read, for they are thought to be technical, legalistic, and difficult of understanding. Furthermore, the Court's opinions are printed not for general distribution but largely for lawyers; hence are not within the reach of the average citizen. Most people are too busy earning their daily bread to read them, and they do not have the time or the inclination to search out and read decisions of our highest court on questions they consider remote from their own lives.

Most Americans feel a slight responsibility for the election of the President and our Senators and Representatives in Congress. They participate in the selection of them. Members of the Supreme Court, however, are appointed by the President and the people feel no responsibility for their selection. They keep up with the acts of Congress and the work of the Chief Executive but not with the business of the highest court in the land. Even the bar of the country is not too much concerned with the decisions of our highest court, for its decisions are of a policymaking nature. The average lawyer is never employed to appear before that Court. His chief concern with that Court is to be admitted to practice before it so that he may frame and hang on the walls of his office his certificate of admission.

The Supreme Court of the United States truly is and always has been a policymaking branch of the Government. Its Justices are public officers in a democracy. They are selected because of their political faiths, and their decisions usually reflect the slant of their political thinking.

Some may believe that the Court decides the same class of cases and controversies as are considered in other courts, or the same character of litigation as is considered by the State supreme courts. That is not true now, nor has it been true for more than a hundred years. Its decisions are on the most important cases—the significant, the far-reaching, the momentous ones. These decisions may go unnoticed by the general public, even by lawyers, but they affect the rights and liberties of every citizen. Even the less important cases are far from routine. All deserve the careful attention and considered judgment not only of lawyers but of historians, political scientists, and other thinking men and women, for they affect not only the welfare of the Republic but the rights and privileges of its citizens. The Court's findings are of equal or greater import than are acts of Congress, for their decisions are the supreme law of the land.

Justices of our highest court are men just like the rest of us and they have political and economic convictions; and their opinions, from the founding of the Government to date, very clearly reflect the predilections of the Justices of that Court. Some Justices are liberal in their thinking while others are conservative. Their decisions are often by divided votes—a practice to be encouraged—and those in the minority have no hesitancy in stating plainly their disagreement with the majority. The reasoning of each reflects his liberalism or his conservatism.

The functions of the Court in policy areas extend—

1. To the interpretation of the meaning of the Constitution of the United States.
2. It interprets and construes the Acts of Congress.
3. It polices the relationships between the Federal and State Governments.
4. It polices the relationships between the States.
5. It is its own judge of its limitations.
6. And it has provided itself with the power to enforce its decrees.

The mere enumeration of these policymaking powers shows only too clearly that the functions of the Supreme Court of the United States are far different from the functions of a State supreme court or any other court or group of courts in the Nation, and causes one to ask if the qualifications for appointment to justice of that court should be determined by the same standards as those for other judges, both State and national.

To understand the men who have been Justices on the Supreme Court of the United States and their individual philosophies it is necessary to consider not only the judges' political background but their individual judicial opinions as well. It is not necessary to review the entire history of the Court for an appreciation of the worth of individual members of the Court and their basic philosophies. A reference to the decisions of any selected year or any one term will suffice. The cases decided in any one term and the various opinions of the Justices will show that liberalism and conservatism are not without meaning when applied to our highest court and any one term will reflect this meaning as well as another.

At the 1946 term,[1] there were 142 cases decided; 8 were of the highest political and legal importance. Twenty-nine of the other cases, while less important, were far from routine. They deserve the careful attention not only of lawyers but of economists, historians, and political scientists. The other 105 cases were those which were of less importance or which admitted of only one likely decision, even though a contrary decision would have made the cases of great public interest. One would be blind indeed to deny greatest importance to this field of policy decisions; they are the final findings on the questions decided.

The subject matter considered by the Court during the 1946 term embraced civil liberties, search and seizure, aspects of a fair trial, freedom of speech, regulation of labor, suits against the Government, conservation of our natural resources, torts, issuance of patents, right-to-work laws, power to tax, monopoly and free enterprise, 15 civil-rights cases, the right to counsel, Federal jurisdiction and procedure, religious liberty, and cases involving various constitutional questions.

Of the 15 civil-rights cases decided only 3 were unanimously decided; the rest were by divided opinions and both majority and minority opinions expressed the divergent political views of the Justices. The civil-rights cases involved unreasonable search and seizure, the right to counsel, and kindred well-known rights of individuals, and generally the rights claimed were denied on the facts.

By 1946 the Court's public law decisions had either stopped moving or were drifting to the right. The New Deal spirit in jurisprudence reached its peak about 1942 and was in recession in 1946. Scarcely a case decided during the 1945 term marked any material advance over anything gone before. In the field of civil rights,[2] antitrust, trade regulation, the taxing power—the march had halted. Indeed one might go farther. The Court has concluded 20 years since President Roosevelt made his first appointment. The Court as a whole had become a more conservative body than the Court which convened in October 1937. The Vinson Court—sometimes referred to as the Truman Court (although Truman's appointees did not express the liberalism of Truman)—became the Court's majority and, strangely, the conservative Justices.

The part the Court plays in the way the Nation is run can be seen in its decisions affecting the Constitution. The nature of that document is such that, as basic laws of limited size, the Supreme Court of the United States makes policy in interpreting its meanings. A decision affecting any section of the Constitution represents the majority opinions of the Justices and their opinions reflect their political and economic concepts. The Court's history proves this to be true; also, that when the Court changes personnel, the opinions of the Court change, often to the extent of overruling their former opinions. Even the nature of the Court's business shifted from the 19th to the 20th century—from private law to a public law docket.

A democracy is constantly changing and in recent years ours has traveled in many directions and rather suddenly; so has the Court, and its decisions formulate new policy

---

[1] Frank, "The United States Supreme Court 1946–47" (15 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1 (1947)).

[2] Civil rights as here used includes freedom of speech, press, public assemblage, liberty of religious worship, and so forth.

and these decisions reflect the changing policy of the Nation.

In periods of repressions, the rights of individuals as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights are pounced upon and restrictive laws usually follow, and our Highest Court has given but infrequent relief in stemming the repression. It becomes apparent that in the Highest Court, the law—whether it be the Constitution or the acts of Congress—is necessarily what the justices of our Highest Court say it is, and basic changes of its personnel inevitably bring changes of doctrine and decision.

Justices are appointed by the President and as Presidents change, Justices change as vacancies arise. Usually, but not always, the Justices share the views of the appointing President. As Mr. Dooley, a humorist of long ago, said: "The Supreme Court follows the election returns." More recently another author noted that this happens "10 or 12 years later." The truth is that Justices are human beings and have ideas and beliefs as do other public men, and their ideas and beliefs are written into their opinions. Charles Hughes, before he became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was quoted as saying: "We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is."

In a free-speech case decided by the Court in 1951, the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 5, 1951, commenting upon the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in that case under the heading, "Six Men Amend the Constitution," said that "never before has such a restriction been placed on the right to hold opinions and to express them."

"The public policy of a State or Nation must be determined by its Constitution, laws, and judicial decisions, not by the varying opinions of laymen, lawyers, or judges as to the demands of the interests of the public."[3] The sources of policy must come from these sources. But the last and final word is with the Court. Woodrow Wilson once said that the Supreme Court of the United States was "in fact a permanent constitutional convention." An early Member of the House of Representatives in similar vein, but more bluntly, was quoted as saying: "No office John Marshall holds will be insignificant long."

Congress makes and interprets traditions, fundamental values, and social trends of our society within the general framework of enacting laws. The Supreme Court of the United States, although at this time sympathetic toward the enactments of Congress, however, does assume the power to strike down acts of Congress. Its attitude in the past has not been so friendly.

II. QUALIFICATIONS AND SELECTION OF JUSTICES

Although the Constitution provides that Justices of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, etc., in practice the President makes the appointment and the Senate meekly approves the appointment.

Only one Justice was ever impeached and he was not convicted.

President George Washington, during his two terms, made the first 11 appointments to the Court, so he might be said to be the only President who ever "stacked the Court."

In the early days the Court had little to do and for long periods of time didn't even meet. Only a few cases trickled into the Supreme Court and they were of little importance. The early Justices concerned themselves with their work as circuit judges and traveled over their various circuits—usually alone.

All of the men appointed to the highest Court were lawyers, although legal training is not a qualification prescribed by the Constitution. Likewise, all appointments were political and they became Justices because they were political friends of the appointing President. If politically sterile, they would not have been named. Once installed, they generally voted according to their political beliefs, as do Members of the Senate, the House, city councils, or any other group of individuals.

In the light of history the vast majority of our Presidents have, all too often, made disappointing appointments to the Court and somehow these appointees did not grow in stature with their service; those that did grow were men already of great natural ability.

The Justices of our highest Court were all kinds of lawyers: students and idlers, the alert and the dull, the learned and the unlearned. All were politically minded. Thirty-eight out of ninety-one of them had no prior court experience; 10 had 2 years or less; 23 had between 5 and 10 years; and 20 had 10 or more years on the bench. Of those that had prior court service only eight came from the Federal bench. Those that had prior court experience sat on courts of varying grades and significance and those courts dealt almost exclusively with private, not public, law cases.

These facts, together with the record that the justices with prior law-court experience made on the Supreme Court, will cause one to ask if such judicial experience is of such aid as would cause the President to select the judge-lawyer over the busy general practitioner, the lawyer-teacher, the political economist, the historian, and other qualified men of letters.

The historians of the Court have catalogued about a dozen justices of our highest court as being great judges—those whose works have shed luster upon that institution. Always heading the list is Marshall—not only because he was a great justice and influenced as has no other man the history of the country, but because he was likewise the first truly great judge. A short statement about Marshall and others should be made in order to give some insight into the reasons for their greatness. Their names symbolize the great historical issues with which they individually have been involved.

A. John Marshall

Born in Virginia, he was untaught save for the instruction his parents gave him and three short periods of schooling from a clergyman who stayed at the home of his parents. He read Blackstone's Commentaries in his youth.

He fought through the long years of the Revolutionary War with distinction and afterward began his preparation for the bar at William and Mary College, the only public seminary of learning in the State of Virginia at that time. He attended lectures there for perhaps six weeks. He was admitted to the bar in August, 1780, and argued 113 cases before the Court of Appeals in Virginia in the period 1790 to 1799.

Elected to Congress in 1799, but prior thereto, 1797, was Minister to France on appointment by President Adams; later Secretary of State under Adams until named Chief Justice.

Marshall was but slightly equipped as a lawyer and informed himself largely from the knowledge displayed by his adversaries. After he became Chief Justice and throughout his long and epochal occupancy of this high place he showed this same peculiarity. He didn't cite many authorities, and it seems certain he would not have relied upon "learning of the law" in any event, for later when precedents were abundant and accessible, he still ignored them.

On January 20, 1801, just before Jefferson was sworn in as President, Marshall was nominated as Chief Justice of the United States. And the battle between him and Jefferson began.

If ever a figure in our history embodied in his career clear proof that ours is a government of men, not of laws, that figure is John Marshall, the great Chief Justice.

He established the supremacy of the judiciary over the rest of the Federal Government and was delighted in doing it. Since the *Marbury* v. *Madison* case, which was rooted in politics not in law, the Court has followed Marshall's concept of the superiority of the Court over both the Congress and the Executive. This only the ignorant would deny.

He did more than any other one man to centralize power in the Federal Government and weaken the rights and authority of the States. The influence of his opinions is still generally accepted by the Court. And he wrote 519 opinions out of a total of 1,106 during his tenure of office—and there were only 74 dissenting opinions.

B. Roger B. Taney

Taney came from Maryland. He was ugly in appearance, a brilliant lawyer, he knew good English and how to use it, and he was a shrewd politician.

He was a defender of the people against flagrant financial exploitation, and he championed the rights of separate States—States' rights against national power.

Charles Warren, the historian, said of Taney that "it seemed evident that Taney would approach a case from the human standpoint."

Under Taney's chiefship the Court upset temporarily many of Marshall's pronouncements, but not for long.

Taney's work made his enduring imprint on the Nation and its law. It has been stated that had he died 8 years before he did, he might have gone down in history; one-half deservedly, one-half by happenstance, as the most liberal Chief Justice of them all. And further, it has been stated there was no Chief Justice for almost 50 years who could hold a candle to him.

C. Samuel F. Miller

History has given him but slight praise but many worthwhile and forthright authors he was said to be one of the Court's ablest justices. Chief Justice Chase said of him that "beyond question he is the dominant personality on the bench."

D. John Marshall Harlan

Harlan is another who is worthy to talk about. Appointed out of political gratitude. Like Marshall, he had little legal education; was an unsuccessful office seeker in Kentucky. He was a Democrat that turned Republican. He was, nevertheless, an outstanding justice.

E. Oliver Wendell Holmes

Holmes was appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt at the age of 61 years. Wise, witty and intellectual, he was one of the truly great men of all time.

He had been for 20 years on the supreme court of Massachusetts.

He left his imprint upon the minds and hearts of men as did Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall and Abraham Lincoln.

He had an abundance of commonsense and also knew the law and its humbuggery and did much to expose judicial, legalistic shams, and legerdemain. Generally in the minority, and known as the great dissenter, his opinions expressed the hopes and aspirations of enlightened men. His two cronies on the bench were Justices Brandeis and Stone.

He outlasted seven Chief Justices, including Taft, and finally left the Court in 1932 at the age of 91.

F. Charles Evans Hughes

Hughes was a studiously inclined lawyer with ability. He became Governor of New

[3] *Hartford Fire Insurance Co.* v. *Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. Co.* (70 Fed. 201 (8th Cir. 1895)).

York and was a member of the United States Supreme Court during Holmes' tenure for 6 years. He became a candidate for President in 1916 and lost the presidency by only about 4,000 votes. He then returned to New York City and built up a lucrative practice. He later became Secretary of State under both Harding and Coolidge and once more returned to New York and his law practice; later President Hoover appointed him Chief Justice of the Court.

He was a well-groomed and impressive-appearing Justice, and I have always regarded him as an outstanding Chief Justice. This opinion is shared generally by those who have written the histories of the Court. Unfortunately for his reputation as a great jurist and Chief Justice, he sat with Holmes, Brandeis, Stone, and Cardozo, all noted for their vision and wisdom.

G. Benjamin Cardozo

His ancestors came to America from Portugal in 1654. He was an appointee of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He had been Chief Justice on New York's highest court. His appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States was opposed by Justice McReynolds, Van Devanter, and Butler. His ancestors were ardent patriots when the British occupied New York. One of them acted as rabbi at the inauguration of George Washington and another was the first Jew to be made a trustee of Columbia University. He was not only a lawyer and a judge but a bookish man and spent his leisure in study and contemplation. He was known as the hermit philosopher. It is said by those who knew him that they never heard from him an off-color story or a word of innuendo against female virtue nor would one of them dare indulge in the mildest form of ribaldry in his presence. He was one of the most liberal men on the Supreme Bench.

In addition to his service on the bench he was professor of law at Columbia.

H. Harlan Stone

Stone was an appointee on the Court in 1925 after serving a year as United States Attorney General. There he appointed J. Edgar Hoover as head of the FBI and instituted noteworthy antitrust litigation. He was a product of New England and graduated from Amherst in 1895; he was president of his class, right guard on a famous football team and a Phi Beta Kappa. He graduated from Columbia Law School in 1898, and later he became a member of the Wall Street law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. He was dean of the law school at Columbia, and was loved and revered by his students more than any other professor of that day. He authored the minority opinion in the well-known AAA case and it was one of the most significant opinions ever written. He said "courts are not the only agency of Government that must be assumed to have the capacity to govern," and "the only check upon our own exercise of power is our own sense of self-restraint." He was one of the less than a dozen great men to sit as a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Because of his unusual intellectual attainments and his knowledge of law and the culture and tradition of the times, he was the bulwark of the liberal minority, and a shrewd and canny fighter. No military leader ever planned his moves more carefully than Justice Stone mapped his legal strategy.

I. Louis D. Brandeis

Although born in Kentucky, he was a product of Boston where he had attended Harvard Law School and was attracted by the atmosphere of that great school. He had a lucrative practice and, although a good businessman, he gave his services as counsel without remuneration to people's causes, and as counsel in these cases appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States. His elevation to the Court was resisted by reactionary forces, including President Lowell of Harvard, William Howard Taft, and many others who followed the ultra-conservative line.

Justice Holmes and he were warm friends but entirely unlike one another in personality and attitudes. Justice Brandeis was a crusader while Holmes was a philosopher. He recognized the position of the Court in the affairs of the Republic and sought to write his liberal economic ideas into the law. He did not believe that the Court possessed the right to interrupt human progress and believed that "to stay experimentation in things social and economic is a grave responsibility. Denial of the right to experiment may be fraught with serious consequences to the Nation. This Court has the power to prevent an experiment, but in the exercise of this high power, we must be ever on our guard lest we erect our prejudices in the legal principles. If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."[4]

He retired in February 1939, an old man who had wisely served his people and the citizens of his country, an Isaiah whose fervor had no need of vehemence.

J. Hugo Black

I hesitate to do more than call the names of the Justices of more recent years who have been rated by the many authors whose articles and books about the Court I have recently read; however, Justice Black has been given high rank by many of them.

CONCLUSION

Much valuable information can be gathered by observing the variety of background of these 10 men. Eight had no prior judicial experience; only Holmes, Cardozo, and Black had prior judicial work, and Black's covered about 18 months, and on a minor court, in his early years of practice.

Of those Justices named, Holmes, Stone, Cardozo, and Hughes had been teachers of the law. Holmes and Cardozo had been teacher-judges, while Stone and Hughes had been teacher-lawyers. All four possessed great talent and the eminence of our highest Court was enhanced by their presence on it.

All agree that it is imperative that worthy and capable men be selected for positions on the Court. What qualifications, therefore, are necessary? Certainly the history of the Court teaches that past judicial experience alone is not the answer; also that the general practitioner with certain experience in public office has made at least an equal, or perhaps better, record, while the law teacher-judge and the teacher-lawyer have done an excellent job on the Court.

Under the appointing system, the President of the United States is as well qualified to make appointments to the Court as anyone, for he has at his beck and call the considered judgment of his advisers in and out of the Government; and certainly he should be able to secure the services of superior men for the bench.

The system of electing judges, however, should not be dismissed, for under it State-elected courts have had many excellent men as judges, and a disinterested study by those seeking only the truth will prove this.

We are not so much concerned over the method used in selecting our judges; we are anxious to secure the services of forward-thinking men of honor and intelligence as judges for our courts, and especially is this true—and imperative—for the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is much that has been done by the Court in the past that we admire—and much, too, that we deplore. Nevertheless, all admit that our court of last resort still enjoys tremendous prestige. Maybe someday a majority of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States will recognize that Court's excesses, and suggest ways that it may divest itself of its judicial supremacy over the Congress and the Executive. Maybe out of the combined wisdom of the leaders of American democracy a better and a finer way can be found to keep the administration of justice in step with the march of progress.

[4] Rodell, Nine Men: A Political History of the Supreme Court, 1790–1955, at 228 (1955).

Unemployment in Chronically Distressed Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the latest fact sheet on unemployment in chronically distressed communities, as issued by Mr. Solomon Barkin, secretary-treasurer of the Area Employment Expansion Committee, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CHRONICALLY DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES

The rate of unemployment is very high in the chronically distressed communities likely to be eligible for assistance under the Douglas area redevelopment bill. Moreover, unemployment conditions in them are becoming more serious as the depression becomes intensified throughout the country. These communities are likely to be the last to improve their conditions should there be a general lift in the economy.

A survey of 24 major and 62 smaller areas of substantial and chronic labor surplus indicates unemployment rates of high severity.

In the major areas, the rate of unemployment for January 1958, which is the latest date for such data, ranges from a low of 6.5 percent in Kenosha, Wis., to a high of 17.1 percent in Atlantic City, N. J. The rates of unemployment in other major labor markets are as follows:

Unemployment rate in January 1958
(percent)

	Number of labor markets
6– 6.9	1
8– 8.9	3
9– 9.9	1
10–10.9	4
11–11.9	6
12–12.9	2
13–13.9	3
14–14.9	1
15–15.9	1
16–16.9	1
17–17.9	1

The rates of unemployment as measured by the number of insured unemployed increased in 15 of these communities, rising in the case of Kenosha by 58.9 percent. In 6 labor markets, the number declined, but it is likely that a considerable part of the reduction was due to the exhaustion of benefits so that the actual rate of unemployment rose in these communities.

Unemployment rates in the smaller areas are reported for the latest available dates. Only 24 of these are for January or February 1958. In any event, these are chronic labor surplus markets where unemployment continues to be very high. The highest rate

of unemployment is in Uniontown-Connellsville, Pa., with a rate of 23.4, followed by Herrin-Murphysboro and West Frankfort, Ill., with a rate of 21.7 percent; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine, with a rate of 19.9 percent; Sunbury-Shamokin, Mt. Carmel, Pa., with 18.1 percent; North Adams, Mass., with 16.5 percent; Welch, W. Va., with 16 percent; Cumberland, Md., with 14.9 percent; Logan, W. Va., with 14.4 percent; Vincennes, Ind., with 13.8 percent; and Litchfield, Ill., with a rate of 13.4 percent.

Attached are lists of the unemployment rates for selected distressed majbr and smaller labor markets.

TABLE I.—*Unemployment and unemployment rate,[1] selected areas of substantial labor surplus, January 1958[2]—Major areas*

State and area	Unemployment, January 1958		Percent change insured unemployment, January 1958–March 1958	State and area	Unemployment, January 1958		Percent change insured unemployment, January 1958–March 1958
	Number	Percent of labor force			Number	Percent of labor force	
Indiana:				Pennsylvania:			
Evansville	8,700	10.1	+6.9	Altoona	7,200	13.4	−11.7
Terre Haute	4,200	9.4	+17.8	Erie	12,100	12.2	+2.7
Massachusetts:				Johnstown	11,200	11.3	+7.4
Fall River	6,990	11.7	+2.2	Scranton	15,700	15.4	+6.6
Lawrence	6,200	10.6	−8.8	Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	22,400	16.3	−18.3
Lowell	6,350	11.6	+6.7	Puerto Rico:			
Michigan:				Mayaguez	4,100	13.6	(3)
Detroit	191,000	12.5	+52.4	Ponce	5,000	13.0	(3)
Grand Rapids	15,700	11.1	+19.1	San Juan	15,100	8.8	(3)
Muskegon	6,900	11.9	−11.9	Rhode Island: Providence	48,100	14.1	+2.5
New Jersey: Atlantic City	10,500	17.1	+.9	Tennessee: Knoxville	15,500	10.5	+20.4
North Carolina:				Washington: Spokane	11,900	11.9	−15.3
Asheville	4,400	8.8	+.9	West Virginia: Charleston	12,200	10.8	+36.3
Durham	4,050	8.5	−9.7	Wisconsin: Kenosha	2,020	6.5	+38.9

[1] Total information as a percent of total area labor force.
[2] January 1958 or nearest available month.
[3] Not available.
Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

TABLE II.—*Unemployment and unemployment rate,[1] selected areas of substantial labor surplus, January 1958—Smaller areas*

State and area	Date of data	Unemployment		State and area	Date of data	Unemployment	
		Number	Percent of labor force			Number	Percent of labor force
Alabama: Jasper	October 1957	850	[2] 5.7	New Jersey:			
Connecticut: Danielson	do	1,400	8.5	Bridgeton	October 1957	3,000	[2] 8.9
Illinois:				Long Branch	January 1958	13,500	11.7
Canton	February 1958	975	6.8	North Carolina:			
Harrisburg	September 1957	2,400	10.1	Fayetteville	September 1957	3,495	20.6
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort	February 1958	15,000	21.7	Kinston	October 1957	1,700	7.9
La Salle	January 1958	2,750	9.4	Mount Airy	December 1957	1,970	9.1
Litchfield	February 1958	3,300	13.4	Rocky Mount	October 1957	1,210	[2] 2.8
Mount Carmel-Olney	December 1957	1,400	6.7	Rutherfordton-Forest City	November 1957	1,833	20.8
Mount Vernon	October 1957	1,400	6.1	Shelby-Kings Mountain	February 1958	3,260	13.0
Springfield	December 1957	3,600	[2] 5.8	Waynesville	October 1957	1,000	[2] 5.8
Indiana:				Ohio:			
Michigan City-La Porte	January 1958	4,000	11.4	Portsmouth-Chillicothe	November 1957	6,400	9.9
Muncie	do	5,000	12.5	Springfield	February 1958	6,400	14.1
Richmond	September 1957	2,000	6.9	Oklahoma: McAlester	January 1958	1,250	9.4
Vincennes	February 1958	2,050	13.8	Pennsylvania:			
Kansas:				Bejwick-Bloomsburg	November 1957	2,085	9.9
Coffeeville-Independence-Parsons	November 1957	1,800	6.2	Clearfield-DuBois	September 1957	2,200	6.1
Pittsburg	September 1957	1,950	8.4	Lewistown	November 1957	2,000	9.1
Kentucky:				Lock Haven	do	1,684	10.7
Corbin	do	3,050	11.3	Pottsville	January 1958	14,200	13.1
Frankfort	do	1,700	8.5	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel	September 1957	3,670	[2] 5.7
Hazard	do	2,150	10.4	Uniontown-Connellsville	January 1958	11,500	23.4
Madisonville	do	2,300	8.9	Rhode Island: Newport	September 1957	1,100	6.8
Middlesboro-Harlan	do	3,400	12.3	Tennessee: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	October 1957	1,400	6.1
Morehead-Grayson	do	2,200	11.5	Texas: Texarkana	January 1958	4,200	10.7
Owensboro	October 1957	1,700	6.0	Virginia:			
Paintsville-Prestonsburg	September 1957	2,200	9.6	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	October 1957	1,975	8.5
Pikeville-Williamson	October 1957	3,000	13.5	Radford-Pulaski	January 1958	4,550	10.0
Maine: Biddeford-Sanford	February 1958	6,400	19.8	West Virginia:			
Maryland: Cumberland	January 1958	6,000	14.9	Beckley	February 1958	3,110	12.4
Massachusetts: North Adams	February 1958	3,010	16.5	Fairmont	October 1957	1,750	6.9
Michigan:				Logan	February 1958	3,000	14.1
Bay City	September 1957	3,000	8.5	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis	do	4,000	10.6
Jackson	January 1958	4,800	10.1	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs	do	1,940	12.9
Monroe	November 1957	2,100	8.8	Welch	December 1957	3,750	16.0
Port Huron	January 1958	3,600	10.8				

[1] Total unemployment as a percent of total area labor force.
[2] Unemployment below 6 percent of the labor force because of temporary or seasonal influences.
Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

"It Was the 18th of April in '75"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it was near midnight, and a cold moon was ghosting the countryside when Paul Revere started his famous ride.

To warn the patriot leaders and the minutemen, that the oppressors were coming.

Paul Revere eluded one patrol of Redcoats, was ambushed by another, his horse was taken from him, he was released, but he managed to get the warning to Lexington in time.

The ride he began that night inspired the farmers and the artisans to fight for their freedom.

It was a ride that has never ended.

Up through the years, in peace and in war, it has summoned the courage and integrity of every real American to be vigilant and determined that freedom shall be defended and extended.

That ride is a part of the American heritage.

Animating the Paul Reveres of today, the men and women whose love of country awakens us from the slumber of indifference. Calling upon us to stand up against those forces that would deprive us of the liberties that were won for us by others, through the greatness of their heart and spirit.

In order to perpetuate the memory of

the man who alerted the farmers and the villagers to the approach of tyranny, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield has announced that a special 25-cent Paul Revere stamp will be first placed on sale at Boston, Mass., on the anniversary of the epochal ride that sparked the war for American independence.

Stamp collectors will be advised by any postmaster concerning the procedure to follow so that they may secure first-day cancellations of these historic stamps that are certain to become items of beauty, and sentiment, and value.

"On the 18th of April in '58."

How Does the Housing Situation Look to Leaders in Congress?—An Interview With Representative Albert Rains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Journal of Homebuilding for March 1958. It is an interview with my very distinguished and able colleague, Representative ALBERT RAINS, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing, conducted late in January of this year by a group consisting of 2 builders, both of them national officers of the National Association of Home Builders, and 6 specialists from the NAHB staff.

The interview follows:

AN INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE RAINS

(How does the housing situation look to leaders in Congress? What do they think about the problems affecting the industry? What sort of legislation can the industry look forward to this year? In an effort to bring you closer to the legislative scene, the Journal publishes this exclusive interview with one of the most knowledgeable men in Congress on the subject of housing, Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing. Mr. RAINS was interviewed at the National Housing Center late in January by a group consisting of 2 builders, both of them NAHB national officers, and 6 specialists from the NAHB staff. The interviewers included NAHB President Nels G. Severin; NAHB Second Vice President Martin L. Bartling; NAHB Executive Director John M. Dickerman; National Housing Center Director Neal Hardy; Legislative Director Joseph B. McGrath; Economics Department Director Nathaniel H. Rogg; Public Relations Director Robert F. Loftus; moderator: Journal Editor Stanley Baitz.)

Question. Mr. Congressman, the home building industry believes that its impact upon the economy is basic to the healthy functioning of the economy generally. At the same time, we do not believe that home building by itself can cure an ailing economy. Also we object to being treated as a kind of economic safety valve to be turned on and off depending upon the opinion of Government officials or advisers as to the general trend of business.

Would you care to give us your own views, Mr. RAINS, on the economic impact of housing on the Nation, and how this might better be treated within the executive branch?

Answer. Well, first of all, let me say that I am delighted to be here and to attempt to answer some of the questions that are so pertinent to the home building industry and to the people in America who need and want to purchase homes.

In answer to your question I would say this, that I agree that home building is one of the basic industries in America and that it should not be used at any time merely as a pump priming device. It plays a very important part in the economy of our Nation. But there are many in the administration who in my judgment have been slow to realize that we are not meeting the housing need in America because of the smallness of some of our programs at the Government level. I hope that they will open their eyes to the need of keeping a live and growing home building industry now that we are faced with a recession.

I agree with your thesis completely, though, that it should not be regarded as an on-and-off program, to be used only to stem recessionary tides. We need to get year in and year out a much greater volume of good homes built in America than we have been able to get in the past. That is my firm belief.

THE TIME FACTOR IN HOME BUILDING

Question. Do you think, Congressman, that the officials concerned with the problem really realize what confronts the home builders today in getting back into a production that will have a real effect upon the economy? I mean the lead time involved in a home builder's program, between when he gets the idea that a particular piece of land, for instance, might be a good place to build a group of houses, and the time that he can actually produce them. Too many people, it seems to me, today are depending upon us now to bring the economy back up, and that is of real concern to us.

Answer. Well, I stated in my speech before your great convention in Chicago, you will remember, that the home building industry is one of the areas which is in need of greater impetus by the Government in order to meet what I regard as a recessionary trend. I did not mean to say, however, that I would relegate the home building industry to the role of economic pump primer only. I regard the home building business, certainly, as an important part of our economy, and if it were not, you would not be entitled to the serious concentrated thinking that I and those like me in the Congress are attempting to give your problems. The basic thing, though, is that we want homes for the American people, and the administration ought to understand that you cannot use it as a stopgap measure, off-again and on-again.

ONE MILLION FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND UNITS A YEAR

Question. Mr. RAINS, I noticed in your speech in Chicago, which you just mentioned, that you pointed especially to something with which we agree wholeheartedly, that the basic problem in housing is not a decline in housing demand but one which reflects primarily financing difficulties in the absence of a true, low downpayment plan. I wonder if you might elaborate, perhaps, on your thinking as to those two points.

Answer. It has always been clear to me over the years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, as I have traveled around the Nation, through the cities of the country, that while there may be certain times in certain areas that demand may be met for a few months, there is no place where, with a little more time, more houses will not be needed in the growing economy in which we live.

It is my belief that the demand for housing is truly great today. In fact, more people write me letters today as a Member of Congress inquiring as to why they cannot get a house, or what can be done so they can get a house, than ever before. I think the people in the administration and the people generally ought to understand that the housing demand has not been met, and there is still a great market and likely will be.

In fact, I think that all of the prognostications for the future show that we will need more houses as the years go by. So I have said many times, and I believe this sincerely, we ought to have at least 1,400,000 units a year of new construction, and another 600,000 should be provided for by reconditioning and rehabilitation of existing housing. Now, that is a much larger program than is envisioned by the President's message to Congress, but it is one that I think is not a crash program at all, but is just meeting the daily needs of the people generally.

I hope that we will be able to fashion in the Congress housing legislation for this year which will aid materially in helping the home builders to arrive at least at that goal next year.

Question. In connection with that, Mr. RAINS, as you well know, last year the Congress helped increase housing demand considerably by lowering the FHA-required down payment. What is your opinion as to the attitude Congress will take toward the possibility of approving an additional lowering of the FHA down-payment schedule?

Answer. Well, you put your finger on what I think is the greatest need in the FHA program. You know, I share your opinion that the thing we need most is the lowering of the required FHA down payment. As to what I think Congress will do, I have to admit that is a rather tough one. Since I personally favor it, I entertain the hope that we will be able to convince other Members of Congress, sufficient numbers both on our committee and in the Congress, that it is needed.

We will run into opposition from other groups, as you know, and there will be the contention that equity in a house should be even more as we face what might be a recession, but it is my honest belief that we will be able to write legislation—I will stick my neck out—which will lower the down payments considerably.

Question. Do you feel that Congress will take any action to continue the VA World War II home loan guaranty program, and if so, is there any likelihood that the interest rate will be increased? Thirdly, do you think the VA direct loan program will be continued?

PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE UNCERTAIN

Answer. I will take those questions in reverse from the order in which you asked them. I believe the Congress will act to extend the direct loan program, but I do not know what will be the attitude of the President. As you know, he vetoed it last year. I also feel reasonably sure that the Congress will continue for at least 1 year, and possibly 2 years, the loan guaranty program of the VA. Now, was there another question?

Question. Yes, will the interest rate be increased on VA loans?

Answer. Well, at a time when interest rates are generally beginning to come down, I can say very sincerely that Congress will be very unlikely to increase the VA rate.

Question. Do you believe that that would be the case in view of the demonstrated inability of the builders to secure financing—almost complete inability to secure the financing needed under a 4½-percent rate for the GI program?

Answer. I am aware that over the months past it was almost impossible to get it.

There is some hope that you may be able to do some financing at that rate if things turn out as expected in the mortgage field this year. I do not, however, entertain too much hope there will be a great flow of money at 4½ percent. But speaking to you from the standpoint of practical reality on the Hill, I must say that Congress will never agree to raise interest rates this year.

Question. Mr. RAINS, in line with that, what do you think of the administration's proposal that all limitations or ceilings on interest rates be reviewed and that authority be given to vary rates in line with market conditions?

Answer. I am personally very much opposed to that proposal. I might also add that I can find no sentiment in favor of it in the Congress. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress agree with me that in such Government-insured programs as the FHA, which are virtually riskless to the lender, that the Congress has a right and duty to establish a maximum interest rate to protect the consumer.

Question. There is a great deal of sentiment, as you are well aware, sir, among a number of members of the lending fraternity, and as a matter of fact, at the meeting of the American Economic Association this past December, for freeing the interest rate completely, as they call it, and for allowing the interest rate, even on the FHA and the VA programs, to be a matter of bargaining between the lender and borrower. I assume you are satisfied in your own mind that the Congress will not take such action this year.

Answer. I am absolutely certain that Congress will not take such action this year or any year in the foreseeable future.

Question. That, of course, came up to the Congress as an idea in the President's budget and economic messages. I wonder, Mr. Rains, what you thought generally of the President's budget message so far as it affected housing and urban renewal?

Answer. Generally, I would say that I felt that the President's budget failed to recognize the truly important place that the housing industry holds in the American economy for two reasons. First of all, the need and the primary want of the average American family is a home. I believe the home is the bedrock of our American democracy. Therefore, housing should have received more attention. Secondly, and I say this sincerely, I think he failed to recognize in his message how important it is to have a thriving home building economy in this year of recessionary influences of various types.

Question. Mr. RAINS, speaking of the budget, we all know that the President's budget is based upon a continuation of present tax rates. Do you think there is any likelihood of a tax cut during this coming year?

Answer. Yes. Of course, I realize that future events may make this prediction of mine look completely out of line, but as one who stays in close contact with the Members of Congress and the problems affecting our economy, by virtue of my service on the Banking and Currency Committee, I am convinced that the Congress will pass a tax reduction bill sometime after the Easter recess, toward the end of the session.

The reasons for it are beginning to show and are clearly evident to me. In the first place, the economy, in spite of all that some people have to say, is truly lagging. I think that February figures will show possibly 5 million unemployed and, frankly, men in both parties who are looking at it seriously expect that figure to grow until possibly 6 million by April.

It is my considered judgment that when the Members of Congress go home at Easter and they get the feeling at the grassroots back home and find out how many are unemployed and how business is declining, they are going to want to do something to reduce the tax burden in the hope that it will revive consumer purchasing power. That will be one reason. In the second place, I am frank to say that you must always remember that this is an election year, and it never hurts the Members of Congress to cut taxes in an election year.

Question. I would like to explore this a little bit with you, if I may, Congressman. From what I read of the reports of the administration and the Members of Congress, too, they are looking to home building to be an important force for recovery from the recession to which you referred, and I have little doubt that a tax cut might be one thing that could encourage people to again consider the purchase of a house.

But how generally is it realized by the Members of Congress that people across the country today are reluctant to buy because they feel a sense of insecurity in their income, and what can Congress and the Government do to make it possible for us to find the buyers of the houses that we know we should build?

Answer. You asked a really hard question. Of course, you actually open up for me one of my pet gripes, and that is that the administration money managers have acted on the assumption that you could stop high prices and inflation by a hard-money policy. The simple truth has been that it did not cut the cost of living, it did not stop inflation in the slightest. Instead, what it actually did was to make it difficult for home builders, home buyers, farmers, small-business men, and others to get credit. This in turn brought on the present recession.

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT CAN DO

Now as to what the Government can do to correct the present situation. First, the Federal Reserve Board should vigorously pursue an easy money policy by further lowering the rediscount rate, strongly support the Government bond market by engaging in open-market transactions, and very probably by reducing bond reserve requirements.

I believe a tax cut would be the greatest help. A $3 billion tax cut would create a vast reservoir of consumer purchasing power. Such a cut would, if given quickly enough, in my judgment, reverse the present economic downtrend. I frankly do not believe the military spending program will be any immediate help because of the time lag. And if all these things fail, we should step in fast with a public-works program.

So, in order to give the economy an immediate shot in the arm, I think Congress will finally come around to the idea, along toward the end of the session, that we had better give a tax cut.

Question. That is a very interesting and fruitful prospect, Mr. RAINS, and I guess you would say that it remains to be seen whether or not we are going to be able to stave off a depression.

Answer. I do not believe at all that we are about to go into a depression. I do not feel that at all, even though in my own hometown employment is down, big steel mills and big rubber mills, and all of those basic industries; but I do say this, that it is absolutely urgent that the flow of money become easier, and that the people get a little better sense of security and more purchasing power, or we could find ourselves in a very serious recession.

Question. Mr. Congressman, in the event that we could get Congress to face up to the fact that there just plainly is no money available for the GI program at a 4½ percent rate, and they would raise the rate to the point that the home builders would be able to secure the funds that they need, do you not believe that that would have a terrific effect upon the ability of the home builders across the Nation to produce housing that would tend to overcome this reluctance that presently exists in the minds of people who buy?

Answer. Well, last year when the question was up—of course, you realize that this particular issue you are talking about is handled by a committee other than mine, which is the Veterans' Affairs Committee, chaired by my good friend, "TIGER" TEAGUE of Texas—I appeared before his committee and presented as best I could what I thought was the need. When it became clear that the GI program was not going to be revived, I attempted, very frankly, to broaden the FHA with a veterans' preference. The FHA insurance premium would have been waived for veterans and they would have received other privileges. Unfortunately, that part of the housing bill was stricken out on the floor of the House.

I never have said that I would not personally favor some increase in the GI loan rate. I am simply saying now that it is impossible, in a year of falling interest rates, to expect the Congress to look with favor on raising it. So, as a matter of fact, I do not think it will be raised. I think instead that you will see lower downpayments in the FHA, and possibly a reduction in the insurance premium to make FHA even more usable to the people who would like to go in the CI program.

It is also my judgment that before the end of the year, if things continue to roll as they are, there will be some money at 4½ percent for the GI loan program.

THE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Question. If I may, Mr. Rains, may I ask you a question about the urban renewal program? There has been a good deal of discussion lately about the administration's proposal to reduce gradually the Federal Government's share in the cost of acquisition and clearance of slum sites. May we ask for your views on this proposal?

Answer. My subcommittee has just concluded 3 days of hearings—in fact, we began them the day after Congress met—on slum clearance and urban renewal.

As to the President's message, I disagree with his proposal completely. In the first place, I do not think his program will provide enough funds to make a dent in getting rid of the slums; and, second, instead of reducing the Federal share of the cost, I think we should be realistic and recognize the fact that cities are up to their eyes already in financial problems, and that we should probably raise the Federal share of the cost. That was borne out by the witnesses at this hearing, and they were among the leaders of the municipalities of the Nation, who said that they had gone about as far as they could.

Question. A moment ago you were referring to some of the procedures being used by the administrative branch in monetary matters. We have had no major overhaul of our monetary system in 50 years, since the establishment of the Federal Reserve. Has there been any discussion, or is there going to be any in this coming Congress, with respect to the powers of the Federal Reserve or any other governmental agencies in these fields?

Answer. There is no proposal for any immediate legislation to do a general overhaul. Among a great many Members of Congress—I am not one of them—the Federal Reserve System Board is almost sacrosanct, and I have to confess that many of us do not quite understand all of its working. There is presently pending before our committee a bill entitled "the Financial Institutions Act," on which we are now holding hearings, which provides for a recodification of the banking laws, but it does not go to the heart of our monetary and credit problems. I am one who thinks that the Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress should undertake a study of our monetary system. You will remember that about a year ago Representative PATMAN had a resolution in

to do it but it was defeated. But some time or other Congress is going to have to look into it to see if the Federal Reserve System meets present-day needs.

Question. In your recent investigation, what were some of the principal abuses you found pertaining to second mortgages, and what could be done toward eliminating them?

DANGEROUS SITUATIONS SEEN

Answer. I know that is a subject in which you gentlemen are vitally interested, because you are generally caught with them, and I am sure don't like it. The truth is, we found in certain sections of the country—and we just issued a long factual report on it without any comment—rather fantastic and what I think are truly dangerous situations existing.

In a great many places we found in use the vicious, balloon-type second mortgage which, as you so well know, comes due all at one time. The purchaser lives in a fool's paradise, paying small payments, and all at once the whole thing comes due. That is prevalent in many sections of the country.

You ask me what can be done about it. We are still in the process of studying this matter and we have not come up with anything like a final answer. I do believe, however, that we may be able to devise some type of legislation controlling abuses of the second mortgage in connection with first mortgages which are made by federally chartered or federally insured lending institutions. Just what form this control might take I don't believe I am prepared to say at this time.

I do feel very strongly, though, that we must find some method of ending this vicious practice. It is certainly not criminal, but it is economically most unsound, and you will recall, gentlemen, that second mortgages made in the 20's were a major contribution to the great depression of the 1930's. I might also add we can help eliminate second mortgages by making the FHA program more attractive and by making sure that there is an adequate supply of mortgage money available for FHA loans.

Question. Mr. RAINS, there has been some discussion within the industry about possible lowering of the FHA insurance premiums. Would you favor such a move, and do you feel that the FHA reserves are in a strong enough position to warrant a reduction or, alternatively, would you agreed that if FHA does not reduce its premium, it should take a risk commensurate to the premium that it is now getting?

BELIEVES RATE CAN BE CUT

Answer. It is my firm belief that in the light of the small losses over the years that have occurred in the FHA-insured loans—and that record is one that we can all be proud about—that the FHA insurance rate could possibly be cut in half. I am told by men who have made a careful and serious study that the reserve is even ample to weather another depression like the 1930's. I am further told, and I think I mentioned this in my speech at your convention, that under a similar program such as this in Canada, their premium is less than FHA's, so I think it could be cut, in my honest opinion, with all safety, and that the reserves would be ample.

Question. The growth of our metropolitan areas has created many problems in the general field, in its community facilities, such as additional sewerage and water plants, for example. Now, there has been talk—no specific proposals—of a special Federal-type insurance to assist in obtaining private loans for such plans. What would be your attitude toward it? Do you believe that the problem has become so broad that Congress would approve a program?

Answer. It hits at two points: First, the cities are hardly able to bear the burden. Secondly, if the homebuilders must bear the burden, anyone knows that the cost must be included in the price of the home. There ought to be some way worked out, and it needs to be done immediately if we are to help bring down the cost of housing in the metropolitan areas, and also to enable cities to meet their just obligations, whereby neither the city nor the builder would be compelled to carry the whole load.

The present community facilities program is not meeting the needs, of course, and I hope that our Housing Committee before the end of the year will be able to bring forth some kind of recommendation in connection with the community facilities program which will be helpful.

Question. May I, Mr. Congressman, ask your viewpoint on the FHA premium on section 203 in particular, which is presently one-half of 1 percent. In view of their demonstrated very low loss ratio, rather than the consideration of cutting the premium presently charged, would you look favorably upon FHA assuming the greater risk, so that more people would qualify?

Answer. Well, of course, (many) people are now excluded by virtue of the regulations of FHA which set up credit rating requirements. I think the FHA is often too retrictive but I do not see how legislation could change that.

Question. I do not ask for legislation. You proposed that legislation might reduce the premium, and I wanted your views on maybe approaching it from the other point of view, leaving the premium the way it is and assuming a little greater risk as an insuring agency than they presently do.

Answer. I think both could be done. We could reduce the premium and they still could be more liberal than they are. It is not true in every office, perhaps, but it is true in some offices that they are too stringent on the credit ratings of some of the people.

DISCOUNT CONTROLS A PROBLEM

Question. Now, may I ask your views on this: the administration, and certainly the real estate and home building industries, regard as one of the major points the removal of discount controls on FHA and VA loans. I come from a part of the country where it is of real concern, and in line with your comments on second mortgages, I think very definitely is responsible to a large measure for the growth of the second mortgage. Now, what would you expect Congress might do this year on removal of discount controls?

Answer. I would first say that second mortgages were certainly in evidence everywhere prior to discount control, and I cannot agree that discount control is the cause of second mortgages, because the record would show the reverse. Secondly, I don't think that discount control carries with it all of the implications of harm that some people seem to ascribe to it.

The people who are truly dismayed with it are the people in the administrative agencies who do not like to fool with it. They say it is difficult to administer, and I am sure it is, but I have no sympathy for the answer, very frankly, because that is what they are paid for, to administer it.

Next, there are many people in Congress who think that discounts are stealing, that they are sinful. They do not understand that a reasonable discount is a part and parcel of the trade. I understand that it is and I know you cannot outlaw discounts completely, and I do not favor that. There are others who think you should set it at a given percentage, and I do not favor that because I know that would create an unreasonable situation. In some areas, like mine in the South, naturally discounts must be higher than they would be in New York or New England.

But not all Members of Congress agree with that. In fact, the majority of them did not seem to last year, so we in the committee, those of us who were trying to draft the legislation, battled for what we thought was a fair compromise; namely, a reasonable limit on discounts. We did not say they should be set at 1 percent, 2 percent, or 10 percent, or what; we said they must be reasonable.

The administrative officials do not like that kind of decision to make, but somebody has to make it—you cannot write into a law what it should be. You must depend on fair and reasonable administration.

I do not think—and this is my considered judgment—that discount control written as it is in the law is unreasonable. It keeps the administration alert to the fact that they must not allow unconscionable discounts, which would put the whole housing program in jeopardy. I do not believe that the Congress will ever agree to completely remove any type of discount control.

Question. Mr. RAINS, I would like to pose a problem here that has worried all of us at NAHB. We sincerely have tried to figure out some solution to the lower cost housing problem for the people who need it. As you know, we have had the question raised that we are leaving our market, we are not taking care of it, and so on. Many people in NAHB have seriously tried to figure out the solutions to it, and we find the impediments to low-cost housing sometimes almost intolerable. Some of them are that the agencies laying down the specifications for housing, and so forth, have raised unrealistic standards. Even more serious, in a way, than that is the fact that money from the life insurance companies, the conventional sources for low-cost housing, is almost unobtainable. You try to get money from any of the major life insurance companies for low-cost housing projects and you just do not get it.

You know, last year we suggested that $2 billion of special assistance be provided in Fannie Mae. This has not come up this year, as I understand it, but in our talks on some way to solve this money problem, which is really serious, I wonder if some thought should not be given this year to providing special assistance under Fannie Mae, or some type of moral pressure be applied to the life insurance companies?

Answer. I share NAHB's opinion that we need in the Fannie May special assistance fund a large sum for the specific purpose of helping the home builders of the country to meet adequately the demand of the people for housing in the low-cost bracket. Frankly, I know of no other way to do the job.

I think that if we are to have special assistance for other programs, including apartment houses, that we ought to recognize—and when I say "we," I mean the Congress—should recognize the need to help you meet the demand in the low-cost field, because that is where the most urgent need is today. I am hopeful that we will be able to put legislation through that will provide a large sum in the special assistance fund just for that very purpose.

Question. I am glad to hear you say that, because I think it is a real tragedy that people who really need housing have to pay the dearest price for the commodity. That is actually what the situation is.

I was going to ask, Mr. RAINS, if this had come to your attention: There has been a problem, at any rate over the past year, regarding some selectivity by the Federal National Mortgage Association, which has worked to the disadvantage in a number of cases of lower cost homes which did not meet with the approval of Fannie Mae and homes which had previously been insured or guaranteed by the FHA or VA.

Now, we are not anxious to open up Fannie Mae for the purchase of all housing in America, but in its help to new construction we are hopeful that it will not in any way discriminate against lower cost housing.

Answer. I think Fannie Mae, as I have said so many times, is not staying within the

law itself when they use the extreme selectivity which they do with reference to the purchases of mortgages.

Fannie Mae seems to feel that it should be operated on the theory of a bank, to make a profit. That is not the concept of Fannie Mae as I hold it at all, and I do not think Fannie Mae is entitled to reject, just of its own desire and its own will, certain mortagages and select others. Time after time we have tried to make it clear in reports of my committee that, in our judgment, that is not the way it should be operated. I think they should be required to buy all properly insured FHA and VA mortgages.

Question. Mr. Congressman, do you think that it might be possible for the Congress to consider the revision of the law to the extent that Fannie Mae might be permitted to accept FHA and VA mortgages as pledges for loans to their mortgages, providing them thereby a different service than is presently provided, so that they—

Answer. This proposal has come up before and it may well have merit as a means of making FNMA a more truly secondary market. We certainly will study it.

HOUSING FOR THE AGED

Question. Mr. Congressman, there has been a great deal of interest, the past 2 or 3 years particularly, and a growing interest both in and out of Government about the problem of appropriate housing for our aged. In fact, I understand that the President has recommended that section 207 of FHA be separated so that there will be an independent rental housing program for elderly persons. May I ask whether you would favor such an action and whether you believe there is enough need for a specific Federal program to justify special legislation in this field?

Answer. To put it rather bluntly, I think—and I have said so in the hearings—that the administration's proposals on housing for the elderly are just mere window dressing. Rents are too high. Under the present proposal the mortgages are not long enough. Several years ago I submitted in a bill, which unfortunately did not get through the Congress, a proposal that would provide for long-term, low-interest loans to nonprofit corporations for the building of homes for the elderly, somewhat along the line of the college housing program.

Actually, that is the only way that we are ever going to get rents the elderly will be able to pay out of their social security and various other retirement income. I think that housing for the elderly, because of the ever-increasing number of elderly people, is one of our very urgent problems, and I think we are going to have to approach it with much more realism than has been done by the administration.

Question. You have indicated your concern about the current state of the economy and probable growing unemployment. Would you care to comment on your views about the long-range future of American economy?

Answer. I am always an optimist on the long-range future of the American economy. I expect the economy to turn up considerably before the end of this year if the proper steps are taken by the present administration to combat the recession. In the long range, with the ever-growing demand and the ability to produce that we have in America, and with the great increase in population that we are witnessing, and the technological advances that we are sure to make, I think we are headed for prosperity in the days to come.

Question. Do you believe that any action will be taken by the Congress at this session on any of the several proposals for partial insurance of conventional loans?

Answer. Yes; there likely will be some action on those proposals. There are, of course, several different types of proposals. I doubt if any of them are enacted in the form in which they are now proposed, but there will very likely be worked out some legislation along that line which will be incorporated in the general housing bill.

Question. One final question—with all of your experience in the field of housing, Mr. RAINS, what do you regard as the largest unsolved housing problem?

Answer. It is my judgment that the largest unsolved housing problem is the one you mentioned a moment ago, the inability of the Federal programs, we will say, to reach the low-income group. I really mean that group that is sometimes referred to as the lower half of the middle-income group. It has been the inability of our programs to reach that group that I regard as the greatest unsolved problem we have.

MORE MORTGAGE CREDIT VITAL

Question. What do you think is the major measure or the major remedy that could be used to solve that problem?

Answer. The only answer is to make available more mortgage credit in that particular field, and in that I am sure the Government—because of the inability of the people to pay high rents based on high mortgages—is going to have to take a hand to help.

Question. I wonder, as we close, if Congressman RAINS might tell us what he thinks time-wise, might happen to the housing legislation in the session this year?

Answer. You all have been around here a long time. The truth is that the housing bill has a habit of being studied all year long [laughter], and then finally being passed in the long, hot, closing hours of the last days of the session. [Laughter.]

I judge that it will follow its usual course. However, the Senate hearings, as I understand it, are going to start sometime in March. We have held some hearings. We plan some other hearings on specific items, and the legislative mills affecting housing are beginning to grind.

I would like to say sincerely that those of us in housing on the Hill, my associates on the committee, and my good staff members, feel that you have given us a great deal of help and assistance, and that while we do not always agree, we are certainly able to work together, and that the end and aim of your great organization, as the end and aim of our efforts, is to get more and better housing for the American people. I want to congratulate your great organization.

Analysis of Administration's Attempt To Cut Down REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, all those who are aware of the inestimable value of REA to rural America continue to be astounded at the administration's open efforts to end its usefulness, if not actually destroy REA. The latest proposal would triple financing costs for all rural electrics, and I need not comment as to the effects of these increased costs.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has been doing an excellent job of showing up the administration's moves against REA for what they are. Under permission heretofore granted me to do so, I insert in the RECORD the NRECA's analysis of the latest administration REA bills:

ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATION REA BILLS

The administration has asked Congress to pass two anti-REA bills which would put Hoover Commission recommendations into effect. The Capehart-Hiestand bill would triple financing costs for all rural electrics. The administration's new Wall Street proposal would provide for Wall Street private financing.

Here are some important features you should know about:

1. The proposal sets up an alleged revolving fund. But this revolving fund is not a fund, and it cannot revolve. Congress would still have to authorize money, as now, to keep this deceptive fund alive.

2. A so-called loan-insurance scheme is set up, but you would still have to find the money you need; your lender would get the insurance.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture could subordinate your present mortgage in order to give your Wall Street lender a higher lien.

4. The Secretary could sell your mortgage to your enemies.

5. No leniency is provided—if you fall behind you would be foreclosed.

6. No refinancing is provided—once you're on the hook, you're stuck, even if refinancing might reduce your interest costs.

7. Partial advances are out—you would pay full interest on your full loan right from the start.

8. No procedure is set up for deciding who is to get 2 percent money, if any, or 6 percent money.

9. The REA Administrator is, in effect, abolished—he isn't even mentioned in what would be the new parts of the law.

10. The Secretary of Agriculture is the specified official, but by controlling financing and rates, the Secretary of the Treasury could still dominate all REA policies.

In a nutshell, this proposal insures nothing but bankruptcy for you. It revolves nothing but your system.

THE REA WALL STREET FINANCING BILL

On February 17, 1958, Under Secretary of Agriculture True Morse transmitted to committees of the Congress, for Mr. Benson and Mr. Eisenhower, a proposed bill "to amend the Rural Electrification Act to encourage private participation in financing the loan programs."

This proposed bill calls for the addition of two new titles to the present REA Act—"Title III, Revolving Fund," and "Title IV, Insured Loans." The insured-loans section was described at the Dallas meeting.[1] The revolving-fund section has been added by the administration since then.

The revolving fund

By adding title III to the present REA Act, the proposed legislation would establish what is deceptively called a revolving fund. Examination reveals that it is neither a "fund" in the usual meaning of that word nor does it revolve in the manner of a traditional revolving fund. Title III is obviously misnamed to make it more palatable.

Under the proposed legislation, the fund is supposed to contain the following items: Loans currently outstanding, collections from borrowers, any new congressional authorizations, and proceeds from private financing operations. The proceeds from private financing operations cannot be more than 50 percent of the total of the other items.

At least two items in the fund are highly deceptive: (a) The loans currently outstanding and (b) the collections from borrowers. Neither of these can be available for new loans.

Loans outstanding obviously can't be loaned. What is even more significant is

[1] See printed report of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of NRECA, entitled "Stand Your Ground," February 4, 1958.

this: As soon as a repayment on an outstanding loan is made these collections must be sent immediately to the United States Treasury. They are never available for new REA loans.

So, to say collections from borrowers are part of the fund is like teasing a child by putting money in his piggy bank to get him to go to bed; then taking it out again as soon as he's asleep.

Part of this sleight of hand is revealed in the order of priority in which assets of the fund must be used.

According to the proposal, the fund must be used in the following order of priority:

First, private lenders must be paid their interest and principal.

Second, the United States Treasury must be paid principal and interest due it.

Third, the Secretary of Agriculture must discharge other liabilities he had incurred under the act, such as losses in connection with loans and his costs of operation.

Finally, there could be new loans to rural electric and telephone systems. Funds for these new loans would have to come from private lenders and/or from any further congressional authorizations.

By the administration's own reasoning the fund would revolve to an ever-decreasing amount as the systems repaid their loans via the fund to the Treasury—unless the Congress, as now, would continue to authorize new money for REA. Organized confusion.

Other provisions

But there are also other and more far-reaching detrimental provisions. For instance, the Secretary of Agriculture, as managing trustee of the fund, would have authority to use any borrowers' notes which are considered as assets in the fund to pay off liabilities such as would develop if a borrower defaulted. In other words, the Secretary could sell these notes to a private lender; the private lender, in turn, could sell the paper to a power company or its owners interested in holding a rural electric's mortgage. Thus, a co-op that defaulted could effectively end up in the hands of a power company.

There is no provision for extending payments for delinquent borrowers. Foreclosure is the only course.

There is no provision for refunding or refinancing. Therefore, a borrower would be prevented from taking advantage of any drop in inteerst rates that might occur in the future.

There is no provision permitting a borrower to draw down partial amounts of a loan. This means money would be advanced as loaned and would draw interest from that date.

If the REA Wall Street bill is passed and the Capehart-Hiestand interest-increase bill is not passed, then loans from the revolving fund would carry different rates of interest depending upon the source of the money. Any loans from new funds appropriated by Congress would still be made at the present 2-percent rate. Any loans made from private sources would be made at the higher rates of interest that the private financiers are expected to demand—plus the service charge.

The proposed legislation does not outline the procedure to be used for selecting those borrowers who would be entitled to the 2-percent money, if any. It could be a selective process, subject to discriminations, or it could be prorated among borrowers as such money may or may not be available at a given time.

And, in keeping with the powers contained in the Reorganization Act of 1953, this bill also removes all effective authority and responsibility from the REA Administrator, and places it in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, who, incidentally, is not bound by the nonpolitical requirements of the REA Act.

Bonds and debentures

In order to bring private money directly into the fund the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to issue notes, bonds, debentures or other obligations in the name of the fund—up to the amount Congress would specify for any given year, but never more in the aggregate than 50 percent of the amount to which the fund might be diminished. Assuming all the systems paid off their loans, this could be 50 percent of zero.

And the Secretary of Agriculture could not act without approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus, the Secretary of the Treasury has responsibility for approving: (a) when bonds, etc. shall be sold, (b) the amounts to be sold, (c) how long they shall run, and (d) what rate of interest they shall bear.

Since the proposed bill says the obligations are in no manner guaranteed by the Government, the interest rates would normally run considerably higher than the usual Government obligations. Obviously, administration and other costs would be added, also.

Under terms of the proposal, congressional authorization would still be necessary each year as now, to increase the Federal money in the fund—or even to keep it from diminishing—and congressional action would also be required to specify how much of the borrowed private money may be used in any one fiscal year.

Insured loans

Title IV would establish a program of Federal Government insured loans from funds made available by private lenders.

Under this proposal, a rural electric or telephone system needing a loan would have to find a moneylender willing to make the loan. If and when the borrower finds a willing lender, he would then apply to the Secretary of Agriculture who is authorized—but not directed—to insure the loan if it qualified under such rules and regulations as he himself deems appropriate.

To be eligible for insurance, a loan must bear interest at a rate approved by the Secretary of the Treasury plus a service charge of at least one percent. The loan is also subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine will encourage participation by private lenders. Nothing is said about encouraging rural electrification. As the REA Administrator has stated, without trying to guess the interest rates, interest will fluctuate and vary by regions.

By agreement in the insurance contract, the Secretary of Agriculture will service the insured loans. Thus, the banker takes no risk and does not even have to worry about loan servicing.

The insurance service charge will be set by the Secretary to cover administrative expenses and create a reserve for probable losses. This is an open-end affair. It has a floor but no ceiling. The charge, says the proposal, shall be "an annual charge at a rate equal to at least 1 percent of the outstanding princip l obligations of the loan."

The Secretary will put these insurance charges along with other specified receipts into a rural electrification and telephone loan insurance fund.

Subordination

The proposal to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to subordinate present REA mortgages now totaling about $3 billion in order to give private moneylenders a first mortgage is a part of title IV.

The Secretary is prohibited from subordinating liens in connection with the insured loan program. Except for this limitation he may use his authority when he finds that (a) the private money may be obtained at reasonable rates and terms, (b) the security is reasonably adequate, and (c) the loans will be repaid within a reasonable time.

INTEREST INCREASE BILL WOULD TRIPLE FINANCING COSTS

Legislation to at least triple the REA interest rate was sent to the Congress last July by the President's Director of the Budget Percival Brundage who said that raising the interest rate will encourage substantiation of private financing. Senator CAPEHART of Indiana introduced this bill in the Senate (S. 2427) and Congressman HIESTAND of California, in the House (H. R. 8714).

The Capehart-Hiestand interest increase bill proposes to give the Secretary of the Treasury the power and responsibility to set the minimum rate on loans. He is instructed to fix the rate taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the loans made by the department or agency.

The bill provides that the agency may charge more than this minimum set by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not less.

The bill also provides that an additional amount shall be added to the interest rate adequate to cover REA administrative expenses and probable losses.

By using long-term maturities as a yard stick for fixing the interest rate, the bill selects the highest priced of the Government paper as the guide. The Treasury's long-term bonds always pay a higher interest than short-term borrowings which account for most of the Government's debt. As of June 30, 1957, only 1 percent of the total Federal debt was in the form of securities with a maturity of 35 years or more.

To tie REA interest rates to the long-term cost of money would be downright dishonest. Government does not finance that way. Moreover, if the administration and Congress are going to insist on regarding REA loans as expenditures out of income (with which we don't agree) then it could be argued just as logically that, with a balanced budget, there is no interest cost at all to the Government.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The administration proposals would emasculate one of the most successful social and economic programs ever initiated by the Federal Government. In 2 decades this program has succeeded in bringing rural America out of darkness. Now, President Eisenhower would subordinate the welfare and living standards of rural America to the financial welfare of Wall Street—a small group of monopoly interests who, since the beginning of the REA program, have done everything in their power to destroy the rural electric co-ops and power districts.

For example, the revolving fund is a fraud. To call it a fund or to say that it revolves is outright deception. There will be no more revolving fund under this proposal than we now have. At present, repayments of principal and interest are transferred by REA to the Treasury and this will still be the case under the proposed legislation. Only Congress could make funds available again—just as it does now. So, the only really new feature in this fictitious revolving fund idea is to permit the Secretary to borrow some money from his Wall Street friends.

The cost of financing the rural electric and telephone programs, assuming that private funds would be available—an optimistic assumption, at best—would conservatively be three times what it is today.

Following are some of the initial effects on the rural electrification program which would be created by President Eisenhower's proposed amendments:

(1) The financial destruction of most rural electric cooperatives, for they would be unable to absorb the increased interest costs or to pass the interest costs on to their consumers, if they could find a source of money;

(2) Much higher electric rates for the rural electric consumers on systems financially able to survive, thus subjecting to power-company sellout attacks;

(3) Added drain on local purchasing power in rural areas as more money would be sent out of the community to Washington and Wall Street.

(4) The death of rural electric generation and transmission cooperatives, thus destroying the effective yardstick bargaining weapon of the systems;

(5) Forcing the REA's squarely into the realm of politics because the bills would (a) sidetrack the REA Administrator who is appointed for a 10-year term and who is subject to no politics provision of the original RE Act, and (b) in line with the Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1953, pass control of REA to the Secretary of Agriculture, who, by law, and by practice, is more politically motivated and free to do as he pleases.

(6) Vest in the Secretary of the Treasury, not the Congress, final authority over rates of interest and the sale of bonds, and provide him power to dominate REA policies, even though he is likely to know little or nothing about REA.

What Is the Tax Climate Doing to Michigan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of an article by K. C. Tiffany, vice president of the Burroughs Corp., which appeared in the April 1958 issue of Inside Michigan magazine. This article is condensed from an address delivered before the Detroit Rotary Club on February 5, 1958, and is entitled "What Is the Tax Climate Doing to Michigan?"

The article follows:

WHAT IS THE TAX CLIMATE DOING TO MICHIGAN?

(By K. C. Tiffany, vice president, Burroughs Corp.)

There are many factors which make a State a good place in which to do business and earn a living. The tax structure is one of the major factors. Other factors are productivity per man-hour, availability of labor, labor relations, industrial sites, utilities, transportation facilities and last but not least governmental atmosphere favorable to business and industry.

The January 1957 labor market reports of the Michigan Employment Security Commission state that employment in manufacturing industries in the State of Michigan totaled 1,230,000 in 1953.

According to the January 1958 market report manufacturing employment dropped to 1,022,000 as of December 15, 1957. This is a decrease of 208,000 jobs from 1953 to date. Analysis of these reports reveals that every class of durable goods manufacturing industry had fewer employees on December 15, 1957, than in 1953.

A review of United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, reports reveal that total employment in manufacturing increased 12.25 percent from 1950 through 1956. Manufacturing jobs in 1950 totaled 15,003,000 and in 1956 increased to 16,841,000, a gain of 1,838,000.

Every State in the Union—except Michigan and Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia, shared in this job increase. Michigan had 1,800 fewer jobs in manufacturing in 1956 than in 1950—Rhode Island lost 18,600 jobs, and the District of Columbia lost 500 jobs. Percentage gains ranged from 130.32 in Arizona to 0.39 in West Virginia.

All Great Lakes States, except Michigan, gained in manufacturing employment. Percentage gains were: Ohio, 13.53; Minnesota, 12; Illinois, 9.08; Wisconsin, 8.44; and Indiana, 6.72. Michigan decreased 0.17 percent.

It is only in recent years that Michigan is at a disadvantage taxwise in luring new industry, expansion of industry, and retaining of existing industry. Ten years ago, taxwise, it was advantageous to do business in Michigan. But since 1948 two taxes imposed solely on business have increased more than 1200 percent.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, business taxes amounted to $8½ million. Due to an increase by normal economic growth, two increases in rate, and elimination of the $50,000 maximum, the yield of the franchise tax alone has increased to over $47 million. In addition, the business activity tax, amounting to about $65 million annually, has been imposed on business. This kind of atmosphere is unfavorable to industrial expansion.

At a time when States are competitively bidding for industrial development, we find our own State severely handicapped by high State and local taxes, threat of new and higher taxes, and a hostile atmosphere toward industry. The State of Pennsylvania, once considered a high tax State, has taken definite steps to improve its tax climate. We in Michigan must take similar steps if we are to retain our present payroll and encourage expansion and new plants in Michigan.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States estimated recently that 100 new manufacturing jobs in a community meant 174 new jobs, when the additional shopkeepers and doctors and television repairmen were included. The chamber estimated that the same 100 jobs meant an increase of $360,000 annually in retail sales of $590,000 in personal income.

In 1957 the governor proposed to solve the State's financial problems by imposing a 6 percent corporate income tax. He conveyed the impression that a 6 percent rate compared with New York's 5½ percent, Pennsylvania's 6 percent, and California's 4 percent.

In reality a 6 percent corporate income tax when coupled with the business activities tax, would amount to an income tax rate in excess of 11 percent. In addition to State taxes corporations in Michigan pay $100 to $125 million annually in personal property taxes. New York does not levy a personal property tax.

I cannot agree with the thinking that further increases in State taxes will solve the State's financial problems. In spite of enormous increases in both State and local taxes since 1948, we are again this year facing a deficit in the State general fund of about 30 million.

In 1952 and again in 1953 the legislature appointed a legislative interim committee to study finances. This legislative committee appointed a citizens advisory group. Princeton surveys were engaged by the committee to study the Michigan tax picture. This study revealed that Michigan's problem was not insufficient taxes, but rather its State-aid policy.

The Princeton survey study showed that the legislature had lost effective control over the financial policies of the State of Michigan. This loss of control was due to constitutional mandate as well as to political restraints. These provisions compel the distribution of enormous sums of money to counties, cities, villages, townships, and school districts each year.

The study also showed that all local governments combined receive more in State aid than they levied in property taxes; and only 26 percent of the total receipts of the State were subject to the discretionary control of the legislature. The reason for the failure of State aid to achieve the desired results was due to two main reasons:

1. Too much money was distributed to too many local units and schools under self-service provisions without regard to the need of either local governments or the State itself.

2. There was too little self help due to gross underassessment of real estate, which is destined to have a fatal effect on local financial independence wherever there is a real estate tax limitation. There were differences as great as 50 percent to 100 percent in the State aid payments to counties of similar wealth.

One city reported State aid exceeding 50 percent of its total receipts exclusive of utility finances, whereas three cities reported State aid of less than 10 percent. This condition is substantially the same today. This is the reason why we are again in financial difficulties. This condition will continue to exist until our policy of State aid is corrected.

I believe that time and experience has proved to us that increased taxes is not the solution to our fiscal problem. Increasing taxes only prolongs the day of reckoning. We must correct the basic cause—State aid policies—which encourage wasteful spending. Michigan spending and taxes must be adjusted so that Michigan industry will again be competitive with industry in other States.

The Governor has stated that the State of Michigan is not facing its responsibilities with elementary and secondary schools, colleges, health and welfare and other State services. Let's look at the facts.

The biggest item by far is the cost of elementary and secondary education.

State government finances prepared and published by the Bureau of Census shows that for the period from 1951 through 1956 inclusive, Michigan with an average population of less than 7 million paid out in State aid to school districts, $1,186,000,000 compared to $649 million in Ohio with an average population of 8.3 million and Illinois $531 million with an average population of 9 million.

In other words, Michigan paid out to local school districts in State aid more than the States of Ohio and Illinois combined which populationwise compare: Michigan 7 million; Illinois and Ohio, 17.2 million. Only two States exceeded Michigan on State aid to schools. New York with $1,986,000,000 with an average population of 15.4 million and California $2,482,000,000 with an average population of 11.3 million.

In 1948, there were 984,576 students in the public schools of Michigan. In 1957, there were 1,454,000 children. This is an increase of 47.7 percent. In 1948 the schools received $82.8 million in local taxes and $108.3 million in State aid or a total of $191.1 million. In 1956 Michigan school districts received $244.7 million from local taxes and $248.7 million in State aid, or a total of $493.4 million, or an increase of 158.2 percent.

Here is the story on higher education. The Governor claims the State is not doing its share. Here are the comparative figures for all the State institutions of higher education, except Wayne University.

	1948	1956	Percentage increase
Student enrollment	48,000	68,000	41.7
State funds	$18,000,000	$70,000,000	288.3
Student fees and tuition	$15,000,000	$16,500,000	10.0

Here is part of the answer why no amount of taxes will ever be sufficient for the State of Michigan. Nationally 45 percent of the students attend private colleges and 55 percent public colleges. In Michigan 82 percent attend public colleges and 18 percent private colleges. The reason for this disparity can be attributed to lower subsidized tuition in public colleges.

In State institutions in Michigan the student pays between 15 percent and 20 percent of the cost of operation. In private colleges the student pays between 50 percent and 55 percent of the cost of operation. The average tuition in private colleges is $374 as against about $225 in State colleges. If this trend continues, the worst is yet to come. If the State colleges continue to take students from the private colleges and force them to close, the taxpayers will have to take care of approximately 16,000 additional students who are now in private colleges at a cost of approximately $8,000 per student for operation and capital improvements.

Another major factor contributing to our financial troubles is health and welfare. The State of Michigan through State aid pays about 80 percent of the total cost of welfare. The program for mentally diseased persons alone costs the State approximately $60 million a year. This item alone could be considerably reduced. Since the State bears the total expense, except for the first year of commitment, the probate courts in most counties are lax on commitments.

In this program alone, the State could save approximately $30 million by requiring the county of commitment to pay 50 percent of the cost. It has been indicated that there are many elderly people in State institutions who are not mentally diseased and should not be there. If the requirements for admittance in a State institution and the collection procedures were strengthened, and the county required to pay 50 percent of the cost, this needed program could be carried on with considerable saving both to the State and the county.

We will never solve our financial problems in Michigan until we tackle our wasteful State-aid policy. Whenever a community can spend a dollar knowing that less than 50 cents is coming out of its own pocket, the result will be more spending. This is the result in about three-fourths of the school districts, most townships, and almost half of the villages in Michigan.

Our school problems will never be solved until we have a complete reorganization of school districts.

Michigan should not have more than 300 school districts. At the present time it has about 3,000. The ideal school district should have sufficient number of pupils to run a complete school from kindergarten through grade 12. Properly planned, each school district would have such facilities and would have an adequate tax base.

Higher education should require more contribution from the students in the way of higher tuition and fees. I cannot agree with the philosophy that the State owes each citizen a college education. We recognize that student fees and tuitions cannot cover the total cost. But, certainly the students should pay more than 15 percent or 20 percent of the cost of a college education.

If we continue our present policies, more taxes are inevitable. Business in Michigan cannot stand any more new taxes or increase in business taxes. Industry is already moving out or staying away from Michigan. If we continue this trend and we lose job-giving industry, our economy will decline and present taxes will yield less.

Michigan must reverse the present trend of losing payrolls. We cannot reverse this trend so long as business taxes are higher than surrounding States, or business is threatened with higher taxes and governmental atmosphere unfavorable to business and industry.

Michigan business is not looking for a tax subsidy. Michigan business wants to pay its share.

An equitable tax policy that guarantees that business and industry will be asked to assume no more than its fair share of the costs of Government will insure industrial expansion with the resultant job opportunities and economic growth.

The Omnibus Education Act of 1958, H. R. 11960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, I addressed the House for 1 hour on the need for a realistic Paul Bunyan plan for education. Today I am introducing the Omnibus Education Act of 1958, H. R. 11960, which I originally proposed on March 10.

I shall not make a statement at this time but should like to refer you to pages 3261–3272 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10.

H. R. 11960 provides for the following amounts of money to be expended:

Grants-in-aid and payments to individuals and institutions	Loans-in-aid and advances	Description of aid
$2,500,000,000	----------	Elementary and secondary school construction and equipment.
----------	$500,000,000	Local school board purchase fund (a revolving fund).
----------	10,000,000,000	Advances to reserve funds (credit assistance to State school financing agencies).
3,000,000,000	----------	Operation of public elementary and secondary schools (increase of teacher salaries, building operation and maintenance, pupil transportation, expansion of curriculums).
1,000,000,000	----------	Guidance and counseling (institutes; aid to State agencies).
500,000,000	----------	Undergraduate scholarships.
----------	10,000,000,000	National student loan fund (a revolving fund).
500,000,000	----------	Summer-school and extension courses for teachers.
500,000,000	----------	Graduate fellowships.
500,000,000	----------	New educational mediums (research, experimentation, equipment—radio, television, and motion pictures).
400,000,000	----------	Special education for exceptional children.
200,000,000	----------	School health services and research in child health.
100,000,000	----------	Adult education.
700,000,000	----------	Vocational education below college grades (agriculture, including onfarm training; home economics; trade and industry; and distributive occupations).
100,000,000	----------	School lunches.

Tribute to Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very wonderful, eloquent, and richly deserved tribute to our able, distinguished colleague, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, outstanding Member of the House, delivered by my valued friend, Gen. William J. Blake, for many years able, efficient, and devoted manager of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Boston.

This fine tribute was rendered at the 5th annual good government dinner of the Crosscup-Pishon Post, No. 281, American Legion, of Boston, and every member of the House will acknowledge its appropriateness in bringing attention to Mrs. ROGERS' great, unselfish contributions to the cause of the veteran:

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Reverend clergy, comrade commander, comrades of the Legion, my friends, it is to be my pleasure and privilege to do very inadequately, in the next few minutes, what it has been my earnest desire to do for over 35 years.

What I wish to do is essentially simple. It is to thank EDITH NOURSE ROGERS for what she has done for over a quarter of a century—to thank her for what she has represented during this long period of years.

It is not impossible that I have had the inestimable privilege of working closer with her during this long span of years than has anyone else in the service of our Government. During those years, it has been my solemn responsibility to care for the welfare of the men and women of Massachusetts who served with the colors in all wars and who now reside within the area under the jurisdiction of the Boston regional office of the Veterans' Administration.

When I assumed office, there were on our rolls many veterans of the Spanish-American War and a few lingering survivors of the Civil War. The bulk of our responsibility concerned the veterans of the First World War—that war which was fought to save democracy and to end war. Beyond was the undreamed of holocaust of the Second World War and the savage toll of the Korean conflict.

This span of years extends in retrospect to Gettysburg and to Chancellorsville. It views in prospect beyond the 20th century to the year 2,000 and the years beyond.

America has a solemn responsibility and a solemn trust where the veterans of the 19th and 20th century are concerned.

If that lasting peace for which we all pray shall come to pass, it is these men and women who have made it possible. By that high standard must their worth be measured.

When the history of the Veterans' Administration is written, there will be in it no more honorable passage than the one that recounts the extraordinary service of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS and her untiring devotion to the welfare of our American veterans.

It is no slight on other Members of Congress also devoted to his welfare to say that no one, in or out of Congress, has ever done so much for the veteran as this lady from our own beloved Massachusetts.

To call the roster of bills which she has introduced for the care of veterans, which she has worked with might and main to see made into law and made effective in that great cause, would be virtually to retell the entire story of veterans' legislation.

Most of the Bills for the care of the blind and the parapiegics, for the special hospitalization of women veterans, for the rehabilitation of those for whom the light of hope still flickers, and the abiding care of those for whom that light has dimned forever on earth have been her work. Where veterans are concerned, she is not the Congressman from Massachusetts. She is the all-American Congressman.

The man or woman who has served and suffered in defense of our great country is her constituent, whether he be northerner or southerner, Republican or Democrat, Christian or Jew, white, Negro, Indian, or oriental. To her compassion there is no barrier, and she recognizes no barrier to making that compassion effective.

Abraham Lincoln in his Second Inaugural Address said in part, "We here dedicate ourselves to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who has borne the brunt of battle, and his widow and orphans."

Mrs. ROGERS is a woman dedicated in the same spirit to that same noble cause. She dedicated herself to it in 1925 when she succeeded her husband in the Halls of Congress. She has never wavered in her dedication in the 33 intervening years. When her day in Congress is done (and may that day be long deferred), she can look back upon the vista of the years and see one solemn dedication prevailing through them all.

She has bound up the Nation's wounds.

She has cared for him who bore the brunt of battle.

She has had compassion on his widow and his orphans.

It has been a noble dedication nobly fulfilled.

Only a noble and divinely inspired soul could have accepted that dedication and carried it to fulfillment.

I thank you, Comrade Commander, and the men of this gallant post of the Legion, for the honor you have paid me tonight by allowing me to pay homage to that noble and dedicated spirit—to our own beloved and courageous EDITH NOURSE ROGERS—Congressman from Massachusetts.

A Name To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the April 9, 1958, issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph concerning Joseph Yablonski, newly appointed president of United Mine Workers, Pittsburgh District, No. 5.

"Jock," as he is known to all of his friends, resides in Clarksville, Pa., in my congressional district. I have known him and his family for a number of years and have watched his career with interest. His father, Stephen, came to this country from the coal mines of Poland and first arrived in Pittsburgh in 1905. The family later settled in California, Pa. Jock is an excellent example of the familiar occurrence—the son of a non-English speaking immigrant rising to a position of importance in America.

Jock went to work in the coal mine when he was just 14 years of age. At 23 he became president of the UMWA local at California and in 1942 he became a member of the international board. He has a fine background of the mining industry and knows the problems of the miners and their families.

While Jock's duties as board member and president of Pittsburgh District No. 5 keep him quite busy, he still finds time to devote to his hobby—writing. His wife, Margaret, enjoys the same hobby and they collaborated in writing and producing a comedy, Shorty, based on the lives of miners. It had a month's run in the Playhouse at Pittsburgh. Jock has also written articles for magazines and his recognition as a writer reached new heights when he had an article published in Esquire.

Jock has rendered the enthusiastic prediction that the coal industry "will bounce back in the years ahead." This optimistic view is encouraging and gives new hope to all who are concerned with the coal industry and the great part it plays in our economy. On behalf of all Jock's friends, and the miners and their families, I want to extend to him best wishes for continued success in the years ahead.

The editorial follows:

A NAME TO REMEMBER

The presidency of district 5 of the United Mine Workers of America is an important office—an office which confers distinction on its holder, whoever he may be.

The presidents of district 5 usually serve over a long period of years and their names become household words in every coal-mining community.

Patrick T. Fagan, now city councilman, was president of district 5. He was followed by John P. Busarello, who retired the other day at 70.

Mr. Busarello is being succeeded by Joseph Yablonski. That is a name to remember, for the president of district 5 is an influential citizen.

The district takes in all of Allegheny and Washington Counties and parts of Fayette, Beaver and Westmoreland Counties. Not many years ago the UMWA had a membership of 31,000 in district 5. It has dwindled to 7,300, but if coal comes back to the extent expected the district's membership will mount again, notwithstanding the continued introduction of labor-saving machines.

However, it is not with the coal industry that we are concerned here but with the personalities of the presidents of district 5. Their stories are inspiring.

Like his predecessors, Mr. Yablonsky went to work in the mines when he was very young. That was the time when miners were ill paid and the work was much more dangerous than now. If they struck for better conditions they were terrorized by the notorious coal and iron police, now happily a thing of the past.

One might suppose that men who began their careers in such an environment would turn out to be rough uncouth fellows. But that would be an erroneous supposition.

The presidents of district 5 always have been hard fighters for what they believed to be right, but they were not lacking in refinement. Mr. Yablonski has written magazine articles for important publications. He and Mrs. Yablonski, a graduate of California (Pa.) State Teachers College, collaborated in writing a comedy, "Shorty," based on the lives of miners. It ran for a month at the Playhouse.

Mr. Yablonski is another example of what has now become a familiar phenomenon—the son of a non-English-speaking immigrant rising to a position of importance in America. Mr. Yablonski's father came to Pittsburgh from Poland and the president of district 5 was born in the strip.

And this directs attention to another recent development of importance in the Pittsburgh district:

The Sun-Telegraph commented the other day on the introduction of the teaching of French into 93 grade schools and a few kindergartens in Pittsburgh.

Now it is announced that Clairton has gone Pittsburgh one better by arranging to establish in the Clairton High School next year courses in the Russian and German languages, in addition to French, Spanish and Latin.

The noteworthy feature in this is the decision to teach Russian. French, German and Spanish have been taught in some of our public schools for many years, but the important Slavonic languages, spoken by so large a segment of the human race and the mother tongues of so many people in the Pittsburgh district, have been completely neglected.

With the introduction of a course in the Russian language in the Clairton High School it is to be hoped the way has been paved for the development of greater interest in all the major Slavonic tongues.

Dr. Karl Bohren, superintendent of Clairton schools, and Principal Bruce Birch of the high school give some good advice in this connection. They are asking their pupils who have foreign-born parents to encourage the use of their native languages in the home, Dr. Bohren says:

"We are reversing the way we used to think. In the past it was 'un-American' to speak anything but English and young people were ashamed of their native tongues. Now it is an asset."

With its many thousands of inhabitants from eastern and southern Europe, the Pittsburgh district is in excellent position to foster and encourage interest in the Slavonic and other foreign languages.

Experiments by Teen-Age Rocketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the first of a series of articles written by George Allen on the danger to public safety posed by clandestine experiments by teen-age rocketeers, and the consequent possible loss to the Nation of a large pool of scientific talent through the attempted suppression of their activities. I understand the program proposed by Captain Brinley, and outlined in the body of the article, is under consideration by appropriate officials in the Defense Department. This article appeared in the April 15, 1958, edition of the New York World-Telegram:

AGENCIES CONDEMN EXPERIMENTS

(First of a series by George N. Allen)

In this frontier-smashing age of space exploration, the zooming amount of audience

participation by small fry is posing a threat to public tranquility.

In this zeal to pace the rocketmen at Cape Canaveral and White Sands, the spaceage Tom Swifts have been blowing off fingers and hands with deadly regularity. The lives of many are threatened every time one of their homemade Explorers blasts off its backyard launching pad.

Agencies like the board of education, the American Rocket Society and the National Safety Council have condemned teenage experiments with live rockets.

MANY UNAWARE OF LAW

The best the adult world has come up with to date is a few pious hopes that boys will experiment with explosive only under adequate supervision. Meanwhile, the basement rocketeers, with Ben Franklin and Henry Ford in mind, continue to handle dangerous fuels without supervision or assistance.

Many boys—and their parents and science teachers—are not aware that their activities are against the law. Section 1894 of the New York State penal law forbids the keeping, mixing or transporting of explosives except by those who get a permit. Injuring the person or property of another with explosives is a felony. The keeping of explosives in homes by anyone is expressly prohibited. If a science teacher wants to keep rocket fuel in his laboratory, he must get permission from the fire department and other city agencies.

Since January 1 the police department's bomb squad has investigated seven explosions caused by teenage rocketeers. One boy lost a finger, another had his legs ripped by rocket fragments, a third had first- and second-degree burns on his face.

The toll has been similar throughout the metropolitan area. In February, a 22-year-old Long Island youth lost part of his thumb, his index finger and the tips of other fingers on his left hand when his rocket exploded. His jaw was fractured and 100 stitches taken in his face.

An 8-year-old boy's skull was fractured in Newark when two teen-agers attempted to fire a rocket near where he was playing. A Vineland, N. J., teen-ager lost a thumb and two fingertips in a rocket explosion.

ONE MAN HAS DATA

Only one man has an idea how many amateur rocketeers there are in the metropolitan area and where they are. He is Capt. Bertrand R. Brinley, chief of the First Army's news desk, the only adult actively trying to bring junior-grade space exploration out of metropolitan area attics and cellars and into supervised experimental clubs and areas.

He estimates that more than 500 rockets have been fired from rooftops and vacant lots in this area in the last 5 months. He has direct evidence of 1,215 junior astronauts within 20 miles of Manhattan and estimates that there are three times that number. There will be about 5,000 teen-age experimenters in the metropolitan area by summer, he warns.

LETTERS SPARKED INTEREST

Captain Brinley won't attempt even an estimate on the quantity of explosives the boys have squirreled away in bedrooms, basements and garages.

Captain Brinley became interested when letters to the First Army from teen-agers requesting technical information on rockets reached flood proportions. Through the press he issued a general appeal to the boys to let him know what they were doing.

The results both appalled and heartened him. Boys throughout New England, New York, and New Jersey wrote casually about hair-raising experiments with lethal quantities of explosive fuels. The letters showed that 70 percent of the experimenters are under 15. Virtually none are aware of the danger to other people in a misfire or an erratic trajectory. Very few groups have any kind of sponsorship or supervision.

A check with some of the rocket clubs in the city showed the captain that many boys were amazingly advanced in the theory and practice of space exploration. A high percentage of the boys intend to be space scientists.

GOT ARMY'S OK

Impressed, Captain Brinley got Army permission to spend full time on devising a program to help them. He told the World-Telegram and Sun:

"The program is designed to help the boys who have advanced beyond the stages of candle-stick rocketry. Some of them have long surpassed their science teachers in their knowledge of astronautics and instrumentation. I wouldn't be surprised if, given enough money, a dozen of the best were able to orbit a satellite in a year to 18 months."

A Man's Fight for His Reputation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again I call attention to one of the sorriest stories of injustice ever to fall within my experience. It is a shameful story but it is a true one. I commend it to the Members of the House of Representatives because this body is responsible for the Commission which deliberately perpetrated the injustice and which now steadfastly refuses to right its wrong.

If this body sees fit to scrutinize the grisly procedures and arbitrary actions of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, it will find that an American citizen, a former Korean prisoner of war who won decorations for bravery in action, has been denied compensation to which he is entitled, and stripped of his reputation without the opportunity of defending himself.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of a free nation is seriously weakened when government rides roughshod over the rights of individual citizens. I hope and pray that the following article, which appeared in the April issue of Redbook magazine, will prompt this body to take steps to correct the wrong which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has committed and, by so doing, to protect the fundamental strength of our democratic form of government:

A MAN'S FIGHT FOR HIS REPUTATION

(By William Peters)

(The story of Joseph Hammond, as reported here, has two parts: his experience as a prisoner of war in Korea and his experience with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in this country. All we can report of what happened in Korea is what Hammond and his fellow prisoners of war say happened there. The authorities who rejected Hammond's story have offered no evidence to contradict it; the Chairman of the Commission has rejected a request for detailed comment on this article. Joseph Hammond's story presents a vivid firsthand account of life as a prisoner of the Chinese Communists, but this is not the primary reason for presenting it. The actions of an official Government body in this case, we feel, constitute a serious abuse of individual rights and demonstrate the need for safeguards against the kind of procedure by which Joseph Hammond was deprived both of the compensation due him as an American prisoner of war, and of his good reputation.—THE EDITORS.)

When Joseph Hammond came home to Toledo, Ohio, in the fall of 1953, he brought with him an honorable discharge from the Army, a Bronze Star for heroism in combat and an assortment of scars. On his right wrist was the mark of a bullet wound received the day he was captured by Chinese Communist troops in North Korea. On both wrists were signs of the sharp-edged Chinese handcuffs which had been screwed down tightly at various times during his 33 months as a prisoner of war. On his left wrist were the faint remains of a self-inflicted wound—an attempt at suicide after 27 days in a wooden box.

Hammond had survived beatings, brutality, solitary confinement, near-starvation diets, disease, two trials by Chinese courts-martial and incessant attempts at Communist indoctrination. He had seen fellow prisoners die for lack of food, warmth and medical care; had helped prisoners to escape, only to see them recaptured; had escaped himself, only to be retaken.

But with all the physical and mental scars of his experience, Joseph Hammond made a good start toward adjustment as a civilian. In March 1954, he married Colleen Priniski, a girl he had known for years. That spring, while receiving a 40-percent disability pension awarded him by the Veterans' Administration, they moved to Detroit, where Hammond enrolled at an electronics school under the VA's rehabilitation program. In January 1955, they returned to Toledo to undertake a more ambitious program: Hammond, bent on a degree in electrical engineering, entered the University of Toledo and found full-time night employment as a die-cast machine operator.

Then, on October 27, 1955, began an experience which was to upset the young couple's plans completely. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (FCSC) denied Hammond's claim for compensation as a prisoner of war in Korea. The law provides payment of $2.50 for each day that a POW's captors fail to live up to the food, labor and treatment provisions of the Geneva Convention. In Hammond's case, this would have amounted to about $2,500. The law specifically denies compensation to prisoners who "at any time, voluntarily, knowingly and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served" the enemy. While proof of eligibility rests with the claimant, the FCSC has adopted the presumption that the North Korean and Chinese forces did in fact fail to meet Geneva Convention standards. The only question in Hammond's case, then, was that of willing aid to the enemy.

The FCSC's letter denying his claim said simply that "after due consideration of the claimant's application and all the evidence of record in this matter, including a summary of information from the Department of Defense, the Commission finds that the claimant has failed to sustain the burden of proof as to his eligibility * * *." He was, the letter continued, entitled to a hearing. Hammond wrote at once, requesting one.

Weeks went by without response, and Hammond went to an attorney. On December 9, the FCSC wrote the attorney that a hearing had been set for December 19, in Washington, D. C., and that Hammond had been sent a summary of information about his case. He had, however, received no such summary. A telephone call to Washington brought word that the summary had been

returned undelivered to the commission and that he could pick it up when he got there. Hammond drove to Washington, arriving on Friday, December 16.

"I picked up the summary of information at the FCSC" he recalls. "Knowing I had only 2 days to prepare for the hearing, I was stunned when I read it."

Here is what he read:

"The Commission is authorized to state that it has certain information before it which tends to show that while a prisoner of war in Korea you:

"A. Assisted the Communist propaganda program by:

"1. Writing and circulating peace petitions promoting Communist causes.

"2. Writing and publishing articles containing information adverse and inimical to the interest of the United States.

"3. Drawing cartoons which promoted communism and reflected adversely on the United States.

"4. Participating in the preparation and dissemination of front-line surrender leaflets.

"5. Attempting to influence prisoners of war to accept communism.

"6. Participating in the publication called New Life.

"7. Actively participating in a group called yen-so-yen (workers), whose apparent mission was to interrogate and indoctrinate newly captured prisoners of war.

"8. Serving as chairman of the camp peace committee.

"B. Received the following preferential treatment from the hostile forces:

"1. Better medical care than the other prisoners of war.

"2. Better food and better clothing.

"3 Easier jobs.

"C. Cultivated the friendship of and were overly friendly with the hostile forces.

"D. Frequently visited the Chinese officials of the prisoner of war camp by invitation and voluntarily both by day and at night.

"E. Were selected and approved by the hostile forces for special jobs such as squad leader and chairman of the peace appeal committee."

To Hammond this list was tantamount to an accusation of treason. "I knew that the charges must have originated with the Army, but I couldn't understand why. If they felt I was guilty of such things, why hadn't they made me stand trial before a general court-martial instead of giving me an honorable discharge?"

Joe Hammond's question was never answered during his hearing. Forbidden to examine the evidence against him, to have specific information as to names, dates, and places, or to cross-examine the witnesses on whose anonymous testimony the broad charges were based, he was allowed only to disprove the charges, if he could.

Before the hearing, Hammond sought help from the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion. He learned that the law required the commission to complete action on his claim within a year of the date it was filed. That meant that a final decision would have to be made within 3 days after the hearing. "The whole affair was being compressed into a total of 6 days," Hammond says, "2 days in which to prepare for my hearing, 1 day to be heard, and 3 days for the commission to decide whether or not I was a traitor."

With a promise that two Legion officials would represent him at the hearing, Hammond telephoned Salvatore R. Conte, of Brooklyn, N. Y., a fellow prisoner-of-war who he felt might be able to testify for him on such short notice. Conte had not only been captured with him but was one of the few American soldiers actually decorated by the Army for his activities as a prisoner. Conte agreed immediately to come to Washington.

In the hours between Friday afternoon and Monday morning, Joe Hammond had plenty of time to think about the charges against him.

His introduction to military life had come early. In November 1942, 16-year-old Joe Hammond quit his vocational high school and, falsifying his age, joined the Coast Guard. A year later, still under age, he was discharged as "unfit for military duty." He immediately went to New York and became an ordinary seaman in the merchant marine. For 5 years he sailed all over the world.

In November 1948, he went home to Toledo to help his mother while his stepfather recovered from a broken back. Less than a year later, when his stepfather was well again, he enlisted in the Army. When the Korean war broke out in June 1950, he volunteered for a company alerted for overseas shipment and was sent first to Japan and then, in September, to participate in the Inchon landing.

In November there were rumors that the Chinese Communists had put a division of troops across the Yalu River into North Korea. The Army newspaper Stars and Stripes reported that Americans captured in skirmishes with the Chinese had been given propaganda material, told they had been duped into fighting in Korea, and then released through the front lines. While Hammond and his comrades pondered these strange tactics, hundreds of thousands of Chinese troops poured across the Yalu, driving a deep wedge into the U. N. lines.

Early on the morning of December 3, Joe Hammond volunteered for the assignment which resulted in his capture. With Sal Conte, he set out in a jeep to try to make contact with a lost infantry company. "Joe and I had been together since Edgewood, Md.," Conte recalls. "He was a great reader, obviously well educated, and I was amazed when I learned that he hadn't finished high school. In Korea, Joe proved to be a good soldier. He was older than most of us; he knew his weapons, and he understood tactics. He was always volunteering for dangerous details."

The detail that bitterly cold morning was indeed dangerous—to drive 8 miles beyond the last Marine-held roadblock with a sealed message for a company presumed to have been cut off by Chinese troops. Along the desolate, winding road, they picked up a straggler from the lost company. A little farther on they heard small-arms fire and, assuming it was the company in a fight with guerrilla forces, hurried ahead.

Topping a final rise, they emerged on a large, exposed plateau. Within minutes, the jeep was under fire from hills on both sides. Hammond drove recklessly, looking for a spot to turn around. Then the jeep was hit, and the three men dove out. In a dash for the protection of some abandoned trucks, Hammond was wounded in the wrist and the straggler was separated from them. Lying in the freezing water of a ditch, Hammond and Conte ate the sealed message and then, looking up suddenly, found themselves covered by enemy soldiers with submachine-guns.

"At the top of a hill," Hammond says, "they took our personal belongings, food, cigarettes and coats and then began beating us with pistols. Beside a large ditch, they forced me to kneel. One aimed a Mauser at my forehead, and I closed my eyes. When I opened them, he was laughing and putting the pistol away."

That night, with six other prisoners, Hammond and Conte began a 16-day forced march, joined, from time to time, by other groups of prisoners. "The temperature was about 30 below zero," Conte says. "We ate twice a day—black, rotten, frozen potatoes dug from the fields, boiled in their dirt. For water, we ate snow. With frequent changes of guard, we marched sometimes for 36 hours without stopping. When we did stop in unheated Korean houses, it was too cold to sleep. We huddled together and rubbed our feet to keep from freezing. A Filipino who'd been in the Bataan death march said it was a picnic compared to this. On the 11th day, we got our first medical attention. They picked off our scabs and applied gauze. Then we started off again."

Twice during the march, Hammond and Conte were interrogated by English-speaking Chinese. They gave only their name, rank, and serial number, along with a phony unit they had agreed upon. The Chinese insisted that they were not prisoners but friends liberated from an aggressor army, that they would be sent north to universities to learn the truth, and then be released.

By the end of the march, there were about 300 survivors. "We were more dead than alive," Conte says. "I was skin and bones, my feet and legs were ruined, and I was doubled over with cramps. Joe was in even worse shape. He had a raging fever, and his right arm was swollen to twice its normal size. The camp was just some Korean houses near Kanggye, about 5 miles south of the Yalu River. The group was split up into squads of 8 to 12 men who lived together in a room of a Korean house. Joe and I were separated."

Food at the camp consisted of a small ball of sorghum seed, cooked as rice, twice a day. Bad as it was, it was far better than they had been getting. "It was at Kanggye," Hammond says, "that I became a squad leader. One member of each squad was chosen by the Chinese. Though the squads were rigorously segregated from each other, we found ways to communicate when we sent men out for food. As the Chinese talk about school increased, word was passed throughout the camp to pretend to go along. The officers, in a unit by themselves, let us know that this was the policy we should follow—pretend to be indoctrinated in order to be released."

Indoctrination consisted of lectures in a large barn for the whole camp every third day. Though the Chinese called the program voluntary, even the sick and badly wounded were forced at bayonet point to attend. On nonlecture days, the Chinese instructors passed out pencils, paper, and written questions, requiring from each prisoner written, signed answers. Recalcitrant prisoners were called to Chinese headquarters for all-night interrogations, and not allowed to sleep in the daytime until they gave in. Even so, efforts were made by the men to keep their answers ambiguous.

During the 6-week indoctrination period, the Chinese published a camp newspaper called New Life. Signed contributions came partly from these written answers, partly from articles and autobiographies demanded from all prisoners as tests of their sincerity. Again, refusal meant all-night interrogations and threats of punishment or even death. Since food rations had been gradually increased, a threat to send a prisoner from the "university" to a regular POW camp was, in effect, a threat to return him to the conditions of the forced march. To the prisoners that meant death.

Joe Hammond's sole article for New Life was, he maintains, a piece of irony. Back home, he had read a booklet called Communism and Its Aims, published by a committee of Congress. It had impressed him, and he remembered much of it. As accurately as memory permitted, he says, he reproduced it, substituting the word "capitalism" wherever "communism" had been. The result was so distorted that he felt sure the Chinese would catch on, but when it appeared in an edited form over his name he knew he had miscalculated. The other prisoners missed its irony completely.

Ordered to write another article, he says he refused. "When I saw the dangers of writing, I drew cartoons instead. I did three, all calculated to raise prisoner morale.

The first two were published. The third was rejected. Taken to an unheated interrogation shed at 35° below zero, I was told I must put politics into my cartoons. They wanted a picture of an armed revolution in front of the White House. I refused.

"They reminded me they didn't report the names of prisoners, that no one knew I was alive. It would be easy, they said, to dispose of me. After 6 hours in the shed, they sent me back to my squad to reconsider. My squad members urged me to draw something. I finally drew a cartoon strip in which a soldier was captured and released; he returned home and handed a petition to a man at a desk. He said: 'Now that the warmongers have been punished, the people can live in peace.' Nothing in the drawing identified either the soldier's nationality or the 'warmongers.' But when the cartoon was published, the Chinese had changed the quotation to: 'Now that Truman, Dulles, and MacArthur have paid for their crimes, the people can live in peace.' That was the last cartoon I drew."

It was at one of the early indoctrination meetings that Sgt. William H. Olson, an American prisoner, proposed a peace appeal to the United Nations. "We had all agreed to pretend to go along with the indoctrination," Hammond says, "but many of us were shocked at this suggestion. I argued against it, with the result that I had 3 continuous weeks of all-night interrogations. When word was finally passed by the senior American officer not to resist the appeal, I gave up and went along."

In the fifth week of indoctrination, Hammond recalls, two men from each squad met to elect a central committee to draft the appeal, which the Chinese were promoting as a "final examination." Hammond was elected to the committee. At the committee's insistence the senior American officer served as an adviser. The group met only twice. When the Chinese demanded the election of a chairman, each member nominated the man on his right; then each nominee withdrew in order. Hammond, nominated last, withdrew last; but the Chinese insisted he serve.

The appeal was drawn up from suggestions of the committee and the Chinese officers, with the committee trying to keep its language as ambiguous as possible. Two marines took down the suggestions and drew up the final statement. "Then," Hammond says, "it was read to all the prisoners and adopted unanimously. Meanwhile, though, the United Nations had branded the Chinese Communists aggressors in Korea, and the Chinese insisted that a protest against this be included, as well as a reference to the Stockholm peace petition then being circulated throughout the world. I was told that Sergeant Olson made the final changes."

The appeal itself was never signed, although separate, blank sheets of paper were signed by all the prisoners. Even here, they resorted to subterfuge, trading names so that each signature was actually a forgery. Then, having passed their "final examination," the 298 prisoners were jammed into boxcars and taken south to Pyongyang, presumably to be released. In the end, 60 were selected for release; the rest were sent back north, supposedly to organize universities for other prisoners. "There was no apparent basis for the selection of the 60," Conte says. "Joe was among them; I wasn't."

The 60 men were marched for 8 days to a point near Wonsan, where the group was split in half. "Thirty were to be released immediately," Hammond says, "and twenty-nine—one had died on the march—later. I was among the 29. The 30 left in trucks, returning the next day with news that artillery had prevented their release. Nine of my group, including myself, were seriously ill and were taken to a valley, where, for 3 weeks, we got better food and some medical care to build us up for release. Then we rejoined the others at a camp where 300 new prisoners were being held."

At the new camp, Hammond found that members of his old group of 60 had been designated "yen-so-yen," or workers, and assigned the task of interrogating and indoctrinating the new POW's. "We refused flatly," he says, "though they threatened to shoot us. Eventually, we agreed to hand the prisoners blank questionnaires, though we were careful to tell them it was up to them whether or not they filled them out. The third day I was there, 17 of our group of 60 were taken away and released through the lines. The next day, the new prisoners were sent north, and the rest of us were marched to the front, cleaned up and prepared for release. Something went wrong. The day after, we were marched under heavy guard away from the front. I felt then that we'd never be released, and my whole attitude about even pretending to go along with indoctrination changed abruptly."

Two days later, Joe Hammond escaped from his guards, and for 36 hours made his way south. Recaptured, he spent 18 days imprisoned in a flooded air-raid shelter, before being marched barefoot for 5 days to a mining camp being used for prisoners. Within weeks he was in trouble with the Chinese. Refusing to be a squad leader, cursing the Chinese officers, aiding POW's to sell personal belongings to North Korean civilians in exchange for food, he was tried by a Chinese court-martial, found guilty and sentenced to 6 months at hard labor.

In November, 1951, the prisoners were marched to POW Camp No. 1, near Changsong, on the Yalu River. Hammond, with 6 or 7 others, was in the criminal squad, still under sentence. When the sentence was lifted, he led a protest against the soupy sorghum seed, the only food at the new camp. The Chinese listened, made a mild improvement in the food and locked Hammond up as an agitator. Three weeks later, he was placed in the camp's "reactionary squad," a group of 21 particularly intractable prisoners.

"I was in the reactionary squad when Joe joined us." Conte says, "and for 2 months we were kept away from the other prisoners. Then, in December, when some agreement had been reached in the armistice negotiations at Panmunjom, we were split up into several squads and put back with the others. Joe and I managed to stay together, and I was appointed squad leader. Again, we were forced to attend lectures, but our answers to the written questions were not what they wanted. We wrote what we honestly believed."

Meanwhile, Joe Hammond had teamed up with a group of prisoners bent on escape. Knowing something of celestial navigation from his years at sea, he taught it to the others. When maps were needed, he stole one from Chinese headquarters and made copies. Too weak himself to attempt an escape, his feet badly swollen by beriberi, he worked at helping others make the attempt. Several did, but all were recaptured.

In April, forced indoctrinating ended, and only a handful of prisoners continued to attend lectures. On May Day, Conte's squad, led by Conte, Hammond, and another prisoner, were ordered to parade under Red flags and refused. Their example led to the refusal of others and eventually of the whole camp. The march was made without flags. That night at a celebration in the public square the men, emboldened by the open mocking of Mao Tse-tung by a British prisoner, came close to rioting. Arrests of suspected instigators began the next day.

Joe Hammond, ordered to headquarters on the pretext of illegal possession of a piece of rope, maintained it was his. To the Chinese officer's contention that all property belonged to the people, Hammond responded with a string of oaths. When the officer insisted that even his clothing belonged to the Chinese People's Volunteers, Hammond stripped to his undershorts. "I don't want anything from you bastards!" he shouted. "I can survive without your stinking clothes!" Conte, who witnessed this scene, adds: "They marched him off to jail in his shorts. For almost 6 months, he had nothing else to wear."

For 3 weeks Hammond was kept in solitary confinement under constant pressure to confess his crimes and implicate others. "After 2 weeks," he says, "I wrote a confession admitting stealing the map and making copies, aiding POW's to escape, committing sabotage, being insincere and failing to repent my mistakes—all the things I was accused of. I refused to name anyone else, though, and that infuriated the Chinese. They claimed that Conte and I were counterintelligence officers who had deliberately become prisoners to disrupt their program. It was flattering, but I refused to 'confess' that."

Eventually, he was taken to a room lined with wooden boxes. "The boxes were 2 feet wide, 3 feet high, and about 5 feet long, with a barred gate in front. Locked in one, you sat cross-legged, without leaning, for 16 hours a day. If you moved, you were beaten with long poles pushed through the bars. Once a day, if the guards felt like it, you were allowed 30 seconds in the latrine. Otherwise, you ate, slept—lived—in that box. Sal Conte spent almost 6 months in one."

Hammond's membership in what its inmates called the Kennel Club lasted 27 days. Sick, very thin, in constant pain from the tight handcuffs, he broke his metal dogtag in half and slashed his wrist with the sharp edge. "When the guards discovered it they dragged me out, demanding the dogtag at gunpoint. I told them to go ahead and shoot me. Several of them jumped me and took it. Then, for what seemed hours, they beat me with rifle butts. Tired, they screwed my handcuffs down as tight as they'd go and locked me in an abandoned outhouse. Every other day for the next 6 weeks, they took me out to beat me. I was in the outhouse, covered with open sores, still dressed only in shorts, and literally eaten alive by giant, filthy blowflies for 4 months."

Hammond's confinement ended with his second Chinese court-martial in December 1952. Sentenced to 1 year's imprisonment "for his education and benefit," he and 15 others, including Sal Conte, were moved to an isolated valley and put in the first enclosed stockade they had seen in North Korea. All were under court-martial sentences for crimes against the Chinese. Most were still there in August 1953, when they were finally moved to Panmunjom for repatriation.

This was the story Joseph Hammond and Salvatore Conte attempted to tell at Hammond's hearing before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. If it lacked coherence, this was perhaps due to their uncertainty as to what, precisely, the hearing officer, Charles Colish, wanted to know. At Colish's suggestion, Hammond, in sworn testimony, answered each of the items on the summary of information. He flatly denied 10 of them and explained the circumstances of duress involved in the others. Conte then began corroborating his story under oath.

"Conte was still testifying," reports American Legion representative Charles W. Stevens, "when Mr. Colish, in an aside to me, said: 'There is enough in the record now.' This does not appear in the transcript of the hearing for the simple reason that the stenographer was taking Conte's testimony at the time. My next remark, however, does appear. Interrupting Conte, I said: 'Apparently enough has been said for the record to make their decision. Just tell briefly, Salvatore, what you know about Joe's being in solitary.' A few minutes later the hear-

ing was over, and Hammond, Conte, Mr. Marsh (another Legion representative) and I, all having heard Mr. Colish's remark, left with the feeling we had satisfied him with our refutation of the charges."

Three days after Hammond's hearing, and 1 year to the day after he had originally submitted his claim, the 3 FCSC Commissioners, none of whom was present at his hearing, rendered their final decision. In a document signed by all three before a transcript of the hearing had ever been typed, Hammond was informed that "* * * the Commission hereby affirms the disallowance." Hammond had lost.

In frustration and anger, he turned to Congressman THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, of Toledo, for help. ASHLEY told a press conference: "From what I can gather, there has been flagrant abuse in Mr. Hammond's case of the time-honored right of the accused to face his accuser." Over the next 6 months, ASHLEY conducted a lengthy exchange of letters with FCSC Chairman Whitney Gilliliand; addressed the House of Representatives on the subject of "the dangerous development of a new kind of criminal law wherein American citizens are tried and convicted by administrative star chamber bodies"; and sponsored a bill which, among other things would make decisions of the FCSC reviewable in the courts.

Meanwhile, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., a prominent Washington attorney, had agreed to take Hammond's case without fee. He immediately applied for a rehearing, but was denied on the ground that after 1 year the Commission no longer had jurisdiction over claims. Later, possibly because of the pressure of Representative ASHLEY and others, the Commission decided it did have jurisdiction beyond the 1-year deadline. Rauh again applied for a rehearing. This time he was denied because, in Chairman Gillililand's words "* * * our rules do not provide for rehearings * * *."

In testimony before a House subcommittee when the POW war claims law was under consideration, Chairman Gillililand had been questioned closely about the right to a rehearing. His response then: "Under our present regulations there are a whole series of rehearings and reviews before the Commission itself * * * so that within the agency itself there are all kinds of chances to get another bite at the apple * * *." What had happened since June 7, 1954, when this reassuring statement was made, that prevented Joe Hammond from getting even another nibble at the apple, Mr. Gillililand has not explained.

On December 12, 1955, FCSC General Counsel Andrew T. McGuire advised the Commissioners: "It is suggested that in the disallowance of claims * * * in which collaboration is an issue, the decision be based upon the finding that the evidence is insufficient to warrant the conclusion that the claimant while imprisoned was not fed or treated as provided in the Geneva Convention * * *."

This policy, which relieves the Commission of any need to prove that a prisoner of war actually collaborated, blends oddly with its presumption that the Chinese did, in fact, fail to meet Geneva Convention standards. The Commission is, in effect, maintaining not that Hammond collaborated with the enemy, but rather that he failed to refute information showing that he had been treated by the Chinese in accordance with Geneva Convention standards. The Commission has never disclosed such information to Joe Hammond or asked him to refute it.

Among those veterans whose claims have been denied by the Commission on this basis are, in Mr. Gilliliand's words, "a few who may have undertaken to ingratiate themselves with the Communists to further an escape plot or to gain information which might subsequently prove useful to our own forces." It was revealed at congressional hearings on Representative ASHLEY's bill to amend the POW war claims law that men honorably discharged and receiving benefits as disabled veterans (like Joe Hammond) had been denied compensation, while men convicted of aiding the enemy had been awarded their claims.

While Chairman Gilliliand denies that pressure from congressional hearings had anything to do with it, it is a fact that by June 1956, all but 55 of the 252 veterans whose claims had originally been denied were paid in full. By October 1957, the number of claims denied had dwindled to 24. Joe Hammond was one of them.

With the failure of Representative ASHLEY's and similar bills to pass the 84th Congress, it seems that Joe Hammond's battle has reached a dead end. Representative ASHLEY has promised to introduce a new bill in the current Congress, but the chances of its passage are not good.

So Joe Hammond has lost his case. It would have been easier for him not to fight it openly, rather than risk the notoriety to which he and his family have now been exposed. This is his personal tragedy, but it is a far greater tragedy—and one which affects us all—that he was not given a fair opportunity to defend himself against broad and extremely serious charges levied by unnamed accusers.

Support for H. R. 607

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I know there is no group of citizens who are more seriously affected by inflation and the high cost of existence today than our senior citizens who must look to their retirement payments for their major income. It is for this reason that I introduced legislation to increase the annuities of retired civil-service personnel.

This body has passed a compromise bill which calls for a 10-percent increase for some 310,000 retirees and survivors. This will help to take care of those medical bills, those groceries, those rent payments, and those replacements for clothing that confront all of us. As I see it, it may not be enough.

However, it is better to do something than to do nothing. I do think it is a good idea for the Civil Service Commission to make a study and an analysis of the annuity structure and of the methods of adjusting annuities and to report its recommendations.

While this study is being made, H. R. 607 will allow some measure of relief to these former civil-service employees who come under the authority of this bill. This is why I have supported this legislation.

It is good some adjustment is being made for retired civil-service personnel, who, I might add, represent only a small number of older citizens. On the other hand, there are a great many more people on social security. These perhaps suffer more than others because of inflation and the rising cost of living. Something must be done for them.

We must certainly watch the inflationary trend which has reduced the value of dollars received through social-security checks each month, and do all we can to prevent further devaluation. Also, there should be some kind of correction for this injustice in the form of the readjustment of social-security benefits.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this body is aware of its obligation to fulfill the needs, not only of retired civil-service employees, but also of that larger group, the elderly people who must live on their sometimes pitifully small social-security benefits.

Adm. George J. Dufek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during my Naval Reserve training duty last fall, I had the honor and privilege of knowing Adm. George J. Dufek, his wife, and family. I admired the admiral for his ability, courage, leadership, and good fellowship.

Admiral Dufek is doing a tremendous job for our country both in his command of Task Force 43, supporting and supplying forces in Antarctica, and in his public relations with the people of New Zealand, where our forces have their main supply base.

The New Zealand Free Lance, a weekly pictorial paper, had one of its staff writers interview the admiral, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the interview.

PEN PORTRAIT OF GEORGE DUFEK, LEADER, ALL-ROUNDER AND PERFECTIONIST

Across the executive-type desk on the second floor at Operation Deep Freeze headquarters in Christchurch Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, Antarctic projects officer, Commander United States Naval Support Force Antarctica, Commander, Task Force 43, smoked a cigarette thoughtfully in the late-morning sunlight. The desk, shipshape in Navy fashion rather than clinically clean, displayed a plain, varnished nameboard that has travelled far. "George Dufek, Rear Admiral, U. S. N.," it said.

George Dufek, overall boss of a 4,000-man enterprise, described what he looks for in his officers, the qualities of leadership he seeks. He couldn't have etched a more perfect vignette of himself. All the characteristics are his.

Landing at Wigram from the United States in the Skymaster that took him back to Antarctica a while ago, Rear Admiral Dufek received the compliment of a guard of honour from the R. N. Z. A. F. station. It was a day of top brass for Viscount Cobham had flown in half an hour earlier. Rapid inspection over, the admiral enjoyed the delighted salutations of Mrs. Dufek and sons George (going on 10) and David (just 8). Nearby, in two ranks, his officers stood at the salute.

Grinning broadly, striding across, Rear Admiral Dufek described a half-circle with his right hand as exuberant boys do, called a delighted, "Hiya, fellas!" and launched into a round of handshakes and back-pattings. The Dufek handshake, seemingly like everything else about him, is something

he means. It's a grand grip. A few steps away Rear Adm. J. E. H. McBeath, C. B., D. S. O., D. S. C, chief of Naval Staff, smiled warmly.

ON HIS OWN

Dufek's a man on his own. "I'd go anywhere with him—and twice on Sundays." Lt. Cmdr. John Mirabito, his chief meteorological man, told me. "The admiral is a dynamic individual with leadership qualities. Even the way he walks about just spurs people on. I know. I've seen it happen so much down there on the ice."

Comdr. Merle MacBain, chief public information officer of the outfit and formerly chief public relations officer for Adm. R. B. Carney, United States Chief of Naval Operations, confirmed the impression. "He doesn't do it by rule," he affirmed. "He's a natural. There's no explaining what that quality is, but whatever it is he's got it."

The Admiral appears invariably good-natured, as when he received a 12-year-old girl, keen to have the Dufek's 2 lads join the Salvation Army cub pack, gave her a signed photograph, a donation for the self-denial appeal and a promise to talk it over with Mrs. Dufek.

"That's right," said MacBain. "But being good-natured and being pushed around are two things. You don't see anybody pushing George Dufek around."

When he's in Christchurch, Admiral Dufek begins his day at 7, then in his crocus-colored rental car he's driven off by John Czerwinsky from his rented residence at Fendalton with the two boys. After dropping them off at St. Andrew's College he is at his office by 8:15 or 8:30. At 10:30 there's a staff conference with principal officers from the headquarters staff—about 40 of them—when he gets reports on ship and plane movements, weather prospects, and general progress.

"I just keep going till lunch time, when someone says, 'Come on, I'll take you out for lunch'," the Admiral explained. "Round about 2 I'm back to go through dispatches, deal with correspondence, and maybe have some individual conferences. Round about 4:45 I pack up and go home."

Having his home in Christchurch rates high with the Deep Freeze commander. No one who saw the family reunion at Wigram could doubt the rich bonds that bind the Dufeks together. His book, "Operation Deep Freeze," he dedicated "to my wife, Muriel, and to our children, who waited steadfastly during my many long absences—and who filled my life with happiness when I was home from the sea."

He places on record that "a Navy career may sound very romantic and interesting, but it is a little rugged on a family. * * * During the Korean war, when I commanded the aircraft carrier *Antietam*, I was absent from my family for most of a year. One day David asked his mother, 'What is Daddy—a man or a ship?'"

Evenings at home in Christchurch mean a family meal, reading books (Admiral's choice, biographies: "What men accomplished, and how and why they did it"), playing records (a prime favorite, "Warsaw Concerto"), helping "the kids" with their homework (the Admiral's proud of the schoolboys, laughingly told press men the day they started at St. Andrew's: "I hope they don't come home with bloody noses"—they didn't), or maybe entertaining a few friends. "There's never a dull moment," he sums it up. By 10:30 or 11 p. m. it's bedtime.

Rear Adm. George Dufek, direct-eyed, composed, gray-haired, immaculate, spontaneously friendly, soft-spoken, ingenuous and immensely likable, belongs to European stock. His father, Frank Dufek, was born in Prague when it was in Bohemia and Czechoslovakia hadn't yet been delivered by statesman midwives. Reaching America by way of Germany, France, and England, he became in turn a railroader, farmer, lumberman, gold prospector. In Wisconsin he met Mary Wachuta, born of Bohemian parents on a farm near Prairie du Chien. They married and George Dufek, born February 10, 1903, was the third of their 4 children.

Young George, early interested in a military career, entered the United States Academy at Annapolis in 1921. He earned honors and an uncommon distinction. He became a triple-threat naval officer and today he's entitled to wear the dolphins of a submariner (he served in the first *Nautilus*—far from an atomic craft), he has his wings and, of course, he's a thoroughly qualified orthodox seagoing officer. For 30 years he led a full and adventurous life, from pole to pole.

"Yet," says Dufek with simple directness, "I had begun to feel there was something missing in my life, that I had failed to leave any positive and concrete work behind me. * * * Men in other professions and trades often have a * * * feeling of accomplishment in a creative enterprise. I felt that if I could use the knowledge gained over the past 30 years in the handling of ships, planes and men in the construction of bases at the bottom of the world for the use of scientists I, too, could gain that sense of accomplishment, of contribution to useful purposes.

DISCOVERED THE TOUGH WAY

There, in a nutshell, is the whole story of Dufek's current command, the reason for the risks he takes, the thrust behind the leadership.

First as Adm. R. E. Byrd's offsider, now as head serang, George Dufek (who in 1939 first went south as a volunteer) discovered the tough way how well equipped a man must be to winter over in Antarctica or to serve there at all. Those who do spend a winter must have passed a submariner's medical, they must be psychologically suited, they must be able "to get along" as well as do their particular jobs.

True, things are different from 1939. Now, the admiral pointed out, they have innerspring mattresses, electric light, clothes washers and driers, movies with current films, good libraries, plenty of hi-fi recordings.

"But there's still the isolation," he reminded. "Yet most of them want to stay 2 years. The commander of the Navy unit at the South Pole station, Lt. John Tuck, at 24, a fine leader, is spending his second winter down there. He was first at Little America, then he came out, and when I talked to him he told me he preferred to winter over a second time, so we gave him this job at the Pole."

In his role of Antarctic projects officer, Rear Admiral Dufek back home meets committees of Congress and other top politicos in the interests of polar exploration. In New Zealand he's about the best non-career diplomat the United States has ever had. The "house-full' sign goes up when he addresses Christ Church groups and displays a film of the expedition's work '"People, especially the ladies, enjoy the movie; they can actually see what we are doing"). In Wellington he lunched with Viscount and Lady Cobham at Government House ("a very great honor"). Everywhere his versatility shines.

There's Dufek the author. Entertaining and informative. "Operation Deep Freeze," published in the United States but not yet in England, though it is being translated into foreign languages, was begun as a time-filler in February, 1956, aboard the Eastwind off the Antarctic coast. When she had propeller trouble, the admiral transferred his flag and infant manuscript to the Glacier. Eventually he got home and took the manuscript with him. The concluding episodes, including the simply-told story of his own landing at the South Pole—the first American to set foot there—he sent back to the United States by "ham" radio.

Now he has an Antarctic book for 12-year-olds ready for publication and awaiting final choice of a title.

There's Dufek the outdoor man with 3 principal activities: Fishing (that's No. 1), hunting (ducks, quail, pheasants, deer) and swimming ("I want to know when you start swimming here again"). The admiral, whose love of fishing came from his father, delighted to spin me this yarn.

"Last time I was here I went fishing at the Rangitata," he related. "I fished for 2 days and a half, just beating that beach, but I never got a strike. Finally, I got a little disgusted and sat down and lit a cigarette.

"Presently the runholder came up. 'I've been watching you fishing here these 2 days or so,' he said. 'How do you do it—how do you catch 'em?'

A BITE RIGHT AWAY

"'There's nothing to it,' I said, taking the rod and making a cast. Bang. A bite right away, and there it was, a beautiful fish. And I hadn't had a bite for two days and a half, remember.

"'Do it again,' the runholder said. 'Right,' I said and made another cast. Bang. Another bite, the same as the other. There were two beautiful fish—the first I'd caught in 2 days and a half.

"'Do it again,' said the runholder. But I didn't want my luck to run out. 'No,' I told him. 'I've got enough fish to do me for the present'."

Admiral Dufek was flying south to McMurdo, 2,500 miles off, when this fishing season opened. But he'd promised himself to be back in time to try to improve on last season's performance and he's back.

In Washington, between phase II and phase III of Operation Deep Freeze, Rear Admiral Dufek received at the hands of Vice President R. M. NIXON the distinguished service medal to add to a vast store of awards. It came for exceptionally meritorious service, and the citation paid a compliment to his sound judgment, resourcefulness and inspiring devotion. The officer who prefers loyalty down to loyalty up accepted it as being "awarded to one man for what many men did." That's a typical Dufek touch.

Equally sincere, I feel, are the closing sentences of his book:

"I think often of my visit to the Scott Polar Research Institute at Cambridge, England," he says. "There on the lawn stands a statue to Capt. Robert Falcon Scott, the last man to reach the Pole before us. An inscription—now carved in our own chapel at McMurdo Sound—bears these words: 'In seeking to unveil the Pole they found the hidden things of God.' Perhaps God has hidden so that men might discover."

While Muriel Dufek continues to wait steadfastly George Dufek still leads his team of discoverers.

Results of Questionnaire in the Second Congressional District of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the results of a questionnaire I recently sent to the voters in my district. I was amazed to re-

ceive a 25 percent return on this questionnaire, which shows the great interest of Nebraskans in national and world affairs.

The returns were grouped into seven classes. Several of these are self-explanatory. The classification "Other rural" includes all nonfarmers in the five counties I represent who are not Omaha residents. "Businessmen" includes both small and large business owners plus executives and plants and company managers.

"Professions" includes teachers, ministers, and accountants as well as doctors, lawyers, and dentists. "Other" includes unsigned questionnaires, retired persons, a few students, and any others that could not be easily classified into one of the other groups.

One question prompted quite a few qualifying comments. That is No. 1, which asks about a summit meeting. Many persons gave a qualified yes and these were counted as yes. These people, however, favored a summit meeting only if the terms set out by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles were met first.

Here are the detailed replies by percentage:

1. Do you favor a summit meeting between the President and Soviet leaders on current East-West differences?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	62	32	6
Other rural	57	41	2
Businessmen	58	39	3
Professions	53	42	5
Employees	47	47	6
Housewives	41	53	6
Other	48	44	8
All	53	43	4

2. Do you believe foreign aid should be: maintained at present rate (or) substantially reduced (or) terminated altogether?.

	Same	Less	None	No opinion
Farmers	12	67	19	2
Other rural	13	70	15	2
Businessmen	14	67	16	3
Professions	31	56	11	2
Employees	11	70	17	2
Housewives	13	60	27	0
Other	19	62	18	1
All	17	65	16	2

3. How do you think a budget surplus should be applied? To reduce taxes (or) to pay off the national debt (or) both?

	Taxes	Debt	Both	No opinion
Farmers	5	46	47	2
Other rural	13	43	40	4
Businessmen	20	39	41	0
Professionals	16	32	41	11
Employees	17	37	43	3
Housewives	16	24	58	2
Other	16	42	42	0
All	17	38	42	3

4. Would you favor a tax reduction if it would mean an unbalanced budget?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	10	83	7
Other rural	13	86	1
Businessmen	17	78	5
Professionals	16	78	6
Employees	18	80	2
Housewives	20	73	7
Other	16	82	2
All	17	80	3

5. If taxes are reduced, how should the reduction be applied? To individuals only (or) business only (or) both?

	Individual	Business	Both	No opinion
Farmers	19	2	74	5
Other rural	18	1	75	6
Businessmen	15	3	80	2
Professionals	14	2	82	2
Employees	24	0	74	2
Housewives	26	3	70	1
Other	8	2	83	7
All	17	2	77	4

6. Would you favor a balanced budget regardless of defense needs?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	33	53	14
Other rural	32	57	11
Businessmen	35	56	9
Professionals	35	58	7
Employees	31	61	8
Housewives	20	65	15
Other	30	58	12
All	32	58	10

7. There is a proposal before Congress to broaden social security by allowing up to 60 days free hospital care annually for older people. This proposal law would require everybody under social security to pay an increased social security tax (based on annual wages of $6,000) of $60 in 1959. This increased tax would go to $106.50 per year by 1975 (on both employees and employers). Would you favor this type of legislation?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	10	90	0
Other rural	18	78	3
Businessmen	15	83	2
Professionals	16	80	4
Employees	29	69	2
Housewives	24	70	6
Other	25	68	7
All	19	78	3

8. Do you favor additional Federal control over labor union finances?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	86	8	6
Other rural	88	8	4
Businessmen	95	4	1
Professionals	83	12	5
Employees	83	14	3
Housewives	73	15	12
Other	89	8	3
All	88	9	3

9. How good a job do you think administration leaders are doing on national defense? Very good (or) fairly good (or) poor?

	Very good	Fairly good	Poor	No opinion
Farmers	23	48	13	16
Other rural	21	53	10	16
Businessmen	22	54	12	12
Professionals	20	54	13	13
Employees	11	57	20	12
Housewives	26	47	6	21
Other	23	49	11	17
All	20	52	14	14

10. Do you think Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson should resign?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	42	46	12
Other rural	21	61	18
Businessmen	11	78	11
Professionals	12	68	20
Employees	21	57	22
Housewives	15	67	18
Other	15	70	15
All	18	65	17

11. Do you favor reducing the postal deficit (estimated to be $650 million this year) by increasing postage rates on first-, second-, and third-class mail?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	63	31	6
Other rural	65	29	6
Businessmen	80	16	4
Professionals	80	19	1
Employees	76	17	7
Housewives	55	40	5
Other	72	23	5
All	74	21	5

12. Do you favor an extension of the reciprocal trade program?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Farmers	52	8	40
Other rural	48	8	44
Businessmen	54	10	36
Professionals	63	8	29
Employees	50	11	39
Housewives	43	10	47
Other	49	11	40
All	52	10	38

13. What are you most concerned about at present?

Farmers: Farm prices, Government spending, honesty in government, Communist influence in United States, unemployment.

Other rural: Government spending, honesty in government, national defense, farm prices, Federal taxes.

Businessmen: Government spending, Federal taxes, honesty in government, national defense, labor-management relations.

Professional: Government spending, honesty in government, Federal taxes, national defense, national debt.

Employees: Government spending, honesty in government, national defense, unemployment, Communist influence in United States.

Housewives: Honesty in government, Government spending, Communist influence in United States, national defense, Federal taxes.

Other: Government spending, honesty in government, national defense, Communist influence in United States, Federal taxes.

All: Government spending, honesty in government, national defense Federal taxes, Communist influence in United States.

Statement by Congresswoman Sullivan, Before House Agriculture Subcommittee Opening Hearings on Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, those Members of the House who know how long I have been working to enact a food stamp plan as an intelligent substitute for the unsatisfactory surplus distribution program now in effect will understand my feeling of gratification in the fact that new hearings began on this subject today before the Consumer Study Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculure.

I appreciate the courtesy of subcommittee chairman ANFUSO in allowing me to appear as the opening witness at these hearings to discuss the provisions and the background of my bill, H. R. 949, which is the prototype for most of the food stamp bills now before the subcommittee.

It may not be modest perhaps to say so—most Members in testifying before committees on their own bills usually insist they do not have pride of authorship in the actual language of a particular bill—but as I told the subcommittee, on the question of food stamp legislation, I have a very strong sense of personal pride for the work which went into the drafting of the original bill which I introduced in February 1954.

It was therefore with a great deal of pleasure this morning that I made my statement as the first witness at the hearings. My statement was as follows:

A FOOD STAMP PROGRAM TO OUTLAW HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES—TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, ON H. R. 949 BY MRS. SULLIVAN, AND OTHER BILLS TO ESTABLISH A FOOD STAMP PROGRAM FOR DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO NEEDY PERSONS—PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE CONSUMERS STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, APRIL 16, 1958

Chairman ANFUSO and Members of the subcommittee:

First, I want to express my appreciation to this subcommittee, and also to Chairman COOLEY of the Committee on Agriculture, for arranging these hearings under circumstances which lead me to be most optimistic about the prospects for action in the near future on a food stamp bill. As you know, I have been urging such a program for more than 4 years. Twice during that period—in both the 83d and 84th Congresses—hearings were conducted on this proposal by the Committee on Agriculture, but unfortunately nothing further happened on it in either Congress. I hope and trust that this time the hearings will be fruitful.

In any event, as a result of the committee's failure to act in previous years, I attempted the direct approach last year of seeking to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act by offering my food stamp bill as an amendment to it from the House floor. The bill we were considering dealt primarily with extending for another year the provisions of Public Law 480 having to do with disposal of surplus commodities abroad, but since Public Law 480 also contains provisions covering domestic donation of surpluses, my amendment was relevant, and, I think, advisable.

RECESSION SUFFERING COULD HAVE BEEN REDUCED

If my amendment had been accepted last year and made part of Public Law 480, I sincerely believe a lot fewer Americans would be suffering hunger today. I sincerely believe our agricultural surplus disposal mess would have been corrected. I sincerely believe the machinery which would have been established a year ago under that amendment would by now be operating so effectively that it could have served as a valuable weapon in fighting this current recession.

Although I lost the battle last year to write my food stamp plan into law through the means of an amendment from the House floor to another bill, I feel my purpose was nevertheless accomplished in some measure at least by reason of these facts:

First, many, if not most of the Members who voted against my amendment in the House last year insisted they were not voting against the proposal itself or against the idea of a food stamp plan but rather against having it incorporated in or tacked onto Public Law 480. They urged that the same proposal come before the House in the regular manner—that is, on recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture. I assume, therefore, we can count this time on the support of many of the same House Members who voted against the proposal last year when it was offered as an amendment to Public Law 480. So far, so good.

Secondly, out of the fight which occurred over this idea on the House floor last year, I obtained the promise of Chairman COOLEY that the committee would take up the food stamp proposal separately this year and that he personally would support it. These hearings, then, and the action which I anticipate will stem from your hearings, represent to me the fulfillment of that promise of last year made during the heat of the House debate on my amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. As you can readily understand, I am most grateful now for this followup.

NEED FOR BETTER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM NOW OBVIOUS

It is my intention today to discuss primarily the means of setting up and operating a food stamp plan rather than the need for a better plan of distribution of our surplus agricultural commodities to our needy throughout the country. The question of need seemed to be the main issue in the previous hearings, in 1954 and 1955. Several Members of the committee on agriculture expressed sincere doubt in those hearings about the need for a food stamp plan or the advisability of one. The Department of Agriculture witnesses who testified insisted it was completely unnecessary to adopt such a plan—that their program then in effect (and still in effect) met all of the needs of disposing of surplus food in a satisfactory manner to our needy citizens.

That may still be the position of the Department's policy makers. I assume it is. I have in my possession one of their recent official publications on surplus distribution, and it insists the present disposal and distribution program for helping the needy is just jim-dandy and couldn't be better.

That has been their position all of these years during which I have been urging adoption of the food stamp plan. At least, no one could accuse the present leadership of the Department of Agriculture of being inconsistent; good or bad, any policy stays on and on and on. But I certainly do not have to point that out to a subcommittee of the committee on agriculture of the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with your permission and the permission of the subcommittee, I am not going to waste your time or mine in discussing the Department's ostrich-like position on this issue. You will no doubt have witnesses from the Department appearing before you to give that side of it, and I would merely suggest that you ask if they still hold to the sentiment expressed for them by Assistant Secretary McLain in 1956, after we wrote a food stamp plank into the 1956 Democratic platform to aid the needy, when he said, and I quote:

"People like to buy their food. They don't like to have it given to them. It's an insult to offer an able-bodied person a handout."

Mr. Chairman, who can argue intelligently with that kind of viewpoint? Food stamps are intended for hungry people, not chiselers and loafers. I think Assistant Secretary McLain has summed up the Department's position on this whole issue concisely if not necessarily admirably.

PRESENT PROGRAM A FRAUD ON NEEDY

The reason you are holding these hearings is that you all know as well as I do that the present system for distributing surplus food to the needy is a monstrous fraud upon the needy and upon our cities and States participating in the chaotic and, to them, extremely costly program.

In desperation over our great unemployment, we in St. Louis have just recently come in under the existing program. While I was at home over the Easter recess, I made an on-the-spot investigation of how it is supposed to operate. I was heartsick. It is not our city's fault. It is the whole blind concept behind the present disposal and distribution system. It is an organized system for dumping a few surplus items on our States and cities for warehousing and distribution in a manner which inevitably reminds one of Winston Churchill's famous phrase about so many owing so much to so few. In this instance, however, it is a case of so many getting so little for so much effort and expense.

A warehouse depot in the center or outskirts of a large city may be a simple method of distribution from an engineering or logistics standpoint. But consider the case of a needy family sending someone across a major city by bus, or street car, or perhaps by foot, to pick up a heavy, bulky package of flour, corn meal, dry skim milk, some cheese—intended to be enough for a family for perhaps a month—and dragging it home that long way when, under an intelligent system of distribution, these things—and a whole lot more—could easily be made available in the corner grocery in exchange for a stamp or stamps which came regularly in the mail along with say, the public assistance check. The cost of the present, haphazard, ineffectual program, meanwhile, is out of all proportion to its benefits and is burdensome to the point of no return to our States and cities.

WHY LEGISLATION MUST BE ENACTED

Our job is to overcome the stubborn inertia and resistance of Mr. Benson's team and force them to use the admitted talents of operating people in the Department to install the kind of program which can work and which can do some real good. I mean good for the needy and good, too, for the farmer—

particularly the small farmer who gets no help at all out of the present hit-and-miss program of dumping surpluses.

Of course, no legislation is needed to install a food-stamp plan. We know that. The same broad, general legislative authority which enabled President Franklin D. Roosevelt 20 years or so ago to establish a very elaborate food-stamp program in depression days—a program much more elaborate and complex than the one I am now proposing—that same broad legislative authority, I repeat, is still on the books and still available to Mr. Benson if he wants to use it. He doesn't want to use it. He refuses to use it.

Then why pass the kind of bill I urge? The answer is that Mr. Benson and his Department leadership take the position that, if Congress wants a food-stamp plan, it must enact one directing the Department to operate it and they will then put it into effect; but without such a specific legislative directive declaring they should do it, they just won't do it. Therefore, it is up to us to build a hot fire under the Department of Agriculture. Our economic situation is much too serious to permit further passing of the buck from Congress to Agriculture and from Agriculture back to Congress. The challenge has been drawn for us to force Mr. Benson to act—in effect he dares us to do so.

So, let us then get on with it.

HISTORY OF H. R. 949

The mechanics for such a program are outlined in the various bills now before you. May I briefly give you the history of my own bill—H. R. 949—which is the prototype for most of those now before you for consideration.

Late in 1953 and early in 1954, when we were already in a recession, even though the Government reports and statistics on unemployment hadn't confirmed it yet, I became deeply concerned by the accounts of undernourishment among many schoolchildren and others in St. Louis at about the same time the main concern on agricultural matters here in Washington seemed to be the unmanageable surpluses of food. The more I thought about this contradiction, the more indignant I became.

I was rapidly getting to the position where I wanted to vote against every single farm aid proposal to come before the Congress. Of course I did not do that. My research into the problem showed me that conditions which ruin the farmer, and particularly the small farmer, do not help the consumer a bit, and actually hurt our workers in every industry. Consequently, I have remained on the side of helping agriculture to combat disastrously low farm prices and high farm costs.

But I felt there had to be a solution to this glaring contradiction of hunger and amid such plenty, of children going to bed without supper while Government warehouses were bulging to the bursting point with the accumulating surpluses of our farms acquired under the price support and other surplus removal programs.

Several States with large numbers of unemployed coal miners, notably Pennsylvania and West Virginia, had begun to seek some of the surplus food for free distribution in mining areas. There was not too much available in usable form—flour and other items were shipped into the States in bulk and had to be repackaged and it was an expensive and far from satisfactory program.

I knew from many conversations with Congresswoman KEE and with the late Congresswoman BUCHANAN and other Members from these areas, the problems they were having in distributing even these few items. Obvously, there had to be a better solution, just as there has to be one now when, with only moderate changes, we are still conducting much the same kind of surplus disposal operation as in early 1954.

FOOD STAMP PLAN OF THIRTIES HELPED FARMERS AND LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS

Consequently, I thought of the food stamp idea and drafted my first bill on it which I introduced in February 1954. Of course the idea itself was not original; as I mentioned earlier, we had a very elaborate food-stamp program in effect in the late thirties when perhaps a third of our people were living under economic conditions which made them eligible for this type of program.

It was a program tremendous in scope. It included all types of food in surplus—fresh fruits, vegetables, eggs, citrus, meat, milk, even—I understand—fresh strawberries during one period when they were in surplus. The food-stamp program in effect prior to World War II helped to supplement the diets of millions of Americans of low income and was a valuable contribution toward our Nation's economic recovery as well, benefiting farmers in every part of the country. After World War II began, however, and everyone who could work even part time could readily find employment, the need for the program became less urgent. And the surpluses themselves, of course, rapidly disappeared under the unprecedented food needs of global war.

New Deal ideas of the thirties which proved so effective under conditions then in effect do not necessarily provide a sure guide as to the policies we should follow today under altogether different circumstances. But the thing which made the New Deal so dramatically successful in so many ways in meeting such terribly serious problems was a spirit of imagination and pioneering in Government policy. New ideas were not discarded merely because they were new. Many of those new ideas, as we know, filled basic needs so effectively that we are all united today in approving them as permanent reforms in our national life. And time after time, we find now that ideas tried even temporarily in those days have new applicability today, but usually with necessary modifications. The food-stamp plan is such an idea.

SIMPLE, NATIONWIDE PROGRAM NEEDED

My bill grew out of a conviction that we do not normally need the kind of elaborate program which was successful in the thirties as we gradually pulled out of the worst depression in history. Instead, I felt a simple program could be worked out covering automatically all of those in every county of ever State on any form of public assistance, plus those jobless who had no income but were ineligible for relief because of legal technicalities of one sort of another in many jurisdictions. During normal times, the latter group would be relatively small. In late 1954, however, and at present, it is a very large group and the families in that group are in desperate circumstances. Public assistance is denied them; the private charities are broke from trying to help too many with too little; and this is the tragedy of the industrial areas of our country.

If we had set up a program before this, intended to provide additional nourishing food for those on public assistance and the relatively few other families which would qualify in normal times, that machinery, as I said, would have been available to us now to help meet this overwhelming problem of hunger amidst plenty.

NEED EXISTS EVEN IN PROSPEROUS TIMES

But I want to emphasize a very important aspect of this problem of helping the needy with supplementary food through a food stamp plan. Right now, we have vast unemployment. But in good times as well as bad—in boom as well as recession—we have at least 6 million persons as a minimum who are not getting sufficient quantities of the right kind of food for decent minimum nourishment. In recession, the number soars, but there is this probably irreducible minimum of about 6 million who are on various forms of public assistance, the disabled, the aged indigent, the families which qualify for aid to dependent children, and so on.

And at the same time we have these vast stores of surplus agricultural commodities—expensive to store, expensive even to give away abroad.

I have no intention of attacking the idea of sharing our surplus with less fortunate nations, or of donating vast quantities directly and through CARE to our church organizations to help feed the hungry overseas. Our surpluses can be effective instruments in the search for world peace. A hungry child anywhere in the world is a charge on our conscience when we enjoy so much.

But to look at our surpluses only from the standpoint of helping people abroad—or only from the standpoint of getting the surpluses out of the country for fear they might depress farm prices here—is too shortsighted a view.

Why not make it possible for our own needy, too, to share on an intelligent efficient, effective, regular basis in these vast surpluses? Certainly we can continue to send much of it abroad—and even continue to pay the ocean freight where that appears desirable. But we can also afford, and must afford, to show at least equal effort and equal concern in getting surplus food to those anywhere in our country who, through no fault of their own, are unable to afford a decent minimum diet. The number of such Americans is tragically high today because of the recession. But even in good times it is high—that fact must be kept in mind.

MECHANICS OF A FOOD STAMP PLAN

The Subcommittee can, if it chooses, find a bewildering variety of means and methods for setting up an elaborate program, but it seems to me that the simpler the program the better it will work. It does not have to be complex. It does not have to anticipate every significant operating problem and write the answer into law. The Department of Agriculture has experts who, if given the green light, can do an outstanding job of carrying out this idea.

My bill has, I feel, the virtue of simplicity. It is customary, or at least common, for Members in testifying before Committees on their own bills to insist they have no pride of authorship and are not wedded to any particular approach in solving a problem through legislation. In this instance, I have to admit to pride of authorship—the bill was drafted only after long study and weighing of alternatives. I am pleased that it has been introduced by quite a number of Members in this and preceding Congresses.

It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture decide each month what foods are in surplus and what quantities of them are available for distribution through his Department as a result of acquisitions under the various price support and purchase programs. He then issues an appropriate stamp for each such item and the stamps go to the provably needy—to all those on any form of public assistance; and to all families certified by State or local welfare agencies as requiring welfare asisstance but not eligible for it because of legal technicalities.

This is the framework of a workable plan. The stamps would be redeemable in such places and under such regulations as the Secretary shall determine—but fundamentally the idea is to have them redeemed in the regular stores. It will be noted that my bill does not actually require that; it is up to the Secretary. The reason is this: if, in a particular area, the stores refuse to go along with this plan for any reason, the needy would not be foreclosed from this help. I don't want to see a narrow restriction written into law which might in some way boomerang to stymie the program. There is no doubt the stores would be the most logical

place for distribution of these surplus items in a manner sufficiently profitable to them to at least cover all of their costs. I assume the Secretary would follow through in that manner. But I wouldn't like to see the program enacted on so narrow a basis that the stores could veto it in a particular area and prevent extra food coming in to the needy.

BROADENING SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

H.R. 949, in addition to setting up the basic eligibility standards for food stamp recipients, calls upon the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to consult together and advise Congress in six months on the advisability of extending the program's scope to additional groups; for instance, to those on unemployment compensation, old age and survivors insurance, etc. Some bills which have been introduced as modifications of my bill would include such groups at the very beginning. I had a reason for leaving them out of the initial program, and not because I am not aware that many such persons do need extra help.

But my feeling was this: A corporation president can be fired after a proxy battle and be eligible for unemployment compensation, or go on social security. But he is not necessarily a needy person. To put him down on the list automatically for food stamps would make a farce and a mockery out of the whole program. We would hear about this or that retired tycoon driving to the store in his Cadillac, or pulling up to the wharf in his cabin cruiser, to get his food stamps exchanged for some free food. How that would set tongues wagging! Our program would be discredited at the very start.

We know—there is no doubt about it—that every person on public assistance of any kind is a needy person (or a chiseler inviting prosecution). We know that in all of our cities and in rural areas, too, there are many, many persons not eligible for public assistance but in real and desperate need. Those are the ones who deserve this help the most. Those are the ones to reach immediately in any program of this kind.

But if the Secretaries of the three Cabinet Departments I cited can come forward later with a sensible program for extending this kind of help to additional categories of citizens deemed to need this help, and if reasonable standards can then be worked out to cover them, the program can be quickly expanded to include them, too. As a matter of fact, many families now on social security would already qualify under my bill for immediate inclusion.

WHAT FOODS CAN BE INCLUDED

As a subcommittee on the committee on agriculture, you are undoubtedly interested in knowing not only how this program can help the needy but also how it can help the average farmer.

May I say that I am aware of the fact that distributing some corn meal and wheat flour and dry skim milk and an occasional pound of butter or block of cheese to our needy does not by any means solve the problem of farm depression. The basic price support commodities which pile up and accumulate under the support programs do not lend themselves too well to the task of rounding out the diets of the poor, because a family can use efficiently and beneficially only a certain amount of wheat flour and corn meal and so on without having a very lopsided diet and thus an unhealthy one. But why must a food stamp program be restricted only to some of the storable price support commodities?

The average farmer in a year's time grows a variety of crops which take turns being in surplus. Often, the more he grows of a desirable fruit or vegetable, the less he makes. You members of this subcommittee know that better than I.

The fact is, however, that we have on the statute books now a provision, timidly and only partly used by Mr. Benson, for Government purchase of various perishables (fruits, meat, vegetables, etc.) when surpluses get to the point of seriously depressing farm income. As you know, 30 percent of our customs receipts are supposed to be used for this purpose, under section 32 of the Agricultural Act of 1935. This comes to more than $200 million a year. In addition, the Department can carry over from 1 year to the next up to $300 million of unused section 32 funds to be used when the Secretary sees fit.

SECTION 32 FUNDS

Mr. Benson has not seen fit to make much use of his section 32 funds. Because he has been carrying over from year to year the full $300 million permitted by law, he forfeits back to the Treasury each year any money he does not use out of current section 32 income. This year, he plans to let $65 million of this money go unused for removing surplus perishables. Next year, he plans to forfeit $78 million out of the $230 million he expects to receive from customs receipts.

He could, as we know, use more than $500 million of this money in the next 12 months to aid the small farmer by buying up perishables in surplus, to use them in the school-lunch program and to aid the needy. A food-stamp program would perhaps give him more incentive to make wider use of the funds and authority he already has to help the small farmer, since there would be a ready-made market for these perishables—our needy families. If we had a national food-stamp plan in operation, public attention would so center on the paucity of the items now being distributed that Mr. Benson—even Mr. Benson—might be stimulated by public opinion into providing a more rounded variety of foods for stamp redemption.

I think that would be a much more intelligent manner of helping to meet the farm problem than a multi-million-dollar Soil Bank plan for curtailing production—particularly when so many Americans are not getting enough to eat.

I am not arguing for purchase of artichokes or strawberries out of season to give away free to the needy. But what's wrong with an occasional Texas grapefruit going to a needy family when the grapefruit harvest is big and the farm price low? Why not some fresh peas or asparagus or corn or tomatoes or apples to help provide a decent diet for an undernourished family if those perishables are just rotting in the fields or selling at disastrously low wholesale prices on the farm? Why not fresh whole milk, rather than just dry skim milk?

CONSUMERS DON'T BENEFIT FROM LOW FARM PRICES

We in this room know that low prices on the farm don't mean low prices to the consumer. Not usually. Not in recent years, in any event. As farm prices sink, consumer prices continue to soar. It is a tragic situation both for our farmers and for our low-income consumers.

So let it not be said that this idea for greater use of section 32 funds to help feed the needy as part of a food stamp plan is intended to raise prices to consumers, or would have that effect. I am sure it would not. But it would help the small farmer and it would also help our needy. And it's about time we did a little more of both things.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to impose on your time by reading a lot of statistics but I have developed a set of facts on the number of public assistance cases in each State as compared with the number now getting dribs and drabs of this surplus food. The figures are startling. I will supply them for the record. They show in many States that while as many as several hundred thousand may be on public assistance, a mere handful comparatively gets any of this free food now. It is an eye-opener as to the lack of effectiveness of this present program. And most of the people who are the human beings behind these statistics go to bed hungry at night, and go hungrily through the day almost each day. (The statistical report referred to appears at the end of this statement as exhibit A.)

A DISGRACE TO OUR COUNTRY

Even the Communists in their complete disdain for human values would, I believe, be too smart to allow that sort of thing to happen if they, instead of we, were the ones blessed with these abundances of food.

Mr. Khrushchev says Russia will soon outstrip us not only in food production but in per capita consumption. We shall see about that. But at least they are trying to increase food production to provide their people with more food and better diets while here in this country, surrounded by the fantastic riches of our harvests, our national leadership can think only of the embarrassment to its political promises of these surpluses; and cannot understand how they can be used effectively and intelligently to outlaw hunger here in the United States. Instead, their goal is merely to curtail production.

The fact is, we do have hunger in this country. It is not a myth; it exists. I have seen it in St. Louis. You have all seen it in your own districts. It is tragic. And it is absolutely unnecessary amidst such great blessings of abundance of food.

Congress is not to blame. But Congress will merit blame if it does not face up to the problem. The problem is to force a reluctant, unfeeling bureaucracy to move off dead center and get food to the hungry. Mr. Benson must stop apologizing for our abundance and instead be pushed into seeing to it that more of it goes to those who need help, and need it desperately.

GOD'S BLESSINGS DESECRATED

I have said that a hungry child anywhere is a charge on our conscience. Mr. Chairman, a hungry child here in America—hungry as a daily experience—going to bed night after night without feeling he has eaten a good meal—staying home from school because he hasn't the energy to study or learn because he hasn't eaten enough to build energy—such a child represents in our country more than a charge on our conscience. The existence of such a situation in this rich land is a shameful blot on our national honor—on our flag. And, unfortunately for our ability to sleep at night, there are many, many such children today in our country. I would say that several million American childen experience that gnawing feeling of not getting enough of the right foods because their families cannot provide them.

Mr. Chairman, I am perhaps emotional about this problem. I do not apologize for that. Hard, commonsense should have told us long ago we needed a better program for distributing our surpluses to our needy. But the need still goes unmet. I do not apologize for being emotional about it now.

Farm failures, ruinous surpluses, bulging warehouses, billions of Federal funds going for agricultural mustard plasters, but millions of Americans still hungry. The abundance lavished upon us by a merciful God—abundance of food in a world where too many starve—this abundance is actually cursed by some who cannot see His purpose. Let us use this food as God intended—to feed those who hunger. Let us outlaw hunger—if not in the world, at least in our America.

EXHIBIT A

MOST PERSONS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE (77 PERCENT) NOT RECEIVING SURPLUS FOOD UNDER PRESENT DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

Statistical tabulation compiled by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, from reports of Department of Agriculture on surplus food distribution program and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on estimated numbers of persons on various forms of public assistance. Reports from both departments cover similar December-January period.

State or Territory	Number of persons receiving surplus food	Number of persons receiving surplus food who are on public assistance	Estimated total number of persons receiving public assistance
Alabama	111,798	42,997	205,703
Alaska			6,540
Arizona			42,500
Arkansas	162,245	67,474	97,556
California	23,288	1,784	583,815
Colorado	8,870	2,403	88,764
Connecticut	303	226	49,637
Delaware			12,843
District of Columbia	16,126	10,328	20,609
Florida			176,679
Georgia			178,460
Hawaii			16,693
Idaho			16,034
Illinois	56,396	39,816	299,647
Indiana	35,752	16,020	119,656
Iowa	67,394	38,600	78,477
Kansas	8,628	8,622	61,043
Kentucky	151,453	48,768	147,943
Louisiana	103,398	0	260,692
Maine	27,270	13,612	39,443
Maryland	1,096	250	49,965
Massachusetts	1,157	1,111	166,478
Michigan	170,374	108,315	229,397
Minnesota	11,510	7,891	101,221
Mississippi	323,420	134,433	150,975
Missouri	36,973	0	246,985
Montana			21,656
Nebraska	2,026	0	33,489
Nevada	968	309	6,530
New Hampshire	4,089	1,921	13,124
New Jersey	14,398	9,073	79,283
New Mexico	30,034	21,541	38,617
New York	160,621	144,626	452,912
North Carolina			170,147
North Dakota	8,753	580	16,606
Ohio	14,607	9,515	277,636
Oklahoma	194,894	90,972	179,137
Oregon			53,505
Pennsylvania	457,347	158,267	282,235
Puerto Rico	519,487	362,699	235,576
Rhode Island	7,770	5,257	35,128
South Carolina			84,805
South Dakota	26,748	7,184	23,856
Tennessee	32,945	6,901	142,096
Texas	55,613	23,229	357,919
Utah	13,932	12,297	26,889
Vermont	3,531	1,674	14,446
Virgin Islands			1,979
Virginia	16,208	3,969	62,566
Washington			131,097
West Virginia	167,511	50,805	105,017
Wisconsin	7,854	3,188	92,934
Wyoming	6,003	3,873	8,142
Total	3,063,390	1,460,530	6,394,975

Calamity Howlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, there are many who believe that the country can talk itself into a real depression. Whether actuated by political motives or otherwise the plight of the automobile industry at the present time seems to be a step in the right direction and its self-inspired proposal to eliminate taxes exclusively on its own product is certainly having an interesting effect on the economy.

A good rugged strike, of the Kohler variety, this spring, could really improve the importation of foreign cars and tend to cripple one of our industries that has heretofore enjoyed outstanding world leadership. Is it not about time to display some commonsense all along the line?

On the subject of taxes and inflation I submit an excellent editorial from the Chatham Courier entitled "The Dangers of Inflation":

There has been a great deal of agitation lately in and out of Congress to have income taxes reduced in order that the Nation might get out of the present recession.

The proponents of the idea hold that if income taxes were lowered there would be more money available to spend and, with an upsurge in consumer buying, the country would again be in a state of great prosperity.

This all sounds very fine and probably has a strong appeal to those who believe that Congress or the administration in power in Washington can reestablish so-called prosperity by just passing a law or a bunch of laws.

Well, suppose this did happen and our next income tax bill was, say, 10- or 20-percent lower than the 1 we paid this year, despite the fact that our income remains the same. From the taxpayers' standpoint that is fine but what about the Government itself?

Each year the Congress adopts a budget and then proceeds to levy taxes in order to meet it. The present budget as recommended by President Eisenhower is the biggest in the Nation's peacetime history and most of it goes for defense.

Lowered income taxes while this obligation still faces us means that in order to pay the bills to run and defend the country we have only two recourses—borrow or else start the printing presses up making phony money. Either of these courses will result in financial ruin and the utter dissolution of the value of the dollar.

In times such as these, and they are not really as bad as some calamity howlers would have us believe, it is necessary to think soundly and act wisely. Bernard Baruch recently stated—and no man knows Government finance better than he does—that the Government did not get us into the recession and the Government cannot get us out of it.

The answer to the situation as he sees it rests with the people as a whole and no magician's wand or fooling with economic facts is going to help. As Mr. Baruch went on to say, there is more danger in inflation right now than deflation and with that we are in thorough agreement.

A Good Place To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the February 20, 1958, edition of the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review. Author Bruce Elmgren is planning coordinator for the Douglas County Planning Commission, and he is familiar with the county and its opportunities. I should like to call his remarks to the attention of this House and to invite each of you to visit this part of our country:

QUIET LIVING FOUND IN DOUGLAS—INVITATION IS EXTENDED TO RETIRED PEOPLE TO MAKE HOMES HERE

(By Bruce Elmgren, county planning coordinator)

Douglas County is the largest county in western Oregon, and is larger than the State of Connecticut. It is reportedly the only county in the United States having an entire river drainage within its borders, and this river, the Umpqua, is no ordinary river, since it is unsurpassed in beauty and known throughout the country for its fishing. This sparkling stream flows swiftly through the Cascade Mountains, then meanders past sleepy valley farms until it cuts through the coast range to the sea for a total distance of nearly 200 miles.

According to the United States Forest Service, Douglas County contains more standing timber than any county in the Nation, and more than half of the county's area is under Government ownership. This means we are surrounded by a vast public park of more than a million acres. Only the hunter and fisherman must invest a small fee for the use of this wonderland.

Crater Lake, 1 of the 7 wonders of the world, adjoins Douglas County, and this lake is one of the highlights of a beautiful weekend trip which is commonly taken by the local residents.

The trip begins at Roseburg, follows the North Umpqua River to its headwaters, then to Diamond Lake, down the famous Rogue River, over the divide to the South Umpqua River and back to Roseburg. Since most of the towns are located very near to the North or South Umpqua River, this trip can be taken as easily from any of these towns.

Another scenic attraction is the Oregon Coast Highway, which is considered the most beautiful coastal highway in the country. This coastal area can be reached within 2 or 3 hours from all towns in the county, and the city of Reedsport, on Umpqua River tidewater, is located amid this beauty.

For the out-of-State readers, it should be mentioned that what is said about any coastal town would apply to all coastal towns, just as a description of any particular valley town would apply to other valley towns. The climate and appearance of all Douglas County coastal areas are similar, and the interior valley areas are also similar in this respect.

TRANQUIL LANDSCAPES

Upon reading the foregoing, it would appear that Douglas County is an untamed wilderness, which is far from the truth.

The valleys are well populated and have been settled for several generations. New residents from the hilly eastern States can feel at home, since the valley farms have a settled look of maturity about them, and the deciduous trees bordering the streams and covering the low hills surrounding the valleys are similar to those trees so common to their native States. Sheep grazing the oak-covered hillsides add to the tranquillity of the landscape.

There is more than ample high quality farmland for those people who are interested in obtaining small acreages. Some of the better lands will raise anything that can be raised on eastern farms, together with a few tender crops that cannot withstand the rigorous eastern winters.

The interior valley section of Douglas County is known as the area that has a greater variety of trees than any other area of the State, which would seem to indicate

that the climate is agreeable to the growing habits of a greater variety of plants. This, of course, makes this area a gardener's paradise, which should be of interest to those people who have leisure time and the desire to garden.

SEMITROPIC VEGETATION

Even a few semitropical trees can be found in the valley areas throughout the county. Fig trees grow very well in all of the interior valleys, and palm trees can be found in such unlikely spots as Roseburg and Gardiner. It is true that fig trees of smaller size can be found in the Willamette Valley, but winter freezes damage the trees and the fruit will only partially mature before cool weather in the fall prevents ripening. These tender trees have no economic value in Douglas County, but they do indicate the winter mildness more clearly than incomplete weather records.

Pleasant weather, friendly neighbors and "elbow room" are perhaps the prime essentials to senior citizens who are interested in breaking away from their familiar haunts. Leaving any loaction that has been home for half a century is difficult, to say the least.

People leaving large eastern cities will gain all of these benefits, while those leaving their small towns and farms will gain only the pleasant weather, since they already possess friendly neighbors and sufficient space in which to putter.

SMALL TOWN CONVENIENT

Another very important factor unknown to the average city dweller, is the convenience of a small town. An elderly person in New York or Chicago is virtually a prisoner, since he is unable to cope with the traffic and crowded businesses. So he becomes useless long before he becomes immobile and must depend on others for favors. This is intolerable to any person with an ounce of independence, regardless of age.

Here in Douglas County, no one reaches an age where he needs assistance of this kind, since even the major highways are uncluttered and all business can be transacted within a "stone's throw" of your car.

Perhaps the above picture appears a little too good to be true, so it might be well to add a few facts concerning the cost of living. Upon inquiry into food prices, it appears that they are generally comparable to those found in the larger cities along the coast, and this is said to be brought about through considerable competition in the area.

RENTAL PRICES NORMAL

During the timber boom, rentals were high, but only because of a temporary housing shortage caused by the opening up of large tracts of timber. This is unlikely to occur in the future since the timber cut has surpassed the timber growth and the possibility of another boom based on timber is highly unlikely. With conditions back to normal, prices also are back to normal.

Much has been said concerning the weather of Douglas County, but nothing is more reassuring to the wary than to quote a few weather statistics that can be verified easily by contacting the Weather Bureau.

The following information was taken from a climatic summary of western Oregon beginning at the time the various stations were established and ending in 1930. From this summary and similar information from Washington and California, one can conclude that the interior valleys of western Oregon, Douglas County are milder than all interior valleys to the north of the Sacramento Valley.

WINTER SEASON MILDER

The average winter temperatures are higher and the wind velocities are lower. The growing season is similar to many Willamette Valley stations, though the populated valley of Douglas County receives less snow than any valley north of the Sacramento.

Sunshine records are not extensive enough to mean much, though comparisons between Portland and Roseburg indicate that Roseburg gets 10 percent more sunshine than Portland, though there are many areas in Douglas County that get even more sunshine than Roseburg, and it is necessary to drive only a few miles from the center of the city to be free of the valley fogs that usually vanish by mid-morning.

Another important consideration in evaluating weather data is to know the number of days that precipitation falls. For example: Glendale, a small town in Douglas County, receives approximately the same rainfall as Eugene, yet this rain is distributed over 93 days in Glendale, while it is distributed over 148 days in Eugene.

Astoria and Gardiner on the Oregon coast each have the same yearly rainfall, though Astoria has 187 rainy days per year, while Gardiner, in Douglas County, has only 144.

AIR POLLUTION NIL

The very low wind velocities prevalent to Roseburg and many other towns in this area might bring up the question of possible air pollution. Yet, the Oregon State Air Pollution Authority in its 1956 study found that Roseburg has less air pollution than any large town in the State. This means the air is very pure when one considers that air pollution in Oregon has not yet become a real problem, such as it has become in many other States.

After reading this short description of Douglas County, the reader may be convinced that the Umpqua Valley and coastal section is a very fine part of the country in which we live, but can't one classify California similarly?

If this is true, why do we have so many former Californians living in Douglas County? Employment opportunities are as good or better in California and everyone is aware of the well-known California climate.

The above statement concerning a number of Californians coming to this area for other than work opportunities is undoubtedly a revelation to easterners, though it is a well-known fact to the people of southwestern Oregon.

One must first consider that California has about every conceivable climate known to man and that only the coastal area south of San Francisco is considered ideal. Thin-blooded easterners have filled these once-pleasant coastal cities to capacity so that they are no longer pleasant but have become teeming cities with nothing more to offer than a nice climate.

If people are only interested in climate and are not concerned with adequate space, they would do just as well to remain where they are and include a sunlamp with their central heating.

From the foregoing, it must be concluded that climate is not enough to sell people on the merits of an area. The pleasant climate must be supplemented with sufficient elbow room to make the goal of relaxed living a reality.

Patriarch Marks His 100th Year by Dancing the Hora at Family Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of April 14, 1958, carried a most happy item. This article depicted the 100th birthday celebration of one of my respected constituents, and it is my pleasure to have it placed into the RECORD.

The article follows:

PATRIARCH MARKS HIS 100TH YEAR BY DANCING THE HORA AT FAMILY PARTY

(By Lawrence O'Kane)

Ellcum Moishe Levin, a wispy patriarch, danced the hora yesterday, doled candy from his pockets to his great-grandchildren and even tasted a Manhattan. It was his 100th birthday party.

Sixty-five guests, nearly all of them family, watched the small man in the brown suit and skullcap do the brisk Jewish folk dance. The party was held at the Rosmont Manor, 1500 Macombs Road, the Bronx.

There could be no doubt that Mr. Levin, who lives with a daughter, Mrs. Samuel Marshall, at 590 Fort Washington Avenue, dominated his party.

He pushed away fussing female hands, asserted his independence with admonishing gestures and reminisced.

A visitor asked the inevitable question: Why do you think you have lived so long and so fully?

"Hard work and no worry," Mr. Levin said in the slight accent of his Ukrainian childhood. "Worry, I leave that to somebody else. Let George do it."

Mr. Levin still works 1 or 2 days a week at selling clothing, a business he has known for 84 years. He specializes in police and firemen's uniforms.

The work now is all mail order. He has a corner of his son Joshua's company, Leff & Levin, at 502 East 138th Street. Thirty years ago he used to visit firehouses all over the city.

He left Russia many years ago, but he could not remember exactly when. He remembered 8 years in Dublin, and 2 in Liverpool.

"I had two stores there," he said. "But the Boer War cleaned us out. I heard about the United States, meat 12 cents a pound, milk 5 cents a bottle. I had 6 boys and 1 girl, then I said I'd go."

Four of the boys, Joshua, Jacob, David, and Alexander, and their sister, Mrs. Marshall, were on the dais yesterday. Mr. Levin's wife, Mollie, died 9 years ago.

A Student Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure April 3 to appear before the Subcommittee on Special Education of our House Committee on Education and Labor. My purpose in appearing was to testify on the provisions of legislation I have introduced, H. R. 10908, patterned after the successful student assistance program of the Student Aid Foundation, Inc., of Arkansas. Judge A. F. Barham, of Osceola, Ark., the general counsel for this splendid student assistance program, had been scheduled also to appear, but he was in Arkansas and unable to attend.

Each member of the subcommittee has given long hours of study and hard work into the general problems of high-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

er education for American youth to meet the present need for specialists. They have held hearings in the early and late hours and have digested thousands of words of testimony. They have studied countless bills and proposals having to do with our educational problems. Yet, I found them courteous and willing to go step-by-step into the provisions of the legislation I have introduced. Indeed, I found that they were familiar with the sections of my bill and it had already been given careful study to ascertain its merits or shortcomings. Too much praise cannot be given these fine Members for the great work they are performing in the interests not only of our educational programs but for the national security of our Nation through a qualified, well-educated citizenry.

Subsequent to my testimony before the committee, I received a letter from Judge Bárham of Osceola enclosing a copy of a letter he had written Representative CARL ELLIOTT, the chairman of this educational subcommittee. What Judge Barham has to say is so much in the interests of a sound educational program and so valuable as a guide to the study by Congress of this problem that I desire to include it with these remarks so that it may be available to all Members. I share Judge Barham's high esteem for the committee and their fine work. When their labors are concluded by the introduction of legislation for the consideration of the House, they will have made a valuable contribution to education and the well-being of America.

The letters follow:

STUDENT AID FOUNDATION, INC.,
Osceola, Ark., April 8, 1958.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Special Education, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you very much for your letter of April 4.

Of course we do not claim absolute perfection for our Student Aid Foundation and its plan of operation but I sincerely feel that something akin to it is badly needed and is about all that is necessary to make and keep ours the best educated people in the whole world.

Necessary as a formal education is to make a well rounded man or woman, I think we fail terribly when we neglect to build into our students a sense of independence, honesty and integrity. A college education must be paid for by someone. If it is not paid for by the one who receives it, then the only other resort is to the taxpayer. With his already back-breaking burden necessarily imposed upon him by wars and preparation for wars to defend his country, it just does not seem fair to require him to defray the further expense of educating young people who should be looking out for themselves.

There should be no such thing as a free scholarship for anyone. I have no quarrel with scholarships which are earned in some kind of competition, but merely to say that because we feel that we do not have a sufficient number of men trained in certain lines and, for that reason, we are going to saddle upon the American taxpayer billions in additional taxes to give free education to such as will agree to pursue such special studies is unthinkable and falls far short of what should be our goal.

In the first place should such a thing be done, it would not help appreciably to raise the educational level of our people and help to give us more and better doctors, ministers, businessmen, lawyers and the like.

Knowledge cannot be conferred by the laying on of hands—or the giving of money. Unless the boy or girl wishing to become educated is willing to put forth the effort which must be employed to gain knowledge, you know you can't just buy it and hand it to them. Education alone does not make the kind of man who founded this country or who have defended it in all of its trials. You must have the right kind of material from which to make that kind of man. Will you find that precious material among the boys and girls who have been trained to lean upon their Government and look to Washington for everything? I doubt it.

I think the safest bet is the one who says I want to go to college and would be there now, but for lack of money. Loan me the cost of an education and I wil get an education. I will make it a strictly business proposition. I will give ample security for what you lend me and repay it with reasonable interest. I have faith in myself. Give me an opportunity to get this knowledge and I will repay what you lend me.

Such a bill as Mr. GATHINGS offers (H. R. 10908) will, in my opinion, give the necessary opportunity to every worthwhile boy or girl in America an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education.

Will the plan fail for lack of ability of the proposed student to be able to obtain proper sureties on his note? Our experience has been that no sincere, honest student has ever failed to obtain one of our loans for this reason, and we require six solvent sureties to every note. Home folks are always willing to back one of these under-privileged students. In fact, Mr. ELLIOTT, we have found it necessary for the protection of some of our friends to make a rule that no man shall be allowed to become surety on more than a certain number of notes and then when he has reached the limit we will no longer accept him, but the student may supply another surety in his stead.

There are so many angles to this question that they cannot be set out in a letter and I shall never cease to regret that it was impossible for me to appear before your committee on April 3.

I shall always remember with pleasure the many fine letters I have received from members of your committee and from other Members of the House and Senate. From what they have said to me I am encouraged to believe that it will not be too difficult to enact a law something like Mr. GATHINGS proposed and if so, I shall feel that it was the careful work of yourself and your committee that did the job.

With kindest regards,

Yours very truly,

A. F. BARHAM, *General Counsel.*

Resolution Opposing the Harris-O'Hara Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was sent to me by the mayor and the council of the city of Livonia, which I have the honor of representing, and expresses my views exactly with regard to the natural-gas bill:

Resolved, That the mayor and council of the city of Livonia do hereby go on record as opposing the passage of the Harris-O'Hara gas bill, which if passed, would remove the gas producers' prices from Federal control, and would be an added burden to the already burdened income of the consumers of natural gas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, United States Representative in Congress for the 17th District, and to the Honorable CHARLES POTTER and PATRICK MCNAMARA, United States Senators, Washington, D. C.

Very truly yours,

MARIE W. CLARK,
City Clerk.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of April 5, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT, BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

APRIL 5, 1958.—Easter time brings cherry blossoms and visitors. This year we are surrounded, too, by sounds of construction. Sounds like boomtime. Of course, I've learned that Washington sounds, including congressional speeches, aren't necessarily the sounds of grass-roots America. A pre-Easter recess roundup of pending legislation now dominating committee and cloakroom conversation includes reciprocal trade, foreign aid, space travel, satellites, missiles, defense, Federal scholarships, labor monopoly power curtailment, Government workers pay boosts, postal rate increase, tax cuts, and old and new spending projects as recession measures.

Bernard Baruch, the elder statesman, lived up to his title this week. He testified to the imperative need for our Government making both ends meet, income and spending, so that we do not further water the dollar. His remarks bring to mind the Joint Economic Committee (Senate-House bipartisan group) Report of January on Federal expenditures, which says, "The subcommittee has found no necessary relationship between the amount of Federal expenditures and the rate of economic growth over the long run." This is quite different from the reasoning now advanced for accelerated spending.

Our real trouble goes back to the Employment Act of 1946 which says:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

Now analyze it—what does it say? On the one hand, "carte blanche" government aid and control—on the other, "for those able, willing and seeking to work." Is there anything it doesn't cover? Could not any

financial scheme be advanced under one clause or other? Is it not apparent that should a language limitation be found in one part, a fuller interpretation can be construed from another? Couldn't this even be descriptive of a socialist government? This becomes even clearer in view of the double-talk and re-defining of words. Socialists and Communist talk of democracy and imperialism with definitions just opposite to ours, and this confusion carries over into fuzzy thinking on our part. It's easy to understand our confusion over the role of federal government from this language. How many people really believe in this employment act wording? Isn't it the ingenuity and hard work of people—not another law from Congress—that underlies the greatness of our economic system? It seems most urgent to me that we return to traditional constitutional principles. Surely we can learn from experience, and our experience is simply summarized—a $280 billion debt, a dollar worth a fraction of its former amount. Our greatest need is to keep a sound currency, which means no inflation and a government living within its income. Tax cuts and increased spending are incompatible. Tax cut champions say that we must deny government the money by cutting taxes—they completely overlook the government's ability to get and spend more by borrowing and manipulating the value of our currency. We are actually playing with the buying power of the dollar. Our only salvation now is to cut government spending (just opposite to our current legislation), then cut taxes; otherwise, we may perish as have many other nations before us. It could be said that we are not applying corrective measures through current spending projects as we claim; we are just embracing socialism.

Why must we disregard the lessons of the 30's and deficit spending? If we have economic troubles, it will not be the fault of free enterprise but of our man-made controls, with acocmpanying federal spending and heavy taxing of our people to pay for it.

The story of free enterprise, as exemplified with a daily story on the floor of the House, is my continuing contribution. Designed to counter the effect of those who would talk us into a depression, intentionally or not, this humorous self-appraisal can re-establish perspective. We can laugh away the panic antics, and we can work away any recession, real or fancied. I am counting now on the corrective force of enlightened, good-humored, realistic citizens, who can good-naturedly see their own strengths and weaknesses—and see through the spending schemes of self-seeking politicians.

Lure May Have Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The State of April 14, 1958:

LURE MAY HAVE FAILED

By attempting to induce Congressmen to vote for the 5-cent letter rate by posing the possibility of 365 new post-office buildings, Postmaster General Summerfield may have killed the bill.

Its future was uncertain at best, but the only sound argument for such a proposal was that the post office has been operating at a sizable deficit. If the increased postage rates are merely to rob Peter to pay Paul, then the 5-cent letter measure should be sent back to the source—with a 3-cent stamp.

Five-cent stamps on letters may be desirable from one point of view, but it might not bring in any more revenue. There is such a thing as pricing a product or service out of the market—which is one explanation for some developments in the present so-called recession.

Actually, the Post Office Department cannot live up to the "trade" suggested by Mr. Summerfield. Congress appropriates the money for operation of the post offices, and would have to authorize construction of the new post-office buildings.

However, if construction of new buildings is dependent on the jump in letter rates, then the 5-cent stamp act will become simply another form of indirect taxation. Americans have never been particularly fond of "stamp taxes."

A Salute to Franklin, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce presents awards to various cities in furtherance of community development. Last week, during appropriate ceremonies, the city of Franklin, Ky., for the second successive year, won the top award for towns with a population of over 3,500.

Franklin, Ky., is located in Simpson County on U. S. 31–W, 6 miles from the Tennessee border. It is known as the friendly city. This friendliness is quickly discerned by all those who visit the town.

The city of Franklin was incorporated in 1820. According to legend, Franklin and another town were vying to become the county seat of Simpson County. It was decided that the winner would be the town having the best water supply. Near the center of Franklin was an old well which periodically went dry. Shortly before the judges arrived the townspeople filled the well with water, with the result that Franklin became the county seat. As the story goes, the well has never gone dry subsequent to that time.

The above legend is an indication of the ingenuity and community spirit still manifest in the good citizens of Franklin. Not only the mayor of Franklin, all city officials, the local newspaper—the Franklin Favorite—and radio station WFKN, the chamber of commerce, the business and professional women's club, but every organization, as well as all religious groups, and the people generally, are concerned with the advancement of their city. Just 10 years ago there was only 1 manufacturing plant in Franklin employing 200 persons. Today the town has 6 industries employing approximately 600 people. And many other instances of expansion could be cited, not only along industrial lines, but by way of cultural development and beautification of the city.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Franklin in winning two consecutive community development awards has not only reflected credit upon its own citizens, but upon the State of Kentucky as a whole. I am proud to have such a city located in the Second Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

Timely Cooling-Off Period for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared on Friday, April 11, 1958, in the Western Hills Press, a weekly newspaper in my district. I think this is an especially good editorial and should be read by all Members of the House:

TIMELY COOLING-OFF PERIOD FOR CONGRESS

Probably the best break for the national economy is the current congressional Easter holiday, which has afforded Members of the House and Senate a cooling-off period. Schemes to legislate the Nation out of recession and back to boom were a dime a dozen in Washington before the Congress adjourned and, had it not been for the recess, some of the half-baked legislation would now be well on the way to enactment.

Also timely in curbing the eager beavers who were in such a lather to legislate in haste and repent at leisure was the sound advice given the Nation by Bernard Baruch before the Senate Finance Committee last week.

Assailing such pump-priming nostrums as Government spending and tax cutting, he warned, "inflation is the most important economic fact of our time—the greatest single perid to our economic health. The credit of the United States Government is the foundation upon which our solvency and security rest. We must prevent any further weakening of it by tax cuts, or deficit spending, or lifting the borrowing ceiling every time the debt presses against it."

Those Members of Congress who used their Easter holiday to descend from the rarified atmosphere of Washington's ivory towers to the grassroots from whence they sprang may have discovered that Mr. Baruch put into words the thoughts of many of their constituents, who have no illusions that Government can add billions more to outgo while cutting taxes in an equal amount without dire results.

Such legislative mumbo-jumbo can only lead to even greater inflation, the economic fact of life which has, more than any one other thing, led to the current psychosomatic illness plaguing the economy. Although many politicians, business tycoons, and labor leaders apparently do not understand this—the rank and file of American people are resisting inflation in the only way they know, by withholding purchasing power.

The economy will recover—and quickly—when prices are dehydrated. When government, industry, and labor leaders accept this economic fact of life and decide to take the bitter medicine called for rather than the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

get-well-quick prescriptions that Mr. Baruch has tagged as inflationary and which the public recognizes as economic quackery, then the economy will right itself.

What are some of the components of this bitter medicine? For government, they would include repeal of outdated and inflationary excise taxes, a thoroughgoing revision of income tax inequities that strangle private enterprise for some while opening gaping tax loopholes for others, and real government economy.

For labor, they would include wage and benefit demands that have some semblance of relation to productivity.

For industry, they would include a departure from the policy of passing all increased costs plus percentage on to the consumer without regard for economic values.

Charging all the traffic will bear is no longer the line of least resistance, the people are plainly saying. It behooves their leaders to listen and act accordingly.

No Friend to Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for Monday, March 31, 1958:

NO FRIEND TO TYRANNY

Millions of Cubans believe that the United States supports Dictator-President Batista, against whom the pressure of public resistance is building toward the point of climax. This is a grave mistake, but it can have harmful results unless corrected.

Cubans cite arms given the Habana regime under the Mutual Security Act. Looking down the barrels of United States rifles, the niceties of diplomatic practice which justify such programs escape them. Great numbers also feel that elections under Batista would be a farce, and therefore resented the American Ambassador's public support of elections as a direct meddling in their affairs.

The Cuban crisis confronts Washington with a dilemma. Shall it remain silent and permit the people of that island to continue in thir misunderstanding of United States policy or can it somehow clarify its position?

Primarily Cubans must work out their own problems. But at this critical juncture of their history the United States Government should make it entirely clear that it is not committed to any particular government in Cuba. There is a line which can be drawn between direct intervention that is intended to manipulate, install, or overthrow governments—which all oppose—and the right of a nation to state publicly its inherent political beliefs and to make clear that it is unsympathetic to oppression anywhere.

In the present instance even a general statement that the United States favors democratic evolution in all of Latin America would be a constructive contribution to a solution of the Cuban problem without civil war.

The point is that key Cuban Army officials will make the final decision on whether or not the full power of the armed forces is to be applied against the Cuban people merely to keep a certain man in office. An indication of United States interest in democracy in Latin America might disabuse them of the belief that the powerful neighbor to the north is committed to continuance of the dictatorial regime.

Sooner or later the United States has got to stand for its political principles in the hemisphere. The American people are seriously concerned about tyranny—and not merely when it appears on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

No Longer Fashionable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Lemmon Leader, Lemmon, S. Dak., which I feel merits the attention of my colleagues. The editorial is as follows:

NO LONGER FASHIONABLE

While the lists of unemployed are reported to be increasing in the Nation a Minneapolis Star staff writer calls attention to a paradox. "There is," he avers "an apparent increasing number of good jobs going begging.

"Private employment agencies complain they have hundreds of good positions from office help to technicians and professional rank that they have been unable to fill. And, at the identical time there were long lines of persons drawing unemployment compensation at the State employment office in this city," the writer continued.

There is no disputing the fact that in many industrial centers tens of thousands of people have been laid off because of factory closings and drastic reductions in personnel have been necessary to permit firms to remain solvent.

At the same time it is a well-known fact that tens of thousands will refuse to take a job of any kind as long as they can draw unemployment compensation.

The Eisenhower Administration is concerned over the increasing number of "unemployed" during the winter months as well it may be. On the other hand, it is known that hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million or more now out of work, are now drawing unemployment benefits paid by the firms that at one time had them on their payrolls. The beneficiaries either refuse or prefer not to work as long as the "easy money" is coming to them regularly.

Under the law no one can make them work. Those who are so inclined can refuse to take a job unless it is suited to them. As a result business firms and many farmers in this area are crying in vain for competent help. This the editor knows from daily contacts and from personal experience.

There has never been an unemployment condition in the Leader office. Since the outbreak of World War II this newspaper has operated with a skeleton force because it could not find competent help. Yet, it is required to pay 2¾ percent of its total annual payroll into the unemployment compensation fund. Tens of thousands of other businesses over the land are assessed the same percentage.

Another thing to remember is that while the figures show more than 5 million persons to be out of work at the present time as against a normal 4 million many of these represent man-and-wife combinations. In some cases both may have been laid off. In others one may still be working, but an unemployment check finds its way into the family just the same.

The only cure for a situation like this is the will to work or a change in the law. And work is no longer fashionable in the great majority of families who now claim to be in difficulty.

The Price of Butter and a Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times of April 9, relative to President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson's farm policies. I extended my remarks recently on this matter, expressing my solid support of our President and Secretary of Agriculture on this vital matter.

The Sun-Times of Chicago should be commended on their fair and accurate analysis of the true feelings of farmers and housewives:

THE PRICE OF BUTTER AND A VETO

While Congressmen are home this week, putting their collective ear to the ground, we hope that they hear plenty from their housewife constituents in favor of President Eisenhower's farm policies. The housewives can thank Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson for the recent drop in butter prices.

The majority of Congressmen, apparently, would prefer to let a big surplus of butter and other agricultural products pile up in Government price prop warehouses than to go along with Benson's program to restore some sanity in the agricultural program and, incidentally, bring prices closer to market reality.

The majority of Congressmen recently voted to freeze farm price supports at high 1957 levels. Last week, President Eisenhower wisely vetoed the bill. We hope that this week Congressmen will find out what consumers think about the price-freeze idea as well as what the farmers think about it.

Here in Illinois, we believe that Congressmen will find that many farmers are not as keen on Government frozen prices as some Congressmen seem to think that they are. Charles B. Shuman, of Sullivan, Ill., head of the American Farm Bureau Federation, praised the Eisenhower veto. He said:

"The legislation was against the best economic interests of farmers. I think it would have been used as an excuse by the advocates of big Government spending for more unnecessary nonagricultural expenditures which would add to the farmers' already burdensome costs."

In his budget message, President Eisenhower pointed out that the index of prices received by farmers today is 9 percent above that of June 1955. High rigid price supports were in effect in 1955, but although they were dropped later, prices continued to go up under the Eisenhower flexible price policy.

That farmers generally have begun to come around to Shuman's position that the Eisenhower farm policies make more sense than a system of rigid price guaranties and controls was indicated recently at the Farm Bureau's national convention in Chicago in

December. That convention showed that not only the bureau's officers, but rank-and-file members, who had elected the delegates to the convention, believed that the Government should not "guarantee unrealistic prices."

The day before Congress approved the price freeze last month, the directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation objected to the freeze in these words:

"The current satisfactory supply, demand, and price situation for cattle and hogs provides impressive evidence that farmers stand to profit from less rather than more governmental intervention in agricultural production and prices * * *. Price support levels must take account of competitive conditions, supply and demand and market trends."

Congressmen who do have their ear to the ground ought to realize that the Eisenhower-Benson policies have more popular support than the oratory in Congress and the fears of professional Republicans would warrant. And despite the sound and fury about the Benson policies, it should be noted that although the price freeze directed against Benson's policies passed the House and Senate, they passed by less than the two-thirds vote needed to override the President's veto.

The chances are good, therefore, that the President's record on vetoes will continue to stand as far as the price freeze is concerned. President Eisenhower is the first President since Warren G. Harding who has escaped having a bill passed over his veto. It would be an act of folly to pass the price-freeze bill over his veto.

Nassau County Commemorates Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present the following proclamation, issued by the county executive of Nassau County, N. Y., in reference to the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Celebration:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION PROCLAMATION

Whereas President of the United States Dwight D. Eisenhower has proclaimed this year of 1958 to be Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Year, ending on the 100th anniversary of his birth, October 27; and

Whereas Theodore Roosevelt was one of Nassau County's most illustrious sons, the only one ever to have held the high honor of the Presidency, a man of action whose life was the exemplification of honor and integrity, whose leadership was an inspiration for a nation growing into a world power; and

Whereas Sagamore Hill, the Oyster Bay home of Theodore Roosevelt, has become a national shrine, visited annually by hundreds of thousands of Americans who revere his memory; and

Whereas the Nassau County Board of Supervisors has authorized the establishment of the Nassau County Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Celebration Commission to work with the State and Federal Commissioners and I, as county executive, have appointed nine outstanding citizens to serve on that Commission; and

Whereas the purpose of this Commission is to provide for the people of Nassau County an appropriate program for this nobly conceived celebration to help perpetuate the memory of the great "T. R."; be it hereby

Resolved, That Nassau County officially commemorate the 100th anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth and that all its people be encouraged to participate in its public exercises.

A. HOLLY PATTERSON,
County Executive.

Peat Moss and Peat Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, production of peat moss and peat products in the United States has a great future potential. While it is a growing industry, it is still in its infancy when the annual production is considered in relation to the vast peat resources scattered throughout 30 States. The Bureau of Mines estimates that the peat and peat moss deposits are in excess of 13 billion tons, enough to last 4,000 years at present production rates.

Although peat is one of our most abundant resources, the deposits have remained relatively undeveloped. The use of peat products in the United States is primarily as a soil conditioner for agricultural and horticultural purposes. Since 1950, the consumption of peat products in the United States has more than doubled and this trend may even accelerate in the future.

Ten billion tons of the estimated total deposits in the United States are located in the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. While Michigan has the third largest reserves of any State, it is at present the largest producer of packaged peat in the Nation. Total production in the United States is about 300,000 tons annually and nearly an equal tonnage is imported.

Except for the relatively heavy imports of peat products into the United States, the domestic industry might have developed more rapidly. Until 1940, the great percentage of peat products used in the United States were produced domestically. However, a customs court decision interpreting the intent of Congress in the Tariff Act of 1930, opened the way for peat moss imports, duty free. A second court decision, 2 years later, further confused the application of the duties specified by Congress and since that time nearly half of the peat products consumed in this country have been imported. Without this competition, the domestic industry might today be about twice its size.

To correct what appears to have been a mistake or capricious action by the Customs Court, I have today introduced H. R. 11938 to restore the language of the Tariff Act of 1930 which called for a duty of 50 cents per ton on imports of peat moss. This legislation, if approved, will resolve the paradoxical situation resulting from court decisions and again place the domestic industry in the position intended by Congress.

Under the court decisions, the identical product, peat moss, is subject to duty in one instance and admitted free in another. If it is labeled "stable and poultry grade," import duty must be paid. If it is labeled "fertilizer grade," it is admitted duty free. It is not difficult to realize that even though the duty rate is low on that labeled "stable and poultry grade," it is only a matter of time until all such imports will be labeled "fertilizer grade" and entered in competition with domestic production duty free.

Interestingly, the statistics on imports show that this is exactly what is happening. Imports on the dutiable classification of peat moss have dropped from more than 31,000 tons in 1948 to about 11,000 tons for the latest year. Imports of peat moss classified duty free rose from less than 60,000 tons in 1948 to nearly 250,000 tons for the latest year.

These facts serve to point up the errors of the court in its decisions. The Tariff Act of 1930 placed fertilizers and chemicals making fertilizers on the duty free list. Congress did not consider peat moss as a fertilizer and in a separate section specified 50 cents per ton duty. During the Customs Court case in 1940, the great preponderance of the evidence showed that peat moss had never been classified as a fertilizer, had never been used as a fertilizer, and research showed that it did not have the properties of a fertilizer. The court confused the functions of soil conditioners with the functions of fertilizer and held that Congress intended that it be admitted duty free as a fertilizer.

Following this court holding, such peat moss was labeled and classified for entry as "fertilizer grade." It should be noted, however, that peat moss has never been sold as a fertilizer, and in fact, cannot be sold as such under the laws of any State in the Union. Customs classifications are supposed to be in accordance with the principal use of a product. If the imports were required to be used according to the classification, sales would be minimal and the imported "fertilizer grade" would merely pile up in warehouses.

In the second Customs Court case in 1942, an importer of the identical peat moss product, labeled "stable and poultry grade" sought classification for his imports as duty free. The court held that duty must be paid since the peat moss was not chiefly used as fertilizer.

As a result of these two court decisions, the customs collector must enter duty free imports of peat moss not in fact used as fertilizer in one instance, and in the second instance, he must collect duty payment on peat moss not used as fertilizer. The United States loses the customs revenues intended by the Congress on the nonfertilizer "fertilizer grade" and the domestic peat industry has lost almost half of its market to the imported product.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The care and wisdom of Congress in drafting the Tariff Act of 1930 is clear. It treated peat moss for what it is—peat moss, not fertilizer. The consequences of the efforts of the courts to construe the intent of Congress otherwise are apparent. It is time that the contradictory customs treatment be corrected and all peat moss imports be subject to the same import duty.

Bureaucrats and the Brussels Fair—Why America Is Slated for a Humiliation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include from the April 14 issue of Human Events, a story by Dillard Stokes, an able and well-informed writer. Mr. Stokes points out some of our shortcomings relative to the International Exposition to be held in Brussels.

The story follows:

BUREAUCRATS AND THE BRUSSELS FAIR—WHY AMERICA IS SLATED FOR A HUMILIATION

(By Dillard Stokes)

By all accounts, April 17 will be a black day for this Nation, when the Universal and International Exposition of 1958 opens in Brussels. There before the scornful eyes of 30 or 40 million tourists America will suffer a shameful humiliation, a cultural debacle, a 6-months denigration of her prestige and pride.

Hundreds of these gloomy phrases in the "liberal" press add up to a forecast that the American way of life is about to be clobbered by alien rivals from Andorra to Yugoslavia. The forecast is being broadcast to put steam behind a high pressure drive to get another $2.5 million out of Congress.

Now this forecast probably is perfectly correct, and now is the time to see why. Next winter the bureaucrats are sure to come whooping back to Washington with official reports that they scored a stuhning success after all.

It is hard to believe America is going to lay an egg at Brussels, when one recalls what Americans have done at other such fairs. Or what they do every year with local fetes—apple-blossom festivals, homecoming carnivals, the Mardi Gras, the Tournament of Roses, the auto shows and so on.

The Belgian invitations went out in 1954 at the height of the cold war. It took no deep vision to see Brussels as a battlefield of propaganda, a priceless chance to pit the American culture against the Red slave system, and also against a baker's dozen of serf (socialist) systems that are kept in business by American grants and "loans."

There was needed a commission, to line up a site, build a nationwide net of State, local, professional and industrial committees, and then promote and coordinate their exhibits.

What a drama, for instance, the doctors, the universities and hospital associations could have made of American medicine.

Think what the steel industry, the movie people, the auto companies—to name but three—could have done to show what America makes, and how.

As for culture—the many, many cultures that are America—who knows how the people of Iowa, Louisiana, or Kentucky would have shown themselves. Would the Texans have wanted to send 10,000 longhorns? Or put up a cluster of oil rigs? Or both.

With Philadelphia sending its symphony, would Boston left Arthur Fiedler and the Pops be left behind? And so with Minneapolis, Louisville, Washington, and every city with a first-rate orchestra.

Exhibits by American industry of course would brush off the Voice of America hogwash about People's Capitalism, and show the world the real, vital, free enterprise for private profit that built the country supposed to be on show. And the cultural showings got up by the people of the cities and States would not jibe with any highbrow Federal theme. They would just be authentic.

Perhaps that is why nothing of the sort will be on view at Brussels. The broad sweep of American life, the living traditions of America shown there will be what the State Department in its wisdom determines to need most to be emphasized abroad.

For there is no fair commission, no local committees, no general participation at all. In fact, nothing was done for 2 years. Then the State Department got $12,345,000 from Congress, paid the Belgians $430,000 in taxes and blew $5 million on a modernistic pavilion. With the rest—and with infinite arrogance—the Department hired a designer and set out all by itself to tell the world what this opulent culture is, and what it means.

As did Russia and her vassal states, this Government barred private enterprise from taking part. The Belgians did not plan a trade fair, it was said, so there must be no commercial exhibits. (As though Americans hadn't invented the "soft sell.")

Some American companies did manage to get in the fair. Pan American Airways, Eastman Kodak, Bell Telephone Laboratories, IBM, Phillip Morris Overseas, and Singer Sewing Machine will have their own pavilions, in the Belgian section, where they were able to—and were forced to—rent space.

This the State Department says nothing about when it proudly lists them in its publicity as participants.

General Motors will be on display, too, as a Belgian industry. This is because cars are assembled in Belgium. And the fair's telecom and electronic equipment is American made.

The Belgian steel industry is making a pageant of its whole production process, from ingot to machined product. In fact, the entire Belgian manufacturing and commercial complex has been able to do a sales job, within the limitations of a cultural exhibition unmarred by huckstering.

The Federation of British Industries will be selling everything from atomic know-how to Jaguars—all in a refined way, of course. The Russians will be showing locomotives, tractors, lathes, milling machines, acres of machine tools. The Germans, the Swedes, the Italians * * * none of them lacks an eye for the export trade.

Competing with all this, the greatest technology in the world will show a few models, a dozen propaganda movies cooked up for the purpose, a chaos of mockups, displays on slum clearance and race relations.

Even the planned live rattlesnake (now canceled) wouldn't have saved the American show from being a flop. More millions, more hundreds of million won't do it. No matter how good a job the bureaucrats do with the money, their exhibition will be a dull and clammy zombie.

For only living Americans acting freely can produce a living sample of American culture.

A Farm Woman's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night I had the privilege of attending a banquet at the Continental Hotel at which members of the Iowa congressional delegation were guests of the Iowa Farm Bureau Women. It was a wonderful affair and it was like a fresh breath of air to visit with these women and to share their optimism about the future of life on the farm. The views of this group were best expressed by some remarks delivered by Mrs. H. L. Witmer, of Tipton, Iowa, State chairman of the women's division of the Iowa Farm Bureau. I was impressed with the sincerity of her message and feel that other Members will be encouraged as I have been, by the solid approach of these people in measuring up to their responsibilities in keeping America the great hope of mankind that it is. Under permission previously granted, I include Mrs. Witmer's remarks in the Appendix:

We in this room, with the exception of our guests, are actively engaged in farming. We know what the world looks like just before sunrise and we know what it is to sit on a bale of straw through a long cold night to help save the life of a little calf or of a litter of pigs. We know the feel of soil in our hands before it has become warm in the spring and we know what the hot July sun feels like beating down on the back of a working person.

Most of the tractors on our farms are lady broke. We know what is being planted in the northeast 40 this spring and we know whether or not the new alfalfa seeding came through the winter.

We know what it is to be tired and discouraged and the next thing to broke but we also know the thrill of being close to nature; of working with live animals; of producing with our own hands and the help of God, the food that is necessary to the world. And we know what it is to occasionally hit the market when it is up and get more for a product that we had anticipated.

We believe in farming as a family operation and we wish that every young person who wants to make agriculture his career could have the opportunity to do so.

Of course, we are concerned about farm income, but we are even more interested in the future we are bequeathing to our sons and daughters and to their sons and daughters.

Are we going to pass on to them a business that is hamstrung by ineffective controls and regulations?

Will the freedom of farmers to farm at their best disappear as so many of our freedoms have disappeared, almost unnoticed?

Will they have the opportunity to live in a great democracy as we have, the right to work and play, to win and lose, the right to plan their own future according to their individual desires and abilities?

Things are happening in Washington which we feel will destroy these freedoms if they are not checked.

It has become the great American pastime to gripe, and we find ourselves criticising as well as praising our Government.

Most of us are not educated in economics but we do not believe that it takes an expert to know that none of us can go on year after year spending more than we earn, and that when certain members of the family keep demanding more than the budget will bear, either something has to give or those members will have to get busy and figure out how to get what they want for themselves, or do without. We know we must constantly cut corners and manage better.

We are not half as afraid of Russia's might and productive power as we are of the panic displayed by many in government and many citizens with every new blast of propaganda.

How often have you heard these statements:

"Russia is outstripping us. Let the Government take over the education of our scientists."

"The Government must build more roads."

"We must set up trade barriers to keep out competitive foreign goods."

"We have to have Federal aid to education. We can't educate our kids ourselves."

And the latest: "Russia has produced more hogs than America."

Our tremendous inflationary spiral has slowed up. We are in trouble.

We are being out-propagandized by Russia.

We are because the American people pick up and echo in mournful voices the latest claims.

We are samrt enough to know that you who represent us can give us nothing which we have not first given you and that in the transfer from us to you and back again we lose a lot and we know that if you furnish the money you will want to help us make decisions and we lose a bit more of our freedoms.

If we are real honest with ourselves, we know that so long as we have the large sums of money we spend on cosmetics, cigarettes, soft drinks, liquor, etc., we should be able to finance our schools.

We know that every bureau that is set up even on the temporary basis, is likely here to stay and make big government even bigger.

We want you to know that we will do all we can to help you represent us in a way that will at least check the loss of our freedoms.

We believe that you want to keep America the great free country she has always been.

We believe in America and the American way of life.

Agriculture is our business and farming is our future. With adjustments and changes brought on by a rapidly changing world, we believe that the family type farm is here to stay.

And we believe that there's life in the old girl yet, if we take away the sedatives and tranquilizers and give her the stimulus of freedom to decide, competitive markets and foreign trade.

This is the future we hope to bequeath to our children and we will help you in any way we can to accomplish this goal.

Is Mr. Truman the Democrats' Answer to All Problems?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Daily News on April 15, following the testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee of a retired Missouri farmer, who obviously knows little of economics and whose quips and general attitude, unfortunately, were hardly suited to a serious committee hearing.

The Daily News comments on the Democrats' new, bold, imaginative economic policy follow:

S. FOR SPENDER, EH, HARRY?

Harry S. Truman mounted the witness stand in Washington yesterday, and gave the House Banking and Currency Committee good ground for supposing that that mysterious middle initial of his stands for spender.

INFLATIONIST IS THE WORD FOR TRUMAN

To combat the recession, Harry wants defense spending hiked in fiscal 1959 (ends June 30, 1959) $3 billion above President Eisenhower's budget figure; $1.5 billion rolled out for foreign technical assistance; $1.7 billion above the Eisenhower estimate spent on education, public health and relief; income taxes cut $5 billion exclusively in the lower and middle income brackets; and interest rates on the national debt pared down.

This would be only a beginning. Little Truman also wants Federal spending steadily increased until 1964 at least.

He is gaily unconcerned about what all this would do to the dollar's buying power, which tobogganed during his and F. D. Roosevelt's administrations.

All his proposals are cockeyed enough, but the one about cutting interest rates on the public debt is the worst. It's a call for partial repudiation of the debt—which would have a murderous effect on Government bonds and credit.

In short, Harry is a dedicated inflationist, a funny-money man, who thinks wild public spending is the answer to virtually every economic problem.

Worse than that is the fact that a lot of people in both political parties think as Truman does. Maybe we'd all better take to studying the devious and intricate ways in which ordinary Joes can hope—if they're lucky—to beat or cheat continuous creeping inflation.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, Tom Haverkos is a ninth-grade student in Cincinnati, and I am very proud of this young constituent. He wrote one of the winning essays in the contest sponsored by the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary in the State of Ohio.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen? by Tom Haverkos, gives excellent evidence that the youth of today is worthy of his heritage. Every American citizen will benefit by reading this brief and well written essay. I am pleased to submit it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

(By Tom Haverkos)

What part will I play as a citizen? This is a difficult question to answer unless one is able to look into the future. I can only hope that as an adult I will be a good citizen. Meanwhile, I want to acquire as much education as is possible in order to prepare myself for my future responsibilities as an adult citizen.

I will consider it my first responsibility as a citizen to obey all the laws and to cooperate with all law-enforcement agencies and authorities.

I will expect to pay a just and reasonable amount of taxes. This I will do cheerfully, because I will regard taxes as necessary for the efficient operation of the government, and for the defense of our country.

As a good citizen I will always expect to exercise my right to vote. I will want to be interested in National, State, and local government. I believe that a good citizen should always consider both sides of any issue and should read and study as much information as possible before deciding which side he or she favors. A good citizen should be unbiased. He should not be prejudiced in matters of race or religion.

I anticipate that I will be interested in all worthwhile activities and projects in the community in which I will make my home. I will be interested in having good schools. Also, I will want to give, not only my financial support, but also contribute my time and energy to deserving organizations that help the youth of community and also charitable organizations.

I expect to train myself so that my employers or the people with whom I do business will be satisfied with my work and will feel that they are receiving proper return on their investment in me. I hope that all contacts with my associates in business will be both pleasant and honorable.

Good citizenship begins in the home. I think I have had a good example of citizenship set for me at home by my parents. When I grow up I expect to establish a home of my own and rear a family. I want to have a home where religion is stressed and fair play is practiced. I believe that in establishing a good home with sound teachings I will be making a worthwhile contribution to citizenship.

Harvard University Center for International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the foremost challenge is whether we are smart enough to survive, the organization of the Harvard University Center for International Affairs is a highly significant event. The following information is from their basic explanatory pamphlet and deserves the attention of every Member of Congress:

I. THE NEED

It is a truism that foreign affairs in our era pose unprecedented tasks. But the full sweep of the challenge is not always grasped. The heavy burden on our physical and financial means tends sometimes to divert attention from the even more critical demands on knowledge, understanding, and creative thought. In these fields the requirements still far outrun existing resources. The causes are apparent but worth restating.

For the first time in history international relations have become truly worldwide. Until modern times the various geographic regions pursued their courses with little or no regular contact. For several centuries world

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

affairs were mainly European affairs. Today no region is isolated, none can be ignored; actions and events even in remote places may have immediate worldwide impact. The fate of every nation and people is bound up in some degree with that of many other countries around the world.

At the same time, vast forces are reshaping the world with headlong speed. Under the impact of wars, nationalism, technology, and communism, the old order has been shattered. Empires have crumbled; nations once dominant are forced to adapt to shrunken influence. New nations have emerged and are struggling to survive. From north Africa, through the Middle East and south Asia, to the Far East, societies long stagnant are now in vigorous ferment. Social revolution is disrupting their traditional systems of thought and belief, of habit and custom, forcing choices among newer patterns of freedom or despotism. Communist imperialism, still seeking to remold others in its own image, is itself not exempt from the pressure for change both at home and abroad. And over all broods the atom with its promise and its threat.

Thus in a time of rapid change diverse societies must learn to live together on intimate terms. In a divided world they must come to recognize more clearly their common needs and interests and to develop methods and institutions for serving them.

In its dimensions and its urgency the task is staggering.

Nowhere do traditional attitudes fit the new realities. Many inherited concepts and ways of thinking are irrelevant and some are serious barriers to effective thought and action under new conditions. Thus notions of sovereignty and independence need revision to apply to a world where a nation's level of life or survival may depend as much on the actions of other countries as on its own.

More and more the various facets of foreign affairs become a single whole which cannot be dealt with piecemeal. Each thread of policy is tightly woven into one fabric. Policy toward one foreign country must take into account relations with and among many others. Few problems, if any, are purely political or economic or strategic: adequate solutions must take into account all aspects.

Also crucial is the new role of public opinion. As never before it is at once an instrument of foreign policy and a limitation upon it. The ideological struggle, the rapid transmission of information, the spread of self-government, the new international and regional forums, all have transformed the conduct of international affairs into a broadly based political process. In the democracies, even the wisest policies will prove unavailing without a well-informed and mature public opinion.

In short, in seeking to shape its destiny each nation requires a perspective and a comprehension of unprecedented scope.

The ability of governments to meet the challenge will depend ultimately upon the caliber of the men who serve them, the quality of the ideas and thinking on which they can draw, and the degree of understanding and support which they can count on from their citizens.

Hence the need is twofold:

First is the pressing need for widened knowledge and understanding; for more awareness of the nature and complexity of foreign affairs; for more informed and imaginative thinking.

Second is the urgent need for wise and skillful people. There must be experts steeped in the study of geographical areas and other specialized knowledge, but also and perhaps even more importantly, individuals able to analyze the deeper causes of events and to pull them together into a whole.

II. THE BASIC PURPOSES OF THE CENTER

The Center for International Affairs is designed to serve both the need for knowledge and the need for men.

Its program is based on the premise that a Center at Harvard can fruitfully combine basic research in foreign affairs with advanced study by experienced individuals. Free from the pressures of day-to-day concerns, the Center should be able to provide an environment fostering sustained and systematic analysis of foundamental issues. The joint participation of scholars and mature practitioners should make the research more penetrating and significant. At the same time, a period of such work should enable the practitioners to deepen their understanding and broaden their perspective. Those are the convictions on which the Center rests.

1. The need for knowledge—research

In the broadest sense, foreign affairs deal with the impact of societies on each other. Hence sound judgments and effective action required knowledge, insight and analytical capacities of wide scope. And knowledge regarding many of the essential fields and processes is extremely limited or lacking.

Consequently the study of foreign affairs stands at the confluence of many disciplines: of philosophy which colors a nation's view of reality; of history which shapes reactions by analogy with past experience; of sociology and political science which can illumine the structure of a community; of economics and of law which reflect its material aspirations and resources and its notions of legitimacy and order; and of various others. Thus many traditional disciplines can contribute to the study of international relations; none of them can encompass its full scope.

Moreover the study of international affairs is not exhausted even by a synthesis of several disciplines. Much of the most significant data is not accessible to research by conventional means. It resides largely in the minds of those who have been responsible for administering programs while technical and social revolutions were daily changing the presuppositions. Furthermore most issues require an understanding of the attitudes and interests of other nations.

Thus the penetrating study of international relations requires the cooperation of many disciplines and many professions and of present and former officials and their experience with vast and often novel practical problems.

The research at the Center will take account of this primary fact. Its program will be designed to foster research which draws on and combines the thinking and knowledge of academic experts, United States and foreign officials, and others with experience in foreign affairs. Some projects will be individual and others joint efforts, but all will benefit from the informed criticism and insight of the various participants at the Center.

Under this program the Center will regularly invite a few qualified people from Government, academic, and private life in the United States and from abroad to work at the Center. From the United States, officials invited will include experienced officers from the Department of State, the military services, and other agencies engaged in foreign activities. From abroad qualified men will be invited from various regions such as Europe, the Middle and Far East, and Latin America. In each case the aim will be to obtain first-rate men of experience. In Europe the emphasis will be mainly on recruiting men from the foreign offices, economic ministries, or private life, specializing in foreign affairs. From the less developed areas the emphasis will be primarily on obtaining officials and private experts concerned with the process of development in all of its aspects.

This method of combining official, academic, and private experts for specific projects should produce thorough and useful studies:

1. It will bring about the pooling of the wide range of experience and knowledge of the members of the group;

2. It will bring to bear the resources of the academic community at Harvard and elsewhere;

3. It will assure an informed expression of various national attitudes and perspectives;

4. It will focus attention and study on basic and long-range issues.

2. The need for men—advanced training

Their work in the research projects and seminars at the Center will serve to widen the horizons of the participants and improve their capacity for broader responsibility, especially in policy analysis.

More and more in this country and abroad, agencies concerned with foreign activities are recognizing the necessity for advanced training of mature personnel and are searching for suitable methods. A comparable need exists outside of government. Key people in the professions, business, the press, and academic life often engage in activities requiring a deeper understanding of international affairs or influence foreign policy in various ways. Exceptional individuals from such groups should benefit from opportunities to widen their perspective in contact with officials and other experts from this country and abroad.

The Harvard Centers seeks to respond to this need in three ways:

(a) Training in Policy Analysis

The agencies engaged in foreign affairs all over the world include a great many talented and devoted public servants. It is no disparagement of these men to recognize the severe shortage of man qualified for top policy positions in these agencies. The shortage reflects the enormous scale and complexity of the problems to be mastered and the pace of change in contemporary life. Career experience in its early and middle stages does not necessarily offer opportunty to develop the analytical and creative capacity required for policy formation on a broader basis.

The continuing research projects and related seminars at the Harvard Center will be dealing with long-range policy issues in major fields of foreign affairs. The participants from official and private life will be expected to take an active part in these projects and to contribute, drawing on their past experience and on current study. The research, criticism and discussions, with able participants of varied backgrounds, will enable them to develop their capacity for policy analysis and their understanding of the interplay of political, military, economics and other factors.

(b) Broadening Perspective

Under modern conditions, national interests can be served only by common policy and joint action with other nations on a wide range of complex matters. Thus the conduct and understanding of foreign affairs requires the capacity for seeing problems and actions through the eyes of other nations and relating such perceptions to national needs and purposes. This process of finding common interests and agreeing on joint methods for advancing or protecting them is not easy, where, as today, it often calls for bridging a gulf of culture and history, and for adapting to constantly changing conditions.

The task clearly requires an uninhibited exchange of ideas and canvass of alternatives. Yet such frankness is extremely difficult to achieve among representatives of govern-

ments. Even among close allies, officials are seldom able to discuss policy with the same freedom which is considered essential for policy analysis within any government.

Over time these obstacles can be a serious handicap to close international cooperation. Faced with a dynamic situation, a rigid policy can become a straitjacket inhibiting decisive action.

The Harvard Center could assist in solving this dilemma. In the atmosphere of the center, the participants should be able to discuss far more freely the problems likely to arise in the future and alternative ways of meeting them. The seminars, the research projects, and other activities will be directed to presenting, analyzing, and prescribing for such potential issues. Free of their normal obligations, the officials could express views as individuals instead of representatives of their countries.

This process should offer several benefits: (1) It should focus the attention of key individuals of the several nations on future problems and issues and promote thinking about their solution; (2) it should enable the participants from each nation to attain a better understanding of the approach and concepts used by the others in analysis of problems; and (3) it should develop relations among the officials of different nations which would facilitate franker and more useful discussions in their later careers.

(c) Insight Into Development

Nations comprising well over half the world population are seeking to develop their societies and economies by various means. In this process they will have to modify radically the economic, political, and social fabric of their societies. This vast effort is one of the major facts of the world situation both for the nations engaged in it and for the rest of the world. Thus an understanding of what this process will entail is vitally important for them and for others.

The amount actually known on this subject is extremely limited. Much more study will be needed to discover the conditions required for successful development. Such study will range far beyond the strictly economic aspects. It must seek to discover the changes in traditions, habits, and institutions required to make static societies sufficiently dynamic to achieve material and social progress for a growing population. And it must seek to examine and predict the collateral consequences of such changes and their effects on stability, interests, and attitudes.

The program of the Center will assist in various ways:

1. The research will seek new knowledge about the process of development and the actions and policies required for progress.

2. Officials and other experts from the less-developed countries should, in this study, enhance their ability to cope with these problems, both by improving the requisite skills and disciplines and by relating their uses specifically to the development process.

3. The participants from the developed countries should gain an insight into the process of growth and its impact on the societies involved. They should be enabled better to understand the pressures and attitudes generated by this process and their effects on relations with outside countries.

Thus such study should itself contribute to better understanding and more effective action both by the less-developed countries and by the developed countries in their relations with them.

III. OPERATION OF THE CENTER

1. Conduct of research

The research activities of the Center will seek to combine two objectives. They will attempt to make the best use of first-rate talent and to pursue studies of basic issues relating to international affairs.

In foreign affairs, it is always tempting to address study to the topics of current interests. But private agencies, in a university or elsewhere, are often not well-suited for such short-run studies. Usually these are the cases where classified data, not available to outsiders, are most relevant. And in general, the research in Government on such short-range matters is at least as competent and well-done as that outside.

On more basic and longer-range issues the situation is reversed. These often require the breaking of new ground or the blending of several disciplines. For such studies Government agencies are often not as well qualified as outside experts. The pressure of the more immediate crises tends to divert energy and attention from more basic issues. One result is that policy-making must often start with premises which are unexplored for lack of time or staff to analyze them.

Such basic or long-range issues are often especially well-suited to outside study. Classified data are seldom of great consequence for such research. A university may have or be able to attract people with the requisite training and skills and to allow the time for thorough study and for creative thought.

The research program for the Center is designed to put these principles into practical operation in two ways.

(a) Continuing Programs

In the first place, the Center is establishing certain fields of continuing concern within which research on one or more specific topics will normally be in progress. In each of these fields, a member of the Center faculty will normally be working and be charged with developing and overseeing other research in that area. In general he will conduct a regular research seminar in that field which will include, as participants, visiting officials, academic, and other persons interested in that field.

Each participant is expected to work on the study of a specific topic of his choice, either individually or as a member of a small research team. The seminar will provide a forum for criticism and discussion which will make use of the experience and knowledge of its members.

(b) Special Projects

The Center will also support research or studies on specific topics related to foreign affairs which do not fall within the continuing programs. It will be receptive to all projects bearing on foreign policy, provided they are conducted by first-rate people. For such work the Center will afford a forum for criticism and an atmosphere of disciplined study.

Such projects might be proposed and carried out by a faculty member or a fellow or might be initiated by the Center itself. In any case, it is expected that full use would be made of the knowledge and experience of members and fellows at the Center in carrying out the project.

In its continuing programs and special projects the Center hopes to provide natural and effective ways for solving the problem of meshing qualified and interested people with studies of major importance.

2. Fields of research

Five major fields suggest themselves as areas of continuing research:

(1) Europe and the Atlantic Community

The rise of other powers, the loss of empire, Soviet control of eastern Europe, and other factors have transformed the position and influence of Europe, and have caused the European nations to seek new relationships among themselves and with the United States.

The center would be concerned with the whole range of forces and issues affecting Europe and the Atlantic Community including: (a) European integration, (b) western and eastern Europe, (c) Europe and the less developed areas, especially Africa, and (d) Europe and the Atlantic Community.

(2) Economic and Political Development

The problems of underdeveloped countries are being widely studied, but there has been some tendency to deal with them as a single phenomenon, mainly economic. There is need for more intensive study of their distinctive problems and of the social and political, as well as economic, aspects.

The Harvard Center will select specific areas for such study. The existing work at Harvard in the Middle East Center and the Pakistan project will be a starting point and can be supplemented by studies on Latin America and perhaps Africa.

(3) The Role and Control of Force

Military policy and its relation to diplomacy have never been more complex. The revolution in modern weapons has undermined many traditional notions as to the role of force at a time when political conditions are in flux and international schisms are extremely deep. The changing situation poses many difficult issues in strategic doctrine, military policy and structure, the role of force and its control, etc. The purpose of the Center will be to analyze these interrelated problems in relation to foreign policy and evolving technological and political developments.

(4) International Order and Conflict

Perhaps the basic problem of international relations is to develop a new international order to take the place of the 19th century world system. What is required is not only a study of explicitly world organizations such as the United Nations and its agencies, but of the basis of international order in its widest sense. Hence this field would embrace research in underlying factors and principles affecting world economic and political relations as well as the maintenance of peace.

(5) Far Eastern Problems

The Far East poses a wide spectrum of issues, which involve a complex of political, economic, military, and other factors, which require intensive research and analysis. In its studies, the Center would draw on and complement research now going on and projected in this general area under the Far East program at Harvard.

The Center will, of course, be concerned with the development and the policies of the Soviet bloc and Communist China bearing on foreign affairs. These are not listed as separate topics, however, since they will be relevant and often major factors in the analysis of each of the fields listed. In its studies, the new Center will be able to draw on the Russian Research Center at Harvard for data and experts. The Center will doubtless also initiate studies of certain aspects of communism and the U. S. S. R. having a special bearing on foreign affairs.

The Center will not attempt to cover all the various aspects of these areas at any one time. The actual work in any and all fields at any specific time will depend on the availability of first-rate men sharing those interests.

3. Staff and other participants

(1) Permanent Nucleus

The Center will have a nucleus faculty permanently identified with the Center. These permanent members will normally be responsible for specific areas of study and advanced training.

(2) Faculty Associates

The Center will arrange for members of various faculties to devote themselves for specified periods to research on specific topics in the international field. Members of faculties of other universities in the United States and abroad will be invited to come to the Center as fellows.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(3) Fellows of the Center

In order to attract unusual individuals from elsewhere, the Center will make provision for a group of fellows, chosen for excellence, from the United States and abroad. In general, the fellows will be drawn from government, academic life, business, the professions, and the press; and most will be between 35 and 45, though some might be older. They will be given maximum latitude in the length of time they will spend at the Center, with perhaps a normal minimum of 6 months and a maximum of 2 years.

While each fellow will be free to select his field of primary concern, the majority will undoubtedly address themselves to one of the chief problem areas of the Center and will be strongly encouraged to participate in current research activities. On the other hand, the presence of a given fellow may make it possible for the Center to add to its research fields.

(4) Research Assistants

In carrying out the research projects and related seminar programs, the Center will regularly have a small number of research assistants.

4. Publications

Essential to the work of the Center will be publication of a series of books and monographs resulting from its research activities. In addition the Center may publish a quarterly journal as a forum for experts in foreign affairs.

Position of the Polish American Congress at Washington Meeting Toward Possible Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum adopted at a plenary session of the board of directors of the Polish American Congress meeting on April 11 and 12, 1958, held at the Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., on a possible conference at the summit:

MEMORANDUM FOR SUMMIT CONFERENCE ADOPTED AT A PLENARY SESSION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

We do not contribute to the current clamor for a summit meeting with the Reds. Whatever the Russians may propose will not be for America's best interest nor for freedom's benefit. There can never be a meeting of the minds. The frightful slaughter of the Hungarians is an example of what they offer the free world.

Conferences with the Russians have already done much damage. They have robbed the world of the peace it so desperately seeks.

Yalta, at which we gambled for the friendship of Soviet Russia and lost the peace, highlights the evil of negotiating with those who have committed the most horrible crimes against humanity in history.

We don't need a conference to convince the Reds that we want peace. They know only too well that the United States has no imperialistic designs, and that it poses no threat to Russia.

Global conquest, however, is a vital part of communism and the Reds will never rest until the whole world is communistic. Nikita Khrushchev has said: "Whether they like it or not, the capitalists must die."

We must face the fact that we are dealing with the world's most relentless exploiters.

If, however, we are forced by world opinion, to take part in a conference, we should request as a prerequisite that the Soviets give some evidence of their good will. If they are honorable, which they are not, they will first restore freedom to all their satellites.

The doors should be open only to genuine negotiations and not to provide a forum for Soviet propaganda.

In reference to this proposed summit conference between Soviet Russia and the western powers, the United States should be keenly aware of the fact that the Kremlin insists on the recognition of the "status quo" as regards the Communist regimes imposed on the countries of central-eastern Europe before it will enter into any negotiations for a peaceful settlement of all our world problems.

This demand was put forward by Khrushchev in his address to the Presidium of the supreme Soviet, December last, which later endorsed this very resolution. It was further confirmed when the Soviets suggested that three Communist governments in central-eastern Europe take part in the proposed summit conference. If we assent to this, we would be tacitly agreeing to keep the "status quo".

This is in line with the basic aims of Soviet policy, which seeks so to consolidate Russian domination in central-eastern Europe as to render it immune from any possible exchange. One of the impelling drives in the Russian race to outer space was the knowledge that if it was successful with its missiles and satellites, it would draw world attention away from its activities in central-eastern Europe.

After the Poznan riots of June 1956 and the virtual coup d'etat in October of that year, popular pressure brought a certain degree of liberalization in Poland, although the Communist regime, with Moscow backing, remained in control of the country. Poland began its desperate search for economic aid, because a better standard of living is needed to consolidate and advance any progress towards the restoration of Poland's full freedom and complete independence. Then began that agonizing tight-rope walk which sought to satisfy Russia's coercive demands and the Polish nation's urge for complete liberty.

As we all know, Poland was imprisoned in the orbit of the Soviet Union as the Red army rolled over Poland in its drive to Germany. The Red army still retains military control over this area, with the understanding that Poland must be kept subservient to the Soviet Union. This theory has been borne out in statements by Stalin himself, as well as in an article of the February 1956 issue of the official U. S. S. R. publication Kommunist.

Communist rule was imposed on Poland through the radical elimination of all political opposition, using all the methods of deceit and subversion of which the terror-system of Soviet-trained secret police is only capable.

The Soviet Government has acted in complete derogation of international law, formal treaties, and war-time agreements entered into it with the United States of America and the other allied governments.

Every country subjected to communism is regarded by Soviet Russia as its vassal and part of the Soviet bloc. Any attempt by the people to free themselves from the Communist yoke and to replace it with a democratic system of government is considered as an act of hostile interference with the sovereign rule of the Communist Party, and therefore an act of aggression against the Soviet Union. We have only to consider the ruthless subjugation of the Hungarians, who dared to fight for freedom, to see how the Kremlin follows this rule in its far-reaching aims for international Soviet imperialism.

President Eisenhower made a proposal on January 12, that in the interests of peace and justice, the right of self-determination of the central European countries should be discussed at some future summit conference. Faithful to their philosophy, the Soviet leaders rejected this proposal, first, Khruschev in his violent speech at Minsk on January 22, and subsequently, Bulganin in his answer to the President's letter. None of the later arguments of the President or the Secretary of State affected their thinking in this matter.

Another objective of Soviet policy is the weakening of the West, particularly the destruction of NATO through the reduction in effectiveness of, if not the outright withdrawal of American and English troops now in West Germany.

The success of this particular maneuver is to be achieved by the sponsorship of the so-called Rapacki plan. This is not a Polish plan, and does not follow the best interests of the Polish people. It provides for the removal of all types of nuclear arms from West Germany, East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Both national and foreign occupation armies would be affected. This would supposedly lead to the creation of a so-called neutral belt in central-eastern Europe.

Here again we have an example of Soviet duplicity. With no concessions on their part, since they say nothing about removing the Red armies which help communism in control of this area, they want to lessen radically the power of the American and British armies in Western Germany.

Deprived of the use of nuclear weapons and rocket-launching sites, the Western nations would leave parts of Russia immune to attack, while presenting the Soviets with the opportunity of ravaging all of Western Europe and north Africa with thermonuclear warheads.

In short, the so-called Rapacki plan, which originally came into view as the suggestion of East Germany, is merely another gambit in the eternal chess game of Russian power politics which seeks to achieve complete mastery over all the peoples of the earth.

These are our recommendations:

We should remember what the Soviet objectives are when we sit down at any conference table with them. When we prepare to conduct serious negotiations at the summit, we should be aware of any and all procedural matters which would imply substantive conclusions that are not even mentioned.

We recommend that the United States go more deeply into the basic problems of a subjugated people living in a Communist world.

We should generalize less in our policy statements. Instead of waiting and hoping that something might be worked out in the near future, we recommend that a genuine attempt be made to find realistic solutions to specific problems. For instance, we should now try to work out a policy which will be ready to meet any new crisis that may arise in Poland because of economic or political pressures generated in that unfortunate country by the activity of the Soviet government or any of its agents.

We should strive to make it clear to the Soviet Union that we will consider its further and continued interference in the internal affairs of Poland and the other satellite nations of central-eastern Europe a threat to the peace of the world.

The overwhelming majority of the Polish people reject Communist ideology and fervently desire to regain their independence

under a freely elected democratic government.

Let us keep faith with them.

STANISLAW R. J. SUCHECKI,
Chairman.

A. C. F. KINOWSKI.
THADDEUS ADESKO.

The President Supports Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the Hartford Courant are to be commended for backing the President in his courageous support of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. Few men in public life have demonstrated greater personal courage and, for that matter, greater political courage, than Mr. Benson.

His policies are designed to free agriculture from controls which have been largely responsible for the surpluses which in turn have caused a sickness in the agriculture economy today. In my opinion, in the final analysis, the farmers who themselves know right from wrong should and will support Secretary Benson.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant:

THE PRESIDENT SUPPORTS SECRETARY BENSON

The President's veto of the farm-price-support legislation is consistent with his effort to make some sense of the Nation's agricultural crisis. In the last quarter century we have spent over $22 billion to help the American farmer. About half of that was in the effort to stabilize prices and incomes. Yet we have failed to check overproduction, or to get at the roots of the real farm ills. Instead, with the exception of the last measured year, the stocks of Government-held surplus have grown until they hit an all-time peak in February 1956.

But it's politically popular to fertilize the Nation's farms with checks. And Congress had moved to freeze for a year farm-price supports, despite a recent report showing that farm returns were up slightly, even in the middle of the Nation's economic troubles. But the effort to peg supports and acreage allotments at 1957 levels would have slowed any real effort to allow farm production to get into harmony with markets. The Committee for Economic Development observed in a recent study that prolonging price and income supports as they are now used would be futile. It can only encourage more surpluses, higher taxes to subsidize some farms, misuse of people and materials, and pressure to get rid of surpluses in ways that conflict with other national objectives.

The farmer is in a tough spot. The growth of marketing processes far different from what our ancestors knew puts prices higher, with less return for the farmer. He is hit by high prices on what he buys. If he has a small farm, he often earns less in a year for his family than any reasonable man would expect. An estimated 56 percent of all farmers sell less than $2,500 worth of products in a year. But unless the Government moves to get rid of unrealistic farm policies, the entire farm problem cannot be solved.

The easy way out is to keep up the flow of checks; the adherence of the farm belt politicians, Republican and Democrat, to this solution shows its popularity. Yet the facts show that the farmer, as the President noted, stands to gain more by less Government intervention. Farm prices right now, according to the economic index, are 9 percent higher than they were in June 1955; the parity ratio is 6 points higher than a year ago. It is a difficult course to follow, moving away from a solid income base toward one based on a balance of production and demand. But it's the best for the Nation.

Nikita the Inflexible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal contains an article by William Henry Chamberlin that needs to be seen, read, and remembered by the Members of the Congress and the American public. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NIKITA THE INFLEXIBLE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Outwardly, Nikita Khrushchev conveys the impression of being a much more human sort of dictator than Josef Stalin. The latter surrounded himself with an atmosphere of gloomy inaccessibility. Many foreign diplomats left Moscow without ever seeing him at close range. He spoke infrequently, on big occasions. His few interviews, granted to foreign newspapermen, were stilted written replies to questions submitted in writing.

Khrushchev's public relations are operated on a very different basis. He makes a practice of turning up at cocktail parties in the Moscow embassy set, jokes with foreign diplomats and journalists, slaps them familiarly on the back.

On one occasion he was even interviewed on an American television program. He is as garrulous as Stalin was taciturn; his recorded speeches, interviews, and diplomatic communications would already fill a large-sized book. But behind this mask of the jolly good fellow there is a mind quite as closed as Stalin's and a purpose just as inflexible, to hasten the coming of the day when, as he believes, communism will dominate the entire world.

One of the most revealing exhibitions of Khrushchev's thought processes is contained in a 9,000-word letter which he recently published in the British left-wing weekly, the New Statesman. This was the third and presumably final shot in a controversy touched off when Lord Russell (perhaps better known as Bertrand Russell) used the New Statesman as a medium for an appeal to Khrushchev and President Eisenhower to agree on a cessation of the nuclear arms race and to promote their respective ideologies only by peaceful means.

Khrushchev made the first reply. Then Secretary of State Dulles, on behalf of the President, sent a much shorter communication, making the point that, while the United States never had sought and never would seek to impose its political and social institutions by force, Communist philosophy demanded expansion by subversion and military force. This apparently stung Khrushchev into a verbose attempt at a rebuttal.

NO FLEXIBILITY

As this letter was directed not to a convention of the Communist faithful, but to an overwhelmingly non-Communist British audience, one might have expected that it would contain a few conciliatory statements, a few evidence of flexibility. Nothing of the kind. It was a most uncompromising assertion of Communist fundamentalism and in some cases the assertions and arguments sound as if they might have come from outer space, so far are they removed from the understanding of people living in the Western World.

Take these two sentences about what happened in Hungary: "The essence is that, in Hungary, the Horthy elements, agents of foreign big monopoly capital, tried to overthrow the people's democratic order, to restore the hated Fascist regime in the country * * *. The conspirators provoked a rebellion against the legitimate government of the Hungarian People's Republic, which the people had elected on a constitutional basis."

In these 2 sentences there are 6 demonstrable untruths. It was not "Horthy elements"; it was workers and students, including a considerable number of Communists, who tried to throw off the Russian yoke. No "foreign big monopoly" had anything to do with the very spontaneous uprising.

The regime in Hungary was not a "people's democratic order," but the dictatorship of a small clique of Communists. At no time did the insurgents manifest any desire to "restore the hated Fascist regime." There was no rebellion against the "legitimate government"; insofar as the Communist government could be considered legitimate, its Prime Minister, Imre Nagy, had gone along with the demand of the insurgents for freedom and a neutral status for Hungary. Nor had there been in Hungary, for many years, an election "on a constitutional basis."

Both in this letter and in more recent speeches in Hungary, Khrushchev displays an ability, at once breathtaking and frustrating, to stand truth on its head.

OH, WHAT RIGHT?

"What right," he virtuously declaimed—in Budapest of all cities—"do the politicians of the United States have to enforce the way of life of their country on other countries?" What he overlooked, but what most members of his Hungarian captive audience probably did not, is that neither now nor at any other time has the United States sought to impose its way of life on foreign peoples in Eastern Europe or anywhere else.

What the United States Government has been demanding, in accordance with international agreements voluntarily signed by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam, is that the Soviet Union cease imposing its own way of life, as it did so bloodily in Hungary, and permit the peoples of Eastern Europe the same freedom to choose their own governments and shape their own political institutions as the peoples of Western Europe already enjoy.

Khrushchev displays the same cynicism in shying away from the idea of a free general election as the basis for unification of Germany and proposing as a substitute negotiations between the existing "two German states."

One of these states, the Federal Republic, possesses a government that has been freely elected, that is competent to represent the will of its citizens. But the other, the regime that rules the Soviet Zone, has no authority except that of Soviet bayonets.

RELENTLESS COURSE

During a diplomatic reception in Moscow, Khrushchev, somewhat in his cups, shouted after some retiring western diplomats: "We shall bury you." In his letter to the New Statesman he puts the same idea more

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

soberly. After giving a very idealized picture of the Communist revolution in Russia he adds: "This is what will happen both in the United States and in Britain, although there are no Soviet Communists there, nor will there be. Such is the relentless course of historical development, and no one can halt it."

Why Suspend Only Bomb Tests?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of an editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the April 11, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report, entitled "Why Suspend Only Bomb Tests?"

The editorial follows:

WHY SUSPEND ONLY BOMB TESTS?

(By David Lawrence)

The Soviet Union's proposal temporarily to suspend, of its own accord, the testing of H-bombs has been hailed by some newspapers here and abroad, and by some partisan politicians in Congress, as a great propaganda victory for the Communists.

To the gullible and the craven, to the weak-kneed and the practical, who used to advocate doing business with Hitler and who now want to do business with Khrushchev, the Moscow proposal is a stroke of genius.

But to the President of the United States, who has faith in the truth, the Communist strategem is a gimmick and a diversionary tactic. To all straight-thinking people throughout the world, the Soviet proposal is a transparently phony scheme.

For the Communists have just completed their own series of tests, and they know that the United States is about to begin a new series of tests. Prime Minister Macmillan told the House of Commons last week that Great Britain now has specific evidence that not all nuclear tests can be detected by other governments. The Soviet Union, indeed, rejected the resolution overwhelmingly adopted last November by the United Nations General Assembly calling for a supervised ban on nuclear tests and the ending of the production of nuclear weapons, with controls. Khrushchev now says he favors international control of tests but avoids endorsement of the United Nations plan. What he really wants is his own kind of supervision.

Why, incidentally, was the offer made by the Soviet Union to ban only the tests of H-bombs? Why didn't Moscow announce a decision to accept proposals already made by Western governments to abandon completely the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons under an inspection system that would insure compliance? If testing is a crime against humanity, then the use of nuclear bombs hereafter would be an even worse tragedy for mankind.

Throughout the 8,000-word speech of Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, there is only one sentence about a possible abolition of the use of atomic bombs, and this is couched in the vaguest terms as an aim or hope. Yet every word uttered against nuclear tests could be applied even more effectively against the production and use of any nuclear weapons.

The argument of the naive in our midst is that the suspension of the tests will be a good beginning. After this—it is wishfully argued—may come other agreements. It is a familiar refrain. It has been heard every year since 1945. Yet after we engage in talks and conferences, we find out what we knew before—that the Communists break their pledges and will not accept anything but the unconditional surrender of the Western world. Once we agree to stop testing, and the agreement is subsequently broken by the Soviets, then—as the cliche goes—we will at least know where we stand. To put it more realistically, Khrushchev will be in a position to terrorize the Western nations and tell them where they will be buried.

Every one of the Soviet proposals, including the recent demand that American bases be abandoned and our troops be withdrawn from Western Europe, has a single military objective—to win domination for the Communists without firing a shot.

There are groups—here and abroad—who are tired of the fight for ideals. They want to appease the Communists—by accepting the present enslavement of the captive countries as irretrievable.

Why do not some of these same unwitting apologists for the cause of the Communists demand the suspension of a few other things besides the testing of H-bombs? Have they no interest in the fate of the Hungarian people and the peoples of the other captive countries who are being tortured every day, not by Soviet "tests" but by Soviet acts of brutality?

Under certain conditions, we would agree to suspend the use of nuclear weapons altogether, and we have indicated this position frequently in the past. But the Soviet Union first must establish the sound conditions that would warrant the taking of such steps by the free nations of the world today.

The Kremlin could, for example, liberate the peoples of Eastern Europe. It could give East Germany back to the German people. It could permit free elections in all the countries now held in bondage by the Moscow regime. It could by "unilateral" action lift the yoke of tryanny that has deprived hundreds of millions of people of their liberty and freedom.

Acts like these would truly be victories for mankind. But they will not come as a result of any decision by the conscienceless men in the Kremlin today. They will come only when the aroused peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia take concerted action and overthrow the dictatorships.

This is the truth that needs to be broadcast unceasingly. For there can be no compromise with evil. We must say again and again to all peoples everywhere that "the truth shall make you free."

Wobbly Props

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat Chronical set out below hits the nail on the head. It is brief and to the point. It is constructive. It makes good commonsense. Why not follow the suggestions in the last two sentences:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat Chronicle of April 1, 1958]

WOBBLY PROPS

The President's veto of legislation freezing farm price supports and acreage allotments was expected. Any other action would have been admission that his objectives for farm readjustment were unsound.

A week ago the American Farm Bureau Federation, in urging a veto, said that freezing minimum support prices "in terms of dollars and cents regardless of the size of surpluses, thereby attempting to prevent needed adjustments in those farm commodities which are suffering from too much governmental interference, is against the interests of farmers."

Congressional action was touched off by Agriculture Secretary Benson's announcement that price supports for manufactured dairy products would be lowered April 1 from about 82 percent of parity to 75, the minimum permitted under the law. Benson's reason was that production has been increasing faster than consumption and that the Government was faced with the necessity of removing from the market increased amounts of dairy products in its support program.

The National Grange urged the President to approve the freeze "while we are afforded a limited time to develop and achieve action" on new farm program laws. This always has been the plea when any move was made to lower supports. Several years ago Benson continued dairy supports at 90 percent for another year to give the dairy industry opportunity to work out a program of its own. In the meantime Congress and the farm organizations have been unable to agree on farm program policies that gradually would ease the dependence of farmers upon the Government. Billions of dollars have been invested in support programs and still farmers are hampered by restrictions while huge surpluses overhang markets and undermine prices and support programs. The farm problem instead of approaching solution has remained a perennial headache.

If the farm program is bad it should be remembered that the present administration inherited the surpluses and allied problems. Flexible price supports are supposed to move up or down with supply, but each time they are flexed downward under operation of the law there have been violent protests and demands that the President fire Benson.

If the President had yielded to pressure groups, many would have been disappointed in him for deserting his principles. We suspect that the political wolves will be turned loose on Benson now, and we also believe that Benson is perfectly agreeable to sitting down with Congress or farm leaders in an attempt to work out a sound program that will be of lasting benefit to farmers and to the Nation. Maybe this is a good time to do just that.

Resolution Adopted by the Detroit Common Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Detroit Common Council. They are not only vitally important to the city of Detroit, but their enactment could do much to alleviate the unemployment situation:

Whereas this common council on January 28, 1958, adopted a resolution urging repeal of the Federal excise tax on automobiles; and

Whereas the city of Detroit, the automobile center of the world, is largely dependent upon the automobile industry; and

Whereas the unemployment situation has reached a critical state in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit reaffirms its previous action and again requests the repeal of the Federal statute imposing excise taxes on automobiles; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all of the United States Senators and to the Michigan Congressmen.

Whereas the unemployment situation in the Detroit area is becoming more critical, being now approximately 15 percent; and

Whereas a great number of the unemployed have exhausted their unemployment compensation and must, of necessity, seek welfare aid; and

Whereas the number of welfare recipients has increased greatly during the past few months, this unusual load creating a large deficit in the welfare fund; and

Whereas the extension of unemployment compensation benefits would be of material benefit to the city of Detroit and its citizens and greatly improve the financial position of the city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council hereby requests and urges the extension and increase of unemployment compensation benefits to relieve the unemployment situation and reduce the welfare burden; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the United States Senators and Michigan Representatives.

Whereas this common council on January 28, 1958, adopted a resolution presenting to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the serious and critical unemployment situation existing in the Detroit area; and

Whereas unemployment in this area has risen seriously and critically since that time, and it is reported that unemployment has increased to approximately 15 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this increasingly critical situation be again presented to the President of the United States with the request that immediate and favorable consideration be given to alleviating the unemployment situation by any and all prompt and expeditious methods for such relief, including the allocation of Government and defense contracts and public-works contracts to industries in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress with the request that any necessary aid be provided in order to relieve this critical unemployment situation.

Tenth Anniversary of the World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization is 10 years old this year. I would like to take this opportunity to remark on the progress this Organization has made in such a short time and what WHO means to every citizen of the United States.

The World Health Organization is one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, a member of the family of nations devoted to promotion of world peace and happiness through united effort. It was my happy privilege to serve as one of the congressional advisers to the United States delegation to the World Health Assembly in Geneva last year. I was most impressed by what took place at that Assembly. Representatives of over 80 countries of the world—countries with different cultural, economic, and political backgrounds—met in a friendly forum to work toward one objective, the attainment of the highest possible level of health for all the peoples of the world. That is the stated objective of WHO.

It was also my privilege to invite WHO, on behalf of the United States delegation, to hold its 11th World Health Assembly in the United States. And I am happy to say that the action of the Congress in appropriating necessary funds makes it possible for the United States to be host to WHO on the occasion of its 10th anniversary.

The anniversary commemoration and the 11th World Health Assembly will be held in Minneapolis from May 26 to June 16. It is very fitting that this important milestone is to receive recognition in the country where the World Health Organization was born. Its constitution was drawn up by representatives of 61 nations meeting in New York in 1947, and 2 years later the required number of nations ratified the constitution, bringing WHO formally and legally into existence. WHO now has 87 member nations, one of the largest of the specialized agencies of the United Nations; in fact, WHO's membership exceeds by 6 that of the U. N. itself.

The meeting in Minneapolis will provide an excellent opportunity for important visitors from all over the world to see our country. Delegates to the World Health Assembly will come to Minnesota by way of the west coast, the east coast, and the Americas. En route to Minneapolis they will have a chance to observe the American way of life. The National Citizens Committee for the WHO, a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization, has arranged a number of tours for delegates after the Assembly adjourns, enabling them to observe virtually every facet of American life—our State and local governmental structures, our schools, health agencies, industries, agriculture, our recreation facilities, and our dams and water supplies. It will be perhaps the greatest opportunity this country has ever had to show other countries of the world our brand of democracy in action.

In 10 years, WHO has proved to be a truly international body promoting the cause of health for all mankind. The whole world benefits from WHO's efforts. Health needs are universal. Diseases observe no boundary. They respect no culture, creed, economic status, or political belief. Health problems must be solved on a global basis, through cooperative effort. That is what WHO helps to do.

The first World Health Assembly, held in 1948, set the stage for organized attacks against disease by establishing priorities for three chief offenders—malaria, tuberculosis, and venereal disease. Programs were developed to help nations improve health services for mothers and children, to provide more sanitary environmental conditions, and to improve nutrition. The list of the world's accomplishments in health, with important aid and guidance of WHO, is impressive. Fewer mothers die in childbirth, more babies live through their first year and start their second in vigorous, robust health. New or improved health centers throughout the world are providing basic health services for millions of men, women, and children. People of all ages, all over the world, are learning good health habits, and are becoming aware of the necessity for clean, sanitary environment. Through WHO, people throughout the world are understanding the need for cooperation in working toward a healthier community of healthier citizens.

WHO's record in fighting disease is outstanding. Millions of people have been freed from the curse of malaria by WHO-assisted control and eradication campaigns; in fact, malaria has been eradicated from 9 countries and from large areas of 7 other countries through programs stimulated and coordinated by WHO. Under the aegis of WHO and the United Nations Children's Fund—UNICEF—millions of people have been examined and vaccinated through mass campaigns against tuberculosis. Other millions have been treated in mass attacks against yaws, trachoma, leprosy, and other deadly and disabling diseases. Through WHO-assisted programs, previously incapacitated millions are returning to work, cured of the diseases which had kept them from contributing to their country's national production.

Although we in the United States do not suffer some of the devastating illnesses which plague populations in other parts of the world, we nevertheless stand to gain from a strong and vigorous international health organization which is working to eliminate disease and raise the standard of living the world over.

WHO benefits every citizen of the United States, in many ways.

From an economic standpoint, we have a major stake in a healthy world. Our country has billions of dollars of investments, private and governmental, throughout the world. American industry has expanded in many parts of the world, and many Americans are living and working abroad. Improving the level of health in the countries in which we have investments is definitely to our advantage.

The stability of our own economy depends in large measure on our trade with other nations. We have better markets for our products where widespread disease does not depress the national economy. By the same token, we must pay more for products and materials we import if the economy of the exporting country is weakened by disease, ill health and a low standard of living.

Improved health conditions throughout the world are to the personal advantage of every American traveling or living abroad. Poor nutrition, poor sanitation, and inadequate, unsafe water

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

supplies have brought distress to many Americans across the seas. More healthful foreign travel is but one of the benefits which United States citizens reap from WHO's activities.

There are still other examples of WHO programs which protect United States citizens in one way or another. One is the worldwide quarantine practices established by WHO to help assure that disease does not spread from one country to another. "Quarantine" in this sense does not mean "isolation" of travelers and merchandise, as it once did. Modern quarantine measures include a variety of international travel procedures which are designed to expedite and protect, rather than hinder, international travel and commerce.

International reporting of diseases is another WHO activity which benefits us. A worldwide communications network, established by WHO 10 years ago, makes it possible to control epidemics. Through this network, outbreaks of quarantinable diseases anywhere in the world are broadcast to WHO headquarters in Geneva. The news is then broadcast to health authorities throughout the world, to ships at sea, to airports, and to seaports, enabling health authorities to apply appropriate measures to prevent the spread of contagious diseases. The importance of such medical intelligence becomes obvious when one realizes that international air travel today makes it possible to transplant communicable diseases from an infected to a noninfected area within a matter of hours.

We were all concerned with the recent Asian influenza epidemic. But I doubt that many of us know about the role WHO played in saving us from another 1918–19 disaster.

Through its influenza study program, WHO keeps a constant worldwide watch on the appearance and spread of influenza. Over 100 laboratories cooperate with two international influenza centers, one in London and one in Montgomery, Ala.—the latter operated for WHO by the United States Public Health Service—to maintain this eternal vigil. Cooperating laboratories in Far East countries first affected by the epidemic identified the virus strains responsible for the outbreaks and reported the information to the influenza centers. Thus it was possible to determine the type of vaccine to combat the causative virus so that the United States and other countries could manufacture protective vaccines in time to prevent a serious epidemic.

WHO has a poliomyelitis program similar to the influenza program. Six outstanding laboratories, designated by WHO as regional poliomyelitis laboratories, together with other cooperating laboratories throughout the world, collect, identify, and exchange strains of polio virus, exchange information on the prevalence of polio, determine the immunity of populations, and constantly seek more effective ways of protecting populations of the world from this crippling disease.

Although WHO has been primarily concerned with fighting diseases which have plagued mankind for centuries and in helping governments set up or improve national and local health services, it has responsibilities in newer fields. One field in which WHO is active is the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Our health and medical professions have found the new radioactive materials to be powerful weapons in the diagnosis and treatment of disease. But these materials must be used correctly, and certain precautions must be taken to assure proper dosages and to protect workers in the plants that produce them. Medical and public health workers must be trained to meet the demands for protecting the public against radiation hazards. WHO has recognized its responsibilities in the new field in a number of ways.

WHO is already working with other international organizations in the distribution of radiation codes. It also is preparing to facilitate training of health workers to cope with problems associated with the use of the new radioactive materials; recommend specifications for preparation of radioisotopes throughout the world; and stimulate and coordinate research on the health aspects of radiation. Thus WHO is concerned not only with promoting health by fighting the old and known diseases, but by utilizing new discoveries to improve the health of mankind the world over.

I think you will all agree that every American has a big stake in a strong and growing World Health Organization. There is no question as to the value of our investment in WHO. The United States share of WHO's current budget is in the vicinity of $4 million. Where else can we get so much in return for such a small investment? I would urge the Congress to take every opportunity in the future to bolster this very important international body.

The value of the WHO as a contribution to world peace is unquestioned. The specialized agencies of the United Nations are promoting world peace in many ways. WHO, undoubtedly the most successful of the U. N. group, promotes the conditions of life which are conducive to peace: good health and a better standard of living. And good health means more than mere freedom from disease. WHO has helped people in all corners of the world gain self-respect, self-reliance, and freedom from a life where sickness and ill health were considered to be the normal state of existence. These are the tenets of world peace. WHO represents a changed concept of health—the realization that good health is every man's right and is potentially within everyone's reach if we work together for it.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Providence Evening Bulletin of April 8, 1958. This article graphically sets forth many of the accomplishments of WHO over the past 10 years and pays deserved tribute to its record of achievement. I urge all my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

TEN YEARS OF HELPING MANKIND

The World Health Organization observed its 10th birthday yesterday, but the event marks a triumph of humanity rather than just an anniversary.

In one short decade, WHO has become one of the most dramatically successful agencies of the United Nations, having saved literally millions of lives and spared countless other millions from the combined human and economic ravages of disease.

Indeed, as much as any other single force, WHO and allied international undertakings coordinated through WHO are changing the world health situation in an inspiring and challenging demonstration of what man can do for man when he wills it.

Although this year's budget of $13,500,000 is the agency's highest outlay to date—and a modest sum it is compared to the price of only one potentially death-dealing missile or jet bomber—WHO already has made deep inroads against familiar world scourges which afflict and debilitate areas containing about three-quarters of this earth's population.

For instance, 10 years ago malaria attacked 300 million and killed 3 million persons annually. Now, it is estimated, malaria may be eradicated by 1965. Only a few years ago, cholera killed 20,500 people each year in Egypt. It is virtually a memory now. In Haiti, 80 percent of the population was oppressed by yaws. The disease, too, has largely been whipped there.

Similarly, the public-health training programs set up by WHO have given primitive peoples the beginning of a knowledge of sanitation and cut infant mortality by more than half in many areas.

WHO also has helped to modernize and win acceptance for international standards for such things as quarantine, drugs, and health statistics. Now WHO is looking ahead to meeting the problems of radioactive poisoning.

This is a record the United States can be proud of, having contributed annually one-third of the World Health Organization's funds.

Unfortunately, WHO's decade of achievement has been overlooked too often in the United States. If its activities are noted, the comment too often involves a criticism of this country's share of the load.

Yet, public health is one area where the community of interest should make a reality of Wendell Willkie's fond dream of "One World." Disease never has respected national boundaries or ideological loyalties, although the oceans once provided insulation of sorts. But with air transport increasing both the speed and volume of travel, nations such as the United States again become vulnerable to diseases once thought eliminated, unless those ailments are licked around the world. A case in point is the frenzy of inoculation that seized New York City in 1947, at a cost of millions of dollars, when an air traveler carried a case of smallpox to that city from Mexico.

The cushion of time the United States had to prepare for the Asian flu invasion is another product of the organization's reporting system and a dividend that Americans receive for their contributions to WHO's humanitarian work. Is further reason needed to wish the World Health Organization 10 times the success and longevity of its first 10 years of activity?

National Jewish Board Provides a Real Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that we wel-

come the National Jewish Welfare Board to our Nation's Capital for its biennial convention.

The work of this fine organization and its affiliates represents a valuable service to our country in war and in peace.

A brief but excellent outline of the National Jewish Welfare Board's service over the last 40 years was given in an editorial appearing in the April 15 issue of the Washington Evening Star, which follows:

As the National Jewish Welfare Board prepares to open its biennial convention here this week, it is appropriate to review the war-born organization's 40 years of service to men and women in and out of military uniform. The board came into existence in World War I to provide religious and welfare aid to Jewish men of the AEF in France. From that small but important beginning the board's program has spread around the world and into nonmilitary fields of assistance and guidance to young and and old. It has been a powerful and effective builder of good character and good citizenship.

A few years after the First World War the board was merged with the controlling body of the YMHAs. It now has affiliated with it 338 Jewish Community Centers and YM–YWHAs having an aggregate membership of more than half a million men, women, and children. It was a founder and is still an active member of the United Services Organizations which did so much to keep up the morale of fighting men in World War II and in the Korean war and which has continued to bring cheer and entertainment to our servicemen and women in far parts of the globe. A special phase of the board's service to the Armed Forces is the recruiting of chaplains from among the Nation's rabbis. And in this age of new methods of warfare, the board is extending its missions to cover DEW line radar installations in remote outposts. All of these activities constitute a valuable contribution to the betterment of the military services and of community life in general.

Highway Safety Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, we are all very much pleased when we read or hear that some group has taken action in the direction of helping to bring about an improvement in the traffic-safety situation. In this regard, I was particularly happy to learn that district 42, Lions International, a group which has done so much to promote safety on the highways of Rhode Island, has designated Sunday, April 27, as Lions Safety Day.

Highway safety is without doubt one of the most serious domestic problems that faces the Nation today. We are agreed that improved highways do not solve the problem by themselves. There are many other causes, most of them touching on the human factor and many of them of the type which can be eliminated or reduced by an intelligent campaign of education.

The Lions Clubs of Rhode Island have recognized this situation and are conducting a specialized highway safety campaign with the purpose in mind of doing their utmost to reduce highway deaths in our State. For this they deserve the highest commendation and I personally extend to all their members my deep appreciation for their efforts. Should the results of these efforts save the life of only one person on the highways of Rhode Island the campaign will be, in my opinion, a tremendous success.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution approved by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island complimenting district 42, Lions International, for its timely highway safety campaign.

The resolution follows:

ENDORSING THE SPECIALIZED RHODE ISLAND HIGHWAY SAFETY CAMPAIGN SPONSORED BY DISTRICT 42, LIONS INTERNATIONAL

Whereas to reach as many motorists as possible, with the safety message and slogan of district 42, Lions International, in a specialized Rhode Island highway safety campaign with the purpose in mind of doing the utmost to reduce highway deaths in Rhode Island, this organization has set aside Sunday, April 27th, 1958, which has been designated as Lions Safety Day; and

Whereas their slogan, "Drive with care, for all lives we must spare," selected from several hundred others submited by members of Lions Clubs throughout the State, in a highway safety slogan contest, was awarded a United States Savings bond to the writer thereof; and

Whereas members of the 32 Lions Clubs of Rhode Island, in cooperation with his excellency, the Governor, the registry of motor vehicles, the Rhode Island State police, and the police of the various towns and cities are working through many channels to make our people highway safety conscious; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the general assembly now compliment district 42, Lions International, for this timely Rhode Island highway safety campaign, cognizant of the appalling loss of life on our highways, in the hope that necessary and official impetus will be given this program, since the Lions of Rhode Island is the first civic or service group to sponsor a highway safety campaign on a state-wide level; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly certified copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to district 42, Lions International, for this exemplary endeavor to save lives on our highways in this State.

Israel's 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my fellow Americans in commemorating the 10th anniversary of the country of Israel. I salute the people of this little democratic country for their remarkable spirit and progress. Against tremendous odds, they have gone forth in 10 years to achieve great and admirable objectives. Israel's open doors have provided a place of refuge and freedom for many homeless thousands—survivors of concentration camps, the displaced of Europe, immigrants from north Africa, Asia, Jewish refugees from Arab countries, from Hungary and other Iron Curtain countries. Already poverty stricken, she has continued to receive destitute immigrants. Her economic problems have been further complicated by the refusal of her Arab neighbors to establish peaceful relations.

In spite of these tremendous problems, and with a population which has almost tripled in 10 years, Israel's achievements have been prodigious in industry, commerce, agriculture, education, health, medicine, science, and culture.

I am sure that American friendship and aid have been a vital source of strength to the people of Israel during this first decade. We will continue to admire the courage of the Israeli people as they go forth into a second decade, still faced with hardship and hazards. We wish them well as they continue to work and strive unceasingly for a life of dignity and freedom, for survival and ultimate peace.

Horror Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, April 6, 1958, entitled "Horror Stories":

HORROR STORIES

Is it possible that any Government program was ever subjected to a more sustained barrage of misrepresentation than the mutual security program? We doubt it. Through half-truths, innuendo, outright falsehoods and other devices, American foreign aid has been smeared by its opponents so badly that many of the answers to the wild and reckless charges will never overtake them. The International Cooperation Administration and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs have been laboring manfully to set the record straight, and this no doubt will help. But the answers must perforce be many times longer than the accusations, and the program's detractors in any case rush madly on ahead.

For example, among the assorted horror stories are charges that (a) foreign aid replaces private investment "and that is why our foreign trade is declining"; (b) we have built airfields in Afghanistan where most travel is still by camel; (c) we have provided dress suits for Grecian undertakers and public baths for Egyptian camel drivers; (d) we have built highways to serve a Portuguese gambling resort, constructed an Italian village that no one will live in and sent 150,000 collapsible toothpaste tubes to Cambodia.

Well. Our foreign trade, in the time since overseas aid began on a large scale with the Marshall plan, has greatly increased. Af-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ghanistan needs air connections with the outside world and for domestic transport—as do many Latin American countries with similar undeveloped local transport—if its economic status ever is to be improved. No civilian clothing has been furnished to Greece. The public baths are part of a public health demonstration program in Egypt which, of course, camel drivers and others are free to use. The story about the highway in Portugal originated with a taxi driver and was confirmed by a hotelkeeper, but the ICA records show no such project financed with American aid.

The Italian village project was designed to improve the lot of a primitive group still living in caves, and there is no evidence that the village is not inhabited as charged. Cambodia did buy $6 worth of collapsible toothpaste tubes in 1955 with its own money, but the United States has provided none whatever. And so it goes, on and on, ad nauseum.

There have been some mistakes, to be sure, but none so great as the mistake this country would make if it turned it back on the economic needs of its allies and of the world's vast underdeveloped regions. Let such a course be pursued for half as long as economic aid has been provided, and the likely results in diminished free world security and in enhancement of the Communist-bloc position in world affairs would furnish a real horror story.

A Great Snow Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt as to the reaction of the small farmer to the President's veto of legislation which would have maintained price supports at 1957 levels, I think a recent editorial appearing in the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., will clarify the situation.

I highly recommend A Great Snow Job to my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial, as follows:

A GREAT SNOW JOB

President Eisenhower's veto of legislation than would have maintained price supports on some agricultural produce at 1957 levels is, according to Mr. Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and others, going to be good for the farmer. The school of thought to which these people subscribe holds firmly to the belief that the farmer would be better off if he had no guarantee of a fair return on his investment. Subsidies are destroying the moral fiber of farmers, these people tell us. The farmer won't be a strong, upright, 100-percent American until he is cast adrift and is required to accept whatever the market will pay for his crops, whether or not the market offers sufficient return for the farmer to stay in business.

The net income of farmers has been declining since 1951. The inevitable result of this has been to drive thousands of people from farming to the seeking of jobs in industry. The exodus from farm to city continues with no foreseeable signs of a halt.

The fuzzy-brained economists who think a recession is good for this Nation think it is also good to reduce the numbers of people in agriculture. According to their thinking, it is good for a few million people to have to subsist on unemployment insurance for a while and on welfare payments for a while longer. And it is good for the man who has been in farming all of his life to turn his back on it and look for a job in the city. If the job in the city isn't there for him that's still all right.

We do not know to what extent President Eisenhower subscribes to this theory of economics. But it is evident that he accepts a part of it. During a period of recession he considers it unimportant to give any special consideration to that segment of the economy that produces its food and fibre, agriculture. He and Mr. Benson think it's better to contine the process of putting the farmer through the wringer than to try to improve his economic condition. That the President does not prescribe the same treatment for other segments of the economy does not, apparently, seem strange to anybody but the farmer and some of his friends.

Senators and Representatives from those States whose economies are based on agriculture have protested what Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson seem determined to do to the farmer. They protest, it is said by people who have no understanding of the problems of the farmer, because they fear that they will not be reelected. These uninformed people have not, as near as we know, at any time conceded that the protests of those Senators and Representatives are the protests of the farmers they represent. The farmers are protesting because their net income is constantly declining and the Secretary of Agriculture refuses to treat the situation as the emergency they believe it to be.

Mr. Eisenhower's veto will not be overridden. It won't because Secretary Benson has performed one of the greatest "snow jobs" ever turned in by a Secretary of Agriculture. His pitch has been made exclusively to the consumer. He has said that he wants to hammer down price supports, he wants to "free" the farmer from Government bondage, so that the consumer can get food at lower prices and so that the taxpayer will have to pay less for farm subsidies. This man who repeatedly tells us that he does everything on the basis of principle knows very well that he has misrepresented the case of agriculture. His program has cost the taxpayer more annually than the farm program ever cost under his predecessors. It has worsened the economic condition of the farmer and retail food prices have continuously gone up. Mr. Benson knows that reducing subsidies will not reduce the price of food to the consumer. It will only reduce the income of the farmer, and he knows it.

Mr. Eisenhower calls this courage and honesty. It is neither. A program that has been designed from the beginning to place the consumer in opposition to the farmer has not been an honest program. And courage is not the correct word to describe the performance of a Cabinet member who disregards his responsibility to that segment of the economy whose welfare is the primary concern of his office.

We've had more than enough of a diet of editorials and magazine articles written by men who argue that the farmer isn't really being hurt, that he just thinks he is. And we've had enough of a Secretary of Agriculture who provides support for such nonsense.

The Late Royal C. Stout and the Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of April 3, 1958, which comments on the passing of Mr. Royal C. Stout, who was well known in the theatrical world:

MR. STOUT AND THE STAGE

Probably no other resident of Wyoming Valley ever gave as much time to the theater as Royal C. Stout, for whom the final curtain was rung down as he slept. He left Wilkes-Barre with a stock company as a young man and never thereafter left the stage, to which he gave more than 60 years.

From the one-night stands of his early career, he rose to success on Broadway and in Europe and then created his own theater at Nuangola, where for more than 20 years he presented Broadway casts in summer stock.

With him when he entered upon his long theatrical career, in which he gained vast knowledge and experience of all facets of the theater, and with him when his career and his life were at an end, was his wife, Ellenor Kennedy, whom he married while she was in Wilkes-Barre as a member of her father's stock company.

It is not supposed that the tragic fire of January 13 which destroyed their home at Nuangola, that he had built with his own hands, and in which he was severely burned, had anything to do with Mr. Stout's death. He had made a remarkable recovery and on March 22 celebrated his 84th birthday at a family dinner. A severe cold which he suffered in recent days probably contributed greatly to his death.

Those who love the theater may well pay tribute to one who gave a lifetime to it and may well mourn with his wife, whose career matched his.

The Great Need for a National Coal Research and Development Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the creation of a National Coal Research and Development Commission, and have introduced H. R. 11802 for this purpose.

The coal industry is in a desperate condition both in my district and nationally. In spite of increased output per miner per day, increased mechanization, and the increased size of mine companies generally, the coal industry has been suffering heavily from unemployment, low earnings, and lack of a synchronized, concentrated research program.

Our annual United States coal production has been at about the same level in recent years but this has been accomplished by fewer mines and less miners. Although the small companies are hit the hardest—the industry as a whole does not have enough know-how and has too limited funds for more adequate research, development, mechanization and improved marketing methods.

Such funds for research should be managed so that maximum results are achieved under proper coordination with findings available to all. The proposed commission is a step in this direction. Substantial unemployment in coal mines

exists in Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. The cost of unemployment hits heavily not only at coal miners and other employees of coal companies but also exacts a cost in unemployment insurance to the taxpayers who would like to see something done to help the industry help itself, the taxpayer and the consumer. Coordinated research can help an industry get back on its feet.

Coal is of great importance to our present and future United States economy. It exists in coal-bearing rocks in 35 States. At present rates of consumption the United States coal reserves are estimated to be adequate for more than 1,900 years. In contrast, our reserves of petroleum, natural gas and uranium are estimated to be much less limited than coal. Coal is the richest and most valuable mineral deposit in the world, and we in America and Pennsylvania are richly blessed with this resource.

Chemists and scientists know that, in addition to its fuel values, coal has great potentials for chemicals, minerals, plastics, roadbuilding materials, alcohols, gasolines, and many other byproducts. Not nearly enough is known about the origin, composition, properties and chemical behavior of coal, or about its possible new uses or improved methods of its production and marketing.

Research on coal to date has been too small in scope and uncoordinated in planning and execution from an industry level, although the United States Bureau of Mines and many companies are to be complimented for the great progress and real advances in safety and methods that are in evidence today. Increased research and sharing of knowledge for the whole industry is needed.

The proposed Commission would stimulate research by private industries and Government organizations, and make all of its hearings and findings public, available to all companies, large and small.

The Commission would consist of a few members experienced in industrial-type research who would be appointed by the President. It could hire additional research and technical staff. Although it would be an independent Commission, it would report to and be responsible to Congress. The Commission would be for the benefit of the total industry and the Nation, cooperating with private firms, educational and research organizations and Government agencies to further the production, preparation, distribution, and utilization of coal in all aspects.

Qualifications for membership on the Commission's advisory committees assure its being representative of types of coal mined, of types of coal machinery, utilities, railroads, management and labor, consumers, distributors, and research organizations. Provisions are such as to preclude stacking the committee with special interest from one or interlocking companies.

I am particularly glad that the Commission's findings are to be open to the whole industry and to help provide opportunities for independent and small coal producers.

The proposed research program of the Commission is worthwhile. It provides for investigation and reports about: First, improvement and expansion of present uses for coal; second, new and more effective uses; third, reduction in cost and distribution; and fourth, emphasis on development of particular value to small producers.

Clearly more research and better research, the results of which will be available throughout the industry, is the great need of the coal industry today. The proposed Commission is a real start toward stimulating and greatly expanding this kind of research for the greater benefit to mankind and our depressed areas in the coal-producing areas of the United States, particularly.

Cancer Cure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, evidence that human cancer may represent a virus infection which can eventually be defeated by the right vaccine was recently given in Philadelphia before the American Association of Cancer Research by Dr. Sergio DeCarvalho, of Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. DeCarvalho is the director of cancer research of the Rand Development Corp., of Cleveland, of which J. H. Rand, of Cleveland, is president.

The Rand Development Corp. has done much research into the causes of cancer, and this recent pronouncement by Dr. DeCarvalho could well be a start in the right direction in the battle against this virulent killer of mankind.

An interesting and appropriate editorial appeared recently in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which I thought would be of interest to my colleagues. The editorial follows:

HAS A START BEEN MADE AGAINST CANCER?

One of the most interesting stories of the recent past for many readers, we suspect, was the cancer agent discovery of a Cleveland doctor reported yesterday by the Plain Dealer's, Josephine Robertson.

In Philadelphia for a meeting of the American Association of Cancer Research, she outlined the breathtaking research by Dr. Sergio DeCarvalho and others for the Rand Development Corp., of Cleveland. That research indicates that these cancer agents or viruses had been isolated from various types of human cancer, the first report that this had been done.

The great interest displayed in Dr. DeCarvalho's account at the meeting showed that the medical and research experts present felt that the work done here may be a major breakthrough, a possible road down which new discoveries leading to cancer vaccines may be beckoning.

As far as laymen can tell, we may begin to hope that cancer research is approaching the same point where polio investigation was when Cleveland's Dr. Robbins and Dr. Enders of Harvard made their virus breakthrough, which was followed by the Salk vaccine.

But we must caution ourselves not to be overoptimistic; there is much work to be done, very costly work, and there will be many persons still dying of cancer until it is completed, and beyond.

On the subject of the costly work to be done, it's worth pondering that the Rand lab, a private and commercial organization, has spent more than $250,000 for its investigations. Its generous publication of Dr. DeCarvalho's findings—for which it deserves a deep bow—means that someone else, checking, seeking, and finding, may capitalize later on a vaccine discovery.

The Rand Development Corp. has had its request for a grant for cancer research before the National Institutes of Health, without action. That request should be given fullest consideration. The fact that the Cleveland laboratory is a private research agency certainly should not be held against it, and its current discovery should speak loudly in its behalf.

Hope for cancer vaccine is certainly brightening, but it needs to be repeated constantly, during Cancer Week and every week, that medical science now can do a great deal in preventing much suffering and saving many lives through early discovery of cancer—through regular trips to physicians and an immediate visit in the event there is any reason for suspicion of the disease.

Certainly it is folly for anyone in the early stages of the insidious killer to wait for vaccine cure, when present techniques may save him.

Greek to Us, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1958, regarding Mr. Truman's testimony before our Banking and Currency Committee:

GREEK TO US, TOO

Mr. Truman was in good and engaging form when he appeared before a House Banking Subcommittee to diagnose the recession and prescribe its cure.

The Truman cure consists of two things: (1) A $5 billion tax cut for low and middle income families, and (2) a big boost in public spending. If this is a formula for more inflation, the former President is quite willing to let someone else make the best of it. Inflation "somewhere down the road in the future" doesn't worry him.

When a subcommittee member asked whether Mr. Truman's public works program might not mean a cut in the purchasing power of the dollar, the reply was that such matters "are Greek to me." Mr. Truman is willing to take rag money, hard money or any other kind of money, and he recalled the sad case of an unidentified Senator who went crazy trying to analyze the dollar. Obviously, the former President does not intend to follow in the footsetps of this Senator. He is not going to worry himself into a straitjacket.

Fortunately for Mr. Truman, he can get away with this. He doesn't have to bother about details such as inflation, nor assume any responsibility for what may happen. Unfortunately, the men who must make the decision must also be ready to take responsibility for it. They cannot breezily say, as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

does Mr. Truman, that talk about inflation growing out of his recommendations is "nonsense"—that to worry about this requires a defeatist choice between inflation and recession.

The wise choice lies somewhere in between. The tax cut and the spending urged by Mr. Truman might cure the recession. But they probably would also set in motion another inflationary spiral which would cut even deeper into the already depreciated purchasing power of the dollar. If this prospect does not worry Mr. Truman, it does worry many millions of his fellow citizens who must live on fixed incomes or who, for other reasons, cannot keep pace with a booming inflation. They have a right to expect that the Government will take at least one more careful look at the economic picture before embracing Mr. Truman's spend-more-and-tax-less philosophy.

Toward the Summit: Allies Whittle Dulles' Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article by Chalmers M. Roberts which appeared in the April 15, 1958, issue of the Washington Post entitled "Toward the Summit":

Nothing demonstrates better than the current allied discussions in Paris how Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is slowly being pushed toward the summit conference table. President Eisenhower will be the chief American figure at the summit, of course. But it is Dulles who dominates American policy.

The point today is that Dulles is losing his grip on allied policy. And the allies are whittling away at Dulles' own firm position while Nikita Khrushchev stands almost immobile.

Of course, it may turn out in the end that all these months of presummit jockeying amounted to little. Dulles, however, contends that in dealing with the Russians the West must fight for every word and comma from the phrasing of the agenda on down. The record generally supports him on that score, too.

But what is happening now is this: all the western statesmen, from the President and Dulles to the lowest ranking NATO Foreign Minister, are resigned to an East-West summit meeting. Why? Because they think the world public wants the statesmen to meet in hopes of reaching some accord which would lessen or end the arms race and prevent a nuclear Armageddon.

That view has been plugged to a "fare thee well" by the Kremlin. And Khrushchev apparently figures that, if he just sits tight, the allies will wear down the American Secretary of State and force him to accept Soviet terms, or a compromise close to those terms, for the meeting.

In his Moscow speech on returning from Hungary last Friday, Khrushchev told some 15,000 Russians that "we must neither hurry nor must we intimidate ourselves, for this is possibly what they (the West) are counting on." And "if we show persistence," the "people will continue to press increasingly on their governments."

Then, in what was a rambling, disjointed speech, Khrushchev gave a clue as to why he wants a meeting. He said Russia did not want war, adding:

"Why should we wage war? To wage war means to kill people, you understand, so why? What can we gain by it? Ruin, because we shall destroy and kill—and in our country they will destroy and kill. We have now other means to fight the class enemy, my dears. And in this, victory to us is insured. To raise our economy, to raise labor productivity, to produce more per human being, so that soon, gentlemen, you understand, the time will come, you, Americans, and we shall, as the saying goes, give them good old Russian hell."

Then he went on to promise the Muscovites that Russia will soon pass America in economic output and "we will then see who eats the most and who has most clothes." Khrushchev ridiculed the West for trying "to frighten people" with the words "Communists" and "communism" and by pointing to the Soviet Union. Swept up by his own oratory, perhaps by his newly enhanced power, he concluded this way:

"When the time comes, my dears, we will throw open the doors, come all of you, and they will then understand that this is communism, that this is Soviet rule. 'What asses we have been,' they will think, 'that we did not know this sooner.' And this is just what we want. And this is exactly what we want."

Thus it appears that the summit meeting is looked upon in Moscow as a means of lowering world tensions and thus making less hazardous the accident of war. Maybe Khrushchev wants only the summit's inescapable atmospherics of peace; maybe he wants a meaningful arms limitation agreement. Only a summit meeting will tell for he will not bargain at a lower level, especially not with Dulles.

But one should look at all the other things Khrushchev has been talking about in the economic field, such as the remarks cited here, to see why he wants a summit, whichever kind it is. He is talking frankly and publicly about the meaning of nuclear war to Russia. And, as the alternative if there is peace, he is promising far, far more to the Soviet consumer than did Georgi Malenkov, the so-called Soviet liberal who wanted to do more for the Russian public only to be purged from the Kremlin.

Khrushchev has even begun to talk a bit at home about the Soviet version of foreign aid despite reports of grumbling over shipment abroad of things needed at home. Speaking of Hungary last week, he said that Russia must "render assistance to our brotherly Socialist Republics" so that the Communist camp will be stronger. "Then our affairs will be even more stable," he concluded.

In the face of all this sort of talk it is not surprising that many in the West want the summit and are impatient at what they consider Dulles' haggling over preparatory work. And so in the latest western answer, fashioned yesterday in Paris, Dulles is impelled a step closer to the East-West dialogue.

Let's Save the Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Army authorities have now made it clear that they intend to abolish at least 6 of the 27 National Guard divisions in the United States, as a so-called economy move.

When we consider the fact that these divisions render a great and continuing service to their communities and their States, while standing ready to defend our country at only a fraction of the cost of a regular division, it is hard to understand the economy in this proposal.

Personally, I hope the President will carefully review this decision in the light of State and community needs and wishes, as well as from a defense standpoint. When he does—and if he does—I feel certain he will change the signals on this new move for economy.

In Oklahoma, the people are rallying strongly in support of our State's famous 45th Division, and nothing would do more to destroy Oklahoma's faith in the military judgment of Washington than the abolition of this great fighting unit.

Some of the reasons for this Oklahoma attitude are summed up in the Associated Press article which follows, as it appeared in the Tulsa Daily World of April 13, 1958:

FORTY-FIFTH, FIGHTING FOR LIFE, HAS ILLUSTRIOUS HISTORY

For the first time in its long and colorful history, Oklahoma's National Guard, a veteran of five wars, is fighting for peacetime survival.

The Army plans to abolish 6 National Guard divisions. Because of low enlistment, it's feared the 45th Division will be one of them.

The number of men now wearing the famed Thunderbird patch is only a little more than 7,000. The division is authorized more than twice that many. These part-time soldiers train with 114 National Guard units at armories in 78 cities in the State, and for that training the Federal Government signs a payroll of $3,800,000 annually, according to the State Adjutant General, Roy W. Kenny.

FORMED IN 1895

The original Oklahoma National Guards were likewise few in number and they organized for self-protection. After the talk of a territorial legislative assembly in 1895, groups of militiamen, volunteers, and Indian scouts banded together against lawless white men and warlike Indians. The Territory supplied a troop of Rough Riders and four infantry companies for the Spanish-American War. These veteranss returned to organize the First Infantry Regiment, Oklahoma National Guard.

When the Mexican war broke out, the President ordered the guard into Federal service in 1916. After that war, the guards were home less than a month before they again were called, this time to fight in World War I.

Following the armistice, Oklahoma won authorization of two infantry regiments. The National Defense Act of 1920 authorized the formation of the 45th Infantry Division for the area covered by Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

AMONG THE GREATEST

For 20 years the organization grew, the Guards attending weekly armory drills and annual summer encampment. Occasionally they were called to duty at time of disasters.

On August 31, 1940, the 45th was called into active duty for 12 months, but before long it was plain the division was slated to take part in the second great world war. The division trained intensively for 3 years before embarking for north Africa in March 1943.

The European campaigns of the Thunderbird Division went down in America's military history among the greatest. The invasions of Sicily, Italy, with its bloody Anzio beachhead, southern France and eventually

the Rhineland took the 45th through 511 days of combat.

It was the 45th's performance in these campaigns that led George S. Patton, the famed blood-and-guts general, to say of the division: "Born at sea, baptized in blood, your fame shall never die. Your division is one of the best if not the best division in the history of American arms."

The late Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McClain was active in reactivating the division after World War II. In the summer of 1950, the division was alerted again, along with four other National Guard divisions. After training at Camp Polk, La., the division shipped to Japan in March 1951 and made its first foreign peaceful landing on the northernmost island of Hokkaido, surrounded on three sides by Soviet territory. Throughout the spring and summer, the Thunderbirds trained and late in November the division was ordered to Korea, where again they engaged in combat.

Commander of the division during the Korean hostilities was Maj. Gen. James C. Styron, a West Point graduate, now retired and engaged in the cotton business at Hobart. The present commander is Maj. Gen. Hal L. Muldrow, a Norman insurance man.

The assistant division commander, Brig. Gen. Frederick A. Daugherty, is a district judge at Oklahoma City.

Politics and the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1958:

POLITICS AND THE RECESSION—REVIVAL OF DEMOCRATS' TACTICS OF THIRTIES SEEN IN TAKING OF TRUMAN TESTIMONY

The Democrats apparently have decided to make political capital out of the recession. They are putting on hearings which are more concerned with making political propaganda than with helping to put America's economic house in order.

The spectacle of taking testimony from Harry Truman, whose administration has been accused of gross indifference to unemployment in the 1949 recession, is a kind of political circus which awakens memories of similar tactics in the 1930's.

For the people of the United States are again paying the penalty today of a divided government. With the Democrats in control of the House from December 1930 through February 1933, the political warfare against the Republican President in the White House grew so intense that the latter once remarked it was tragic to find his opponents preferring to play politics with human misery.

For almost 4 years now the Democratic Party has had the major responsibility in Congress, while the White House has been occupied by a Republican President. When recessions come and national unity is so essential to economic recovery, why is it so important for the partisans to play politics?

Thus President Eisenhower has just pleaded with Congress to pass legislation, which he recommended on March 25 of this year, to provide a temporary continuation of unemployment compensation benefits for workers who have exhausted their benefits under State and Federal laws. The President declared on Sunday:

"I said at the same time that prompt action was necessary to give these workers and their families a greater measure of security. This is not a matter of statistics or economic theory. It concerns people—human beings—who need, and should have, the assistance of their Government.

"I hope that the Members of the Congress will move as swiftly as possible on this vital problem when they return to Washington. All of us in Government have a special responsibility to act to alleviate the hardships which are being suffered, through no fault of their own, by these workers and their families."

But what is Congress doing? It started out this week with a show in which former President Truman was invited to air his political views. Mr. Truman has been making sarcastic comments about President Eisenhower, one of which was that if he were President: "I would be doing something. I wouldn't be sitting still or playing golf."

To this, Meade Alcorn, Republican National Chairman, replied, as follows:

"In 1949, a serious economic recession began in the spring and unemployment grew through the summer and into the winter. President Truman and the Nation were told in November that unemployment in the previous month had mounted to 3,823,000 or 6.1 percent of the smaller working force of that time.

"On November 26, President Truman left Washington for Key West, Fla., where he spent 24 days. He returned to Washington on December 21 and 2 days later left on a holiday trip of a week to Independence, Mo.

"The recession meanwhile deepened through the winter and into 1950. A peak was reached in February when 4,828,000 or 7.8 percent of the working force was out of work—slightly more than the 7.7 percent who were unemployed in March 1958.

"That figure was announced in the first part of March 1950. On March 13, President Truman again left Washington for Key West where he spent 29 days. The latter trip was taken shortly after Mr. Truman said in an interview that up to 5 million unemployed was 'supportable' and it was 'healthy for the economic body' if job-seeking went on at all times."

The Federal Reserve Board has just announced that industrial production in March of this year was 28 percent above the 1947–49 average. This was during the Truman recession.

Mr. Truman was asked at the hearing here this week by Representative HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa, Republican, if he said in an interview in the New York Times in 1950 that unemployment of 3 million to 5 million persons would not be too bad a thing. The former President denied that he said it, whereupon Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, who had obtained the interview, issued a statement saying that Mr. Truman proposed the interview to him and that the manuscript was submitted to the White House and was returned to the Times in the form in which it was printed. Mr. Krock also says that in the press conference at the White House the next day, Mr. Truman was asked if the interview was authorized in the form in which it appeared, and he answered: "It was."

Meade Alcorn says the former President possesses "a rather convenient memory of events in his administration."

That's what is going on in Washington in time of recession—the partisan clamor is just as it was in the 1930's when the Government was divided between two political parties. It deepened the depression and prevented recovery in America even though a worldwide recovery movement was underway in 1932.

Keep Our Shirts On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip W. Porter, the distinguished columnist of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, recently submitted an excellent article to his readers. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues, for I believe it is most timely. The article follows:

PUBLICISTS SHOULD GENERATE LESS FEVER ABOUT CURRENT RECESSION

(By Philip W. Porter)

I wish it were possible for publicists of all sorts, particularly politicians and journalists, to discuss the current recession coolly without that twitchy, nervous attitude, as if some doom were impending.

For a long while, we had the same sort of semihysteria when discussing the state of the world, particularly Russia. Still do, to some extent, but lately commonsense has broken out in many places and more and more people have come to believe that Russia is not sitting there just itching to invade Western Europe, or idiotic enough to fire atomic rockets over here.

Matter of fact, if you read the inside as well as the first pages, you know that there is quite a bit of tourist travel from here and from Western Europe into Russia; that exchange of scientific and cultural information is going on now and likely to increase; that the Russian Embassy over here is going out of its way to be more relaxed and outwardly friendly toward just plain tourists as well as newsmen. Such cordiality may be phony, but it's better than the complete hostility and suspicion which existed for so long.

But to get back to our recession—because we were in a boom period for so long, with all of its minor insanities, and everyone is not gainfully employed today, racking up scads of overtime, the recession is the big news of the moment. It seems bigger to us around here, too, because we're in the auto-steel belt.

DOWN TO EARTH?

But really now, can't we come down to earth? There are places around the country which had a slump in certain industries—had it bad—for several years, but the world didn't come to an end. Textiles, for instance, and anthracite coal. A score of cities in New England have had widespread unemployment for several years because both wool and cotton factories were not producing or selling as much as they used to; new synthetic fabrics, the fact that men wore more sport garments and fewer vests, changes in styles, etc., fouled them up. And the anthracite coal mines by Pennsylvania and West Virginia have been in bad shape, too; the use of gas and oil for home heating crippled that industry. Lumber has been in trouble the past year, also.

This slump today is primarily an auto recession. Because the auto industry is so big, and so closely affects other industries which supply it, the effects have spread to steel, glass, rubber, and so forth. But there are quite a few areas completely unaffected, and countrywide, the unemployment total is nothing fearsome. When people not used to statistics see totals mounting each month, they may start to worry, but in normal times there are about 3 million unemployed at this time of year. Actually, the newly unemployed are only about 2½ million out of 65 million. Almost all are drawing compensation from State governments.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Such funds are supposed to be heavily drawn on in times like these. Otherwise, why build these cushions up? The weekly checks are not any more than enough to pay for food and shelter, but since when is a jobless man expected to live as well as he did when he was working? And was there ever a time when there was not fluctuation in business and some thousands, or even hundreds of thousands, were not looking for new work, or out of work between jobs?

CASH ON HAND

There are plenty of folks with cash in the bank and in the pocket today. They're spending some—such seeming luxuries as the home and flower show, the advance Met Opera sales, and various boat and sportsmen shows all over the country have done well—but they're just not buying autos just now. And they're not going to respond to fatuous appeals to buy for the good of the country; people buy only when they need something or think they do.

The auto industry is oversold just now for several reasons—too high prices, too big cars, too soft credit. The high prices resulted from inflated wages, but the other two reasons can be blamed only on bum judgment. When common sense returns autos will sell again. The legitimate replacement market alone is tremendous—I don't mean the keep-up-with-the-Joneses replacement.

If we'll just keep our shirts on, and not act like nervous mothers with their first cases of chickenpox, we'll come through all right.

One-Man Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, recent events make it more and more obvious that on the word of one man alone may hinge peace in the entire world. I believe it has been a matter of dismay to most of us that Russia has returned to one-man dictatorship.

In this connection, I believe my colleagues will be interested in an editorial by Mr. Gene Kemper, editor of the Alliance Times-Herald, published at Alliance, Nebr. The editorial seems to outline the situation quite appropriately. Gene Kemper thinks straight and his views well represent the thinking in the Midwest:

ONE-MAN RULE AGAIN

After a brief interval, Russia seems to have returned to one-man power under Nikita Khrushchev.

The abrupt elevation of Khrushchev to supreme power as Soviet Premier has come as something of a surprise to the world outside the Red orbit. It came as a surprise in part because Khrushchev as Communist Party chief denounced the "personal cult" and was the leader in seeking to erase the worship of Stalin after his death. Now, it seems, the Kremlin will return to the same sort of one-man domination it had under Josef Stalin.

Despite the surprise, the shift which moved Bulganin out of the premiership, has been developing for several months. As Khrushchev pushed Bulganin more and more into the background, there was a strong suspicion that a change was in the making. Most of the observers, however, didn't expect it to come quite as completely as it did.

It will take time to determine just what policy changes the new Khrushchev government has in the making. Almost certainly it will not make the Kremlin any more reasonable or any more willing to ease its aggressive policies a bit. It will not be surprising if it does mean the launching of a new era of stern and tough Communist pressures at every possible point. Khrushchev will seek to equal or surpass the Stalin achievements with some of his own. That could mean more severe trials for the free nations.

The faint hope which awakened at Stalin's death, that Russia might assume a more peaceful role in the world, will be extinguished by the newest move. In its place comes new apprehension.

Great Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter and enclosure, dated April 7, 1958, which I received from the managing editor of the Detroit Free Press. This letter and enclosure concerns a foreign policy education program the Detroit Free Press has been participating in known as Great Decisions.

THE DETROIT FREE PRESS,
Detroit, Mich., April 7, 1958.

Representative ALVIN BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BENTLEY: The Detroit Free Press took part this winter in a foreign-policy education program known as Great Decisions. It is sponsored nationally by the Foreign Policy Association, of New York, and has the approval of President Eisenhower and leaders of both parties.

You may be interested in what the Detroit program showed about the foreign policy views of a cross section of your constituents.

The Free Press devoted a full page every Sunday to impartial background articles on 1 of 6 major foreign-policy topics. Readers were encouraged to get together informally, study the material and discuss the issues.

Printed with the background information was an opinion ballot, which readers were invited to fill out and mail in to us.

The response ran from 100 to 225 ballots a week. They came from a wide range—Supreme Court Justices to laid-off factory workers, pensioners and college students, men, and women, Republicans, Democrats, and independents.

While the sample was small, it was spontaneous. No special interest groups were involved. Anybody who wished could pick up his pencil and mark down his views.

Besides our readers, from 50 to 70 persons met in weekly discussion groups. They also filled out opinion ballots prepared by the Foreign Policy Association.

Attached for your information is a summary of the highlights of the opinion ballots.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK ANGELO,
Managing Editor.

SUMMARY OF OPINION BALLOT—HIGHLIGHTS

ON FOREIGN AID

Favor administration's $3.9 billion aid bill, 19 percent. (Among Republican readers, 14 percent approved; among Democrats, 33 percent.)

Wish foreign aid reduced, 31 percent. (Republicans, 34 percent; Democrats, 28 percent.)

Wish foreign aid ended entirely, 50 percent. (Republicans, 52 percent; Democrats, 39 percent.)

Of those who favor some foreign aid, 43 percent want more economic help; only 10 percent urged more military assistance.

ON TARIFFS

Favor higher tariffs, 43 percent. (Republicans, 48 percent; Democrats, 37 percent.)

Favor lower tariffs, 33 percent. (Republicans, 24 percent; Democrats, 44 percent.)

Favor extension of Reciprocal Trades Act for 5 years, 29 percent; for 3 years, 15 percent; for 1 year, 45 percent; not at all, 11 percent.

ON RED CHINA

Favor complete trade embargo, 58 percent. (Republicans, 76 percent; Democrats, 34 percent.)

Favor limited (nonstrategic) trade, 22 percent.

Favor as much trade as possible, 17 percent.

Favor all possible help to Formosa short of war, 48 percent.

Favor recognition of Red China, ignoring Formosa, 21 percent.

Favor recognition of Reds on mainland and Nationalists on Formosa, 28 percent.

ON THE UNITED NATIONS

Keep Red China out, 70 percent.

Abandon U. N., 35 percent. (Republicans, 51 percent; Democrats, 25 percent.)

Strengthen U. N., 56 percent. (Republican, 42 percent; Democrats, 71 percent.)

Favor U. N. armed peace force, 61 percent.

ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Support Eisenhower doctrine, 18 percent.

Urge pro-Arab policies, 32 percent.

Urge pro-Israel policies, 32 percent.

Favor U. N. guarantee of Arab-Israel border settlement, 75 percent.

Favor U. N. economic development agency in Middle East, 48 percent.

ON AFRICA

Use United States influence with Britian and France to speed independence of African nations, 77 percent.

Support British and French colonial policies, 3 percent.

Support native anticolonial movements, 7 percent.

Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska as an example, 71 percent.

ON WESTERN EUROPE

Encourage development of European common market, 92 percent.

Retirement of Lt. Gen. James H. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of March 31, 1958, on the retirement on that date of Lt. Gen. James H. Gavin, wartime

commander of the famous 82d Airborne Division and, for the past 2 years, Army Chief of Research and Development:

GENERAL GAVIN RETIRES

Wilkes-Barre today joins the Nation in a salute to Lt. Gen. James H. (Slim Jim) Gavin on the occasion of his retirement from the Army. The 82d Airborne Division passed in review before its wartime commander at Fort Bragg to honor him on this occasion. For the past 2 years, General Gavin has been Army Chief of Research and Development.

General Gavin made all four combat jumps with the 82d during the war, being the 1st man out the door and setting for his men a stirring example in courage and fidelity to duty. It is easier to understand why America triumphed over Hitler's formidable military machine when the careers of officers like General Gavin are reviewed.

Of him, it can be truly written:

Well done.

President and Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of March 30, 1958]

PRESIDENT AND TARIFF

Speaking before a trade policy conference Thursday, Mr. Eisenhower gave perhaps his most comprehensive plea for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The administration's proposal, facing a battle in Congress, would extend the 1934 act for another 5 years. It would permit the President during this period to make further tariff cuts of up to 25 percent in exchange for concessions from other countries, and would enlarge his authority to raise the rates where imports are hurting domestic industries.

Because of the recession and increasing imports, opposition to the reciprocal trade program is probably stronger now than at any time in the act's history. Even as the President spoke, a protectionist group held a rally in another Washington hotel and charged that small-business men and their workers are being robbed of a living by cheap imports that are assessed low tariffs or none at all. There are few congressional districts in which at least one industry, however small, is not pressing for protection.

The general good of the country, both economically and politically, justifies the extension proposed by the administration.

Protectionists claim that 338,000 employees have lost their jobs because of competition from imports. The President replied with an estimate that 4½ million men and women in this country owe their jobs to our export trade and would lose them if foreigners could not earn dollars by selling goods to us. Although some unions, such as the flint glass workers, are crying for protection, the AFL–CIO as a whole is behind the President's plan.

It is true that our imports are large—some $13 billion a year; but our exports are larger, and account for $20 billion a year. It is true, also, that our tariffs are lower than ever before; in the last 26 years the average rate on dutiable goods has dropped from 59 percent to 11 percent, as the accompanying chart shows. Yet customs receipts last year were the highest in history.

Some vital industries such as precision instruments are threatened by foreign competition. But vastly greater defense industries such as steel, automobiles, and aircraft, thrive on their exports. In fact the President has received a good deal of advice in favor of low tariffs from a leading steel man, Clarence Randall, of Chicago.

In cases of proved injury, such as the clock and watch industry, the President has raised the tariff as high as the present law will permit—to 50 percent above the rate of 1945. Under the proposed extension, he could raise it further to 50 percent above the rate of 1934—or as high as under the arch-protectionist Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930.

The Democrats launched the reciprocal trade program in 1934 as one means of getting us out of the depression. How effective it might have been is hard to tell, for the war boom was soon on; and in the last 12 years prosperity has minimized the importance of the tariff as a protective measure. It is interesting to note, however, that while the Trade Agreements Act was enacted to fight a depression, it is now being attacked as bad medicine in a recession.

In his recent speech to a group of Republican women, the President asked, "If we do not buy from [foreign nations] and pay them in dollars, where will they get the dollars to buy our goods?" The implication is that if the trade act is extended, Mr. Eisenhower will not persist in his demands for foreign aid.

In the President will pledge himself and his party to a massive reduction in foreign aid in return for the extension of his tariff powers, much of the opposition to his program will evaporate.

Nuclear Test Ban Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in sharp contrast to the rather hysterical editorials appearing in some Eastern United States newspapers regarding the Soviet's current shell game on nuclear tests, western United States newspapers are assessing it as the intellectual embezzlement it actually amounts to.

The old shell game, of course, was a city slicker's trick to part the yokel from his cash. Three shells were manipulated on a table, with a pea supposedly under one. The yokel bet which shell covered the peas. But he always lost because the slicker palmed the pea and it was under none of them.

Seems that some of the city slick East coast editorial writers have been playing yokels for the Communist propagandists latest device to strip the free world of its needed power to deter Soviet aggression. This does not, of course, apply to all newspapers. For instance, this morning's Wall Street Journal carried an editorial cutting this business of an alleged Russian propaganda coup down to size. It relates that by now the so-called neutralist nations have pretty well firmed up their position between the free world and he Iron Curtain, whereas our allies have pretty well alined their destinies with us, so propaganda of the test ban nature probably has little effect anyway. The editorial is as follows:

THE BOMB AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

The Soviet Union has won a big victory, we are told. With its call for an end to nuclear tests, which we have rejected, it has won a major campaign in the propaganda war.

For example, India is hailing the Soviets and tak-taking the United States. In the British Parliament, meanwhile, Conservative Prime Minister Macmillan, the custodian of the tradition of the old World War II alliance with this country, is backing the United States position. The laborites are damning the United States.

It seems to us that the United States worries overly much about propaganda victories and losses. Or, as it used to be phrased, about the battle for men's minds.

After more than a decade of cold war, whatever propaganda issue is raised, the so-called neutralist nations and our allies have their minds pretty well made up. By and large the camps are rather well drawn.

Mr. Dulles and his aides apparently realize this for the fact that it is. And they are rightly acting not from what is good public relations for America, but from what is good for the American public.

Notwithstanding the logic of the foregoing, and the fact that Gromyko's announcement remained wholly silent about the fact that Russia has both A-bombs and H-bombs which it could use to destroy great segments of mankind, with sort of an obsession about the subject of propaganda, a Washington Post editorial writer earlier this week attributed a great propaganda coup to Khrushchev and company while failing, in my opinion, to cite and expose the treachery of the move as forcefully as should have been done.

By way of contrast the Los Angeles Times pointed out editorially on April 1 that the Russian announcement has no real meaning in terms of peace or hopes for peace, but that United States actions since 1946 have pointed consistently in such direction. The editorial is as follows:

LET'S STAND WHERE WE ARE

It must appear to all reasonable Americans—all of whom yearn to see the end of nuclear weapons—that the announcement that Russia is suspending nuclear tests has no real meaning for disarmament.

RUSSIA IS JUDGE

First of all, the Russian statement is ambiguous. How long are the Soviets suspending tests—for a day, a week, a month? They say they will resume firing nuclear charges if the West does not go along with them. That means that they can resume tests any time on the pretext that the West has not met their specifications for suspension. They are the sole judge.

They are seeking to embarrass the United States. They have conducted 14 detected nuclear tests since last August while we have held none. Presumably they have fired everything in that series from which they could gain data. The United States announced that it will hold a series of tests in the Pacific beginning late this spring. The opportunity for propaganda was perfect. The tragedy is that many among our allies, and even some of our own people, will be determined not to see through this sham.

The United States Government fired a message back at the Russians as soon as the Russian foreign minister stopped talking and it was loaded with logic that does not become weaker with its 12 years of aging. The United States is eager to discuss disarmament through the long-agreed agency, the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

U. N. Commission, which the Russians have boycotted; the United States stands ready instantly to respond to a supervised suspension of nuclear tests.

The first American nuclear shot in the spring testing is likely to be the pretext to release the Russians from their suspension. Then there will be an attempt to make it appear that the United States deliberately prolonged the nuclear frightfulness. Americans will join in the clamor.

REPEATED AT GENEVA

Adlai Stevenson is one of the Americans who would stop the tests on our side. We shudder and give thanks that the American voters did not put him in the place where he could experiment with American security in order to please his foreign friends. The present administration, we are confident, will take no chances.

The United States proposed first, in 1946, that nuclear weapons be abolished. It proposed the abolishment when America alone had the atomic bomb. That offer to Russia and the world has stood ever since: The United States will stop nuclear tests and the manufacture of nuclear weapons whenever a reliable system of international inspection is set up. President Eisenhower repeated the formula with modifications at Geneva. That is where we stand and that is where we should keep on standing.

The Washington Post again this morning dealt editorially with the A-test ban topic, but again from the standpoint of its editorial writers' preoccupation with the propaganda theme instead of the basics of the case. Two suggestions were made as to United States action, one of which seems proper, the other highly dangerous to the Nation.

The first deals with an explanation by our Government of the case for testing. It is a matter which many in the Congress feel should be dealt with by the President himself in a speech to the world at large. As the Post put it, the administration, following the Red announcement, should have made:

A really thorough, documented explanation of why this country was continuing its nuclear tests, an explanation that avoided the usual pooh-poohing of fears and instead made a sober statement of risks. The best case the administration could make for the testing of clean weapons is that they might permit conversion to the sort of deterrent that would not imperil all humanity in the event of large nuclear war.

Had the editorial writer stopped there, he would have been within the range of his technical knowledge and properly backgrounded editorial comment. However, he went on to make a second, and I believe dangerous, statement as to what should have been done by our Government following the Gromyko announcement; it was as follows:

The other, and in this newspaper's opinion far preferable, course was to announce that we were placing further tests under United Nations supervision—and that simultaneously we were making the technology of a clean weapon available to the Russians.

Now, unless this editorial writer has sufficient knowledge of the science and technology of nuclear weapons-making to be able to guarantee to the people of the United States and the people of the rest of the world that placing such information in Russian hands would not simultaneously place in their hands an ability to fabricate nuclear weapons of greater offense capability against the free world's defenders than they now possess, then it was not, in my opinion, a responsible recommendation.

There is at least some substance to the argument that the mere fact that Soviet nuclear armament is dirty deters its use. Giving them clean weapons, and possibly improved weapons, could certainly have nothing but an adverse effect on the strength of the free world relative to the Reds.

Further, such a suggestion coming from 1 of the 2 largest newspapers in this Nation's Capital, now gives the Soviets an additional propaganda weapon to hurl back at us, as well as a lever to try to pry loose this information so vital to our security.

A lot more could be said on this subject, and probably will as time passes. I speak of it somewhat briefly with a hope that calling attention to the need for a rather broad scientific and technological background to make valid recommendations regarding many aspects of the nuclear weapons problem, may deter some editorialists from shooting from the hip with suggestions on this subject which may not stand up, or even be dangerous, when analyzed by our people engaged in the weapons program who have more intimate knowledge of the subject.

So that the Post's editorial comments this morning may be read in context, I include the editorial, as follows:

TEST PROPAGANDA

If the administration regards the controversy over nuclear weapon tests as merely a battle of propaganda, it is no wonder that the United States has come off so badly. President Eisenhower yesterday termed the announcement of the suspension of Soviet tests a gimmick. It may well be a gimmick, coming as it does just after completion of Soviet tests and before a new series of American tests. But the effect could not really have been offset by just a gimmick on our side.

It is true, as Secretary Dulles observed, that the Russians are formidable propagandists who go to lengths to which the United States will not go. They are capitalizing on men's fears and hopes for their own purposes. But their appeal cannot be countered just by calling it propaganda; nor can these fears and hopes be dismissed as impertinent. The Russians appear to be doing something imaginative and affirmative. We don't. It is as simple as that.

Through a combination of hesitation and poor articulation the administration has accentuated its own dilemma. There seems to have been no very clear idea of what the administration wanted to do in anticipation of the Soviet move—except do nothing. The result is a largely negative position which not even the most polished Madison Avenue gloss could have converted into something positive.

Whether or not the decision not to suspend American tests was right, once this decision was made the administration had two logical alternative courses. One was to make a really thorough, documented explanation of why this country was continuing its nuclear tests—an explanation that avoided the usual pooh-poohing of fears and instead made a sober statement of risks. The best case the administration could make for the testing of clean weapons is that they might permit conversion to the sort of deterrent that would not imperial all humanity in the event of large nuclear war. To make a convincing explanation would have been difficult, but it could have been tried.

The other, and in this newspaper's opinion far preferable, course was to announce that we were placing further tests under United Nations supervision would help relieve taneously we were making the technology of clean weapons available to the Russians. United Nations supervision would help relieve fears of radioactive contamination. And if the administration really believes in the humanitarian advantages of clean weapons, such as they may be, surely it would be in our own and our allies' interest to encourage the Russians to clean up their own stockpiles.

These courses remain open. A move along either of these lines now would seem belated, but until the administration determines to assert itself in some such way this country will inevitably remain at a disadvantage. The best propaganda still is constructive actions.

To show editorial contrast, I call attention to the message carried on this morning's Los Angeles Examiner editorial page. The Examiner's comments well exemplify the caution, reason, and good judgment which should characterize editorial comment on the vital subject of nuclear testing.

STEADY ON COURSE

Reason is beginning to supplant emotional clamor here and abroad in the reaction to the Soviet announcement that it is conditionally halting nuclear tests. The evidence:

Refusing to be jarred off course, the administration will proceed calmly with our own tests in the Pacific in the interests of national security, the security of our allies and, as inevitably will become clear, the benefit of mankind.

The propaganda fallout from the Russian announcement shows no indication of damaging the American position to the fearful extent some commentators and editorialists have predicted. Its first effect was considerable. But it was not a debacle. And any propaganda advantage gained by a shoddy and obvious fraud cannot last long.

Secretary Dulles fortified the side of reason when he revealed at his press conference Tuesday that President Eisenhower brusquely rejected last week a suggestion from his top advisers to grab the world headlines ahead of the Russians by announcing we would halt nuclear tests.

The President rejected the idea because, he said, (1) it would be phony propaganda and (2) it would be dangerous to the security of the United States and the free world.

Precisely the same words can be used to describe the Soviet statement by Foreign Minister Gromyko and its consequences if we allowed it to sway us from working realistically and patiently toward real peace, of which one vital condition is to remain strong.

The Soviet announcement is a fraud for two reasons. The first is that the Russians have just completed an intensive series of nuclear tests, conducted in rigid secrecy, and monhts must elapse before it will be technically possible to begin another series. The second is that the big bugle blare about halting tests is conditioned on the United States and Britain doing the same.

In other words, the Russians are using a nontesting interval, that they could not avoid under any circumstances, to make a phony pitch for peace.

In contrast, the administration has announced our coming tests publicly—and for the first time anywhere is inviting scientists representing free world, neutralist and Communist nations (including Russia) to observe the test of a clean-nuclear device.

And that, as Mr. Dulles correctly emphasized, is a chief objective of our tests; to develop small tactical weapons, and to drastically reduce the fallout from big bombs by making them clean, a process in which the

Russians never have shown the slightest interest. As far as is known, they are standing pat with their dirty ones.

Development of a clean bomb is not only a humanitarian refinement of a horrible weapon, but it opens also the prospect of peaceful uses of a force that could almost literally move mountains and give its strength to huge public works.

In view of these facts it is difficult to understand on what logical grounds the frenzied commentators and editorialists are saying that we have suffered an enormous propaganda defeat. What they are really saying, with implicit intellectual arrogance, is that while they can see through the Soviet fraud the people cannot.

We don't go for that. We believe the administration's course is the right one, and that if it is calmly and firmly followed and calmly and firmly expressed, people will understand and indose it, and recognize the Soviet sham for what it is.

Let no one be fooled about the real intentions of the Soviet leadership. Their treacherous record speaks for itself. While their propaganda has been reaching a crescendo in demanding immediate cessation of tests by the West, the Soviet Union exploded 3 nuclear weapons in the megaton range within a period of 5 days (February 23–27) and 6 more nuclear weapons in a period of 9 days (March 14–22). These are in addition to 5 other Soviet test explosions in the August-to-December period, making a total of 14 since August 1957. I am accompanying these remarks with a table summarizing announcements regarding the current Red nuclear test series.

The real motive behind the Soviet propaganda barrage is to tie United States' hands in the development of a rounded arsenal of clean nuclear weapons. They want to deprive us of a colossal counter-weapon against their threatened intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads.

They made their decision to mount their nuclear offensive capability against us in ICBM's several years ago. They have proceeded to develop such missiles as well as the nuclear warheads to aim against United States cities and industries if they ever decide to start allout war against us to attain their ambition of world domination. When such Soviet nuclear ICBM capability will be operational is anybody's guess.

Meanwhile, our only really effective defense against such type of attack is to develop antimissile missiles with atomic warheads large enough to intercept and destroy a Soviet attack while it is high in the atmosphere. In order to use such defensive antimissile nuclear missiles over our own heads they must be clean, and not involve radioactive fallout dangers to our own population.

The Reds know we need to test in order to perfect the variety of clean weapons needed to defend ourselves in such manner. They want to force us to stop testing to prevent us from getting them and thus neutralizing Soviet attack power against the United States.

We and the rest of the people of the free world must recognize that the same inhuman masters in the Kremlin who directed the slaughter in Hungary are those who now propose the nuclear test ban. Therefore their move is not prompted by a concern for humanity. They simply have no such concern. What they are doing in this instance, as they have done in all others, is simply what they calculate is most effective in forwarding the designs of Communist aggression. The one thing they want most of all is to render us incapable of resisting those designs. That is what is behind the current propaganda campaign and neither America nor her allies must fall into the Red trap.

We can test with safety, and have consistently done so. It is quite apparent from our recent underground test shot in Nevada that in all probability most of our testing after the current series in the Pacific will, in fact, be done underground where the possibility of radioactive fallout is nil.

A sober look at the fallout problem indicates that even the latest series of 14 blasts by the Russians, when totaled with all previous tests since Almagordo in 1945, have added not more than 2 percent to the radiation background naturally occurring in the earth.

In terms of statistical effect on the human race, authorities have calculated the maximum shortening effect of that radioactivity increase is one-half day in the average United States life span of over 70 years.

By comparison, wearing a radium dial wrist watch is calculated to reduce average life span by 10 days, smoking cigarettes by 9 years.

When a dispassionate and informed balancing is made between the dangers to humanity from safeguarded free-world nuclear tests, and the dangers to humanity from stripping ourselves of the means of checking the Soviets' ambition to impose thir Communist dictatorship worldwide, our course is apparent.

We must continue the fight for human freedom and accept the cost and the responsibilities involved in winning it. An important ingredient of victory is that we calmly chart our course into the nuclear age, without hysteria induced by propaganda from the Communist conspiracy overseas.

Table summary of AEC announcements regarding Soviet nuclear weapons tests (Aug. 23, 1957–Mar. 22, 1958)

Date of AEC press release	Date of Soviet tests	Range of yield
Aug. 23, 1957	Aug. 22, 1957	Detonation of substantial size.
Sept. 9, 1957	Within the past 2 days	Nuclear weapons test of moderate intensity. This appears to be the 2d test in a series which began Aug. 22.
Sept. 25, 1957	Sept. 24, 1957	Detonation in the megaton range. 3d nuclear explosion in the U. S. S. R. announced by the United States since Aug. 22.
Oct. 11, 1957	Oct. 10, 1957	Another test conducted in Soviet series. Latest test was a small explosion.
Dec. 30, 1957	Dec. 28, 1957	Soviet Union is continuing its testing of nuclear weapons. Most recent nuclear explosion occurred Dec. 28. (No announcement re yield.)
Feb. 23, 1958	Feb. 23, 1958	Soviets conducted weapons test today. The yield was in the megaton range.
Feb. 28, 1958	Feb. 27, 1958 (2 tests)	Soviets have conducted 2 more large-yield explosions in current series. Today's test explosions were both in the megaton range, and brought to 3 the number of Soviet large-yield nuclear explosions in the past 5 days.
Mar. 14, 1958	Mar. 14, 1958 (2 tests)	United States has detected 2 Soviet nuclear weapons tests today. Neither test was in the megaton range.
Mar. 15, 1958	Mar. 15, 1958	Soviets today conducted another nuclear weapons test. The yield of the detonation was below the megaton range.
Mar. 21, 1958	Mar. 20 Mar. 21	Detection of 2 further nuclear tests by the Soviet Government. First occurred Mar. 20 and the energy yield was small. The 2d occurred Mar. 21 and the energy yield was in a larger range.
Mar. 22, 1958	Mar. 22, 1958	The test of another weapon by the Soviet Government was detected today. This detonation, which appears to have been in the medium range, is the 3d in the past 3 days and the 6th in the past 9 days.

U. S. S. "Jarvis" (DD–799)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the port of Long Beach, Calif., is the home port of many stanch vessels of the United States Navy. One such vessel, the U. S. S. *Jarvis* (DD–799), was written about in the March issue of the Independent Businessmen's News. We sometimes tend to forget the importance of vessels such as the *Jarvis* to the peace and protection of our country. Therefore, I think it well to recount the stories of the three U. S. S. *Jarvis*' as told by the News:

DISTINGUISHED NAVAL DESTROYER
U. S. S. "JARVIS"

The U. S. S. *Jarvis* (DD–799) is the third United States destroyer to be named in honor of Midshipman James C. Jarvis, who died a hero after he refused to leave his battle station on the mainmast of the U. S. S. *Constellation* in spite of extreme personal danger involved.

The first U. S. S. *Jarvis* (DD–38) was launched April 3, 1912, at the yards of the New York Shipbuilding Co., of Camden, N. J., and attached to Torpedo Flotilla, Atlantic Fleet. Until the outbreak of World War I she operated along the Atlantic coast. During World War I the *Jarvis* operated with the Atlantic fleet in Cuban waters and served on patrol duty off the Irish coast and assisted in controlling the menace of German U-boats. She was decommissioned in 1919 and in 1935 was scrapped and the material sold.

The second U. S. S. *Jarvis* (DD–393) had its keel laid in 1936 at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash. Until the outbreak of World War II the *Jarvis* was used in patrol work on the Pacific coast and for summer cruises of Naval Reservists. On December 7, 1941, the *Jarvis* was among th first United States naval vessels to fire on the attacking Japanese bombers at Pearl Harbor. The *Jarvis* shot down four of the attacking bombers at Pearl Harbor. After Pearl Harbor and following convoy escort duty in Australian waters in 1942, the *Jarvis* joined the group of 83 ships in the attack on the Solomon Islands. At Guadalcanal on August 8, 1942, the *Jarvis* took a Jap torpedo intended for the cruiser *Vincennes*

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and was badly damaged with the loss of 14 men and 7 wounded. After being towed to Tulagi, where her crew endeavored to make her seaworthy the *Jarvis* started on its way to Sidney, Australia, for permanent repairs. She was never heard of again. After World War II a search of Japanese records, disclosed that the *Jarvis* was mistaken for an Achilles class cruiser of the Australian Navy by the Japanese destroyer Yunagi, reporting her position. The *Jarvis* was attacked by 31 Japanese planes. No trace was ever found of her or any member of her crew. The *Jarvis* (DD–393) died a noble death, having served to divert the attacking planes from continuing on to Guadalcanal where they would have caught the unprotected transports unloading marines. The U. S. S. *Jarvis* (DD–393) had many men aboard from southern California, among them being the son of the executive secretary of the IBMA.

The third U. S. S. *Jarvis* (DD–799), home port Long Beach and presently operating out of our port, is captained by Cmdr. C. E. Dunston, USN. She was built by Todd Pacific Shipbuilding Co. at Seattle and commissioned January 2, 1944. Her first assignment was in the Aleutian Islands with the Northern Pacific striking force attached to Destroyer Squadron 57. The *Jarvis* got her first crack at the enemy on November 21, 1944, when she participated in the bombardment of an airfield installation on Matsuma Island. The home islands of Japan were the next target of the *Jarvis*, participating with Squadron 11 in the first appearance of American surface vessels west of the Aleutian chain. In late June 1945 the *Jarvis* distinguished herself by sinking an armed seagoing tug and severely damaged a small cargo ship.

After hostilities ceased the *Jarvis* supervised the demilitarization of Japanese naval bases and prepared the way for the army of occupation. The *Jarvis* returned to Charleston, S. C., in late 1945 and was deactivated until February 1951 when she was brought out of mothballs to participate in the Korean war. Joining in the famous police action in early 1952 on the bomb line in North Korea, she gave an excellent showing.

Neutralizing the port of Wonsan; operating with Task Force 77; screening, protecting and lifeguarding the carriers while they launched planes for inland strikes was the job of the *Jarvis* until she returned to the east coast in 1953.

During the time she was on the east coast the *Jarvis* was part of the hunter-killer forces Atlantic taking part in training exercises in territorial and Mediterranean waters.

The *Jarvis* was permanently transferred to the west coast in January 1955 and is a part of Destroyer Squadron 19, with home port in Long Beach.

The I. B. M. A. is proud to have this distinguished naval vessel with her officers and crew as a part of our friendly community.

Abolish Capital Punishment, H. R. 11912

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 11912, a bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States except the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I favor such legislation for two reasons. In the first place I doubt that the penalty is actually a deterrent to those who would commit the heinous crimes for which the death sentence is imposed. The conclusion that it is deterrent is based on the faulty assumption that the commission of these crimes is the result of rational consideration. But all evidence indicates that these acts are either those of diseased minds or are emotional, compulsive, and irrational. On the other hand, we also have much evidence indicating that the death penalty is no deterrent. Many foreign countries and six States have abolished the death penalty. The figures in all cases show that abolition of the death sentence does not result in an increase in crimes for which it was a penalty.

Secondly, I feel that sentence of death is unconscionable in that we know we are all too capable of error. Only recently the Governor's order to delay an execution reached San Quentin 2 minutes after the fatal act had been committed. Many other examples could be recited. The point is whether we will continue to arrogantly play God knowing full well we are without the omniscience which this role requires. Lafayette's statement is most apropos:

I shall ask for the abolition of the punishment of death, until I have the infallibility of human judgment demonstrated to me.

No Contamination Without Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following advertisement which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, March 24, 1958:

THE WORLD'S PEOPLE HAVE A RIGHT TO DEMAND NO CONTAMINATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR AMERICANS ABOUT HYDROGEN BOMBS

Question. What is one of the fundamental arguments against the testing of the hydrogen bombs and nuclear explosives?

Answer. The main point is a simple one. Whenever a nuclear bomb is exploded, dangerous radioactive poisons get into the atmosphere and circle the globe. There is no way of knowing how much will fall on any given place on earth. Nor is there any way of controlling the fallout even if we did know.

This means that a nuclear explosion affects all peoples and not merely the people of the nation which exploded the bomb. A profound moral question is therefore involved in the explosion of nuclear bombs:

Does any nation—whether the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain or the other nations which will test in the future—have the right to contaminate the air and soil and water and food that belong to other peoples?

We have every right to take such risks to ourselves as we wish in the pursuit of our own security. But we do not have the right—nor does any nation—to take risks, large or small, for other people without their consent.

The American people fought a revolution because vital decisions were made at a distance without our consent. The issue today is even more basic so far as the world's peoples are concerned. They have every right to demand no contamination without representation.

If we persist in an act that is actually or potentially hazardous to other peoples, we have the obligation to give them the complete right to participate in the processes of Government and public debate inside our own Nation.

Question. Haven't other nations given their permission to the testing countries to set off nuclear explosions?

Answer. This is the heart of the matter. They haven't even been asked. In fact, many nations have been protesting vigorously—inside and outside the United Nations. Their protests have been directed against the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain.

Question. Has any evidence been advanced by these countries that nuclear testing represents a hazard to their people?

Answer. Yes, Japan, for example, has presented evidence to show that detectable quantities of radioactive strontium he turned up in the populous Tokyo area. Japanese scientists estimate that if not another nuclear bomb is exploded, the additional fallout from past nuclear explosions that will continue to fall to earth will bring the rate up to levels far beyond reasonable estimates of safety.

Question. Is there any evidence of actual or potential contamination in the United States?

Answer. In February of this year, a survey under the auspices of the United States Atomic Energy Commission revealed that the amount of poisonous radioactive strontium now in the bones of adults has increased 33 percent over the 1955–56 level. There was a 50 percent increase in the bones of children. For children up to age four, the increase went as high as 60 percent. These amounts are but a very small fraction of the total "permissible dose" of strontium. But the increase, percentagewise, is cause for concern, especially since it is not known with precision how much strontium the body can tolerate without harm.

Question. Why have the tests resulted in a greater increase of radioactive strontium in the bones of children?

Answer. The growth process in children makes heavy demands on the body to assimilate calcium. Since strontium is chemically similar to calcium, the growing body mistakes the strontium for calcium.

Question. Have there been any other official surveys which give proof of radioactive fallout?

Answer. Yes. In 1954, studies made for the Atomic Energy Commission definitely established the fact that farmlands in the Midwest and milk in the Nation showed traces of radioactive strontium.

Question. Did these figures indicate any real or imminent danger?

Answer. The figures show that the amount of poisonous radioactive strontium in our soil and milk were at that time (1954) well under what the Atomic Energy Commission believes to be the danger limits. But the radioactive materials in the air have multiplied since that time because of the many bombs that have been exploded—not only by the United States but by the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

Question. Exactly what is the danger now?

Answer. This is where the debate begins. Some scientists say that the body can absorb radioactive poison up to a certain point without ill effect. But the large majority of scientists who have spoken out on this question say it is dangerous to assume that there is such a thing as a "safe" dosage of radioactive strontium, especially for children. In any event, they believe that the health of our people—and the world's peoples—is too vital a matter to be left to guesswork. That is why they earnestly call upon all nations now testing nuclear explosives to suspend their testing until these questions can be scientifically answered. They point out, further, that as new scientific evidence on the effects of radiation comes in, it becomes necessary to lower the safety limits.

For example, only a few years ago it was generally believed that people could have X-ray examinations at frequent intervals without ill affects. But these estimates have been sharply revised in recent months. Today, the safety margin is known to be only a fraction of what it was believed to be 3 years ago.

We cannot afford to make the same wrong guesses about radioactive fallout that we did with X-rays. After the poisonous radioactive materials get into the air, there is no way of washing the sky. Indeed, a nuclear bomb explosion will have its fallout effects for many years after a bomb goes off.

Question. How long will the danger last?

Answer. Radioactive strontium, for example, loses its power very slowly. After 28 years, it still retains half its strength. Therefore, each nuclear explosion adds to the long-term killing power of the radioactive material in the air.

While it is correct to say that the radiation danger from a nuclear explosion is comparatively small at any given time, we must remember that it does its harm over a long period.

Question. What happens when other countries—France and Germany for example—insist on their right to test nuclear weapons?

Answer. Here most of the debate among scientists disappears. For whatever the difference of opinion among scientists may be on the degree of danger today, most agree that testing cannot go on indefinitely. Even the most conservative scientists foresee a period of serious danger within the near future if there is unlimited testing.

Question. What about the clean bomb?

Answer. The use of the word "clean" to describe a hydrogen bomb is a moral outrage. There is nothing clean about a bomb that can incinerate millions of people at a time. The word "clean" is intended to describe a nuclear bomb that is supposed to be free of radioactive fallout. No such bomb now exists. Even its proponents admit that it may take years to produce it. But we can't afford that kind of time.

Three or four years from now we may be able to point to a stockpile with a lowered radioactive yield. But overhead the sky may have become a canopy of radioactive poisons. In any event, the absurdity of clean-bomb speculation becomes apparent when we reflect that the Soviet may have no interest in dropping clean bombs on its enemies.

And even if the nuclear stockpiles were to consist exclusively of clean bombs it would still be important to seek a ban on H-bombs because of the cataclysmic power of such weapons.

Question. How powerful is a hydrogen bomb?

Answer. A hydrogen bomb has already been tested that is 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, Japan, in 1945. One 20-megaton hydrogen bomb carries more explosive power than all the bombs put together that were dropped during the entire Second World War.

Question. Would hydrogen bombs be used in a major war?

Answer. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have served notice on each other that hydrogen bombs would be used in another war. With the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile the war strategies of the major nations are being built around their ability to deliver bombs on enemy cities within the shortest possible time.

Question. Is there any effective civilian defense against attack by missiles carrying hydrogen bombs?

Answer. It takes a missile less than 18 minutes to complete its journey across the ocean. There would not be enough warning for people to take shelter, even assuming we could develop the kind of radar that would locate the missiles near the start of their journey.

Question. How, then, can we stop the runaway race towards annihilation?

Answer. Doing away with nuclear tests will not by itself bring peace. But it at least represents a vital start.

We recognize that other things must be done. A way must be found to reduce and control stockpiles of nuclear and conventional weapons. The arms race itself cannot be separated from the problem of world security and the larger problem of world justice. The United Nations must be strengthened to provide for just settlement of political problems and human needs.

But unless we are to remain caught on dead center a start must be made somewhere.

Question. How can we make this start?

Answer. We can and should disentangle the nuclear-test issue from the larger disarmament packages of the West and the U. S. S. R.

We should propose a ban on nuclear testing for an extended period, say 2 or 3 years, under a reciprocal-inspection system to be supervised by the United Nations.

Both Harold Stassen, former Disarmament Adviser to the President, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, say this is possible now.

The ban on testing should be universal, applying both to countries already in possession of nuclear weapons and those countries about to embark on nuclear armament.

Question. How do we know what the Russians will do?

Answer. We don't. We do know that the Russians have agreed to a test ban under a rigorous inspection system. We don't know whether they will finally accept the necessary conditions, but we have yet to meet their challenge with a clear and determined voice.

When we do this, we may attract to us such massed support in the world as may render it difficult for any one nation to obstruct the already expressed demands of the world's peoples.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY.

NEW YORK.

(Signed by Adelaide Baker, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Prof. John C. Bennett, dean of the faculty, Union Theological Seminary; Dr. Wayne A. Bowers, professor of physics, University of North Carolina; Ray Bradbury, author, "The Martian Chronicles"; Henry Steele Commager, historian, author, The Rise of the American Nation; Norman Cousins*, editor, the Saturday Review; The Reverend Henry Hitt Crane, Detroit; Melvin Douglas; India Edwards, Washington, D. C.; Clark M. Eichelberger*; Maurice Evans, actor; Eugene Exman*, vice president, Harper & Bros., publishers; Harold E. Fey, editor, the Christian Century; the Reverend George B. Ford, pastor, Corpus Christi Church, New York; the Reverend Harry E. Fosdick, minister emeritus, the Riverside Church; Dr. Erich Fromm, psychologist, author; Robert Gilmore*, New York secretary, American Friends Service Committee; Patrick E. Gorman, secretray-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America; Oscar Hammerstein II, playwright; the Reverend Donald Harrington*, minister, Community Church, New York; Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, United States Army (retired); Dr. Homer Jack*, minister, Evanston, Ill.; James Jones, author, From Here to Eternity; Dr. Martin Luther King, president, Southern Christian Leaders Conference; Rabbi Edward E. Klein, Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, New York; Paul Lavietes, M. D., chairman, Physicians Forum; Max Lerner, author, America as a Civilization; Murray D. Lincoln, president, Nationwide Insurance Co.; Howard Lindsay; Dr. M. Stanley Livingston, department of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Clarence H. Low*, retired; Thomas G. MacGowan, Akron, Ohio; L. D. MacIntyre, president, American Ethical Union; Arnold H. Maremont, chairman of the board, Thor Corp.; Lenore G. Marshall*, author of Other Knowledge; Lawrence S. Mayers, Jr.,* president, L. and C. Mayers Co., Inc.; the Reverend Robert J. McCracken, minister, the Riverside Church, New York; Lewis Mumford, author, The Condition of Man; Elliot S. Nichols, civil leader, Detroit; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Orlie Pell,* president, United States section, WILPF; Clarence Pickett,* executive secretary emeritus, American Friends Service Committee; Dr. Ernest Pollard, professor of biophysics, Yale University; Josephine W. Pomerance,* director, community relations, Committee for World Disarmament and World Development; Dr. Charles C. Price,* chairman, department of chemistry, University of Pennsylvania; David Riesman, sociologist, author, The Lonely Crowd; Eleanor Roosevelt; Elmo Roper, marketing consultant and public opinion analyst; Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Church Methodist, New York; Dr. Pitirim Sorokin, professor of sociology, emeritus, Harvard University; Dr. Edward J. Sparling,* president, Roosevelt University; Samuel Standard, M. D., associate professor of clinical surgery, New York University College of Medicine; Norman Thomas,* chairman, Post War World Council; Dean Howard Thurman, Marsh Chapel, Boston University; Dr. Paul J. Tillich, university professor, Harvard University; Jerry Voorhis, executive director, Cooperative League of America; Bishop Hazen G. Werner, the Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio; Allan M. Wilson,* vice president, the Advertising Council; Dr. Hugh Wolfe,* chairman, department of physics, Cooper Union, New York; W. Barry Wood, M. D., vice president, medical affairs, Johns Hopkins University.)

(The signers of this statement do so as individuals and not as representatives of organizations or as members of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Names followed by an asterisk indicate members of the national executive committee.)

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at New England Hospital Assembly

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 24, 1958, I had the very

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

happy privilege of addressing the Women's Auxiliary of the New England Hospital Assembly at Boston, Mass. This auxiliary is an organization of dedicated women who devote much effort and many long hours toward the continuous improvement of our hospital system.

I had been told by expert hospital administrators that an outstanding contribution of women's auxiliaries is the ability to interpret community needs and viewpoints to the hospital and at the same time interpret hospital needs and policies to the community. To my personal knowledge auxiliary members here in New England have admirably exhibited this ability. Much of the credit for the excellent community response to the hospitals as well as for the high degree of service which the hospitals offer to the communities must rightfully be attributed to their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit my speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, DEMOCRAT, RHODE ISLAND, AT THE NEW ENGLAND HOSPITAL ASSEMBLY, STATLER HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., MARCH 24, 1958

Last year the hospital auxiliary newsletter carried an excellent article from the American Hospital Association's Washington bureau which described how the great bulk of the Nation's legislative business is developed through hearings before committees of the Congress. Such hearings are primarily a means to assist the Congress in learning the problems and needs in specific areas which may require legislative action of some sort. The hearings also provide a means of communication between interested citizens and the Congress before specific legislation action is taken.

In a democracy, communication must be a 2-way process—from legislator to citizen, as well as from citizen to legislator. Consequently, Members of Congress spend a great deal of time addressing groups such as this. It is one of our best means for reporting to especially interested groups on legislative action and needs in a given field.

But Congressmen should report to the general public as well as to special groups. That is one reason I was particularly glad to accept the invitation to discuss health legislation with your organization. You represent the general public of your communities as well as a specialized aspect of your respective hospitals.

I have been told by expert hospital administrators that an outstanding contribution of women's auxiliaries is the ability to interpret community needs and viewpoints to the hospital. I am sure this is as necessary and valuable as your function of interpreting hospital needs and policies to the community.

The size and position of an object often can be determined best when viewed in relation to other objects. Therefore, I propose to discuss the hospital and health situation, as I see it from the Nation's Capital, in terms of its relationship with two other subjects of current importance—the aging problem, and the economic recession. Since hospitals, health, and the aging problem are all profoundly influenced by the status of medical science, I shall also devote some time to this subject.

Let me begin by reviewing briefly a couple of facts which are almost certainly familiar to you. The first fact is that as a people, we are growing older; and yet medicine, hospitals, health services, employment patterns, housing—in fact, virtually every aspect of our culture apparently is still oriented largely to the idea that we are entirely a Nation of bright-eyed and pink-cheeked youngsters.

Before World War II, major changes were apparent in the age composition of our population. We were becoming an older people. There had been drastic reductions in the death rates for infants, children, and young adults. Thus much larger numbers of us were living on into the later years. Accompanying these changes were profound changes in the patterns of national health.

Cancer, heart disease, arthritis, mental illness, and other so-called chronic illness had supplanted the infectious diseases as the major health problems. As a Nation, as communities, and as individual, we were not properly equipped to deal effectively with these diseases.

The Congress became concerned with this situation and shortly after the war initiated a thorough study, which has continued virtually uninterrupted since. Much of this study has been conducted by Appropriation Subcommittees in the House and the Senate responsible for reviewing the annual appropriations requests for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a member, and for many years as chairman of the House subcommittee, I have been privileged to play an active role in that process.

At this point, I want to pay tribute to the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and numerous other non-Federal groups for the advice and technical data they have given in our effort to find out what is needed. In the Federal Establishment all branches of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Public Health Service in particular, have contributed much technical data and advice.

I must mention also the fact that this has been a nonpartisan effort, Republicans and Democrats forgetting political differences in their detremination to do what was best for the entire Nation.

Those of us who have participated in this continuing battle for better health in the face of mounting incidence of diseases like cancer, arthritis, mental illness, and heart disease have had to be practical. From the outset, we saw two major deficiencies which needed remedial attention. Very simply stated, these were (1) insufficient medical research on the chronic diseases, and (2) inadequate facilities for their diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation.

Therefore, our first major actions were to set up the Hill-Burton hospital and health facilities construction program, and to authorize a long-range expansion of medical research both in the Public Health Service and, through grants of Federal funds, in medical schools, universities, hospitals, and other institutions throughout the Nation. Subsequently, program for grants to stimulate construction of research facilities at medical schools and universities, as well as fellowships and other awards to assist promising young scientists to complete their training for careers in medical research, were authorized.

These two basic programs got their first real impetus some 10 to 12 years ago. That impetus was given through Federal funds, which stimulated and encouraged State, local, and private financial and other support.

What has happened to hospitals in these years?

Under the Hill-Burton program, a total of 3,772 projects have been completed at a cost of more than $3 billion, of which the Federal share has been less than $1 billion. For this expenditure we have obtained 163,000 brandnew hospital beds and 991 local public health units.

Magnificent as these gains have been, they actually are only a beginning. I will go into our remaining needs a little later in these remarks.

What has happened to medical research duing these years?

A few weeks ago Dr. James A. Shannon summarized the past 10 years of medical research for our subcommittee. Dr. Shannon is the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the branch of the United States Public Health Service in which the bulk of medical research by the Government is conducted, and which administers most of the funds Congress authorizes each year to assist non-Federal research projects.

In his summary, Dr. Shannon pointed out that at the close of World War II the United States was spending about $88 million a year for research in the medical and related sciences. Two factors—public support and research opportunity—were at the base of the changes that ensued. The dollars available for support of research and research training began to increase steadily, with part of the increase coming from private sources and part from public funds made available through State and Federal appropriations. By 1950, medical research support was at a level of $140 million. By 1954 it was $220 million. Today, it is estimated that nearly $360 million is being spent for research in medicine and biology in this country. Of this, the Federal Government provides over half, or $220 million.

Dr. Shannon then reviewed for the committee a few of the scientific advances that have been made during these postwar years: Cortisone and other steriods for treatment of rheumatic disease; vaccine for the prevention of polio, influenza, and many respiratory infections.

Radioisotopes have joined other radiation sources and surgery as a means of treating cancer, and a number of compounds which ameliorate certain forms of cancer have been developed.

We have seen the development and widespread use of an inexpensive public health measure that can cut tooth decay in half.

A wide array of chemical weapons useful in the management of high blood pressure have been discovered.

The death rates among mothers and infants and certain of the diseases arising from complications during pregnancy and at birth have been sharply reduced because of research results.

Dramatic improvement has been made in surgery for congenital heart malformations and hearts damaged by rheumatic fever.

A test for early diagnosis of a form of cancer in women, permitting treatment before it is too late, has been developed and given wide application.

A family of drugs has been developed permitting startling advances in the management of mental illness.

Just as in the creation of new hospital beds, progress of this kind is proof that the planned use of a segment of our national resources for medical and biological research is a sound investment, with dividends that are both humanitarian and economic.

When we first began these programs of Federal financial assistance to stimulate hospital construction, and promote medical research and training, there were many who thought that legislation in these fields—particularly Federal legislation—would automatically lead to Government regulation of hospitals and research. I believe we have proved beyond doubt that Government regulation need not accompany Government assistance. Neither of these programs could have been so successful except for very harmonious cooperation between the Federal Government, State and local governments, national and local organizations, universities, medical schools, and hospitals. These programs have demonstrated once again that

Government is truly an instrument of the people.

The health needs of our senior citizens are not substantially different from the need of the Nation as a whole—good nutrition, adequate medical attention, suitable housing, and opportunity for appropriate social, intellectual, and physical activity. However, there is one need, common to all, which takes on particular significance in the later years of life. I refer to the need for coping with the costs of long-term illness. For someone who is retired and living on an income barely sufficient to meet ordinary living costs, the expenses of long-term hospital and medical care can prove truly catastrophic. Prepaid medical care plans, Blue Cross, disability benefits, and other protective measures of the productive years are usually no longer applicable at the very time when they are most likely to be needed.

Surely it is not beyond our capacity to devise more satisfactory methods of providing during our more vigorous years for the medical costs that accompany old age.

Another problem needing, and at long last beginning to receive our attention, is that of providing more adequate facilities and programs for domiciliary care of the aged.

Obviously the ideal place for the old folks to stay is in their own homes or in homelike places in their own communities. This should be possible far more often if the essential community welfare and health services were better organized and made more easily available for this purpose. Home nursing services, dietary consultation, homemaker services, suitable recreational programs, together with good personalized medical attention could keep many people happy and healthy right in their own homes at less cost to themselves, their relatives, and the community than in hospitals and nursing homes.

Earlier this month an important conference in Washington was called by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service interested in better care of the aged.

One of their conclusions was that we have failed to use both the remarkable scientific and technical advances of this century and the comprehensive array of services available within the community in our fragmentary and inadequate efforts to meet the challenge posed by our older citizens.

Then, too, we have failed to seek out ways to make it possible for old people to help themselves, thus earning part of their support and maintaining both themselves and their selfrespect.

I feel that absolute first priority should be given to those measures which help retain the older individual amid familiar surroundings—in or near his own home, cared for by his own physician, sustaining insofar as possible his interest in community activities. It seems to me that we are too prone to move old people into circumstances where they will be no trouble—to isolate them, to separate them from familiar and loved scenes, to segregate them, if you will. Each community has the capacity, if it has the will, to keep this from happening in many instances.

For those individuals for whom a special kind of care is required that cannot be provided at home, there is often an in-between kind of facility required—between the home and the hospital.

There needs to be more such facilities adequately licensed, and supervised by professionally qualified persons, located in or near the community which the older people call home.

The community hospital has a major role in helping devise plans and provide the medical, nursing, and other services needed in any realistic effort to cope with the problem as it now exists.

In planning for future construction and for future organization of services, the hospital must keep the needs of the aged foremost in mind.

I am convinced that if we could look ahead 20 or 30 years, one of the greatest changes we would see in our hospitals would be the structural and organizational changes required to provide more keep well clinics and more home care services for the aged and chronically ill.

You may be certain that women's auxiliaries will be more essential than ever in the hospital that is dedicated to care of the aged and chronically ill and to preventive medicine as much as to acute illness.

At the outset of my talk I mentioned the recession as one of the major problems that needed to be taken into account in this discussion of health and hospitals.

The Department of Labor has recently announced that over 5,200,000 people are unemployed, the largest number since 1941. Other reliable estimates have placed the number at well over 6 million.

Both the Congress and the executive branch of the Government are considering appropriate measures to combat this recession and strengthen our national economy.

The issues at stake go far beyond the domestic scene.

The world today is wondering whether this Nation will continue to be economically and financially strong, or whether our private-enterprise system will be unable to stand the strains of this modern age. Our position of leadership among the Western Powers is in jeopardy if our economic structure falters and weakens. Our allies are deeply concerned. Our enemies are already deriving great satisfaction from our economic uncertainty; to them, a depressed America presents opportunity to propagandize the world concerning the failures of our fine society.

Among the most important measures being considered to combat the recession are extensive construction programs for highways, schools, and post offices. To this list I would like to add hospitals. I felt so strongly about this that on February 21, I wrote to the President urging that he revise his estimate for Hill-Burton hospital construction needs, raising it from $75 million, already requested in his budget, to $210 million for fiscal year 1959. This increase to the full amount authorized under the law would not only help bolster a sagging economy, but would also enable the States to achieve substantial reductions in the backlog of need for community health facilities.

Just a few weeks ago the Appropriations subcommittee of which I am chairman, took under consideration the President's budget recommendation that only $75 million be appropriated for the Hill-Burton hospital construction program for the fiscal year 1959. From the testimony and data provided the committee, it is evident that while this program has made substantial progress, there are tremendous unmet needs for new and replacement hospital beds in communities throughout the Nation.

Estimates by the Public Health Service place these needs at the following levels: 185,000 general hospital beds; 400,000 mental hospital beds; 303,000 other hospital beds; 300,000 nursing-home beds.

In my many years of service on the House Appropriations subcommittee I have become rather familiar with the hospital situation throughout the country. Among the things I have learned is that many of the Nation's hospitals are over 50 years old, and many suffer major losses of efficiency from inadequate physical plants. The obsolescence factor contributes substantially to our need for hospital construction. Two percent of our general hospital beds become obsolete each year, representing an annual loss of approximately 9,500 general hospital beds. As opposed to this figure, we must consider that 30,000 new beds are needed each year merely to keep pace with our annual population increase.

I offer no comparison to the relative importance of hospitals with post offices, schools, or other public facilities. The national concern for adequate hospital facilities, both public and nonprofit, stems from our interest in health affairs and in providing the American people with the highest quality of medical and hospital care. Moreover, at the present time, hospital facilities have special importance for reasons of national security. With every city and community potential targets, the number of persons who might survive an enemy attack depends directly on the adequacy of the facilities and the organization of care for the injured.

In my opinion, there is no facility more vital than the community hospital in our national civil defense survival program. Funds expended to build up our general hospital beds are investments in national security, as well as in health.

On February 21 of this year, in a letter to the President, I summarized as follows the importance of hospital construction and renovation in any program designed to fight unemployment through federally financed construction programs:

First. Hospital construction and renovation would have a more rapid impact on the economy than would most other kinds of construction. Statewide and up-to-date hospital construction and renovation plans have been made in all the States.

Second. At both the Federal and State level, administrative machinery is in existence and has long been dealing with these matters.

Third. If funds were available, many projects could be quickly reviewed by existing public agencies and construction started in a very short period of time.

Fourth. The need for hospital construction and renovation is widely spread throughout the United States. There is appreciable need for new construction in many of the rapidly expanding suburbs of our larger cities and still great unmet need in our smaller communities and rural areas.

Fifth. Hospital construction and the installation of hospital equipment requires more kinds of highly skilled personnel than does most other construction work. Consequently, a hospital construction program would have great impact on retaining highly skilled persons in their particular fields. In addition, hospital equipment requires the employment of highly skilled labor in its manufacture and has far-reaching effect on production plants and labor which generally would not participate in a public works program.

Sixth. Renovation of hospital plants depends primarily on local contractors, local supplies, and local labor. Such a program would have immediate effect on the economy of local communities.

I told the President that for these reasons I was convinced that a program of hospital construction and renovation would stimulate our national economy and thus would help counteract the recession. It could be undertaken through additional grants under the Hill-Burton Act, with appropriate adaptation in the method of distributing the funds, or much of it—especially the renovation of existing hospitals—could be carried out through loans carrying no interest or very low rate of interest.

I believe the logic of these proposals is inescapable, and I intend to do everything in my power to bring about their adoption.

As I look back over the years that I have represented my State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, I find that one of the greatest rewards has been the friend-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ships I have gained among those who have dedicated their lives to tending the sick, the lame and the halt.

In conclusion, I would like to read to you three short paragraphs that were written some 30 years ago by Dr. Frederick Smith, who was at one time in charge of all hospitals in the Public Health Service. What he wrote will, I am sure, describe the institutions in which each of you serve. I hope, and I believe, it will also describe the typical hospital of 100 years hence.

"A hospital pays higher dividends in usefulness than any other public building. A department, bureau, agency or court, post office or custom house is open only a third of each 24 hours and is closed 52 Sundays and many holidays each year. A hospital is never closed. Its lights are an eternal fire on the altar of service. Its door is never locked; its windows never darkened.

"When vacation grass grows lush on silent schoolhouse grounds the hospital knows no respite. While the cathedral drouses many days each wek over empty pews, the hospital vibrates through every crowded moment with never-failing service to humanity. Through long hot summer days and nights, as in winter storm and autumn blast, the hospital carries on. In public disaster, when other enterprise is dazed and crippled, the hospital never fails.

"The best that is in men and women is brought out in the crises that try the soul. In operating room and ward is forged, in the fire of sacrifice and renunciation, the character that ennobles. Pious resignation, courage and generosity are here daily witnessed. To the hospital come both saint and sinner, the victim of wasting disease, of violence, or of his own vicious habits. Whether they march to the drums of war or the pipes of peace, the sick and maimed seek refuge where pain is eased and life held sacred and find there, true to hospital traditions, not only scientific efficiency, but tolerance, kindness and understanding sympathy."

Congressman Celler Speaks His Mind on His Weekly Radio Broadcasts, Over Station WINS, New York, April 13, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the transcript of one of my weekly radio broadcasts over Station WINS, New York, April 13, 1958:

ANNOUNCER. Do you agree with Mr. Bernard Baruch that our taxes should be increased rather than decreased?

Mr. CELLER. That idea of Mr. Baruch's is as startling as it is uneconomic. His only concern is inflation. But there is more involved than our present economic distress of inflation. Unemployment, not solely the result of inflation, has gone over 5 million. The peril point has been reached. Recently, 10,000 workers went on jobless relief in New York City alone. All industrial areas are threatened with more layoffs. Detroit, the auto center, is a ghost city.

Purchasing power throughout the Nation is like a flat tire. Money must be pumped into the market to buy goods deteriorating on the shelves. Some tax reduction, particularly on the widest base possible—that is, to low bracketed income taxpayers—must be passed. This will permit more money to be spent, thus moving inventories, and give the spur to production. Dr. Arthur F. Burns, erstwhile chief economic adviser to President Eisenhower, advocates a $5 billion tax cut. He said as follows:

"If * * * we delay more than a very few weeks, in the hope that economic recovery will come on its own by midyear, we shall be taking the risk of having to resort later to drastic medicine. In that event, we will find ourselves piling a huge deficit on top of the deficit that automatically flows from reduced tax revenues, with the result that our economic problems in both the short run and the long run will be multiplied manyfold."

As to Mr. Baruch, let me dip a little bit into history. Away back in February 1933, when we were in a depression, Mr. Baruch offered the same prescription for ending that depression, to the Senate Finance Committee.

What he said last week was a repetition of what he said in February 1933, namely, that a tax cut would be folly and that taxes should be raised. Let me quote his 1933 statement. "Balance budgets, stop spending money we haven't got. Sacrifice for frugality and revenue. Cut Government spending, cut it as rations are cut in a siege. Tax—tax everybody for everything."

Contemplate for a moment what would have happened if President Roosevelt had followed his advice in 1933. We would have plunged deeper and deeper into depression. Indeed, Mr. Baruch gave bad advice in 1933, and he is giving bad advice in 1958.

ANNOUNCER. Have you offered any bills for a tax cut?

Mr. CELLER. I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee but I am trying to cushion the current recession by offering a bill which I hope will pass. This would provide immediately a 3-month moratorium on withholding tax paid by all workers who earn less than $10,000 per annum and a corresponding adjustment in individual tax liability. A great bulk of our working population have a part of their wages withheld for income taxes, social security, and the like. The workers would have the benefit of these funds for a 3-month period, thus enabling them to return to the market for more than the bare necessities. It should prime the economic pump by restoring some purchasing power.

ANNOUNCER. How accurate is that report that you are a candidate for the United States Senate from the State of New York?

Mr. CELLER. When asked this question previously, I have said that I am not an anxious candidate but, on the other hand, I am not a reluctant or hesitant candidate. However, I await the wishes of the party. I have had 35 years of experience in Congress and, as we all know, there is no substitute for experience. My record is an open book. I like to think that I have the mental competence, and I am sure I have the moral fitness to fill that high and exalted station. Many good names have been mentioned for this preferment and I am proud to have my name associated as well with these exemplary gentlemen.

ANNOUNCER. Your name has been frequently associated with immigration legislation. Will there be any changes in immigration law?

Mr. CELLER. Immigration comes under the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman. Hearings are scheduled to be held in about a month on pending legislation. These will be comprehensive hearings to cover all shades of opinion on the subject of immigration and naturalization. My personal conviction is that the immigration quota law, as we have it set up, is unfair and discriminatory. We are permitted to admit, roughly, 152,000 people a single year under the quota system. But, unfortunately, people of certain races are favored over others. For example, most of the quota of 152,000 goes to individuals of the Aryan or Nordic races, that is the English, the Irish, the Germans. Speaking comparatively, about one-third of the total annual figure is set aside for natives of Italy, Greece, Spain, France, and countries of Eastern Europe get tiny quotas. When I speak of Eastern Europe, I mean Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and I don't mean the Communists. Communists are barred, but there are many non-Communists who are nationals of these countries. Great numbers of them do not even live in Eastern Europe but are refugees in all parts of the world. They clamor for admission into the United States. As we know, they make good citizens—just as good as the Irish, the English, and the Germans.

I would eliminate such discrimination against the Italian, the Greek, the Spanish, and others, and which favor the English or the Germans. Such a distinction is contrary to our American tradition. All these people are equal in my eyes. I am not so much interested as to where they were born as long as America is born in them. If they have an appreciation of liberty and freedom and fair play, then America has been born in them and they should be admitted on a parity with all others. I shall strive to have the law changed so that it will be freed of its prejudicial and discriminating features.

I want men to come here who will be of good character regardless of the label of their race, creed, color, or place of origin. Character is what you are in the dark. Character is what you are when no one is watching.

The opponents of my ideas on immigration are usually those who prate of their better or nobler blood. I say to them—send your noble blood to the market place and see what it will buy.

Others who oppose my point of view are those who boast of their family tree and their ancestors. As for them, I say one cannot make for himself a place in the sun if he continually takes refuge in the shade of a family tree. Your grandfather may have been 6 feet 7 inches tall, but you have to do your own growing.

ANNOUNCER. You are the author of the civil-rights bill which passed the Congress and which was signed by the President and which is now law. Do you contemplate any further steps on civil rights?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. My civil-rights bill was primarily a bill to insure equality of rights on the political level, that is, voting rights. Negroes had been disfranchised in primary and general elections in numerous States. My bill offers remedies against such practices. The bill also sets up a Civil Rights Commission, which is just about getting off the ground. Its purpose is to study desegregation as announced in the Supreme Court decision and to consider other discriminations against the colored people. In all this, we have reached a sort of plateau on the way to the summit. We cannot tarry there.

I have offered a bill to prevent discrimination against colored people on all levels of American life, housing, labor, transportation, public welfare, and the like. The Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman, has jurisdiction over such bills and I shall start hearings in about a month's time on this highly important subject.

Justice still must be done to the Negro. His rights are still flouted and disregarded in many parts of the land. It has been said justice is the bread of the Nation because all hunger for it, white and colored alike. The colored should have this bread of the Nation.

ANNOUNCER. What do you think of bomb testing?

Mr. CELLER. I believe it is criminal—and I use that word advisedly—for our administration to impose its bankruptcy of ideas upon this Nation. There is not one area, be it our domestic economy, foreign policy, military or scientific advancement, where we have not suffered tragic loss of leadership. Now the Russian announcement of the cessation of nuclear testing has caught Dulles in bathing and the Russians have made off with his clothes. He did not have to go to the summit to lose his shirt. Now we are paying the price for his inflexible, negative, quibbling policy on nuclear test detection. As Adlai Stevenson said, in anticipation of the Soviet move, we have again missed the opportunity to take the initiative. For months we clung to a formula unacceptable to the Russians. We insisted that cessation should be tied in not only with inspection but with an end to the production of nuclear weapons. When the Russians accepted the inspection principle, we still refused to budge. It was all or nothing.

And nothing is what we got.

The President all too easily became captive of the Dulles policy. Inch by inch, and now yard by yard, the United States has lost the initiative in world affairs. Mr. Dulles is so busy saying "No" that he has no time, if indeed he has the imagination, to come forward with any affirmative idea which would give the lie to the Soviet propaganda—that we are warmongers interested only in making bigger and more devastating bombs. Propaganda-wise, now the flag of peace flies on the Kremlin instead of the White House.

Can we pull ourselves out of the dilemma in which the administration attitudes have placed us? We cannot become a mere echo of the Soviet line and stop the tests at this point—only because the Russian announcement pushed us into it. The stopping of such tests must be based on considered judgment, whether or not it would best serve the cause of an honorable peace.

Ought we not to consider the placing of all future tests under United Nations supervision as solid evidence of our good faith, placing our emphasis on the need to increase the peaceful uses of nuclear energy? Then the world could know the results of the tests of detonating clean weapons. Thus the United Nations could declare the devastating effect of radioactive fallout and its danger to humanity, and order all nations to cease testing bombs.

ANNOUNCER. What about Federal aid to education?

Mr. CELLER. That is a very interesting question because I have some novel ideas on this subject and I think we can help the economy of the Nation and help education in the same step.

The most acute domestic deficiencies of the United States are our schools, educational facilities, and teachers. These deficiencies are now reflected, and will continue to be reflected, in the quality of our social, as well as our military achievements. There is no question at all of the need for accelerating the building of schools and making provision for adequate teaching staffs.

I believe we can attack this problem constructively and, at the same time, give the needed impetus to economic revival. There is a way, a practical and realistic way, of accomplishing this. I intend to propose that a percentage, shall we say 1 percent, of each Federal, personal, or corporate income-tax payment be paid directly to the resident State—to be earmarked and used exclusively for educational purposes—which would include the building of schools and the increase in salaries for teachers.

Thus, the objection, valid or otherwise, which has stood in the way of enactment of legislation giving Federal aid to education will be removed. Many have feared Federal control of education and this has been one of the major stumbling blocks. My proposal will give the States control of the management of these funds, albeit for educational purposes exclusively. Likewise, this direct payment to the States by the residents thereof will give a tremendous boost to the economy of each State, for it must perforce create the demand for quantities of goods of many types, and thus spur our productivity. It will put back to work thousands within each State. There will be a need for steel, aluminum, cement, paint, woods, etc. The necessary economic stimulation would result, and it would be no make-work proposition. It would permit each State to draw upon the wealth of its own citizenry. I would propose, further, that such legislation provide that each State render an accounting to Congress on the uses to which these funds have been put.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*..
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*..
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*....The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Proxmire, William E., *Wis*...
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*...
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*..
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, ———, Aiken Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Proxmire, ———, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Church, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4832 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, Harrison of Nebraska, Dixon, Smith of Kansas, Krueger, Teague of California, Tewes, Quie, Burns of Hawaii, Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Steed, Alexander, Boyle, Santangelo, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Ostertag, Bow, Budge, Jonas, and Laird.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Lankford, Huddleston, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Morris, Kitchin, Arends, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham of Iowa, Bates, Hess, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Reece of Tennessee, Gubser, Becker, Burns of Hawaii, Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Healey, Rutherford, Coad, Anderson of Montana, Breeding, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Bass of New Hampshire, Seely-Brown, Siler, Henderson, and Chamberlain.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Wier, Multer, Dowdy, Matthews, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Mitchell, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Broyhill, Hyde, and Holt.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, Holland, Teller, McGovern, Dent, Gwinn, Kearns, Hoffman, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Nicholson, Ayres, Griffin, Haskell, and Lafore.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Gordon (chairman), Morgan, Carnahan, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Hays of Ohio, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, O'Hara of Illinois, Fountain, Fascell, Coffin, Farbstein, Saund, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Bolton, Messrs. Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, Bentley, and Curtis of Massachusetts.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Brooks of Louisiana, Mrs. Kee, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Hoffman, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Knox, Minshall, May, Michel, Mrs. Dwyer, and Mr. Westland.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, Elliott, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Everett, Messrs. LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Lipscomb, Halleck, and Ray.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Baring, Ullman, Anderson of Montana, Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Chenoweth, Utt, Thomson of Wyoming, Weaver, Collier, Burns of Hawaii, Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Harris (chairman), Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Jarman, O'Brien of New York, Moss, Dingell, Loser, Wolverton, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, Derounian, Younger, Avery, Alger, and Neal.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Rodino, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Chudoff, Dowdy, Holtzman, Montoya, Whitener, Libonati, Keating, McCulloch, Hillings, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Cramer, Moore, Nimtz, Smith of California, and Cretella.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Rivers, Macdonald, Lennon, Young, Delray, Tollefson, Allen of California, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Gross, Curtin, McIntosh, Glenn, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Mr. Holifield, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Beckworth, Porter, Young, Hemphill, Scott of North Carolina, Delray, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Broyhill, Cederberg, Johansen, Wainwright, Cunningham of Nebraska, and Dennison.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Thompson of Louisiana, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Edmondson, Kilgore, McFall, Brown of Missouri, ———, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Stauffer, Byrne of Illinois, Dooley, Broomfield, and Robison of New York.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Latham, and Scott of Pennsylvania.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Willis, Tuck, Kearney, Jackson, Scherer, and McIntosh.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Boykin, Aspinall, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, Baring, Whitener, Mitchell, Everett, ———, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Saylor, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Smith of California, Teague of California, ———.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Mills (chairman), Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Frazier, Reed, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Courthouse, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6017
	Circuit Judges	
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Oliver 2–3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		North 7–8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–5047
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–8653
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–8315
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–4343
	Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Jefferson 3–1347

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone, National 8–4696)

Chief Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—Giles S. Rich, of New York, 4949 Linnean Ave.
(Vacancy)

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7–0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)
(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia
(Washington 1, D. C.)
Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws
Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward A. Tamm
James W. Morris	Charles F. McLaughlin
David A. Pine	Burnita S. Matthews
Matthew F. McGuire	Luther W. Youngdahl
Alexander Holtzoff	Joseph C. McGarraghy
Richmond B. Keech	John J. Sirica
Edward M. Curran	(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)
(Phone, Liberty 5–6700)

Chief Judge.....Robert E. Quinn
Judge.....George W. Latimer
Judge.....Homer Ferguson
Commissioner.....Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk.....Alfred C. Proulx

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind.* 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Byrne, Emmet F., *Ill.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio.* The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn.*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa.*
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William A., *Utah.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J.*
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md.*
Dies, Martin, *Tex.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa.* 3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.* 3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Myron V., *Kans.* 3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky.* 2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Hale, Robert, *Maine.* 2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind.* The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.* 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del.*
Hays, Brooks, *Ark.* 314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Heselton, John W., *Mass.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hill, William S., *Colo.* 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa.* 200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio.* The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.* 3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J.* 2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.* 1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.* The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4648 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn.*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak.* 112 Schotts Court NE.

Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*—The Congressional
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.*—507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—Mayflower Hotel
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine.*—220 2d St. SE.
McIntosh, Robert J., *Mich.*
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—115 Dale Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Edwin H., Jr., *Conn.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*—8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*—220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Neal, Will E., *W. Va.*
Nicholson, Donald W., *Mass.*
Nimtz, F. Jay, *Ind.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Ponge, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—5603 24th Ave. SE. Hillcrest Hgts. Wash., 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*—203 C St. SE.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Calvert-Woodley
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Stauffer, S. Walter, *Pa.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*—Mayflower Hotel
Tewes, Donald E., *Wis.*
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—110 Maryland Ave NE.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, Richard B., *Mass.*—3257 N St.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 [illegible]th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Burns, John A., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Rd., Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Dr., Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Pl., SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Appendix

Assistance for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four editorials which comment on the proposal which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I have made regarding economic assistance to India. These editorials, reflecting viewpoints in different parts of the Nation, all argue for the importance of meeting India's crisis now when there are chances for realistic action, rather than later when the crisis can no longer be treated effectively.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune of March 26, 1958]

HELP AND HOPE FOR INDIA

The Marshall plan, a farsighted program of economic assistance developed by former Secretary of State George C. Marshall in 1947 and later adopted by Congress, is generally given credit for having made a major contribution to Europe's speedy economic recovery after World War II.

Now Senators JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and JOHN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, have proposed a similiar program to help India achieve the goals of its second 5-year plan.

Their three-pronged program calls for immediate legislative and administrative action to meet the immediate and emergency needs of the Indian Government, adoption of a congressional resolution expressing American interest in the success of the second 5-year plan, and a multilateral attack on India's long-term economic problems with European experts joining Americans in working out plans for such a program.

In a speech to the United States Senate urging adoption of the program, KENNEDY quoted testimony by Prof. W. W. Rostow, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with respect to the future attitudes of the newly emerging independent states in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America:

"Shall these new powerful states emerge to maturity from a totalitarian setting, their outlook dominated by bitter memories of colonialism and by memories of painful transition made without help, while the rich West sat by, concerned only with the problems of defense?

"Or shall these states emerge from a democratic setting, built on human values, shared with the West, and on memories of shared adventure in the decisive periods of transition?"

Through the adoption of the kind of an imaginative, far-reaching plan proposed by KENNEDY and COOPER, the United States could play an important role in helping determine the kind of an economic transition these new nations make in the years ahead. The plan for India could, in fact, serve as a pattern for help to others.

It would cost money, of course, just as the Marshall plan did. But the investment is worth making. India, even though its leaders often annoy us, is a democratic country which is trying desperately to coexist peacefully with its Communist neighbor, China. It has appealed to the West for aid, and the United States already has provided some. But the Kennedy-Cooper program offers the Indians long-term hope as well as immediate help.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of April 4, 1958]

FREE WORLD HAS BIG STAKE IN UNITED STATES HELP FOR INDIA

In urging greater American support for India's economic development program, Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, observed the other day that "no thoughtful citizen can fail to see our stake in the survival of free government in India."

The point he was making on the Senate floor was painfully obvious. Unles we pledge greater help to India, and do it this year, we will wipe out much of the good we've realized from a war and the billions in aid that we've sent to Asia in the last decade.

It's sometimes difficult to stomach India's seemingly vacillating foreign policy, as one day she appears to favor Russia and the next the United States. But let's not lose sight of the fact that India is the biggest democracy in Asia, and with some encouragement she can also become one of the greatest in the world.

The unfortunate thing is that as a free nation India is so young that her leaders are faced with the same problems we had when the United States also was an infant republic. They have no choice but to play the game of international politics as neutrally as possible and yet find friends within the family of political thought they adopted as their own.

If geography hadn't placed India so close to Russia the situation might now be quite different. Senator KENNEDY and the pro-India bloc in Congress might not be encountering the difficulty they are in explaining the advantages of a stronger India-American economic alliance.

But geopolitics being what it is, it's high time we put aside our suspicions of our Asian partner and look at the facts. India is in a desperate struggle with the demands of economic necessity. Her leaders must either be able to show to their impoverished constituents that democracy offers a more promising reward than communism or they'll lose them.

India is so bad off financially that she has had to scrap all except the core of her 5-year plan of economic redevelopment. This means that there will be fewer dams, fewer steel mills, and fewer land reclamation projects with which to sustain her people than were planned even 6 months ago. It means also that the Indian mind will become less resistant to communism and the blandishment inspired within the Kremlin is greater aid isn't offered by the West.

Help for India will strengthen the democratic structure, as well as firm up democracy's position in other parts of the Far East, particularly in strife-torn Indonesia. No one can be sure just how much a loan to the Nehru government will help in this regard, but the alternative would be disastrous.

An economic collapse for India or even a continuing discrepancy between India and Communist China is something we cannot afford now or in the foreseeable future. Should we lose this Asian rock of freedom the consequences would be dire indeed in the populations, natural resources, and trade outlets we would hand by default to Russia.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of March 31, 1958]

AID URGENT TO STRENGTHEN INDIA AGAINST RED DANGERS

Suppose India, with her vast population (377 million in a 1954 U. N. estimate) should go Communist. That, of course, would be a terrific setback for the cause of freedom and peace throughout the world. Not only would India's own people and resources come under Red control, but other peoples in Asia and Africa, whose political direction is not now very firmly established, would be greatly influenced toward communism. In some cases this influence probably would be decisive.

While India's government has maintained a neutralist stand in the East-West struggle, its leaders have been striving to meet its very difficult and urgent problems along democratic lines. Its people, like those of other lands, are ardently seeking, with new hope, to achieve better living standards. The country now is in the second year of a second 5-year plan to that end. The extent of progress achieved will, of course, have strong impact on political trends.

In an address in the United States Senate last week, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, called on the free nations to unite in support of a Marshall plan to aid India in her political development.

Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, former ambassador to India, supported the Kennedy proposal, which calls for increased United States assistance this year and further assistance from the United States and other free countries in the 3 remaining years of the current 5-year plan.

"India stands as the only effective competitor to Red China for the faith and following of the millions of uncommitted and restless peoples," Senator KENNEDY said. "Should India fall prey to internal disorder or disillusionment among either its masses or leaders and become absorbed in the Communist system, the free world would suffer an incalculable blow."

The Massachusetts Senator's appeal is very timely. Recently demands have been growing for a reduction of foreign aid. Some strong opposition has been voiced to any aid at all for India because of its neutralist position.

Senator KENNEDY, however, declared that "if the second 5-year plan collapses, so may democratic India and the democratic hope in all of Asia."

Of the enormous and acute needs of the people of India we Americans now know pretty well. But if we all well realized in concrete terms what general economic conditions are and considered the crucial effects they have on political affairs, support for giving sound assistance to the efforts to build up an advancing, free economy would be much greater.

Here is something about which our Nation cannot afford to be indifferent.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Remember, only a comparatively few years ago, many of us thought that a Communist triumph in mainland China was almost unthinkable. But the Red tide moved swiftly forward and a Communist regime came into power.

Our own American interests, as well as the cause of freedom everywhere, will be well served by wise assistance to the aspiring people of India.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of April 8, 1958]

INDIA IN THE BALANCE

It may be coincidence but it is not without significance that Republican Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, and Democratic Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, have introduced a resolution for United States support of India's endangered second 5-year plan just at the time of the first anniversary of the Communist electoral victory in the southwestern Indian state of Kerala.

The Cooper-Kennedy resolution in effect proposes that the United States move resolutely to see that what happened among the 14 million impoverished people of overpopulated Kerala does not happen throughout India.

How any substantial number of Members of Congress could reasonably oppose the Cooper-Kennedy resolution is hard to see. Senator COOPER, who speaks with the unusual and convincing experience of a former Eisenhower administration Ambassador to India, says the alternative is to risk watching India go the way of Red China.

What India needs above all else is dollars with which to buy capital goods such as machines and engines and turbines urgently required for the industrialization of the teeming nation of nearly 400 million depressed people. But India does not have the dollars to buy from the United States and it cannot get them unless we make large loans.

Following the recent talks on Indian requirements, Washington announced a plan to lend India $225 million, half of it through the Export-Import Bank. This latter portion would be repayable over a 15-year period at 5¼ percent and so could not remotely be termed a giveaway.

The Cooper-Kennedy resolution would declare it public policy for the United States to support further loans, perhaps as much as a half billion dollars by 1961. Its stated goal would be to assist India to complete its current program for economic development.

India has made great forward strides in the 10 years since it became independent and Prime Minister Nehru became its leader. Villages with thousands of people have begun new lives, with gainful work, sanitary living conditions and greatly improved agriculture.

But this is hardly more than a beginning. If the second 5-year plan is carried through to success in 1961, one of India's leading financial authorities says the average weekly income per person would be only barely more than a dollar. How modest the plan is can be seen from the fact that the 1961 steel goal is 6 million tons—big for India but small when compared with our steel production of 100 million tons.

A great deal of small and misguided talk about Indian neutralism has been spoken in Washington in recent years. India is the most promising fledging democracy in the world. But it cannot toil up that rocky road alone. India needs help and the United States, in our own interest as well as India's, must provide help while it can be of use.

It is fine to talk about democratic ideals. But democratic ideals fill no empty stomachs. They set no hydroelectric projects going.

Senators COOPER and KENNEDY deserve a salute for taking the lead in introducing their resolution. We hope to see Senators from this part of the Mississippi Valley—HENNINGS and SYMINGTON, of Missouri; DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, of Illinois; and FULBRIGHT and MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas—associate themselves with it.

Columbia River Regional Power Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, proposals for financing future water-resource development of the Columbia River through power revenues, under the direction of a regional power corporation, are receiving increased attention in the Pacific Northwest. Since the introduction of the Columbia River Regional Corporation bill by myself and numerous co-sponsors early in this session, the idea has been discussed editorially by many newspapers, with varying degrees of acceptance. I am pleased that two leading newspapers in my home State have recently given additional endorsement to the regional corporation concept of Columbia River development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power Can Pay Its Way," published in the Portland Oregonian, of April 13, 1958, and an editorial entitled "This Is the Way To Do It," published in the Pendleton Oreg., East Oregonian of April 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER CAN PAY ITS WAY

Bipartisan legislation to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to pledge its power revenues for financing of additional projects is approaching a vote in the House of Representatives. A similar bill was adopted in the Senate last year by a vote of 61 to 20.

The Pacific Northwest has a sharp interest in the proposal, made in three messages by President Eisenhower, for TVA self-financing. A Senate bill has been introduced to establish the Columbia River Development Corporation. It would have authority to issue revenue bonds, based on power sales of the Bonneville Power Administration which the regional corporation would supersede, to pay for the share of the costs of multiple-purpose projects—and later, atomic plants—assignable to power. This would speed up hydroelectric development of the Columbia Basin immeasurably, by taking the major costs of new dams off the back of Congress.

The Northwest Public Power Association, author of the Columbia River Development Corporation bill, points out that the self-financing pattern to be established in the TVA bill may be the precedent for regional self-financing here.

One point needs clarification, in view of early attacks (in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and elsewhere) on the Columbia River Development Corporation bill. This new Federal corporation, subject to strict administration and congressional controls, would not be the equivalent of TVA, nor would it resemble the Columbia Valley Authority idea of New Deal days.

It would be limited to power development—its goal to make up the deficit between generation and need created by the inability of Congress and local utilities to invest in facilities at a necessary rate of about $1 million a day. The corporation would not, as does TVA, hold responsibility for development of other resources—navigation, flood control, fisheries, mining, agriculture, chemicals, etc. But it would be required to conduct itself in a manner not adverse to other resource development, and to cooperate in such development. It could not, as the Federal Power Commission does, dismiss the fishery as of no account. Its operations would have to be coordinated for flood control, navigation, and other uses of the waters.

The attempt by the Seattle Post-Intelligencer to brand the regional power corporation as another CVA proposal is indefensible.

The only resemblance a Columbia River Development Corporation would have to TVA, if the new TVA legislation is adopted, is that both would stand on their own financial feet rather than being dependent wholly on appropriations from the United States Treasury. The astonishing record of power expansion in the Northwest shows that the region is fully able to finance its own big power projects, for which Congress should be grateful.

THIS IS THE WAY TO DO IT

State Treasurer Sig Unander, one of five candidates for the Republican nomination for governor, told a Pendleton audience recently that he agrees in principle with the proposed Northwest Regional Corp. for development of hydroelectric power from the Columbia River and its tributaries.

"There can be little question that formation of such a corporation would answer many of the area's hydroelectric power problems. Such a program has many advantages. It provides for regional control as opposed to Washington, D. C., control, and would not be dependent upon congressional appropriations for financing," said Mr. Unander.

There is much to be said in behalf of a regional corporation. At this point one of the best arguments for it is the record it can show of support from members of both political parties.

The necessity that a program be developed which would assure the necessary funds annually to develop the hydroelectric potential of the Columbia Basin and at the same time that development be accomplished wisely has been apparent for a long time.

So long as most of the money required to develop the water resources of the basin must come from congressional appropriations orderly development is impossible. The Oregonian, originator of the regional corporation plan, sketched the problem as long ago as July of 1952 and it hasn't changed since. Said the Portland newspaper at that time: "The Pacific Northwest has been staggering forward for 20 years under the most confusing hodgepodge of projects, agencies, and statutory authority—all lumped under the general heading of Columbia Basin development—ever proposed by a President and accepted by a befuddled Congress."

Regional controls of all the many programs that deal with water resource development in the Columbia Basin could bring order out of chaos. And it could get the Federal Government out of the power business in the basin by turning the development program over to an interstate agency, which could finance project development by sale of reserve bonds.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has introduced legislation which would create a regional corporation. He has said that he is not satisfied with all of the provisions the bill encompasses but he likes the principle. Others share his hesitancy in accepting all the

clauses in the legislation as it is now written. Mr. Unander has expressed agreement in principle, and so have many others.

Many who support this legislation fear that the private-power companies operating in the Northwest will try to block congressional approval of it. Perhaps they will. If they do we believe it will prove for them to be a tragic mistake. They cannot make a sound case that a regional corporation would harm them. Opposition would leave them in the poor position of having to refute the charge that they want the game to be played under their rules or they won't play.

Spokesmen for the private-power companies have said that the hydroelectric potential of the Columbia Basin must be fully developed and that it will be necessary for everybody to participate in the program in order to get the job done. If they really believe that, they much support a regional corporation approach to full development of the region's resources.

Swift and Constant Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minutes of the 938th meeting of the Six O'Clock Club of Minneapolis, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. These minutes summarize an address I made before the club on April 8, 1958, entitled "Swift and Constant Change." The minutes were drafted by the secretary of the Six O'Clock Club, Mr. Ralph Keller. Mr. Keller has for many years been the effective manager of the Minnesota Editorial Association. I know him not only as a good friend but also as one of our State's most able administrators. Mr. Keller has helped unite 435 Minnesota weekly and daily newspapers for the common good of their industry and the reading public which they serve.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 938th meeting of the Six O'Clock Club warmly welcomed to membership Dr. Robert Towne Thompson, dentist. President Anderson regretfully announced to 63 members and 13 guests the serious illness of Judge Waite, our nonagenarian first president.

In introducing Minnesota's senior United States Senator, the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, President Anderson pointed out the significance of seniority in the Senate, commended our former governor as the progenitor of current improvements in the State capitol approach, and praised his constructive public record and warm human qualities.

Senator THYE opined that the type of citizen represented in the Six O'Clock roster implies a handsome contribution by the club to the growth and prestige of the city of Minneapolis and the State of Minnesota during our 64 years.

There are today, with due respect to many honored names, only two great nations vying for world leadership, the Senator said. If one doesn't supply it the other must. Which? United States or Russia? How can we prevent a war to resolve the issue? We had sense enough to outlaw mustard gas during the First World War (in which the Senator served with distinction and rapid promotion in the United States Air Force). We have sense enough to avert today a far more dangerous and destructive atomic war, if we try.

We could lose to Russia on the basis of scientific skills, with which they are impressing many nations. We could lose to them on an economic basis, by permitting Russia to extend help to needy oriental countries and nations. We could lose to Russia on the basis of diplomatic negotiations, because the United States has been busy carving a nation out of a wilderness while our older neighbors rehearsed their diplomatic skills. As a result, we find ourselves now able to feed and clothe and arm most of the world's people but woefully unable to persuade them.

One course worthy of vigorous development is reciprocal trade; we stand to gain far more than we could lose by extending trade agreements to encourage the export and import of all manner of goods and products. The few producers and processors who might be injured by such a program, Government could well afford to subsidize.

Perhaps, said the Senator reverently, God intended America, the youngest of the great nations, to be the world's interracial catalyst. Nearly all peoples of earth have here lived neighbor, intermarried, and teamed up in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Since we have learned to live so peaceably and productively together, why cannot the rest of the world? Can we teach mankind to live with one another? If we fail, the capitalistic system of freedom and abundance can only collapse, and war and desolation must prevail.

We must turn the tide of our unemployment, we must take up the slack in our scientific progress, we must keep our economy healthy and our freedoms strong: Our Government will be as good as we help our public servants make it.

Answering questions, Senator THYE doubts that the Russians are bluffing. It is difficult to trust them because they have not hitherto proven trustworthy. It is possible that when enough Russian citizens have been educated under their aggressive modern program, they themselves will see the shortcomings of their system and repudiate the Kremlin. The Senator believes we are justified in reposing full confidence in our State Department, although perhaps the public could be more articulate in the formation of new and different approaches to international policies. Tax reduction might speed our economic machine, but carried too far it could cripple our governmental program; caution is called for both in accelerating and decelerating our material progress. On the grounds of inadequate information the Senator did not attempt to discuss the so-called Sadlak tax proposal.

R. W. K., *Secretary.*

Mission 66 Program in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the mission 66 program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The mission 66 program, which envisions completion of needed national park improvements by 1966, is in jeopardy. If funds for the program are not substantially increased above administration requests, the mission 66 program, one of the most important conservation issues facing Congress, may never be completed.

It will take an additional $12 million to keep on schedule the mission 66 program for campgrounds, buildings, and facilities, and an additional $9 million will be needed to keep road construction on schedule. Furthermore, funds needed for management and operations have been cut by about $1 million.

These cutbacks would curtail planned works in Montana estimated at $1.3 million. On the west side of Glacier Park alone $550,000 more could be spent at once on buildings, utilities, and new campgrounds. The Park Service has another $240,000 worth of projects that could be started by late fall if funds are provided. An additional $180,000 worth of road improvements in the Glacier area could also be undertaken. At the Custer National Monument in Montana an additional $340,000 could be programed this year, for shops, warehouses, and housing.

National Park Service Director Wirth advised me today that the additional funds listed for Montana are for projects that could be undertaken as soon as the money is appropriated. On this basis I shall confer with key members of Congress to determine what can be done to get badly needed improvements underway not only in Montana but throughout the park system.

By slashing the budget requests for the National Park Service the administration broke faith with Congress, which has given warm support to mission 66. The very existence of a recession should call for a program ahead of last year's level. Additionally, there has been an 18 percent increase in park use in the last 2 years. More than 60 million Americans visited our parks last year and the number is growing. It will only grow if we can maintain these parks and equip them to handle our expanding population.

Beautiful Bandera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the Christian Science Monitor, which is truly an international daily newspaper, published an article about one of Texas' most famous vacation spots, Bandera.

Located in the timbered mountain valleys and in the breaks of the Edwards Plateau's rugged and beautiful hill country of Texas, Bandera is the dude-ranch capital of Texas and is one of America's most unique vacation areas. For here in all its glory and grandeur still lives the magnificence, the essence, and the spirit and the scenery of the old West; not the artificial, motion-picture old West, for there is no need at all for anything

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

artificial in Bandera. Here in the hill country of Texas, the spirit of the West, the rugged mountainous scenery of the West, and the hearty, down-to-earth honest folk of the old West, have never for one moment been absent.

The article very accurately describes one of the truly great thrilling vacation spots and one of the finest places to live in the entire country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "Old Southwest Sparkles in Modern Texas Setting," written by Fern Pois, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 15, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD SOUTHWEST SPARKLES IN MODERN TEXAS SETTING

(By Fern Pois)

BANDERA, TEX.—The spirit of the rip-roaring days of the old Southwest is still alive in the famous hill country of Texas.

Located on Highway 16 and only 40 miles northward of San Antonio and the shrine of Davy Crockett, lies the frontier town of Bandera, dude ranch capital of Texas and the favorite vacation spot of thousands. From here many cattle have been driven over the Old Spanish Trail to the pioneer Kansas market.

As one turns onto Main Street, 19th century Bandera looks for the world like a setting for a western movie thriller. Near the Pack Saddle Grocery, the Silver Dollar Cafe, and the Frontier Hotel is the chamber of commerce in its own frame building. A young attendant in true western regalia, blue jeans, bright shirt, and 10-gallon hat, welcomes the vacationer to the hill country, advises about accommodations and where to buy western attire for the entire family. All dress is informal. Jeans and boots and broad brimmed hats are the favored attire.

HOTELS, MOTELS, AND RANCHES

There are hotels and motels in Bandera. Guest ranches such as Flying L, Wagon Wheel, Joleta, Lost Valley, Dixie Dude, and a host of others are readily located by the sharp arrows pointing toward the hills in every direction. Rates at he guest ranches include three meals a day. The motels do not. All try to operate on prices attractive to the average man and his family.

Each ranch offers its own interpretation of a home on the range. Many have tiled swimming pools while others have nature's finest, a swimming hole in the placid Medina River which winds its way through the hills. One ranch has found it necessary to provide its own landing field for private planes. Another boasts its own nine-hole course complete with golf shop and equipment.

Some are real operating ranches covering hundreds of acres. Opportunity is offered here to ride the range with the cowboys, to go on real roundups at branding time and take part in the general ranch routine. Each ranch has its own string of horses for its guests. Ranch hosts are generally agreed that the best way to see the country is from the top of a horse. There is a horse for every type rider imaginable, even for those who have never been on a horse before. All are safe under the ever-alert eyes of the cowboys in charge.

"Give a man a horse he can ride," one cowboy said, "and he's sure to come back again."

Weekly rodeos draw guests from the surrounding countryside. Four of the Nation's top rodeo stars, Scooter Fries, Buddy Groff, Toots Mansfield, and Ray Wharton live here in the Bandera Hills. They're always glad to perform for the appreciative spectators who come in great numbers to see a rodeo.

FLEXIBLE PROGRAMS

The dude-ranch vacationer can be as active or as quiet as he likes. There is always something to do from early morning until late at night. Early morning rides with breakfast over the open campfire beside the river is a favorite way to start the day.

Guests from all over the hill country come into Bandera at nightfall to dance to the cowboy tunes at one of the cafes. Put Yer Little Foot, Hokey Pokey, and Cotton Eyed Joe can be heard coming from the fiddle, guitar, and piano in true western style.

Liquor is prohibited in Bandera and it is a hundred dollar fine for starting a fight.

Some visitors come from the far corners of the United States for their first glimpse of the authentic old West. Others have been coming regularly for years, as they say, "just to get away from it all."

Wisconsin Celebrates Youth Participation Week and Wisconsin Parent-Teacher Congress Meets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the able Governor of Wisconsin, the Honorable Vernon Thomson, has proclaimed this as Youth Participation Week in my State.

He urged everyone to increase their efforts to help youth become active in the areas where they can be of greater service to their communities.

In other words, let us give our young people a chance to work constructively. Let us tap their vital energies and channel those energies into the most useful civic projects.

In that way, the youngsters will serve themselves, they will serve their communities, and they will serve their country.

I am pleased to note that, simultaneously with Youth Participation Week, there has been meeting, in the city of Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Certainly, there are few, if any, groups in the entire United States which better symbolize constructive grassroots interest than do the PTA's.

A PTA, serving our children from nursery school upward, is one of the most heart-warming types of organizations in all the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Milwaukee Journal describing the meeting of the Wisconsin PTA Congress, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

HOME IS RATED FIRST IN A CHILD'S LEARNING—REGIONAL PTA OFFICER FEARS OUR ABODES HAVE MORE CHROME THAN CHARACTER

(By Louise Cattoi)

The home is not only the most important educational center, but the child's first community, Mrs. Ralph Hobbs, Cataula, Ga., a regional vice president of the National Congress of Parent and Teachers, said here Monday morning at the auditorium.

She addressed the opening session of the 49th annual convention of the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers. The meeting, which has delegates from 946 PTA units, with a total membership of about 130,000, will continue through Tuesday. "Circles of Responsibility—in Family and Community" is the theme.

Mrs. Hobbs said that it was in the home that a child "begins to learn the spirit of cooperation, the lessons of give and take, the joys, disappointments and testings that make for character." She observed that the degree of happiness in a home was not contingent on the amount of money a family had.

HAPPY HOME STRESSED

"You can't rear children with a check book," she said. "Some of the happiest homes are those with a very low budget. It is wonderful to have things money can buy, but we need to take care lest we lose those things money cannot buy. I fear sometimes we have in our homes more chrome than character, more kilowatts than kindness, more electronics than ethics. * * *"

Mrs. Hobbs told the delegates that the public schools were "your responsibility, whether you have children enrolled in them or not."

LINKS SCHOOLS TO DEFENSE

"Education means freedom—democracy," she said. "Education is our Nation's most powerful weapon. The public school is the largest defense industry in production today. You, as a taxpayer, are one of the millions of investors of stockholders who provide the money and raw material—your child—that keeps the wheels of this huge factory turning.

"Our Nation—our world—is the customer patiently awaiting, that we may all benefit by the capabilities developed by the public school industry."

STATE PRESIDENT SPEARS

Mrs. James Lohr, Sheboygan, State president, stressed the PTA's responsibility of "knowing your schools." This entails opportunities "to discuss, question, and suggest what might be done to improve them," she said. She recommended a close relationship with the school administration, knowing the school board members and "attending their meetings and inviting them to yours."

Mrs. Lohr urged the delegates to be informed about legislation.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 15, 1958]

PARENTS ARE URGED TO INSPIRE CHILDREN—HARRIS ASKS SPARK OF REBELLION AS WELL AS ADJUSTMENT; CITES NEED FOR VALUES

Parents probably should "spark a certain rebellion as well as adjustment" in children, a child development expert told the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers here Monday night.

Dale Harris, director of the institute of child development at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, spoke before 1,200 delegates at dinner at the auditorium. Their 2-day convention ended Tuesday.

Harris challenged parents to "take a stand on values" or risk rearing a "generation of drifters."

He said youth must have outstanding character in a world "where signals sent out by parents no longer work." Love and security are important, he said, but children also must be inspired.

FEARS TOO MUCH FREEDOM

That, he said, possibly should include inducing some rebellion. But, he added, when children are given too much freedom, they may turn out to be "persons uncommitted to life."

"This is not to say that we must never let a child make decisions," Harris said. "But we must also indicate that there must be value standards that he is expected to live up to."

George E. Watson, State superintendent of public instruction, urged the PTA delegates to remember that "You and I have a stake in free, universal education in America, and that if we lose this system of education, we lose part of America."

CITES INDIVIDUAL'S ROLE

At an education workshop Monday afternoon, Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, provost of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, said that "Russia's sputnik is not nearly as important in the field of higher education as some alarmists would lead us to believe."

A crash program in science is not the answer, he said. We must never forget, he said, that the individual is important in American life and education, and that America is committed to free and universal education.

After a luncheon Tuesday, PTA life memberships were awarded to these leaders: Valbur Borger, 2719 North Stowell Avenue; Mrs. Willis Van Horn, Appleton; Fred Delli-Quadri, Madison, director of the division of children and youth of the State department of public welfare; and Henry Weinlick, Madison, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Education Association.

Winners of the Minetta Hastings scholarships for teacher training announced Monday night are: Annemarie Sladky, Custer High School, Milwaukee; James Jones, Eau Claire Memorial High School; Jewel K. Le Mahieu, Cedar Grove High School, and Nancy Watkins, Madison West High School. The scholarships, each totaling $500 covering a period of 2 years in teacher training, are outright gifts. They are given to senior students in Wisconsin high schools having PTA units.

Community Facilities in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, I placed in the RECORD a number of letters from officials of Wisconsin communities. The letters set forth the projects in my State which were ready to go upon the passage of the Community Facilities Act.

Today, I have additional letters, from the cities of Watertown and Schofield, which make clear, as the other letters did, that this legislation will benefit the local units of government in Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letters from the heads of government of Watertown and Schofield.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF WATERTOWN, WIS.,
April 14, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have your recent letter relative to a Federal program to public works planning and financing which is administered by the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

You have requested a list of projects which might be included in work of this sort. The following public works projects are being considered for this community:

Remodeling of high school	$500,000
New Douglas School	600,000
Municipal building	450,000
New street lighting system	100,000
Water works improvements	400,000
Oconomowoc Avenue Bridge	150,000
	$2,200,000

Very sincerely yours,
CITY OF WATERTOWN, WIS.,
C. C. CONGDON,
City Manager.

CITY OF SCHOFIELD,
Schofield, Wis., April 9, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It has been brought to our atention that you are interested in finding out the needs of smaller cities, which could be alleviated through Federal aid.

We are a small community situated in central Wisconsin and we are in a stage of rapid growing pains. We have, with the assistance of the Wausau Chamber of Commerce, developed an industrial area and as a consequence our growth in the last few years has been tremendous. A few years prior we put in a water and sewer system, added a fire department and enlarged our street department, so that we have just about reached the limit for bonding purposes.

Last year we inaugurated a 3-year plan to install storm sewers, which were completed, curb and gutter and black topping. The curb and gutter and black topping has not been started due to lack of borrowing power. So if it would be within your power to help us procure aid for the completion of these projects, it would relieve a desperate situation in the city and greatly improve it.

Very truly yours,
HARRY C. SPANTON, *Mayor.*

Financial Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, Mr. Gus Norwood, recently delivered before several groups in my State an address on the need for maintaining low interest rates for rural cooperatives.

"The exploitation of the West," he correctly pointed out, "took the form of high interest rates and huge profits for the absentee owners. The development of the West is most effectively achieved through low interest rates."

Mr. Norwood delivered the substance of this address before the Lincoln Electric Cooperative in Eureka, the Vigilante Electric Cooperative in Dillion, the Beaverhead County Chamber of Commerce in Dillon, the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative in Huntley, the Billings Business Men's Breakfast in Billings, and the Valley County Electric Cooperative in Glasgow.

This address is commendable not only for its force facts, and timeliness. It is a masterpiece of concise exposition. I would commend it especially to Government officials, who should clearly see in it the reasons why I and many other Members of Congress unalterably oppose the administration's proposed increase in interest rates for REA cooperatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Norwood's address, entitled "Stand Your Ground," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAND YOUR GROUND

Money, like this $20 bill, is of interest to everybody.

Money is something about which we all should know a lot more.

A Congressman once was asked what did he know about money. He answered that all he knew about money was that he did not have enough of it. For most of us also that is probably our main thought on the subject.

But today money is again becoming one of the hot economic and political questions being debated by Congress.

My talk is divided into five parts.

First, the historical struggle for low interest rates.

Second, the importance of the 2 percent REA interest rate.

Third, the effect of interest on electric power cost.

Fourth, the legitimate object of government.

Fifth, I conclude and urge you to stand your ground.

Let me begin then by outlining some of the background or tradition which has grown up in our country in the direction of low interest rates. The original colonies were generally established on a shoestring or on borrowed money. It is now 350 years since Virginia was first settled, and for more than three-fourths of those 350 years we have been a borrower nation. We had to go to the European bankers for our money and we had to pay high interest rates. We were an exploited nation and we resented the high interest rates. As a result of these first 250 years of our history as an exploited borrower nation, we developed a political tradition of sympathy for the borrower. We adopted laws against usury. We learned to distrust the big financial interests.

After the Civil War and ever since then we have had the same struggle of the haves and the have-nots, the lenders and the borrowers, the financial interests against the little people.

We in the West have especially become aware that we were in the borrower class. We have traditionally been the advocates of low interest rates, and of Federal programs for making loan funds available for western development.

The free-silver movement was a part of this tradition. William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, became a candidate for the Presidency in 1896 largely on the basis of his speech at the Democratic convention which concluded with the words:

"* * * we will answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns, you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

In our struggle the last century against the exploitation of high interest rates we have established our farm cooperatives, our systems of farmer-owned grain elevators, our hail, auto, and life insurance cooperatives, our oil and farm supply cooperatives, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

now our rural-electric cooperatives. These are all self-help, do-it-yourself programs.

Under Teddy Roosevelt we started the great western irrigation program; we created the Forest Service and the great program of conserving our forests on a sustained-yield basis. We began the harnessing of water resources by the use of Federal investment funds, for the benefit of all the people.

Each of these programs illustrates the following general rule: The exploitation of the West took the form of high interest rates and huge profits for the absentee owners. The development of the West is most effectively achieved through low interest rates.

Thus the issue is drawn. One is white. The other is black. Either we have exploitation or we have development. High interest rates means exploitation. Low interest rates means development and industrial progress.

To bring this background up to date we have seen in recent years a steady buildup to increase the interest rates on all forms of Federal loans. The veterans housing and other housing loans, the farm loans have all gone up. One of the few areas which have been able to hold the line and resist the attack has been the rural electrification program.

I think the worst of the battle is over, but we should not unload our guns yet.

The reason I think the worst is over is because of what has happened in the past 4 months to the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve Board. Two statistics dramatize what has happened. Four months ago the Federal Government had to pay 3.6 percent on its 90-day Treasury bills. Today the rate is 1.2 percent. The Federal Government can borrow short-term money today at only one-third the interest that prevailed 4 months ago. There has been a tobogganing, a real downward skid in the interest rate.

The revolt against the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve Board has been growing in recent months. It has been spearheaded by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who last year introduced a resolution calling for a congressional investigation of our financial institutions, or in other words on our system of money and credit and why the interest rate is so high.

Congressman PATMAN lost the vote on his resolution by a vote of 225 to 174 just a year ago on March 27. But the idea did not die. The pressure is mounting. The public is getting more curious about why we have 5 million people out of jobs. Why has the Government deliberately sponsored these high interest rates? But let me leave that question on your minds and turn to my second point.

My second point is to show the importance of the 2 percent REA interest rate. Your cooperative is owned by the people who receive electricity from it. It belongs to you. You are the stockholders. You have borrowed money from a banker called the Rural Electrification Administration, which in turn draws its loan funds from the United States Treasury. Thus the REA program is a method whereby we lend money to ourselves. You and I collectively make up the credit of the United States. Our credit is behind the loans which REA makes to us. We are only lending the money to ourselves.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress to increase the REA interest rate from 2 percent to rates varying from 4 percent to 6 percent. This means that where we now pay $20,000 a year interest on a million dollar loan, we would instead have to pay $40,000 to $60,000 or from double to triple our present annual interest payments. This is a considerable amount of money even for a big cooperative and a much greater burden for a small system to bear. The extra interest cost would take a bite out of your pocketbook.

That is the immediate issue in the REA interest rate battle. We want to hold the line on the present 2 percent rate. Your national, regional, and State associations are determined not to give way on this one, and I would like to urge you to support these associations in their efforts on your behalf.

Now let me turn to my third topic on the effect of interest on power cost. I will use two illustrations to show that interest is the most important factor in determining power rates. My first example shows how the power business is different from almost any other kind of business with which we are generally familiar. Take the grocery business for example.

When the grocer invests $1 he expects that dollar to turn over up to about 8 times a year. That is, he expects to receive $8 of gross revenue each year per dollar of original investment. But when you look over the financial statements of a large hydroelectric power system like the Bonneville Power Administration which operates 7,500 miles of high voltage transmission lines to carry about 5 million kilowatts of power from 12 major dams, then we are looking at an entirely different kind of a business.

For every $1 of original investment in dams and transmission facilities the Bonneville Power Administration does not get $8 per year in revenue, it doesn't even get $1 per year, it gets only 8 cents. So there is your contrast, the grocer gets $8, Bonneville gets 8 cents from the same dollar of investment. The difference between the grocery business and the power business is 100 to 1.

Now let's turn this example around a little in order to analyze what the effect is of interest rates in the power business. First let's recognize our figures so that both the grocer and Bonneville get $8 in gross revenue per year. In order to do that the grocer must make an investment of $1 and Bonneville must make an investment of $100. Now in both of these cases let's increase the interest rate by 1 percent. To the grocer the added cost is 1 penny. This is the price of 1 stick of gum and he is always giving away sticks of gum to the kiddies anyway, so it makes no difference to him. But for Bonneville the extra 1 percent on $100 means it must collect an extra dollar from its customers, so instead of collecting $8 it must collect $9, or a rate increase of 13 percent. So for the Bonneville system we have our answer of what is the effect of interest rate on power rates. On the Bonneville system a 1 percent increase in interest forces a 13 percent increase in power rates.

Before leaving our Bonneville Power Administration example let me emphasize that even with only 8 cents revenue per dollar of investment it is in a very sound financial condition. For example for the year ending June 30, 1956, BPA took in $61 million or more than a million dollars a week. How did it spend the $61 million? On a percentage basis 35.6 percent went for interest and was the biggest cost, next 30.4 percent for debt retirement, then 24.3 percent for all operation, maintenance and administrative cost, and that still left a profit of 9.8 percent.

Now if someone would like to crosscheck these figures. BPA's average interest cost is about 2.6 percent. By dividing 2.6 into 35.6 percent we get 13.5 percent as the ratio, and thus again we see that a 1-percent rise in the interest rate would result in a 13-percent rise in power cost. The leverage is 13 to 1.

My second example on power cost comes closer to home. Here again I want to show that interest is the chief factor in the cost of power. This example I call the Hungry Horse iceberg. When we look over the operating statement for Hungry Horse Dam we find it costs about $3 million to cover the costs, but very little of that money is spent at the dam. The entire cost of operation, maintenance and administration at the dam is only $290,000 a year. This is 10 percent of the total. Thus when we visit the dam and see the operators at the control panels and when we watch the men doing the painting and greasing and in fact all the activity that we can see at the dam—we see only the upper 10 percent of the iceberg.

The huge 90 percent that is left of the iceberg is underneath. In order to see how the other 90 percent is spent we must go to Washington, D. C., where once a year, possibly while everyone else is out for coffee, a bookkeeper makes an entry of $900,000 for amortization. This repays the United States Treasury loan over a 50-year period. Next he enters $1,800,000 for interest. Thus 30 percent of the annual cost of Hungry Horse is debt repayment and 60 percent is interest.

Interest is the chief factor in determining the price of power. With interest at 2½ percent, we can easily figure out by dividing 2½ into 60 that each 1 percent of interest cost causes 24 percent of the power cost. Thus at Hungry Horse Dam the leverage is 24 to 1. A 1 percent increase in interest causes a 24 percent increase in power. If we had to pay 3½ instead of 2½ at Hungry Horse, we would have to increase the power revenue $720,000 each year and this rate increase would have to be paid by you and me as the ultimate consumers.

One reason for my presenting the Hungry Horse iceberg example is because the financing challenge of certain other Montana dams such as Paradise Dam in western Montana and Yellowtail Dam in eastern Montana is directly analogous to Hungry Horse. There also, about 60 percent of the power revenue would go for interest, and therefore these new dams can produce low cost power only if we hold the line on keeping down the interest rate.

Summarizing my third point I hope that these 2 examples of the Hungry Horse iceberg and the difference between the grocery and the power business have served to show that low cost power depends on using low cost money, on keeping the interest rate low.

For my fourth point I would like to read you one of my favorite quotations from Abraham Lincoln. Many a time in his writings and speeches Abe Lincoln explained his philosophy of government in these words:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves."

In my view the Hungry Horse Dam serves as a clear cut illustration of Lincoln's philosophy of government.

Here is a dam which under traditional private utility financing would produce power about three times as expensive as the present low cost. Obviously no private utility would find a market for such expensive power and therefore no banker would help any utility to finance such a project. Thus the Hungry Horse Dam was going to be built by the Federal Government or it was not going to be built at all.

Incidentally I have heard it said that if a private utility had built Hungry Horse Dam there would have been considerable tax benefits to Flathead County. Of course, there is an obvious fallacy in that statement. Under private utility financing the project would not have been feasible and the tax payment would have been zero.

Now let us take a look at the Flathead County tax situation today. Bear in mind that Hungry Horse Dam is not on the tax rolls. There is not 1 penny of taxes paid. Yet from 1946 to 1956 the tax base of Flathead County has jumped from $35 to $84 millions. The great Anaconda Aluminum Co. plant and all the new homes have been made possible only by the building of Hungry Horse Dam.

Other counties have also benefited. Listen to the report made by Mr. J. M. Gillet of the Victor Chemical Co. when he addressed the Columbia Basin Interagency Commis-

sion at Butte in 1955 when he explains why Victor came to Montana:

"Bonneville Power Administration was building transmission lines to this area so that low-cost power would be available. Phosphate rock was cheaper in Idaho than here because it can be strip-mined, while rock in this area must be mined underground. Bonneville power rates, however, were enough lower to offset this disadvantage. After careful balancing of the economic factors, rock, power, and freight rates on raw materials and finished products, the Butte area was selected, and a plant site was sought."

Look at all the counties of western Montana where rural electric cooperatives enjoyed a reduction in power cost as soon as Hungry Horse Dam was nearing completion. There power cost dropped from about 12 mills, if the power was available at all, to the present Bonneville rate of about 3.5 mills. Also the quality of service is better. This means a higher standard of living for the people in the rural areas of western Montana.

In some respects the same is true in eastern Montana because the Montana Power Co. gets a solid block of 50,000 kilowatts of Hungry Horse Dam power at 2 mills flat charge which it sells in eastern Montana. In fact, the Montana Power Co. receives a large portion of its power supply at an average cost of only 2 to 3 mills from Canyon Ferry Dam, Fort Peck Dam, and Hungry Horse Dam. In addition, it has the advantage of being able to exchange power with the Bonneville Power Administration so that it can either buy more power or sell any temporary surplus as market conditions permit.

Thus Hungry Horse Dam has benefited everyone. It has increased tax payments, it has brought hundreds of stable industrial jobs to Montana, it has facilitated rural electrification, and it has improved the power supply of the largest utility in the State.

Hungry Horse Dam thus qualifies under Abe Lincoln's test of the legitimate object of government.

Another area of public need which meets Lincoln's test is rural electrification. Here again is an area where the traditional private financing methods could not see enough promise of profit to warrant building electric lines into the rural area. Congress decided to lend money through REA to enable the people to do the job themselves. The rural electric cooperative is a self-help, do-it-yourself program where the people in each area actually do the organizing and operation, and Congress has REA act as banker to do the financing on a strictly self-liquidating revenue-producing basis.

For my fifth and last point I want to urge that you stand your ground in the national contest on interest rates. We in the West should advocate the lowest possible rate of interest. We should try to get the public interest rates down as close to the legitimate cost of borrowed money as possible.

* * * * *

Montana alone has a potential of about 6 million kilowatts waiting to be harnessed. The tragedy is that we should have such severe unemployment when there is obviously so much work waiting to be done.

* * * * *

In the winning of the West we have a struggle between development and exploitation. We have a struggle between the advocates of high interest rates and low interest rates. High interest rates means exploitation, and we have had enough of that. Low-interest rates means progressive development and we can stand a lot more of that.

Here is one of the central, universal issues of our time. On this issue the REA interest rate is the main battleground. On this issue I urge you to stand your ground. The 2 percent REA interest rate is good not only for your cooperative, it is also good for the entire country.

Thank you.

Relations With Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written for the Miami Herald by our colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and another by Mr. Hendrik J. Berns.

These two articles written at the beginning of this Pan American week both emphasize vividly the importance to us of our ties with the Republics of Latin America. The junior Senator from Florida has been foremost in pointing the way to a firmer and more durable Latin American policy for the United States.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIGHTEN THE TIES

(By GEORGE SMATHERS, United States Senator from Florida)

All of us, at one time or another, make a serious mistake in dealing with close friends. We take them for granted. We assume that a friendship can flourish unimpeded without care and attention to the wishes and needs of our friends.

But this is dangerous and sooner or later we find our friends gone.

What is true of individuals is to a great extent true of nations. What is said of the erring friend can be said at times, unfortunately, of the United States.

For we as a nation, caught up in the myriad complex problems of life today, sometimes overlook the enormous contributions made to the United States by our Latin American neighbors.

We sometimes forget their unwavering, traditional friendship for us. We sometimes overlook the common ties of democracy and an unquenched love of liberty that binds us to the 20 Latin American Republics. We sometimes fail to note the tremendous importance of their trade with the United States and of the enormous political importance of Latin America as a bulwark against communism.

In a word, we sometimes forget to practice our friendship.

Mounting problems are arising in Latin America. Sensible trade programs are needed for development of the continent's vast resources.

Communist attempts to gain through trade programs what they could never gain through political activities must be countered effectively.

Health, education, and sanitation of the underdeveloped nations must be aided and encouraged.

We have an unmatched opportunity this year—now—to demonstrate in specific terms how firm our friendship is toward our Latin American neighbors. We have an opportunity to discover this again, and to further the valuable and mutually advantageous friendship that now exists.

LATIN AMERICA—WHAT IS IT?

(By Hendrik J. Berns)

What is Latin America?

Is it just a nebulous, turbulent region?

Or is it a promise to be fulfilled in the future?

Is it just a headache caused by foreign aid?

Or is it a sound investment?

Is it just a continent of political upheavals?

Or is it a continent groping for proper answers?

Looking at Latin America, these are some of the questions you must answer.

Let us try to help you:

Latin America means 20 sovereign republics, covering more than 7 million square miles. And in human lives it means more than 150 million people.

In the depth of its soil are all of the world's minerals.

On the surface of its soil grows every type of food.

Among its people are the incredibly rich and the incredibly poor.

And there are, also, the very educated and the illiterate.

Among its cities are the supermodern and the superantiquated.

There is the genial swing of glass-bursting Niemeyer architecture and there is the windowless, termite-infested shack.

There is the sprawling, shining beauty of Copacabana and the plank-built hut, deep in the jungle hills.

There is the wealth that sails to Europe and the Riviera twice a year.

And there is the poverty of the squatter who lives on garbage.

There is the spending for the splendor of uniforms and the election, again and again, of feudal cliques.

But there is also the barefoot miner who never learned to write—much less to vote—and the Congressman who pompously represents him in parliament.

There is the glory with which only God's hand can crown a land's hilltops, valleys, forests, and shores.

And there is also the snakepit where thousands of mentally ill rot to their death.

You want to know what Latin America really is?

It is the child of today growing into the adult of tomorrow.

It is that part of the world which, by its very nature, holds all the promises that a greater tomorrow can fulfill.

It is the land of the future waiting for the vision of today.

Death of Senator W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH. W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when Senator W. KERR SCOTT passed away yesterday, the Senate lost one of its most loved Members.

While this is not the time for formal tributes in his memory, I think it appropriate that the Senate note the sketches of his life which were published this morning in two of the Nation's leading newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

an article entitled "W. KERR SCOTT, 61, Senator, Is Dead," published in the New York Times of April 17, 1958, and an article entitled "Senator SCOTT Dies of Heart Attack," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 17, 1958.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

W. KERR SCOTT, 61, SENATOR, IS DEAD

BURLINGTON, N. C., April 16.—Senator W. KERR SCOTT died today in Alamance General Hospital here. His death came on the eve of his 62d birthday. A Democrat, Mr. SCOTT was elected to the Senate in 1954. He had also served as Governor of this State.

He entered the hospital a week ago, after suffering a heart attack.

Surviving are his widow, the former Miss Mary Elizabeth White; two sons, Osborne W. and Robert W., both of Haw River, and a daughter, Mrs. A. J. Loudermilk of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio.

He is also survived by 4 brothers and 4 sisters.

A temporary successor to the Senate seat that had been held by Senator SCOTT is expected to be appointed in the near future by Gov. Luther H. Hodges, a Democrat. At the general elections next November a candidate will be chosen to fill out the unexpired term, which ends in January 1961.

Senator SCOTT's death reduces the Democratic margin in the Senate to 48–47.

A SOUTHERN LIBERAL

WILLIAM KERR SCOTT, blunt-spoken, well-to-do dairy farmer who was once described as "the jet-propelled plowboy with a rose in his lapel" was one of the foremost liberals of the South.

Long a champion of progressive measures in social legislation, Senator SCOTT during his 1949–52 tenure as Governor of North Carolina spoke out for Negro rights (although he was not an integrationist) and cracked down on the Ku Klux Klan when that organization attempted to conduct a membership drive in his State.

Senator SCOTT was elected Governor after having served 12 years as State Commissioner of Agriculture. Support from the farmers, whom he called "the branch-head boys," enabled him to win the gubernatorial and Senate races.

As Governor, he constantly criticized the telephone and power companies in public speeches and insisted that the utilities be extended into rural areas. During his tenure 21,000 miles of powerlines were strung to homes occupied by 153,000 persons.

Also as Governor, Senator SCOTT pushed through a $200 million road-bond issue that resulted in the paving of 14,810 miles of roads, more than had been paved in all previous years of the State's history.

He appointed the first Negro to serve on the State board of education. When he was elected Governor he declared it was time for North Carolina to stop dodging the Negro question.

"I am going to follow through to see that the minority race has a fair opportunity and gets the training to fit into the State's growth," he said.

OPPOSED DESEGREGATION

At the same time, he was not willing to let the segregation barriers down in his State. He expressed the opinion that the Negroes did not want desegregation. When four Negroes were enrolled in the University of North Carolina's law school for the first time he said he expected the influx of Negro students at the university to increase for a few years and then to decline after the novelty wears off.

It was also during his tenure as Governor that the State removed salary discrimination against the staff of the mental hospital for Negroes in Goldsboro.

Born on his father's farm in Haw River, N. C., on April 17, 1896, Senator SCOTT kept the same farm all his life, operating a 200-head dairy. He graduated from North Carolina State College in 1917 and held honorary degrees of doctor of agriculture from his alma mater and doctor of laws from the University of North Carolina and Elon College.

He served as a private in the field artillery in 1918 and became a county farm agent in 1920. He was regional director of the Farm Debt Adjustment program of the Resettlement Administration between 1934 and 1936.

In January, 1956, as chairman of a joint Senate-House subcommittee investigating the controversial Al Sarena mining case, he charged that the Department of Interior had awarded claims before receiving official reports on which the award was to have been based.

His charges were a major development in the Al Aarena case, which the Democrats at the time labeled a Republican administration giveaway of public timber, a dispute that became a part of the political campaign that year.

SENATOR SCOTT DIES OF HEART ATTACK

Senator W. KERR SCOTT, Democrat, of North Carolina, a plain-spoken, tobacco-chewing southern liberal, died of a heart attack yesterday in a Burlington, N. C., hospital.

Mr. SCOTT, who would have been 62 today, was stricken a week ago, and death came yesterday from what doctors described as "a sudden extension of the heart attack."

The renewed attack came without warning on a day in which it had been earlier reported that the Senator was making good progress. A birthday party had been planned for Mr. SCOTT in his hospital room today.

Mr. SCOTT is the fifth North Carolina Senator to suffer a heart attack in recent years. Because of deaths, illness, and political defeats, the seat he occupied has been held by 7 different men in 12 years.

SENATE ADJOURNS

The Senate adjourned its session last night after the news of Mr. SCOTT's death was announced to the Chamber by Senator SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina.

Upon ERVIN's motion, the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution expressing its profound sorrow and deep regret. It authorized the Senate to send an official delegation to attend Mr. SCOTT's funeral.

Noting that a day would be set aside later for eulogies, ERVIN said in a statement that Mr. SCOTT "never failed in his devotion to North Carolina and her people."

"A humble and honest man," he said. "Senator SCOTT has plowed to the end of the road; his furrow is deep; time will not erode his indelible imprint upon our great State for which he so well labored and gave his full measure."

Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas called Mr. SCOTT "one of the most respected members of this party." JOHNSON said Mr. SCOTT "had a long and colorful career which endeared him to the people of his State and to all who knew him."

ELECTED IN 1954

Mr. SCOTT, a prosperous dairy farmer who never forgot his country background, was elected to the Senate in 1954 after having served as North Carolina's Commissioner of Agriculture for 12 years and as Governor of his State from 1949 through 1952.

Mr. SCOTT always attributed his political success to his popularity among the rural voters, and he was a consistent champion of the farmer throughout his public life.

As Governor, he supported a $200 million bond issue to pave the State's series of rural roads, and they became known as Scott roads. He also was active in behalf of school construction, hospital building, rural electrification, and rural health centers.

Mr. SCOTT appointed the first Negro to the State board of education and appointed the first woman to the superior court bench. He also appointed the liberal president of the University of North Carolina, Frank P. Graham, to fill a Senate vacancy in 1949.

RACE ISSUE IN CAMPAIGN

When Mr. SCOTT ran for the Senate in 1954, his opponents brought the race issue into the campaign, charging that Mr. SCOTT encouraged a breakdown of racial segregation in North Carolina public schools. Mr. SCOTT said he favored separate schools for whites and Negroes.

He was elected to fill the unexpired term of the late Willis Smith, who died of a heart attack while in office. In 1956, Mr. SCOTT was renominated and reelected by the largest majorities ever given to a Democratic senatorial candidate in North Carolina.

In the Senate, he served on the Agriculture and Forestry, Post Office and Civil Service and Public Works Committee. He was chairman of a joint Senate-House committee which investigated the Al Sarena timberlands case, in which Sarena was given mining claims on timberland. He also was active in agricultural legislation.

STUDIED AGRICULTURE

Born in Haw River, N. C., Mr. SCOTT was graduated from North Carolina State College with a degree in agriculture in 1917. A few months after graduation he began a lifetime career as a farmer and dairyman. He served as a county farm agent before being elected agriculture commissioner.

The death of Mr. SCOTT reduces the Senate lineup to 48 Democrats and 47 Republicans.

Surviving are his wife, Mary; 2 sons, Robert, who manages the family farm; Osborn, of Washington; a daughter, Mrs. A. J. Lowdermilk, Akron; and 1 grandchild.

Funeral services will be held at 3 p. m. Friday at the Hawfields Presbyterian Church, where Senator SCOTT served as an elder for many years. Burial will be in the church cemetery.

Fort Clatsop National Memorial Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the course of legislation for the establishment of a national memorial park at Fort Clatsop near the Oregon seacoast is watched with great interest and pride by residents of my home State. During an Easter adjournment visit to Oregon, I received numerous inquiries about my bill which passed the Senate early in April to authorize the park at this historic landmark where Lewis and Clark brought the American flag overland to the Pacific for the first time. An excellent editorial about the Fort Clatsop National Memorial was published in the Astorian-Budget for April 8, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIG STEP FOR A BIG PROJECT

Establishment of a Fort Clatsop Memorial Park with museum and permanent custodial service will be one of the greatest things that

ever happened to Clatsop County from the standpoint of development of our historical background.

All of us know what a tremendous tourist attraction the Astor column has become, with tens of thousands of visitors every year.

The Fort Clatsop Memorial Park will be an even greater attraction, we predict, because of its easier accessibility from the main highway and because of the greater historical interest that attaches to the picturesque site of the Lewis and Clark expedition's winter encampment.

Legislation to establish this memorial park made a great stride toward accomplishment last week when the Senate passed Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER'S bill. Senator NEUBERGER, with justifiable pride and pleasure, has sent the Astorian-Budget copies of the speech he made on the Senate floor advocating the bill, and of the committee report he wrote recommending its passage.

Efforts now on behalf of the legislation are to be concentrated in the House of Representatives where Representative WALTER NORBLAD has a companion bill awaiting hearing in late April before a subcommittee, and where NEUBERGER has reiterated a statement that he will help NORBLAD obtain favorable action.

The goal is to have the legislation adopted in time to have the new park dedicated during the 1959 Oregon centennial celebration. This is a worthy goal, and such a dedication could become one of the major events of the centennial year.

Let's Learn the Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest concerning the problem of safety on our highways, I believe that the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger of April 16 is timely and significant:

LET'S LEARN THE CAUSES

There seems to be a growing awareness of how little we really know about the causes of highway accidents. If this is so, it is probably the most important development in finally achieving some progress in cutting down the toll on the roads.

No matter how vigorous, a safety campaign based on mistaken notions of accident causes is bound to get nowhere. Perhaps the best course now is to discard the preconceived notions and start out from scratch.

That is what this newspaper has recommended in the past. We need a case study approach, a detailed analysis of series of accidents to diagnose causes with some measure of exactitude.

This is similar to the approach recommended the other day by D. Louis Tonti, executive director of the Garden State Parkway. He suggested that a research foundation be established to get to the bottom of accident causes and do a scientific job of conducting safety campaigns.

A research foundation dedicated to a scientific understanding of accident causes could be the means for getting to the root of the problem. It's an idea we would like to see catch on.

Neglected Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am enclosing an article entitled "Neglected Men," written by Maj. Gen. Jim Dan Hill, retired.

It is provocative of much thought and I feel sure that my colleagues will value its reading.

The article is attached.

NEGLECTED MEN

(By Jim Dan Hill, president, Wisconsin State College)

The National Guards, Air and Army, are being sold down the river of false economy.

This volunteer force that gives the most for the smallest fraction of each defense dollar is being sacrificed by meat-ax technique in sputnik-inspired false emphasis, budget trimming.

America has become dangerously rocket happy. Missiles have become more important than men.

The desk fighter's popular science fiction dream of pushbutton, intercontinental wars has captured so many imaginations that America is about to accept the dangerous dictum that for combat men have become obsolete.

Khrushchev nurtured this theme for us in one of his well-planned speeches early in the brief period that sputnik successes were giving him a worldwide forum.

If Nikita Khrushchev actually believes that malarky, why is Russia still training pilots?

Why are Russian crews being drafted into an ever-expanding Soviet submarine force?

Why does Russia, in the face of world clamor for arms reduction, cling tenaciously to the largest army in the world?

The Soviets have 175 divisions on full active duty at all times. Billions are being spent on their modernization.

Khrushchev, distrustful of Field Marshal Voroshilov, degraded him to Siberian obscurity for his resistance to Communist Party surveillance within this powerful force.

Khrushchev and his henchmen are insistent that this great mass of military manpower will unquestionably fight foreign wars for the expansion of Moscow's own brand of aggressive Marxism.

Thus, when Khrushchev says men have become obsolete, his policies give his words the lie.

Men can never become obsolete in a man-made activity.

Great teams of men are essential to the coordination, operation, and relocation of these increasingly complicated and science-inspired engines of war. The greater and more complex the machines become, the greater the need for more men, disciplined into smoothly functioning, fearless teams.

That engines of war must be coordinated, operated, and relocated by large teams of trained men is a principle of warfare that goes back to the ballistae and the battering rams that Caesar used in ancient Gaul. They were the engines the scientists of his day contributed to warfare.

Note the emphasis upon relocation of weapons. No war has ever been won, or ever will be won, without a combination of fire and movement. Any rocket base we cannot readily transfer from one place to another is a base America will not have very long. The enemy will capture or destroy it. In each alternate position, where the weapons are actually located, there must be defense by ground troops, air cover, patrolling submarines.

All this fire and movement by weapons old and new call for men, trained men with teamwork instincts.

No cannon was ever any better than the artillerymen who fired it. And let us never forget that a rocket is just another form of artillery.

Where does America find these teams and teams of men?

The full-time, active forces of the Army, Air Force, and Navy are already small. They are but little more than vocational schools for the development and teaching of techniques and job skills. In these each private costs the taxpayer over $5,000 a year. Higher ratings and ranks cost proportionately more.

Long ago it was decided America should initially depend heavily upon volunteers from civil life who would organize themselves into appropriate team units, and comply with the professional and training specifications of the regulars. These techniques and team training are readily transferable to newer weapons.

The National Guards, air and ground, along with less completely organized reserves of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, are America's most immediate sources for citizen soldier and air volunteers for such service, be it with rifles or rockets.

By coordinating civilian and military interests, these teams of avocational-service men give the taxpayer the most for the least cost to the Treasury of any defense agency.

In this sudden delusion that pushbuttons can defend a great nation, the already small, compact, well-trained Guard units are being meataxed by a strength reduction of 76,000 men from their earlier 436,000.

This is just enough to wreck the organizational strength and morale of the 360,000 now being budgeted. The so-called saving is pennywise and pound foolish. The cost of each guardsman is but one-sixth of that of a full-time soldier or airman of like grade.

This small corps d'elite of America's trained and fully organized combat manpower is normally expanded, when money is tight, as an economy measure. Today we witness the folly of reduction.

Credit Where Credit Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the American labor movement has suffered tremendously because of the actions of a few corrupt union bosses. Millions of honest, devoted union members have been the biggest sufferers, first, because they are most conscious of corruption yet powerless to combat it; and, second, because it is their dues money which is used to feather the nests of the crooks.

It is fitting, therefore, that we pay tribute to some of the well-managed de-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cent labor unions which are operated for the benefit of their members and the public at large, instead of being run to fill the pockets of the union bosses.

An outstanding example of a soundly operated union is local 11 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, which has a membership of just less than 9,000. It has 4 units in southern California: 1 in the Los Angeles Harbor area, 1 in downtown Los Angeles, 1 in the San Fernando Valley and 1 in the San Gabriel Valley.

Local 11 takes great pride in upholding good relations among the union, its members and their employers. Naturally, there are occasions when all do not agree, but usually some common ground can be found where problems can be resolved. The union is interested in the advancement not only of its members, but of the electrical industry as a whole and the Nation as a whole.

Local 11's internal affairs are exemplary. Every bill is approved by the executive board before being paid. A certified public accountant gives a quarterly financial report which is available for any member's inspection at any time. A summary of this report is posted on every bulletin board with copies of it in every district office where anyone can request and receive it.

Moreover, the international brotherhood gives a complete financial report in its Journal Quarterly which is mailed to all members.

In local 11 an election is held every 2 years. Balloting is secret. The polls are open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m. in each district office. Judges and tellers are elected by the membership to conduct the election. The same method of voting is used as in civil elections, with booths and ballots.

Members take a sincere interest in their union's affairs. At the general meetings there is an average attendance of about 800. Officials estimate that between the general meetings and the unit meetings that somewhere between 2,300 and 2,500 of the members attend a meeting every month.

Local No. 11 feels a strong sense of responsibility to the public. The IBEW construction department has not had a major strike since 1922. There is a clause in the constitution which forbids any local union to strike without permission of the international office.

In 1923, the council of industrial relations was formally established in the IBEW. It is composed of 6 members representing the employers and 6 representing the union, and they come from various parts of the Nation so that a broad segment of the electrical industry is represented. The council of industrial relations considers any unresolved problems arising during negotiations if these problems cannot be decided locally. Decisions of the council are binding and none has ever been violated.

Locally, there is a joint conference committee set up to resolve minor grievances which arise because of differences in interpretations of agreements.

The organization has a pension plan which has been in effect for some 30 years. Both employers and employees contribute to the plan.

Local No. 11 publishes a newsletter to keep its members informed of union affairs and problems. It encourages the families of members to take part in union activities.

Contests for members—including families—with Government bonds as prizes, family picnics, sponsorship of youth activities and other community projects, apprentice-training programs with savings bonds and other awards for outstanding trainees, and information programs for all members, are among the many activities which local No. 11 promotes for the benefit of its members.

Local No. 11 is an outstanding example of a union which operates from the ground up, in behalf of the rank-and-file union man and his family. What a contrast this is to some unions, and especially to some union leaders whose performance and reputation are far more widespread.

Statement of Policy of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit to my colleagues the statement of policy unanimously adopted by the executive officers and the board of directors of the Polish-American Congress, which speaks authoritatively on behalf of 7 million Americans of Polish origin:

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Executive officers and the board of directors of the Polish-American Congress, the representative body of 7 million Americans of Polish origin, meeting in Washington on April 11 and 12, 1958, unanimously agreed on issuance of the following statement of policy:

1. While since its very inception 14 years ago, the Polish-American Congress stands unalterably opposed to communism and condemns its tyranny, its insidious designs for world conquest, and its suppression of civil liberties. We cannot agree with those few American statesmen, politicians, and publicists who insist on regarding Poland as a Communist country and would deny the Polish people any help from the United States.

It is true that Poland is presently governed by a very insignificant minority of adherents to the Moscow-dominated Communist Party. This situation, however, is not of Poland's free choice. It has been forced on Poland by treacherous means of Red conspiracy and with tacit consent of the West. Poland's 28 million people continue loyally dedicated to democratic principles.

Throughout her 1,000-year history, Poland, as a powerful nation on the ramparts of Christendom, has offered time and again proof of her steadfast and unyielding allegiance to the tenets and democratic ideals of western civilization.

This noble tradition of 10 centuries cannot be changed by Communist oppression of recent years. Historically, traditionally, culturally—the Polish people cannot be susceptible to Communist persuasion and will never accept it even in the face of overwhelming pressure from the Kremlin.

Poland's valiant spirit of resistance against Communist designs for world conquest can be weakened and broken not by the powerful forces from the East, but only by the indifference and lack of moral and material support from the West. Deprived of this help, the gallant Poles would rightfully feel betrayed, abandoned, and the hope of freedom would die in a nation whose people desperately long for a return to the Western family of nations.

A Poland, broken in spirit through our indifference to her plight, to her rights, and to her deeds of the past, would be a major calamity for the West for we cannot emphasize too strongly that a free Poland is the real key to peace in Europe. It is therefore in the best interest of the United States to constantly seek out ways which will restore complete sovereignty to the people of Poland as quickly as possible.

For these reasons, we strongly believe that the people of Poland should be given more economic, technical, and cultural assistance. We of the Polish American Congress are grateful to the United States for having the courage to distinguish between the present Communist regime in Poland and the urgent needs of Poland's people. We strongly urge further assistance to Poland not only in the form of surplus commodities but of credits to help build her consumer industry. We are confident that an economically sound Poland will not long remain in the Communist orbit.

2. We commend the stand of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State against a hasty and ill-prepared summit conference between the heads of governments of the free world and the Communist bloc.

It is our considered opinion, that in addition to undeserved gains in propaganda value, the Soviet Union is striving to create among the subjugated nations within the Red empire an impression that the West, by implications, if not by written consent, is accepting the intolerable status quo among the captive nations in central and east central Europe.

To perpetuate this erroneous impression of status quo would be a tremendous gain for the Soviet Union in the cold war. It would kill the hope of freedom and deliverance among the 100 million people of the captive nations whose only salvation lies in the Western nations' moral force and their determination to oppose Russian conquests and encroachments.

If the United States decides upon a summit conference with Soviet leaders we strongly urge that the first prerequisite of such a conference, the first point on the agenda, should be a demand by the United States for the liberation of the satellite nations. Unless the Soviet Union is willing to place the liberation of the captive nations on the agenda, we feel the United States should refuse to participate in any further summit conferences.

Under no circumstances should the United States agree that liberation of Poland from Communist rule is an internal matter for the Poles to determine. The Red regime was forced on the Poles by acts of omission from the West and restoration of her liberty is a world responsibility.

3. The Polish American Congress further believes that American foreign policy would gain immeasurably in stature in central Europe if the United States would now take effective steps to ratify Poland's western boundaries as agreed at the Potsdam Conference. It is an indisputable fact that the formal ratification of Poland's western boundaries along the Oder-Neisse Rivers would deprive the Soviet Union of her only claim for keeping Soviet troops in Poland under the guise of helping Poland protect her western boundaries. The urgency of this ratification becomes even more apparent when we take into consideration the fact

that leaders of Western Germany have on various occasions indicated they would be willing to discuss ratification of Poland's western boundaries as agreed at Potsdam.

4. The Polish American Congress further believes that the United States should expose the fraud presently being perpetrated by the Soviets and the present Communist regime in Poland that the hundreds of thousands of Poles taken from their homeland to Soviet slave labor camps by the Communists in the early phases of World War II are now being returned to Poland. There is indisputable proof, supported by letters smuggled out of these Russian forced labor camps, that only a small fraction of these long-suffering Poles are in fact being returned to their native land. The United States should not be misled by the so-called "reproachment" between the present Communist regime of Poland and the Moscow rulers regarding the Polish repatriates. This pact is not being fulfilled by the Soviet Union. The United States should proclaim to the world that any continued imprisonment of these gallant Poles in Russia is a violation of the United Nations Charter which the Soviets have signed, and is in violation of the accepted conduct of civilized nations. The United States should demand very strongly that before any further discussions for easing of world tensions are held, the Soviet Union must, through its puppet governments in the satellite nations, release all political prisoners now being incarcerated for alleged acts against Communist authorities.

5. The Polish American Congress believes that we should treat Russia's move to suspend nuclear tests with suspicion. Anyone who indulges in any wishful thinking is immature. The Russian announcement is just another ruse to relax our guard. The Russians will never deviate from their goal of world conquest. Any delusions about this matter may prove fatal. While talking about peace and suspension of nuclear tests, the Reds are building the world's greatest war machine. Before the United States agrees to any discussion regarding suspension of nuclear tests the Soviet Union should be compelled to show the free world the exact extent of its nuclear developments just as the United States had done in 1947 at Eniwetok. This point becomes even more significant when we recall that the United States has agreed to invite representatives of the entire world to view its nuclear tests scheduled for this summer. The Polish American Congress further feels that it would be a tragic mistake to recognize the so-called Rapacki plan to create a "nuclear-free" buffer zone in central Europe because it is clearly apparent that the Soviet Union has authorized this move merely because the Soviets themselves, are fearful of giving their satellite captives nuclear weapons.

6. The Polish American Congress strongly supports current efforts to compensate Polish nationals, and American citizens in Poland at the time, who had suffered indescribable physical injuries at the hands of Nazi troops during the invasion of Poland; with such compensation to be paid by the United States to these victims from the currently frozen German assets in this country. We feel that Congress should enact appropriate legislation for such compensation in keeping with America's traditional policy of justice and humanity.

7. The Polish American Congress congratulates the United States State Department for undertaking action to relieve the pitiful plight of thousands of Polish refugees now stationed in Germany, Austria and other west European countries, through its American escapee program. We pledge our cooperation with the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee which has been designated by the State Department to perform this task.

8. The Polish American Congress feels that for too long American policy has been on the defensive regarding our dealings with the Communists. We feel that a firm and decisive policy toward the Soviet Union will have the most effective results toward world peace and one such area where decisive action can be taken now is for the United State Congress to adopt the recommendations of a select committee of the United States Congress which in 1952 indicted the Communists for the Katyn massacre and urged that the Soviet Union be tried before the International World Court.

9. The Polish American Congress further affirms that it cannot condone organized excursions to Poland by recognized American organizations lest such excursions be interpreted as tacit approval of the present Communist government in Poland and we caution those who would arrange such excursions that they take every precaution possible to avoid exploitation for propaganda purposes by the regime in Poland of their group visits to that country.

10. We further strongly urge our State Department to demand of the Polish Government that the $1 CARE food packages be admitted into Poland for general distribution to relieve hunger and privation—as a condition of any further discussions with the Polish Government on cultural and economic exchanges.

11. The Polish American Congress sends to the people of Poland warm and sincere congratulations on their basic faith of a free people living under God, and we congratulate the Polish people for the magnificent manner in which they have conducted themselves in bringing about the great changes in Poland. The world owes these gallant people a debt of gratitude for piercing the first significant hole in the Iron Curtain.

12. The Polish American Congress congratulates the American press, radio, and television, and particularly the Polish language press in the United States, for distinguishing between the Communist Government of Poland and her overwhelmingly non-Communist population. We urge continued support of the Polish language press in the United States as an essential link in the continued struggle for Poland's independence.

13. We note with reverence, that in October of 1958, 350 years will have passed since the landing of the first Poles in Jamestown, founded in 1607 as the first permanent English settlement in the New World. Historians justly speak of Jamestown colonists as the beginners of the Nation. The Poles were among them. They were instrumental in building the first factory in America, the historic Glasshouse, in manufacturing rosin by-products, and in defending the colony against Indian attacks.

Contrary to popular beliefs, created by ethnic prejudices at the turn of the century, Americans of Polish origin are not late comers to American shores. Their heritage reaches the earliest epoch of American history.

Justly proud of this historic fact and of enduring contributions made by men and women of Polish origin to the growth and welfare of the United States, we call upon all chapters and divisions of the Polish American Congress and other units of Polish American organizations to commemorate in their localities the 350th anniversary of the coming of the first Poles to America, and to join the national observance planned.

In conclusion, we pledge our moral strength and all material resources of the Polish American Congress to help Poland in her difficult progress toward full freedom—and to support American policy in its search for a just and lasting peace and international security in a world where freedom reigns.

ROMAN PUCINSKI, *Chairman.*
Z. P. ZAKRZEWSKI.
WILLIAM GLOWACZ.

Statement Presented Relative to Assistance to Unemployed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House are aware, the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I have the honor to be a member, acted expeditiously to conduct public hearings on pending legislation to provide for an emergency extension of unemployment compensation benefits so as to alleviate the hardships resulting from widespread unemployment throughout the Nation. These hearings covered not only the subject of an emergency extension of unemployment compensation benefits in the case of those individuals who have exhausted their benefit rights under State law, but also were for the purpose of receiving advice and recommendations relative to the most appropriate methods of providing assistance to unemployed individuals who are not within the purview of the coverage provisions of the unemployment compensation laws of the several States.

During the course of these hearings a fellow Californian, Mr. George McLain, president of the National Institute of Social Welfare, presented a statement to the Committee on Ways and Means expressing the views of the National Institute of Social Welfare with respect to the inadequacies of present general relief programs in most States, and particularly with respect to the inadequacy of those programs insofar as unemployed heads of families are concerned.

In order that the views of Mr. McLain may be readily available to Members, I include his statement in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George McLain, and I represent, as its president, the National Institute of Social Welfare, whose Washington address is 200 C Street SE., Washington, D. C., and whose main headquarters are located at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

May I thank you for the opportunity to present my statement, which has been confined to recommendations relative to the most feasible emergency measures which might be suitable for affording assistance to individuals who are unemployed and who cannot qualify for the additional unemployment compensation benefits because they have not been covered by unemployment compensation programs of the various States, as outlined by your chairman, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, in his directive dated March 18, 1958.

I feel that Chairman MILLS and the members of this committee displayed great understanding of our economic problems when you included other emergency assistance with your deliberations on extending unemployment compensation benefits. Certainly, we all know that great numbers of the unemployed do not qualify under State unemployment compensation laws, and, generally speaking, these have been the tragic

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cases displayed in newspaper headlines across the country during these past few months.

It is my belief that Congress has delayed far too long, in taking into consideration the vast number of people who are destitute, and, yet, cannot meet qualifications established for receipt of public assistance funds under any one of the present four categories, which include: Aid to the aged, aid to the blind, aid to the physically handicapped, and aid to dependent children.

Naturally, the present economic depression has been felt most deeply by this group of people, simply because there is no State or Federal program to act as a cushion for their economic downfall. Reports from across the country indicate that county welfare officers are jammed, relief rolls are swollen by people who can qualify for some measure of county relief at the same time, hundreds of thousands of desperate people have been turned away without any aid, because either county funds were exhausted or county rules and regulations prohibit such individuals from receiving assistance.

I, and many others, have long maintained that a fifth chapter, titled "General Relief," should be added to the public assistance sections of the Federal Social Security Act. The need for this was evident during fairly high employment. Now that our Nation faces its greatest economic crisis in nearly two decades, such action would appear almost mandatory.

Under the present hodgepodge—general relief in some form is given in most States. However, it is almost entirely a county affair and the rules and regulations are often so harsh as to make the program practically inoperative. We cannot be too hasty in condemning county governmental units, however, since the entire cost must now be borne by the homeowners in county property taxes.

A number of circumstances combine to make the general relief problem a national one. We are faced, first of all, with the realization that our society has become more mobile each year. Much of the work force, particularly in the low-income, manual-labor bracket, attempts to follow the labor market, with little regard for State boundaries, let alone county lines.

On the other hand, we find States and counties clinging tenaciously to the archaic residence requirement dating back to Queen Elizabeth's poor laws in the matter of public welfare responsibility. Obviously, this mobile society of 1958 is completely incompatible with the static, rigid qualifications borrowed from 17th century England. And yet, it is difficult to blame any one State or county for the harsh residence requirements. Their fear that a great influx of destitute people would be the result of local lessening of residence requirements, I believe, is well founded.

Local boards of supervisors and State legislators are faced with providing funds for their local and State activities. Certainly, no one county—by eliminating its residence requirement—could afford to take on financial responsibility for all the destitute from other communities.

Local governing boards must, necessarily, be concerned with local problems and responsibilities. They can rarely afford an overall look. Congress, however, must always endeavor to see the overall picture, and I feel confident that if you gentlemen take a good, hard look at conditions all over the country, you will see that thousands of destitute families in every part of the country are faced with one and the same problem—they cannot meet State or county requirements for either public assistance or general relief, and no other program exists for their salvation.

Just as an example, let me point to cases in widely separated sections of the country, which have come to the attention of the press during these past few months of economic stress:

In Milwaukee, Wis., the Milwaukee Journal highlighted the personal tragedy of Mr. and Mrs. Carmelo Torres in an article which pointed out the privation now being endured by thousands of families, whose breadwinners have not been able to find jobs. The Journal reporter recounted how Carmelo Torres and his wife had to stand by helplessly while their 2-month-old daughter, Nilda, survived several days on a diet of sugar and water. Nilda's father painfully recounted his futile efforts to obtain work, any kind of work, and when he applied for county aid, he was told that he was not qualified because the family had moved from Chicago just 7 months before. Therefore, he could not meet Wisconsin residence requirements. "Go back to Illinois," he was told.

The newspaper reporter then said that a private charity, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, has helped with food. It gave Torres $5 to buy milk for the baby. For those who do not qualify for relief under the residence law, the society is almost the only resort, but many need help, and there is a limit to what it can do.

Now, let's go from the Great Lakes of Wisconsin down to the vast plains of Texas, where we find an article from the Fort Worth Press, reporting that a jobless father of five cold and hungry children said he is almost desperate enough to steal.

He said that he has had no steady work since he was laid off from an aircraft plant last September.

To make matters worse, he and his wife, Peggy, and their 5 sons, age 6, 4, 2, 1, and 3 months, have been plagued by sickness. The past 2 weeks, this distraught young father has borrowed money from friends to buy milk for the baby. They face eviction from their house in which the heat has already been turned off.

The father said that welfare workers helped the family in December, but he has not been able to get any help since. He said he has applied for unemployment pay, but so far it has not come through.

From the great State of Missouri, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, comes this frightening story of want and suffering. The headline reads, "St. Louis Families in Depression—Children Hungry, Some Have No Shoes and Cannot Attend School—Fathers Are Ineligible for Relief or Unemployment Compensation."

"The man is 41 years old and he has 5 children who range in age from 3 to 13. The family has never been well-off, but they have been properly fed, well clothed, and reasonably secure. Two weeks ago, however, this man went through an ordeal that was almost more than he could endure. For 2 whole days, his children didn't have a bite to eat.

"I never would have believed that I'd ever hear my children crying for food," he told the reporter.

"This family is one of the estimated 1,000 or more in St. Louis whose breadwinner is out of work, unable to find work, and is ineligible for State relief or unemployment compensation.

"In Missouri, no State relief funds can be given to a family which has an employable member, even though the employable member is unable to find a job.

"Thus a man who is employable but not covered by unemployment insurance, has no place to turn but to private agencies. For all practical purposes, this means the Salvation Army. The Red Cross is not a direct aid agency for unemployed. The Family and Children Service, a United Fund Agency, does not have direct aid as a part of its program.

And now, to the golden State, California, where we find thousands of migratory workers starving as inglorious victims of the counties' harsh, 3-year residence requirement.

As one example, I point to the agriculturally rich San Luis Obispo County, where several hundred people are stranded without food or shelter. These people came to San Luis Obispo County as harvesters of the big pea crop, but when torrential rains set in, pea picking was impossible, and so their earning power was stopped. Agricultural workers are not covered by unemployment compensation, so they have no recourse there. San Luis Obispo County and California's other 57 counties require a 3-year residence in order to qualify for the most limited, general relief funds and a more harsh, 5-year residence requirement is imposed for receipt of public assistance under any one of the four categories.

In plain terms, so far as the State of California, the county of San Luis Obispo, or the town of Nipomo are concerned, these hundreds of people can starve to death, and no public aid will be granted. And, in view of the lack of Federal action, it would appear that Congress is of the same bent.

As I said earlier, it would be difficult to blame any particular State or locality for the injustices I have just recalled. They are the victims of too little planning and coordination on a broad, sociological basis, and so they stumble along with grossly inadequate, piecemeal programs which are fair to none and downright inhuman to many.

The only solution to this national problem must start right here in this Committee on Ways and Means of the House. This fact is recognized, not only by me and others of us who are primarily concerned with the humanitarian aspects of society, but I am happy to say, by many men across the country who are the administrators of State and community affairs. In support of this, I direct your attention to the sixth report by the Committee on Government Operations which was compiled by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee as a result of its study on joint Federal-State activities.

Questionnaires were sent out to governors all over the country, requesting among other information, advisement on how social welfare programs could be improved.

Among their recommendations, many governors specifically requested Federal participation in general relief or assistance. For instance, the Honorable James E. Folsom, of Alabam, replied, "Participation by the Federal Government in a program of general assistance would be helpful."

Colorado's Governor Edwin C. Johnson, replying through his department of public welfare, said, "The department also feels that Federal funds should be available to the States for the purposes of general assistance."

From the far-northern State of Maine Governor Edmund S. Muskie's department of health and welfare said, "We approve of the principle of the Forand bill, H. R. 10803, which would enable States to retain their present assistance programs or participate in a single, comprehensive, public welfare plan. The only eligibility requirement would be financial need."

Missouri's Governor, Phil M. Donnelly, said, "It is our belief that the Federal-State programs of public welfare should be expanded to include Federal financial participation in the general relief program, which would enable the States to extend assistance to more needy persons, as well as to provide higher benefit payments."

New Jersey's Governor Robert B. Meyner, suggested, "Direct recognition in Federal law and therefore, in attendant Federal financing, that public welfare responsibility relates to all needy persons, and not merely the aged, the blind, the severely disabled and selected, dependent children."

And from way out West, the then-Governor of Washington, Arthur B. Langlie, said, "Basically, Federal grants-in-aid should recognize the comprehensive nature of public welfare responsibility, so that financial assistance and services would be provided for all needy persons."

In brief, we know that widespread suffering exists for a very great percentage of our people. We know, further, that there is widespread recognition of this problem by people on the local levels. It remains only for Congress to recognize this as a national problem—and it surely is—then to proceed with a national remedy. I believe you gentlemen have the power to effect this much-needed national remedy by writing a "general relief" chapter into the Public Assistance section of our Social Security Act. But, in so doing, I would alert you to avoid the harsh restrictions which are largely to blame for the complete inadequacy of present State and county programs.

Most assuredly, I would strongly urge that you specifically forbid enactment on the State or local level of any residence requirements. Unless this is done, you efforts to relieve the most intense suffering will be mostly in vain.

You are convened here to try and find at least a partial solution to our national economic crisis through considered changes in the unemployment compensation programs and other emergency measures. A Federal general relief program is desperately needed to act as the sop for the inadequacies of all our other public welfare programs. Put into immediate operation such a measure and you will have done much to stabilize our economy in the midst of the spreading depression. And at the same time, you will have solved one of the most pressing, humanitarian problems of our day.

Thank you.

I Knew Handy Eulogy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the late W. C. Handy, the father of the blues, lived in the city of Memphis for many years. It was there he wrote the Memphis Blues and the St. Louis Blues. He rose from very humble life to a place of great stature throughout our country. He made a very real contribution to music and his name will last forever.

I first knew him when I was a student at the University of Mississippi. We became warm friends and up until his death we kept in touch with one another.

Lt. George W. Lee, grand commissioner of education for the colored Order of the Elks, knew him perhaps better than anyone else I know. Lieutenant Lee, soldier, author, lecturer, civic leader, and successful businessman, delivered a masterful eulogy at the memorial services held in the city of Memphis, where both white and colored sought to pay tribute to this great man.

Lieutenant Lee is one of the great orators of our time and I have asked to include his speech entitled "I Knew Handy Eulogy." Its reading will prove that he has orange blossoms in his voice, his language is as smooth as velvet, and his wisdom and reasoning equal to the wisest.

The speech follows:

I KNEW HANDY EULOGY

(By George W. Lee)

"I hate to see that evening sun go down," is a line in the St. Louis Blues which hangs in the mind like tinsels on a Christmas tree. For W. C. Handy, the composer of this immortal tune, the evening sun has gone down, for the last time, beyond the river. But like Old Man River, the melody of his sad sweet songs will just keep rolling along through the corridors of the centuries and baffle the mist of time.

I once asked W. C. Handy "What is the source of your greatness?" He pondered the question for a moment and finally when he lifted his head to answer, a strange light was in his eyes. He said slowly, "Just say that I love people and I love doing things to glorify them. Somewhere in the Book it says, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto Me.'"

Handy's life is the tale of three streets—Beale Street, Market Street in St. Louis and Broadway in New York. But from the dust of Beale Street rose the legend of a man. He pressed his trumpet to his lips and a song rose with the drift of the wind. I'd rather be there than any place I know.

Handy had no more irritations or problems on Beale Street, than any other genius would have in any other place that men suffer who star their age and time. He once said to me "Whenever I come to Memphis, a freedom comes over me that I feel nowhere else. The past fills me with a boundless joy and the present prompts me to every fond delight, when I am in the midst of these comforting scenes."

Handy loved Beale Street. He spent a lifetime in full service to all its demands and its traditions, its weaknesses and its ecstasies. To him there was humor, pathos, and drama in this crooked little street which sprang as from some miasmic dream of paved congo, the jerky pantomine of plaint and piety, suppression and sensuousness which was the outer soul of the Negro come to the American town.

Handy had been blind for years, but he could see, though his eyes were closed. Mrs. Louise Handy, his faithful wife, was his eyes. She was the increment of his humble fortune. He had been married once before to Mrs. Elizabeth Handy, the companion of his youth and years who died in 1937.

Last Friday, at 3 in the morning, at the Sydenham Hospital, he slipped quietly away into the unknown, before he had time to see the evening sun go down. There were those about his bedside who saw him come to the end of his day, long before the night had fallen from heaven on a rope of twilight. W. C. Handy, Jr., and Wyer Handy, his two sons; Charles Handy, a brother; Mrs. Catherine Lewis, a daughter; Mrs. Irma Louise Logan Handy, his wife and William Handy a grandson. But from the ends of the earth there are other mourners as thick as grief.

Long before his passing, he had left his beloved Beale Street, to try his fortune on Broadway, but he always came back. He came back to get the Cottonmaker's Jubilee off the ground. He came back again to spark the drive for war bond savings. He came back again and again to furnish the drama for the Elks Blues Bowl Christmas charity game. All the while, he was working on Broadway to establish a Foundation for the Blind.

Rivers full of muddy water have rolled down to the sea since that night, back in 1909, when Handy first got a song right in his head and set it down on music paper, and gave it everlasting voice with his golden trumpet. The mood and melody of the Memphis Blues has resounded around the world and then back to a crossroad shack in the Montana plains. Its melody created the St. Louis Blues which went with President Harding's flagship to Alaska and to Washington to entertain Ramsay MacDonald, England's Prime Minister.

Handy admitted to me many times, the part white southerners played in popularizing his music. When they went North, they clamored so loud for his music that band leaders in hotels and night clubs were forced to place it in their repertoire. Negroes brought him to Beale Street and made him its most glamorous figure.

The life of W. C. Handy and the story of how he originated the blues has been told many times. He has been honored by everybody. His hometown of Florence, Ala., rerently erected a handsome ultramodern public school in his honor; Memphis has a town square named after him; and St. Louis has a scholarship fund in his name to be awarded annually to worthy Negro and white youngsters with musical talent. The fund offices will be housed in a new building to be erected on the spot where Handy once slept as a hobo. The huge clock on its facade will play the opening bars of the St. Louis Blues on the hour.

Handy made a long step from Alabama to the advancing wave of circumstances on which he advanced himself to one of the high pinnacles of earthly grandeur and renown.

The Milwaukee Journal, in its issue of September 22, 1949, listed the 20 grand old men of the world. It named W. C. Handy along with George Bernard Shaw, Lionel Barrymore, Connie Mack, Toscanini, Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, and others.

He was born on November 16, 1873, in Florence, Ala. As a child he was thrilled by the singing of his people. In his 10th year, he could read music at sight and he had a good tenor voice. His father and mother wanted him to be a minister, but Handy wanted to be a musician. His first step was to get enough money to pay for instructions. To this end, he left home and walked all the way to Birmingham, where he taught school for a while. When the depression that marked the Cleveland administration brought general unemployment, he joined a saloon quartet and set out for the world's fair at Chicago. The singers had no money, so they hopped a freight train and attempted to beat their way west. Luckily for them, the brakeman who discovered them had a weakness for songs, so with cornet and guitar, as Handy said "they soothed his savage breast," and instead of being redlighted, they were conducted to a caboose de luxe.

In 1897 Handy returned to Alabama and taught vocal and band music at the agricultural and mechanical college in Huntsville. His life at this period was restless, interspersed with travel in Mexico, Cuba and Canada. Handy the composer had not found himself. It was in Memphis, Tenn., where Handy received the impetus that sent him along the road to renown.

Through the mist of the years he beheld the golden towers of his dreams rise at last against a background of reality. A great impulse to set the songs of the cotton pickers, the work songs of the railroad, the river songs of the roustabouts, who made music as they worked. To them singing was a necessity, rather than a luxury. W. C. Handy, who, like Stephen Foster, brooded over the songs of the Negro flowing in quick tears and laughter straight from his unhappy heart. So, in Memphis, Handy emphasized the native and nationalistic element of these songs

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and gave them as an enduring gift to America's treasury of music.

A political situation in 1909 afforded nationwide publicity for Handy and his new music. In that year Williams, Talbot, and E. H. Crump were running for election for mayor of Memphis. Jim Mulchay, political ward boss, hired Handy to play for Crump. Echford and Bynam bands were employed for the other two candidates. In order to outdo these two great bands, Handy was spurred to creative efforts. Down in Clarksville, Miss., in St. Louis, Mo., in Evansville, Ind., in Henderson, Ky., and later on Beale Street, Handy had devoted himself to acquiring the material and atmosphere which would someday aid him in making a musical rendition of Negro folk songs.

Now he found his store of knowledge useful in another way. His band opened the campaign at Main and Madison with a piece called Mr. Crump, a composition which took the shape of the inevitable results of the tempo of cotton-picking work songs along the aching side of old man river, of happy nights in the pleasure palaces strung out along Beale Street, and the privation of poverty-chinked cabins and slender, precarious meals. The crowd in the streets literally went wild over it. They shouted until they were hoarse demanding to hear it again and again. They whistled and danced with the rhythmic sway of the music as the words came with the drift of the wind:

"Mr. Crump don't 'low no easy riders here,
Mr. Crump don't 'low no easy riders here,
I don't care what Mr. Crump don't 'low,
I'm gonna bar'l-house anyhow.
Mr. Crump can go and catch hisself some air."

That tune was the vehicle which carried two to victory. Handy rode on it from Beale Street to Broadway. Crump, to 25 years of undisputed political leadership in Memphis. After the election, the Mr. Crump song was changed and titled "Memphis Blues" and offered for publication. After every publisher in the country had turned it down as worthless, it was sold to T. C. Bennett a young white man, head of the music department of a department store, for $100. The young white man made a fortune out of the Memphis Blues.

Handy's next number, the St. Louis Blues suffered the same fate with the publishers as did the Memphis Blues. When the publishers rejected it and laughed at him, he became discouraged and laid it aside. Finally, he organized the Pace & Handy Music Co., to publish the St. Louis Blues.

This little song about the man stealing woman with her diamond rings, has sold more than 2 million copies, is played and recorded in almost every country on the map and has become one of America's national anthems.

The growth of Handy's music in our times has a consequence which is still impossible to determine. I think someday this music called the blues will provide the raw material which will stimulate American culture.

There are many people in these vast United States, who have become famous in the field of music, but without a doubt the leader and dean of them all is the late W. C. Handy, famous for composing and writing the Memphis, the St. Louis, the Beale Street Blues and in addition, many sacred songs that America is now listening to, such as, They That Sow in Tears Shall Reap in Joy.

Among the outstanding and leading books that have been written by Handy, father of the blues, his autobiography and treasury of the blues, which he edited.

The last time Handy was a visitor in my home, he said that Handy Brothers Music Co. was about to publish an outstanding symphony called Blue Destiny. The first movement would be based on the St. Louis Blues, the second movement on the Beale Street Blues, the fourth movement based on the Harlem Blues and the Memphis Blues.

So, the dean of American music has passed. He brought to the American public songs that the heart cannot tell in its own futile terms, but must borrow out of travesty and fervent plant, the wails from which he drew his own great songs.

The Beale Street Blues, the Memphis Blues, the St. Louis Blues holds fast to something deep down inside of one. They are more than songs. They are a loving, shining symbol that only the soul of man can understand.

So, when the last sun goes down on judgment day, it will reveal three bright musical mansions in the sky. The one on the right for George Gershwin, built out of Rhapsody in Blue. The one on the left for Stephen Foster, built out of My Old Kentucky Home. Then a shaft of lightning will thwart the inky skies and reveal in the center, one for W. C. Handy, built out of the Memphis Blues and the St. Louis Blues and resting on the solid foundation of those who sow in tears, shall reap in joy.

St. Peter, standing in the doorway, in extending his hand in fellowship will say, "You captured the attention of art, and music entrusted her charms to your joyous care. Your magic genius opened the closed door. Your achievements under the Stars and Stripes engaged the wonder of civilized man."

Need for Revision of Federal Policy in Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on January 30, 1958, my distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEE METCALF, Representative from Montana's First Congressional District, delivered an address entitled "The Need for Revision of Federal Policy in Indian Affairs," before the 75th annual meeting of the Indian Rights Association.

Representative METCALF is one of the Nation's best informed students of Indian Affairs. He has, very clearly, pointed out in this speech the shortcomings of present administration policy and ably presented worthwhile alternatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Representative METCALF'S address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR REVISION OF FEDERAL POLICY IN INDIAN AFFAIRS

(By LEE METCALF)

The way white men treated the Indians is truly a sorry page in the history of the United States. The American Indians were driven from their native lands like cattle, and were ostracized, paternalized, supervised, baptized, scrutinized—and finally victimized.

The United States can take justifiable pride in our accomplishments in restoring millions of victims of World War II at least to a measure of peace and security. Our various foreign-aid programs have gone a long way toward alleviating suffering and hunger abroad.

But there is no satisfaction in our record of dealing with the American Indian, from the beginning to the present. Tremendous effort has been put forth. Huge sums of money have been spent. Humanitarian programs have been launched. But today the composite American Indian is the worst fed, the worst housed, the worst clad, the sickest—and, finally, the shortest-lived—racial group in the United States.

The average life of a white man in the United States is now 68. That of a Negro is 60. But the life expectancy of a baby born on the Papago Reservation in southwestern Arizona is 17 years. That figure is approximately the same for the Navajos, the Hopis the Utes, the Sioux, and on other reservations.

CHILD DEATH RATE HIGH

In a report on health services for American Indians, to the Congress last February, the Public Health Service said that the mortality rate from pneumonia was almost 4 times, the national average; the Indian mortality from pneumonia was almost 4 times, from gastritis and enteritis more than 10 times, and from dysentery more than 15 times the national average.

Today the Indian standard of living is low and getting lower, as the population increases on reservations inadequate to provide a living for a fraction of the people already there. Tribal assets, such as they are, are under the trusteeship of white bankers. Indian resources are undeveloped or are being exploited by non-Indian groups—while the Great White Father in Washington pays lip service to proposals to develop these resources.

Our history books tell part of the bloody story—(of white conquest) and the movies and television complete it. What they leave out is that—before they lost—the Indians fought for what was theirs, even as you and I might some day have to fight for what is ours. And when we didn't fear or hate them—for what they did to General Custer—we laughed at them. We mostly laugh at them today as we translate their names into our language—Peter Who Runs With the Wolf, John Takes His Gun. Had we treated immigrants in the same fashion, I doubt that Franklin Delano Field-of-Roses or Dwight Hewer-of-Iron would have become President.

I came to Congress in 1953 and it was then in the 83d Congress that we saw the high-water mark of the flood to make Indians first class citizens by relieving them of everything they owned, of their property rights, and of the obligations secured by treaties entered into between two sovereign nations.

A DECEPTIVE SLOGAN

To the uninformed outsider, the slogan that we must get the Government out of the Indian business makes sense.

The simple, easy-and-false-solution appealing to these uninformed outsiders is the so-called termination formula. As you know, this is a special legislative device which would permit the presently responsible public agencies and officials to shift their responsibilities elsewhere and dispose of the so-called Indian problem by sweeping it under the rug.

Let me review with you briefly the efforts to bring about acceptance of this persistent and serious attack upon the Indian people and their property cloaked by the termination formula.

Like most Members of Congress, I believe that ultimately Indians must be given the management of their own affairs. Eventual—and I emphasize that word eventual—establishment of the American Indian as a full, integrated citizen should be national policy.

So, when House Concurrent Resolution 108 came before the House early in the 83d Congress, I did not object. You recall that it declared as the policy of Congress that

certain Indian tribes be freed from Federal supervision and control.

I voted for this plausible, almost pious, expression of good intentions. But I was appalled at the administrative interpretation given the resolution by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. And I was dismayed at the immediate attempt by some congressional leaders to use the resolution as a basis for immediate termination of Federal services to various Indian tribes.

In addition to House Concurrent Resolution 108, the 83d Congress passed Public Law 280, the so-called law and order bill. It permits any State to impose on tribes its own civil and criminal codes and enforcement machinery—thus wiping out tribal authority and codes of self-protection.

When President Eisenhower signed the bill, he pointed out that it failed to require even—and these are his words—"full consultation in order to ascertain the wishes and desires of the Indians." He recommended that—and I'm quoting him again—"at the earliest possible time in the next session of Congress (that would be the 2d session of the 83d Congress) the act be amended to require such consultation with the tribes prior to the enactment of legislation subjecting them to State jurisdiction."

In view of President Eisenhower's willingness to veto meritorious legislation that didn't quite measure up to his standards, I can't see why he didn't veto the law and order bill because of the inadequacy he pointed out. But he did not. And in four subsequent sessions of Congress, we have been unable to secure passage of the amendments he recommended—largely because of the opposition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In this case, no consideration was given to the ability—or the willingness—of local agencies to take over the job of enforcement—to provide social and juvenile workers and probation officers, in addition to policemen.

Because these matters were not considered, and because the Indians were not consulted, the transfer of law and order has not been successful—and in some areas, such as the Winnebago and Omaha Reservations in Nebraska, has broken down.

There is a good deal of difference between consultation and consent. The difference becomes even greater when the administrative record on consultation is examined. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is apparently determined to terminate the various services the Federal Government performs for the Indians whether the tribes or individual Indians like it or not. Consultation is meaningless when, regardless of the opinion of the person consulted, the course of action is predetermined.

TRIBAL WISHES IGNORED

This was the case in the series of termination bills proposed in the 83rd Congress. An example was the proposal for termination of Federal supervision over the Salish and Kootenai Tribes on the Flathead Reservation in the congressional district I represent. The bill was sent to Congress by the Secretary of Interior. In the letter of transmittal signed by Mr. Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary, the result of consultation is recited as follows:

"Field officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of this Department have held group meetings and individual conferences to discuss a preliminary draft of the proposed bill with tribal members, officials of the State of Montana, officials of the local Government primarily involved, and other interested persons, both Indian and non-Indian. The sentiment expressed by individual tribal members residing in the reservation areas was decidedly in opposition to the proposed bill. At a general meeting called for the purpose of discussing the preliminary draft, attended by about 130 adult Flathead Indians, a substantial majority voiced their opposition. The tribal council members voted unanimously against endorsement of the proposed bill, declaring they did not want to accept a terminal bill at this time. They are supported in this petition by the tribal attorney and by officials of a missionary group on the reservation."

In spite of this overwhelming opposition expressed in the consultation, the Secretary of the Interior submitted the bill to Congress and requested its passage. In addition, the letter of transmittal admitted that the problem of protecting the watershed area covered by the Flathead Forest, and the mechanics of transfer of the management of the Flathead Irrigation District had not been solved. But the termination proposal was submitted anyway and a determined effort was made to pass the bill. Other termination bills are in the same category. The Menominee termination program was amended in the 84th Congress and has been the subject of considerable controversy in the Wisconsin Legislature.

Since consultation is a word which this administration brushes aside, it, of course, is violently opposed to legislation, which I have sponsored, requiring consent of the tribes prior to transfer of jurisdiction over Indian reservations from Federal to State governments.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs called this consent provision an "insidious proposal" and said its adoption would—in his words—"be the worst thing for the Indian people." Commissioner Glenn L. Emmons used those exact words at the final general session of one of the conferences the Bureau of Indian Affairs rigged with the tribes. This was at Salt Lake City, Utah, on September 6, 7, and 8, 1956. I have Mr. Emmons' remarks on consent verbatim from the minutes of that conference.

INDIANS PRESSURED TO ACCEPT TERMINATION

Although it is more subtle than it was in 1953, the attack mounted on the Indian people and their property in the 83d Congress continues today.

Many of you will remember the bill to restore certain ceded lands to the Colville Indians passed 2 years ago. The United States Supreme Court has held that the Government is only the trustee for the Indians and undisposed of lands remain the property of the Indians until disposed of in accordance with the law. But, when the bill to restore the (Colville) lands was before Congress, the Indian Bureau put in a contingency. The Bureau refused to consent to the restoration until the Colville Indians had submitted an agreement for termination. As a condition precedent to the restoration of lands that in justice and equity belonged to the Colvilles, the Bureau added these additional demands. One of the representatives of the Bureau testified, "We are not trying to blackjack anyone, but we are very frankly—and I have no hesitation in telling you—we are very frankly discussing this type of planning, i. e. termination planning, with every group that we think are ready for it, regardless of whether there is this piece or some other piece of legislation or no legislation before the group."

And they have done just that. One of the groups that is slated for termination is the Indians on the Flathead Reservation in my own congressional district. In every way possible, at every meeting of the tribal council, during discussions of routine transactions pressure is being put on the Flatheads to draft and submit a termination plan. Then the Bureau will come to Congress and say that here is a tribe that is ready to be terminated and wants termination and here in the plan.

The price for administration consent to a per capita distribution of tribal assets to the Menominees was termination. The same was true of the Klamaths.

TRIBAL LAND PURCHASES OPPOSED BY BUREAU

Even more subtle is the attack on tribal ownership of land. Late last year, the Bureau held a supervised land sale on the northern Cheyenne Reservation. Indian allottees were selling their land and the tribe wanted to buy this land and keep it in Indian ownership. The northern Cheyennes had tribal funds to make the purchases. But, because of technicalities placed in the way of the tribal council by the Indian Bureau, the tribe was not afforded the opportunity to purchase this land. Nor would the Bureau postpone the sale until the tribal money could be made available.

Some of the key units were lands on which the springs were located or land favorably located adjacent to summer range. Thus, by the loss of half a dozen or so allotments, this grazing economy of the entire tribe has been jeopardized. This is not an isolated instance. The same pattern has been followed on other reservations.

In justice to the Bureau, yesterday the bill for the restoration of these undisposed of lands to the five tribes who had never received their ceded land back, came before the House committee. It received the wholehearted support of the Bureau without any conditions.

Likewise, as to the Cheyenne land sales, the Bureau states that it agrees with the principle that the land base must be maintained in order to sustain the economy of the reservations. A later sale on the Omaha Reservation would seem to set a pattern different than the stated policy of the Bureau. We shall see.

Just last week the Blackfeet Tribal Council passed a resolution protesting the present conduct of land sales. It would seem to be only reasonable that the tribes be permitted to use tribal funds to purchase allotted lands. There should be no question about the right of the tribes and individual Indians to buy adjacent land offered for sale or to purchase key sections when necessary to sustain the economy of the reservation. But the policy of the Indian Bureau has been to discourage and oppose tribal acquisition of allotted lands at these supervised sales.

LAND BASE VITAL TO INDIANS

A secure land base is more important to the Indian than it would be to a comparable group of non-Indians. There is an attachment to the land and a security in land ownership that is a spiritual and psychological factor as well as economic. The individual allotments almost always pass into non-Indian ownership and the only hope of keeping the remaining land in Indian ownership is opportunity for tribal purchase.

As you have read, our present Commissioner of Indian Affairs has said that he is one Federal employee trying to do himself out of a job; he is trying to get the Federal Government out of the Indian business. Of course, you realize that was exactly the aim of our Army for many years. Sometimes I wonder if there isn't a similarity, not only of aims, but also of methods.

Now, precisely against whom are these forces, first military, now civil, arrayed? Well, let's go back to that Public Health Service report to Congress in February of last year. Here are some excerpts:

"The Indian population resides in areas that vary widely in climate, geography, and natural resources, yet environmental deficiencies stand out clearly in all parts of the country. Substandard housing, absence of safe water for domestic purposes (and frequently an extreme scarcity of water of any quality), absence of safe, sanitary excreta disposal facilities, and undue prevalence of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

flies, rodents, and other vectors of disease are the rule rather than the exception."

Second, here is an excerpt from the report on the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota:

"About one-half of the dwellings are constructed of logs caulked with mud and roofs covered with earth. Almost 25 percent are frame; and the remaining families live in tents or shacks. * * * Forty percent of the dwellings have only earth floors. The remainder are of wood, very few being constructed rightly or properly for healthful living. Seventy-five percent have no ceilings except the bottom of the inside of the earth-covered roof. About 75 percent of the households have only 1 room, with an average of 6.2 persons living in each dwelling. * * * Although electric powerlines run conveniently through the village only 2 of the houses are served. Kerosene lamps are used for light in all homes without electricity. The community obtains its water from the Little White River, Soldier Creek, and 8 underground sources, only 1 of which approaches sanitary standards."

After examining Indian housing and other environmental conditions, the Public Health Service concluded: "To achieve good health, Indians need more than measures aimed directly at disease prevention and control. They need better general education, vocational training, housing, food, roads, and means of transportation. They need more understanding and acceptance by the rest of the population, particularly their own non-Indian neighbors. They also need adequate economic opportunities."

The Service's general conclusion as to current economic conditions and the outlook for the future was:

"Available information and estimates indicate that in spite of some migration the overall reservation population is increasing, although not on every reservation. If this trend continues without accompanying development of reservation resources, the disparity between population and opportunities for support will increase, with consequent deterioration of already poor economic conditions."

The facts summarized in the foregoing report of the Public Health Service state the problem. The conclusions are not those of Indian tribal leaders or organizations espousing the Indian cause, who have in the past been charged with bias, but of a governmental agency. The conditions described clearly call for a concerted program of economic and social improvements.

RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

It is clear that the existing problem is one of such proportions that it can only be solved by governmental action. The only institution equipped to deal with it is the Federal Government.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has correctly stated that the solution to the foregoing problem lies in, first, voluntary relocation of the excess population of Indian reservations, and second, economic development of reservation areas.

With regard to relocation, few will quarrel with the following comments of the Public Health Service:

"In recognition of the overpopulation in comparison with resources on many reservations, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has begun in recent years to promote voluntary relocation. Under this program, reservation Indians and their families are helped to settle in urban communities where opportunities for employment and housing are known to exist. During the year ending June 30, 1956, the Bureau assisted in relocating over 5,100 Indians, including over 1,000 families and almost 1,100 unattached men and women. According to Bureau officials, approximately a fourth of those choosing to relocate found the experience too difficult and returned to the reservation. The rate of return differed considerably among reservations.

"Indian attitudes toward relocation vary. In spite of poverty and lack of opportunity, many Indians prefer the emotional security of the reservation, with its kinship ties, religious ceremonials, and freedom from the disciplines of an industrial society. Other Indians have felt inadequately prepared to cope with urban living conditions or unable, because of skills and experience, to compete vocationally with non-Indians. The requirement by some tribes of birth on the reservation as a condition of eligibility for tribal membership has also been a factor in causing some Indians to remain on the reservation, or to return.

"In spite of these factors, however, Indian interest in relocation has increased steadily since the relocation program was established several years ago. The number of Indians applying for relocation and assisted to relocate has increased considerably each year. As a result of this demonstrated acceptance, the program has been greatly expanded to cover more reservations and to provide additional areas for relocation. It is anticipated by Bureau officials that during the current year approximately 10,000 Indian men, women, and children will be assisted to relocate."

RELOCATION NOT A PANACEA

"The relocation program is limited to individuals and families who are considered to be able to support themselves away from the reservation. This means that a high proportion of relocates are younger and more acculturated people, with aged or unemployable persons included only if they are members of self-supporting family groups. It is probable, therefore, that even with increasing migration from the reservations the need for health and welfare services on the reservations will not diminish in corresponding proportion."

These facts stand out from the report:

1. The current rate of relocation is under 10,000 annually. Assuming a 25-percent return factor, the net rate is under 7,500; this compares with approximately 14,000 live births annually;

2. A high proportion of relocations are younger and more acculturated people.

It thus is evident that relocation is not, at this time, the sole answer to the problem.

RESERVATION DEVELOPMENT ESSENTIAL

As I have indicated, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has committed itself to the theory of reservation development. So it is, or ought to be, unnecessary to argue the broad principle that such development should be encouraged. However, the fact is that for the last 8 years the Federal Government has failed to develop a comprehensive program of reservation development. As far as I can understand it, Federal policy has been one of drift, permitting economic and social conditions to continue to deteriorate without developing a program of positive action. That is the charitable way of putting it.

It is a matter of record before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that this administration, which is on record as favoring additional economic development on Indian reservations, opposes legislation to do just that.

The administration bill, S. 1433, which Mr. EMMONS supports, makes no mention of Indians. The aid or loans provided by that bill would be confined to industrial areas. The only thing that Indians could get from that bill would be advice, and the Lord knows the Indians get plenty of that now.

In sharp contrast to this bill is S. 964, the area-redevelopment bill by Senator DOUGLAS and 18 other Members of the Senate, including Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD of Montana.

In grants for public facilities, and in the section on loans for redevelopment, it provides specifically for Indian tribes. Yet the administration opposes this bill.

All this adds up to the proposition that the relinquishment of Federal supervision and Federal trusteeship must come about in an orderly manner and as a result of gradual change.

Within the framework of existing agencies, many things could be done to help the Indian. You, of the Indian Rights Association, who helped secure the Meriam survey, know that part of the answer has been in the files of the Bureau of Indian Affairs since 1928, for almost 30 years. I'm talking about the recommendation that reads:

"The most fundamental step that can be taken is to advance the economic and social conditions of the Indians of each jurisdiction with due regard to the economic resources of that jurisdiction, and to supply each jurisdiction with a sufficient number of properly trained workers to make that program effective."

In order to give the Indian a chance to make anything like a reasonable adjustment to modern society, he must have a modern education.

Immediate steps must be taken to eliminate the deplorable conditions on the reservations that have made the Indian mortality rate so much higher than that of other population groups.

Any long-term program must concern itself with the natural resources of the reservations. Disregard of watershed values, of the effect of State water laws, of management of irrigation districts—as shown in the Flathead termination bill—can lead only to disaster. It will result in the disruption of the orderly development of entire regions, to the detriment of the entire population, Indian and non-Indian alike.

INDIANS MUST BE HELPED TO RETAIN LAND

Indians must be helped to develop their own resources and the resources of their reservations. The integrity of the present land holdings is the key to the whole program. Land sales must be discontinued—and if the policy of issuing fee patents is to continue, the tribes must have an opportunity to buy the lands when the individual allottees sell them. This will require an extension of credit, sometimes credit up to 100 percent of the purchase price of the lands. Sustained-yield forest operations, the land base for cattle and sheep ranching, the protection of other tribal assets depend on this.

Now, in order to permit Indians to develop their own resources we must remove the dead hand of the House Concurrent Resolution 108 from the program. Regardless of what that resolution meant, it has permeated the Bureau with termination thinking. By that I mean that any new program must, in the minds of the terminators—termites, if you will—must be related to the overriding drive to end Federal responsibilities. Under these circumstances, it has been impossible to develop in the Bureau the programs that could improve the life of our Indian population because such programs would necessarily entail a Federal relationship with the Indians for some time to come.

It is significant, I think, that there has been only one comprehensive Federal program to improve conditions on Indian reservations. And that program was prepared, and is being carried out, by the Public Health Service, not the Indian Bureau.

The main reason offered by the Bureau for its failure to develop a comprehensive Federal program to improve conditions on Indian reservations is that it considers itself under a mandate from Congress to reduce Federal responsibilities for Indians. That alleged mandate is House Concurrent Resolution 108.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 108 REPUDIATED

Whatever that resolution may have meant, it expressed the sense of a Congress dead and gone. Since then, two Congresses have failed to follow its recommendations, so it has been repudiated.

It is time now for a new policy declaration. Such a declaration is Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, by Senator MURRAY, of Montana. I have cosponsored it as House Concurrent Resolution 155.

This resolution is a policy declaration and a call by the Congress upon the Bureau of Indian Affairs to formulate a new approach to the handling of its responsibilities. The resolution suggests a program of community development similar to those carried on in underdeveloped countries of the world, as well as those of the Department of Agriculture in depressed rural area of the United States. Such a program would try to develop the natural resources of Indian reservations for the benefit of the Indians themselves. It would also attempt to develop human resources as the Department of Health Service point out.

Thus the development of natural resources and employment opportunities must go hand in hand with a program which would condition the Indian population to an approach to life under which they could fully utilize them.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 is a statement of a proposed approach, of a fundamental policy. It is not envisaged as a specific blueprint. The specific blueprints, which will vary from reservation to reservation, can be developed only with the help of the resources available to the Federal Government.

At this time I would like to serve notice on the Bureau that Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 is being supported by a growing group, ultimately a majority, in Congress—and that it should be considered in advance planning for our Indians.

The Indians can get along in the white man's society, and still retain their Indian culture, if we help them by constructive legislation. But those who want to maintain their tribal association and Indian culture must also be permitted to do so.

A basic American principle is the consent of the governed. The consent of our Indians—consent freely given—must be obtained prior to any change in policy. They must be consulted by Congress and the administration and must be given adequate opportunity to be heard on legislation affecting them, their property and their freedoms. For mutual participation—not government by decree imposed upon the group—is the way of progress.

We in Congress must legislate to preserve the Indian heritage, insofar as it can be preserved in the 20th century. We must engender respect for the Indian as an individual and for his way of life. We must seek a basic understanding between our races—so that we can mutually trust each other and cooperate for the betterment of our American homeland. We must recognize that our Indians are not an abstract problem to be solved by legalistic formulas administered by a distant and unsympathetic bureaucracy, but that Indians are people—our people.

A Tale of Two Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a vivid and timely article on the serious unemployment situation, as described by Mr. Burt Beck, managing editor, Textile Labor, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO:

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

(By Burt Beck, managing editor, Textile Labor, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO)

This is a story of economic disaster in two American communities. It happens to be about the twin towns of Biddeford and Saco, in Maine, but it could be about any of the hundreds of textile towns, mining villages, or industrial centers that have been left stranded when their prime industries gradually or suddenly withered away.

The situation in the Biddleford-Saco area may vary in degree from the picture in other depressed areas. The proportion of unemployed may be greater or less than the jobless total in other sections which are facing economic blight. But in one respect, Biddeford-Saco is similar—these cities are skirting the edge of a black depression.

The twin cities sit astride the Saco River, and the historic falls of that river provide the power that initiated the area's industrial development more than three centuries ago. One of the prime products was textiles.

It is said that when Admiral Perry sailed to Japan in 1854 to open the doors of that country to foreign trade, he carried, as samples of America's finest products, textiles made in Biddeford. From this famous textile region have poured uncounted millions of yards of textile fabrics, to all corners of the world.

Textile machinery, shoes, ships, sealing wax, sewing machines, machineguns, bricks, nails, matches, airplane parts, men's collars—all of these have been turned out by the skilled craftsmen of Biddeford and Saco, in peace and in war.

Today the area is rapidly becoming a deserted village. Typical headlines in the Biddeford Journal proclaim: "Unemployment in Biddeford-Saco Area Takes Jump," or "Biddeford-Saco Food Stocks Running Low, Over 3,000 Get Aid," or "Jobless Claims Reported at Record 20-Year Level."

What is taking place in Biddeford and the sister town of Saco never happened before, not even during the terrible days of the depression of 1929. There are lines of able-bodied workers, men and women, receiving food to keep them and their families alive.

Michael Schoonjans, international representative of the Textile Workers Union of America, in the Biddeford-Saco region, is understandably concerned about the situation. To Mike, the unemployment figures are not statistics; behind each figure is an unemployed worker, in most cases the chief breadwinner of the family.

"A few years ago," said Mike, "we had 7,000 members in the Biddeford-Saco joint board. Today we have less than 3,500. The decline in textile manufacturing also hits all the other workers in town."

ONE-FOURTH JOBLESS

For concrete evidence of this, it took only a visit to the Biddeford office of the Maine Employment Security Commission and a talk with manager Francis M. Coughlin.

He compared unemployment insurance claims for two different dates to show how joblessness is increasing. For the week ending December 14, 1957, his report showed that there were 1,252 claims for unemployment insurance, and what was even more alarming, 561 people had already exhausted their benefits and were consequently ineligible for further compensation.

If this is shocking, what has happened since that date makes even more terrifying news.

As of March 1, there were 3,023 people unemployed in the Biddeford-Saco area, or roughly 25 percent of the total labor force of about 11,000 workers. Of these, 1945 were still eligible for insurance, while 1,078 had exhausted their benefits.

Unemployment in Biddeford-Saco has not increased gradually. Only a few years ago the entire work force was employed. In 1953, a survey of 10 of the larger employers showed that 9,616 men and women had gainful employment. By 1956 the figure was down to 7,836 but the bottom really dropped out in 1957 when unemployment rose 22.2 percent. For one thing, the Bates Mill closed up and over 1,400 jobs were lost. One of the large shoe companies shut its doors, not because of falling business but because the owners had a falling out, and another 325 jobs went down the drain. The Saco-Lowell shops, world-famed manufacturers of textile machinery, have been seeing very rough days and have tried desperately to diversify their products.

The success they had enjoyed was nipped in the bud by the current recession, and only a handful continue to work in the shops. Even the Pepperell Mill, one of the area's mainstays, has cut out one shift completely and is working 3 days a week on the two remaining ones.

When the Bates Mill closed, there was much speculation that soon a contract would be forthcoming that would get the machinery humming again. These rumors gave the people hope and buoyed up their spirits. But even that hope has been exterminated. A junk dealer signed a contract to break up the machines for salvage and on February 19 the sledges started swinging.

These plants that have shut down have not moved away, they simply shut up shop and the jobs were lost, not relocated. Only one new industry has moved into the Biddeford-Saco area—a cabinet manufacturer employing 30 workers.

GHOST TOWNS

Biddeford and Saco, instead of the bustling communities they were until recently, have taken on the characteristics of ghost towns. You see as many men as women on the businses streets. Fewer and fewer younger people are seen—not that they are working, they have left to find jobs elsewhere.

Arthur Maxwell, president of the largest bank in Biddeford, is confident about the future. He thinks the bottom has been reached, and although it may take a few years, things will pick up.

"If some sort of plan can be drafted to give assistance to depressed areas, we can come through with flying colors. It will take hard work," he maintained, "and we'll need help in attracting new industries, but we can do it."

Most of the civic authorities share Maxwell's cautious optimism. The mayor of Saco, Peter A. Garland, is of the opinion that something must be done along the line of encouraging new industry.

"We've laid the groundwork by starting an industrial development committee," he declared. "Now we need help. We're contacting certain manufacturers, but until these things bear fruit, some of the help contained in Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' area redevelopment bill (S. 964) would give us a terrific boost."

The exmayor of Biddeford, Albert C. Lambert, also feels that the region can make a comeback.

"We've got the skilled manpower and we've got wonderful industrial sites," he points out. "All we need now is the third ingredient—industry."

Strange as it may seem, the man who defeated him for the post in the recent election, Clement Deschambeault, holds the same views. He recently headed a delegation which went to Washington to plead for Federal aid. The delegation was well

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

treated, and many promises were given, but that was about all.

NEED IS JOBS

Even a stanch defender of the Eisenhower administration could not stomach this. Congressman ROBERT HALE, Republican, is reported in the Biddeford Daily Journal as expressing himself this way:

"The administration has answered with generalities, but has offered very litle in the way of concrete assistance. Federal aid for a Saco (sewerage) treatment plant was approved last year, but that is nothing new. The area will be given full consideration for defense contracts, but promises are not jobs. Possible post office construction is only a trifle. I shall continue to press for a more concrete response from the White House, and seek favorable action in Congress on depressed areas and textile legislation. I shall also continue to work for defense contracts for Saco-Lowell shops.

"Biddeford-Saco needs jobs and more jobs," he concluded, "and I shall not rest until it gets them and unemployment is wiped out."

The appeal for jobs is nonpartisan. Maine's two Senators, FREDERICK PAYNE and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, are both Republicans and both are highly critical of the way the Eisenhower administration is mishandling the whole question of aiding depressed areas. Congressman FRANK COFFIN, the only Democratic legislator from Maine, and Democratic Gov. Edmund S. Muskie join them in the fight to bring this area back from the specter of economic blight.

The bitter employment picture has had its effect on the youth. The percentage of completions of school had dropped as youngsters try to get jobs to help the family eke out its existence. Since jobs are unavailable in the section they live in, they look elsewhere.

"Our citizens have their roots in this community," says Carl Swanson, secretary of the Biddeford Industrial Development Commission, "and they don't want to move away unless they have to. Even when the kids leave the nest to find jobs elsewhere, they come back as often as possible. Why, on a long holiday weekend, most of the autos have out-of-State licenses."

But leave they do.

There are four concrete indications that the situation is not improving; in fact, it is becoming drearier.

Item 1. Many Biddeford and Saco stores held their year-end sales prior to Christmas instead of after the holiday season as was the usual custom.

Item 2. For the first time in many years, the annual Community Chest drive fell short, and the fall-off was mainly from individual contributions.

Item 3. Breaking and entering, especially into food stores, has become a common notation on official police records in Biddeford, Saco and the surrounding communities. These cases were extremely rare previously.

Item 4. City welfare aid doubled from July to November, then started a meteoric climb. As many as 3,000 persons stood in line during the recent bitter snow storm in the hope of obtaining some part of a fish allotment that had been received in the city. More than 1,000 Maine National Guard men joined together to donate canned goods and staples to the welfare departments of Biddeford and Saco, and the number of those eligible to receive surplus commodities stood at 2,319 on February 26, and was still rising.

DOUGLAS BILL NEEDED

There's universal agreement in Biddeford-Saco that they will pull out of it. All they need, they are sure, are some good contracts to start the ball rolling. But where the contracts will come from, no one knows.

"Right now, nothing short of area redevelopment assistance as proposed by Senator DOUGLAS will help us and other depressed areas," is the way Mike Scheonjans sums it up. "There are a lot of people here who are too young to die and not old enough for social security. They want to work, and this sort of program could provide the work for them."

Tonnage Moved by Water in Past 9 Years Is Up by a Healthy Percentage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article written by Morris Cunningham, one of the country's most accomplished reporters who represents the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal in Washington.

He has written a splendid article on the importance of water transportation on the Nation's inland waterways. Knowing that it will be of value to many of my colleagues, because of the factual information it contains, I was anxious that they have the benefit of its reading.

The article is attached:

TONNAGE MOVED BY WATER IN PAST 9 YEARS IS UP BY A HEALTHY PERCENTAGE—TRANSPORTATION BY INLAND STREAMS STEADILY BECOMING MORE IMPORTANT IN RELATION TO ECONOMY OF NATION

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—Water transportation, the importance of which long has been recognized in the Mid-South, quietly and steadily is assuming increasing significance in relation to the national economy.

A recent survey by the American Waterways Operators Inc., shows that during the past 9 years tonnage on some of the Nation's inland waterways has increased almost 500 percent.

Braxton B. Carr, AWO president, called the tonnage increases a remarkable tribute to the efforts of individuals on local, State and Federal levels to obtain better navigational facilities.

He also praised the towboat and barge companies for the continuing improvements that have enabled the industry to provide more efficient and reliable service.

He pointed to the increased prosperity that comes to areas that acquire improved navigational facilities. As in the case of Memphis and its harbor project, this frequently takes the course of new business and industries, more jobs, and bigger payrolls.

FEW REALIZE FULL IMPORTANCE

Many Members of Congress, Federal, State, and local officials and leaders, the Corps of Engineers, TVA, and many others have contributed to the construction of the Nation's system of inland waterways.

It has taken many years, and the job still is incomplete. Annual battles still are fought in Congress and elsewhere over extensions, improvements, and maintenance. New ones are shaping up this year.

Few people, particularly in off-stream areas, probably realize the full importance of our inland waterways or the magnitude of the traffic that moves on them today. The writer, on a trip down the Mississippi last month, was amazed at the heavy volume of traffic and the charts showing how it has increased in recent years.

The boats salute each other as they pass on the river. And today the still calm along the banks of the Mississippi increasingly is shattered by the honks of the passing parade of towboats, symbols of the Nation's expanding economy and the growing industrialization of the South.

To portray the spectacular rise of water transportation, Mr. Carr listed the ton-mile and net tonnage growth on the 13 major waterways from 1947 to 1956, the last year for which complete figures are available.

MIGHTY MISSISSIPPI CARRIES BIG LOAD

The 652-mile Tennessee River, which runs from Knoxville to Chattanooga and into northern Alabama before it swings north to Paducah and the Ohio River, showed a 467-percent gain in ton-mileage over the 9-year period to lead all other waterways in percentage of increase.

Ton-mileage on the Tennessee rose from 352,739,600 in 1947 to 2,003,420,261 in 1956. The Tennessee also chalked up the largest net tonnage growth—from 2,792,427 tons in 1947 to 12,299,396 in 1956, a gain of 340 percent.

The main stem of the mighty Mississippi, running 2,350 miles from Lake Itasca, in Minnesota, to the Gulf of Mexico, continued to transport the largest total of waterborne freight.

And the Mississippi secured its lead during the period by chalking up healthy gains. Ton-miles increased from 10,774,164,768 in 1947 to 31,588,018,968 in 1956, a gain of 193 percent. Tonnage rose from 51,426,564 in 1947 to 104,212,466, or 102 percent. The Ohio River, spanning 981 miles from Pittsburgh to Cairo, Ill., continued to be the Mississippi's closest competitor in volume. In 1956, a total of 76,876,633 tons moved over it, an increase of 84 percent over 1947.

Others among the Nation's 13 major inland waterways, the tonnages of freight they handled in 1956, and the percentage of increase over 1957, are:

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, 1,171 miles from St. Marks River, Fla., to Brownsville, Tex., including the Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route, 48,243,445 tons, an increase of 112 percent.

The Monongahela River 128 miles from Fairmont, W. Va., to Pittsburgh, Pa., 36,956,496 tons, an increase of 16 percent.

Illinois Waterway, 349 miles from Crafton, Ill., to Chicago, 23,377,342 tons, an increase of 129 percent.

NATION MOVES BY WATER

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, 1,327 miles from Norfolk, Va., to Key West, Fla., including the Dismal Swamp Canal alternate route, 8,458,824 tons, an increase of 179 percent.

New York State Barge Canal System, 522 miles including the Erie, Oswego, Cayuga, Seneca, and Champlain Canals, 4,858,044 tons, an increase of 26 percent.

Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, 415 miles from Birmingham to Mobile, Ala., 4,409,240 tons, an increase of 139 percent.

Missouri River, 762 miles from St. Louis, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa, 4,333,191 tons, an increase of 393 percent.

Allegheny River, 325 miles from East Brady, Pa., to Pittsburgh, 5,245,102 tons, an increase of 91 percent.

The Columbia River, 421 miles from Wenatchee to Vancouver, Wash., 21,575,596 tons, an increase of 25 percent.

Houston Ship Channel, 50 miles from Galveston to Houston, Tex., 52,293,262 tons, an increase of 65 percent.

As traffic grows on the Nation's inland waterways, more and more industrial plants and businesses that depend upon cheap water transportation spring up along the routes.

During the past year, AWO reported a total of 485 new industrial plans costing millions of dollars were constructed or started on inland waterways.

Many of these were new projects by established companies that have decided to take advantage of the proximity of water transportation.

A Livestock Checkoff Bill Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I include a statement by Mr. Herb Pike, farmer of Whiting, Iowa, director of the Iowa Swine Producers Association. During the last session of Congress this House defeated the rule for a checkoff bill. Had the rule been adopted and had the proponents of the bill had a better opportunity to explain the bill I am quite sure the House would have approved the bill by a large majority. Another livestock checkoff bill will soon be brought to the floor, similar to the 1957 bill. I am quite certain that when the Members of Congress understand that the stock raisers pay the entire cost of the checkoff program, by paying a small amount for each head of livestock marketed, and that such funds will be expended to improve the quality of meat and for publicizing this pure, tasty, healthful food, this Congress will pass the bill by an overwhelming majority. Mr. Pike's statement follows:

In the swine industry it appears we need to do four things:

1. Standardize and improve the quality of product;
2. Assure processors an adequate day-to-day supply;
3. Level out the year-to-year boom-or-bust swings in production; and
4. Try to develop new markets, especially abroad.

Much good educational work has been done along these lines by the USDA, State colleges, and processors, but progress has been slow and uncoordinated.

Following the pattern in the broiler industry, vertical integration (or contract farming) has been advocated as a means of improving hog production and marketing. Producers would contract directly with packers for delivery of quality hogs at specified times and would be assisted by packers, and even feed dealers, with management help and financing. While integration threatens to upset the status quo as regards established producers, markets, processors, and even traditional hog-producing areas, such changes will come if integration proves it can contribute to greater efficiency.

Of great concern to producers, however, is how a more integrated swine industry will be controlled. Can a large number of individual producers organize to bargain effectively with other segments of the industry or will feed manufacturers and packers make most of the management decisions, encourage chronic over production, and reduce the producer to the status of a share hogger?

If hog producers are to have effective organization we think they will need a fair and industry-wide method of financing, such as a checkoff when livestock goes to market. At least, that is the way other producer groups (dairy, poultry, cotton) have built strong marketing organizations with top management personnel comparable to those found in the processing and merchandising phases of the industry.

It is impossible to predict what changes are coming in swine production, and how fast they will come, but it is most unfair that producers are hampered by an outmoded law restricting them from using an adequate method of raising funds. We ought to anticipate what turn integration will take and be ready to maintain some degree of control over our own business.

Finally, I would like to see livestock production retained on family farms, but only through effective marketing organizations will they be able to compete—quality wise and price wise—with large specialty farms. Livestock production is still the best way to intensify production and increase family income on a given number of acres. Livestock complements crop production to make yeararound employment and offers a better solution family wise and community wise than an off farm job or Government subsidies to underemployed farm operators.

Burned Book Bares Why Farmers Are Giving Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the story of the Burned Book as reported by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, it is truly a great opportunity to help maintain our freedom of expression through the means of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A clipping from Labor, the national railroad organization's paper, tells Mr. REUSS' story, and a letter from Mrs. P. H. Sedlund, Route 1, Center City, Minn., a constituent, tells the family farmer's story without having been burned.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the clipping and letter, which follows:

BURNED BOOK BARES WHY FARMERS ARE GIVING UP

Defeat of a book-burning attempt has made available an extraordinarily graphic picture of the worsening plight of small farmers and their families, but this picture has been only sketchily reported by daily newspapers. Here is how it happened:

Every year, the Department of Agriculture publishes a report telling how much farm population has increased or decreased during the past year. To throw some light on the reasons, the report has always included comments gathered from farmers all over the country. That was true of the report for 1957, printed about 2 months ago, but not made public.

It leaked out that Assistant Agriculture Secretary Don Paarlberg, right-hand-man to Secretary Ezra T. Benson, had ordered that all copies of the report be burned, and a new report prepared and made public. That was done.

This censorship of an official document aroused Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Government Operations Subcommittee. He demanded a copy of the original report, but the Agriculture Department insisted they had all been destroyed. FOUNTAIN finally got a copy of the report by putting Paarlberg on the subcommittee's witness stand.

TWO MILLION IN ONE YEAR

Then Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, compared the original and substitute reports and told the House this story:

Of the 19 pages in the original report, 15 were omitted from the new one. The 4 remaining pages gave figures showing that, during the past year, the number of people living on farms fell from 22.3 million to 20.4 million. That, REUSS pointed out, was an unprecedented drop of nearly 2 million in 1 year.

The reasons for that huge flight from farms, REUSS said, are graphically revealed by the farmers' comments which filled the 15 omitted pages. He proceeded to read those comments to the House.

Some of them were from farmers who claimed they were getting along satisfactorily under the farm policies of Benson and the administration. A large majority of the comments, however, were like the following samples:

"More and more farmers in our locality are moving away from the farm. In 3 townships, you will find 15 farms where the buildings stand empty. Farmhouses are being abandoned and torn down.

"In this area of 3 communities of better-than-average farms, not 1 young person plans to farm as a career.

"More and more farmers in our locality are moving away from the farms because they can't make a living for their families. The small- and medium-sized farmer is a dead duck."

LEAVING FOR CITY

"I have before me 2 dozen auction notices of farms selling out. Forced auction sales here have been terrific.

"Because of the price squeeze and the Soil Bank plan, farmers are leaving for city and factory work. I plan to put all possible land in the Soil Bank, remove buildings or let them rot down, and let it go at that.

"And so on and so on," REUSS said. "The story told in the burned report—of declining farm prices and income, of catastrophe for the family farmer, of ever greater consolidation by the big corporate-type farmer—is a far different explanation of the decline in farm population than the one given by the Department of Agriculture. Reading of the burned portion of the report offers a clue as to why it was burned."

MOST STILL SECRET

Several days later, REUSS added another chapter to this amazing story. He pointed out that the 125 farmers' comments printed in the original report were selected by Agriculture Department officials from 2,700 comments the Department had received from farmers.

REUSS asked permission to see the 2,575 comments which were not printed but are in the Department's files. Then, REUSS said, here's what happened:

"True D. Morse, Acting Secretary while Benson is away, said I may examine the comments but must keep them confidential." That is, not disclose them to the public.

"In effect, the Agriculture Department is asking me to join its organization for promotion of secrecy and suppression of farmers' opinions.—I must reject the invitation to membership in such a club."

CENTER CITY, MINN., *April 12, 1958.*

Mr. ROY WIER,

DEAR SIR: It is hard for one who tries to be honest and frugal in ways of living to hear radio and other reporters, as well as the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

President, say we should "buy our way out of the recession." We know you, Mr. WIER, are doing all you can for the common people and farmers and we thank you for that. But we felt that perhaps a little report from the real family farm people would encourage you to work harder and get help to override the recent bill vetoed by Mr. Eisenhower that has hit the dairy farmer and many more. When buying power is taken away from these people, how can we buy what we know we need? That is one of the many quirks I can't see this administration thinks possible. Just in our case alone, our monthly cream check has dropped $50, due to this dairy defeat. Take that for a year, and then multiply by just each of our closest neighbors in this area, and the sum is large. We spoke to our feedmill man recently, and he said they will feel this veto badly—since farmers buy feed there. Some have had to charge until their cows begin to come into full production to pay up their accounts. Now, this millman said they will be left in a bad way, too, since they know some will not be able to pay as they used to. The hardware and implement dealers have a hard time of it trying to sell new equipment and machinery that both he and farmers know and see need to be replaced, due to age and wearing out. Banks have been as lenient in some cases as they can be to help farmers who have always been fair and honest in paying debts—but, even here too, farmers are both ashamed and afraid to ask for more credit, knowing there's a limit to all this. Yes, that prices are made in Washington we surely can see and experience sadly. Burning reports not favorable to Bensonian ideas don't change the local conditions. Instead, it is causing more farmers—and small- and large-business men—to begin to mobilize for changes and try to get real facts before our Representatives and Senators.

We have farmed for over 35 years—have only 3 years until retirement, as farmers now can (?) at 65, so want to remain on our place. We need to make long-needed repairs to roofs and parts of buildings, and had hoped by our steady (now?) milk check to do a little each year ourselves. Can't afford to hire at rate of rising costs in everything we have to buy from a few nails and bolts and even cheapest lumber to repair with. And here again we're not alone in these needs. Every farm around this area could and needs repairs to one or more of the buildings. The idea that a farmer should work part time away from the farm sounds wonderful. But do what and where is the question. Many farmers are being pestered by smooth talking land agents having as prospective buyers some city folks either jobless or about to enter that vast army of unemployed. These come out in the country thinking to live here. Often a city home is offered as downpayment or trade. But upon investigation such property is heavily mortgaged, etc. So what would the farmer get then should he fall for those buyers? Young couples often want to take over the home place or some farm nearby and have in some instances started farming. Had to mortgage selves for everything—and now we've seen auctions lately where income from them went to pay for the equipment bought (and not always new) and cattle, so there stood the young folks barehanded—broken in spirit—farm taken in some cases, too. What jobs can they find in the cities, where already the crowds grow larger every day.

Yes, this is a dismal picture, but a true one, that should be presented to those who farm statistically and on paper in the Department of Agriculture. Facts can't be burned as reports have been.

Thank you for being patient in listening to one farm region's prosperity and more from the vetoed dairy help bill. Do all you can to override it, and we shall both remember and thank you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. P. H. SEDLUND.

University of Alabama's New President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Alabama has inaugurated its new president, an outstanding educator, Dr. Frank A. Rose.

Mississippi-born, Dr. Rose comes to the university from Transylvania College, that noted Lexington school from which came Alabama's first president in 1831, the Reverend Alva Woods.

The people of Alabama already are fond of the personable new president and we hope that Dr. Rose's tenure at the university will be one of long standing and great accomplishment.

I am sure the Members will be interested in an editorial entitled "Dr. Rose Charts Course," which appeared in the Anniston (Ala.) Star on April 14, 1958. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this editorial:

DR. ROSE CHARTS COURSE

The formal inauguration of a president of the University of Alabama deserves all the stage setting given to it, the office being one of great responsibility and great honor.

The event symbolizes the wide range of a university's meaning, significance, and service to the State of Alabama.

The weather somewhat beclouded the ceremonies last Wednesday but in no way dampened the spirit of the occasion, and certainly did not dampen the evident courage and enthusiasm of the president of the university as he declared his idea of a university's function.

President Frank A. Rose saw the university as an institution with a defined purpose; namely, the cultivation of excellence. That is a magnificent formula.

The proclamation of that formula to the people of Alabama will no doubt give them renewed confidence in the university and equally generous confidence in President ROSE.

It is almost platitudinous to observe that Alabama, with the Nation of which it is a part, literally faces a new world environment.

There are old grads who will remember when the students who graduated returned to native homes and communities and gave service almost within hearing distance of their alma mater. Now the graduates are to be found in distinguished service in all the continents of the west and the east.

This enlarged range of service, vocationally and geographically, gives added force to President Rose's emphasis on purpose, quality instruction, and the cultivation of excellence.

As these observations are reflected upon by the people of Alabama, they will be able to see in the appearance of young men in the present political campaign a fulfillment of the university's service to the State.

For young men are now looking on their State as wealthy in natural resources, and as equally rich in human resources.

In a sort of a biological phrase, organism is a higher and more concrete conception than that of matter and energy. An enlarged meaning of life is the product of experience and its interpretation is a mental product.

The principle of life consists in the tension which connects spirit with the realm of matter. And that tension is made visible by instruction, by what President Rose called good teaching.

Knowledge is a means for liberating men from the destructive fear which often attends tension and points the way toward a goal of rewarded ambition sustained by faith and decreeing excellence as man's final peace.

A university is the institution of a man's faith, which outmodes parochialism and declares the sovereignty of reason.

The Anniston Star offers congratulations and good wishes to President Rose, nor less to the citizenry of Alabama that he gives them good promise of high purpose, and the goal of excellence.

Local Service and Territorial Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it was a pleasure during the Easter adjournment to be the invited participant and banquet speaker of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, holding its quarterly regional meeting in Las Vegas, Nev.

Participating in this program, the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, James R. Durfee, delivered an address keyed to today's status of the local service and territorial airlines. The chairman's remarks were related to anniversaries, first of the Civil Aeronautics Act and appropriate tribute to the original contribution of the Honorable Pat McCarran of Nevada; of the anniversary of ALTA and the aggressive part it has played in advancing the industry position of local service and territorial airlines, and finally, his own second anniversary as chairman.

Believing the remarks to be so timely and of interest to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOCAL SERVICE AIRLINES TODAY

Address by the Honorable James R. Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, at the quarterly regional meeting of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, Las Vegas, Nev.

I want to speak to you today about anniversaries—three anniversaries that brought to mind the points I want to make in this talk this noon.

The first of these anniversaries is the 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which was signed into law 20 years ago this June 23.

Before I go on, I would like to interject that our setting here in Nevada today is a particularly appropriate one for noting this anniversary. It was under the guidance of the Honorable Pat McCarran, from Nevada—predecessor of my cospeaker today—that this charter of air transportation in America became law 20 years ago. Nevada can well be proud of having another of its sons—the Honorable ALAN BIBLE—as a godfather of this same industry in his role as a distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I need hardly point out the importance of the Civil Aeronautics Act to this group, for your local service industry is entirely a prod-

act of the Civil Aeronautics Act. The existence and growth of this local service industry is a vindication of the vision of the drafters of the act.

Last year the 13 local service carriers moved over 3.9 million passengers or almost 3½ times the number carried by the entire domestic industry in 1938, the year the act was passed. It did this job at a subsidy cost only slightly more than 1½ times the subsidy cost for the entire domestic industry in 1938, and it did this despite a significantly shorter average passenger haul.

In the 6-year period since 1951 local service passenger miles have gone up 250 percent—a growth that exceeds that of the air carrier industry as a whole—which grew approximately 238 percent in the same period. To make the achievement the more remarkable, the local carriers have realized this greater increase in their share of the total market during a period of almost explosive growth in trunkline traffic. Over this same 6-year period the locals have cut the passenger-mile subsidy cost by more than 30 percent, despite steadily increasing cost of operation.

I wanted to make these growth comparisons in terms of traffic carried, rather than in terms of total aircraft or total investment or some other index of growth, because traffic figures are the real measure of service to the public.

We are often inclined to forget the public service being provided by the local service carriers when we consider the annual subsidy bill. Their public service record, however, is the important fact of their lives. The act was designed to promote a public service. The subsidy bill is the cost of spreading this service and the bulk of the year-by-year increase in subsidy has been due to route extensions that have brought service to more cities and more areas across the continent.

If the route systems are spread further—and at a still greater annual subsidy cost—it will be because the local representatives of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens, supported by their Senators and Congressmen, have appeared before the Board to urge the further spread of this public service.

However significant the public service the local carriers have performed—however much they may have improved their operating characteristics while expanding their services—there will have to be even faster improvement in the future.

If the Board grants any major portion of the route improvements that both the public and the carriers are seeking in the several area cases, there will be a substantial jump in the annual subsidy bill. This will be compounded during the initial years of new equipment, if experience is any lesson.

The increased subsidy bill can be justified only if the local carriers are, at the same time, showing real progress in efficiency—in the ultimate elimination of that subsidy bill.

This is your job. The Board cannot do it for you. The plan of regulation contemplated by the Civil Aeronautics Act is not intended to be a substitute for sound managerial initiative and discretion.

What we can do, and what we will do, is to improve the regulatory framework in which it will be easier for you to do your job. Experience is teaching us that some of the basic regulatory concepts require improvement.

First and foremost, the Board has become increasingly convinced that our present ratemaking methods cannot achieve both financial stability for the carriers and subsidy control for the Government.

The ratemaking methods now in use were formulated, in the main, to handle the trunkline subsidy needs, the needs of a group of carriers with significantly different economic characteristics. For a variety of reasons they do not appear to be working for the local service carriers.

Despite constant efforts by the Board and its staff, the local carriers have not achieved the financial stability that is necessary to their sound development. The Board is constantly put in the untenable position of reversing management judgments on a hindsight basis, often with respect to management decisions as to equipment, as to scheduling practices, the kind of decisions that are most difficult for the Board to review.

In too many instances the Board is faced with the impossible choice of making disallowances that will cripple a carrier or allowing expenditures that, in our judgment, should never have been made.

Our present system does not provide the necessary incentive to remain on final rates. It provides no real incentive to minimize expenses under a temporary rate, and no definite dollars-and-cents standards by which carriers can judge their own performance.

In our review of individual mail rates, and in talks with the managements of various carriers during recent months, we and our staff have become convinced that some drastic revision in approach must be found. You have undoubtedly noticed expressions of this conclusion in recent orders and opinions of the Board.

In discussions with our staff, we have become convinced that an alternative can be found.

As we announced in a letter to Colonel Adams for your group earlier this week, our staff is already at work in developing the basic information and tentative formulas that will be the starting point for future discussions with all the carriers affected.

Our basic objective will be to provide definite subsidy standards within which the carriers will have to live, within which carriers will have the freedom, and the profit and loss incentive to conduct their operations as good management judgment dictates.

By improvements in the ratemaking process, by route improvements that we hope to accomplish in the area cases, and by other regulatory improvements, we hope to create an improved atmosphere to complement the developmental steps that the carriers will be taking in the next few months, the new financing, the introduction of new equipment, the extensions of routes, all the things that promise to make this 20th anniversary year a memorable one for local service carriers.

The second anniversary I want to mention is that of your own organization, ALTA, your first anniversary. It slipped by almost unnoticed a few days back, on March 19, to be exact. I do not believe it ought to go unobserved.

In one short year, under the able direction of my former colleague, Col. Joe Adams, your association has emerged as one of the most potent forces for progress in the local service industry.

To my mind one of the most important, and most promising, objectives of ALTA is to promote improved relations with appropriate governmental agencies, and to undertake such actions as are necessary to insure full cooperation with interested Federal agencies.

You have already made real progress in furnishing us with that kind of help. Last January, representatives of your group made a very able and thorough presentation on subsidy policy to the Board. This gave impetus to the searching reexamination of those policies by the Board, of which I have already spoken.

The meetings between your group and the Board, as well as other contacts between the Board and individual managements, informal meetings of that kind are the ferment of progress in regulation. Without them we at the Board could never hope to keep abreast of this dynamic industry. Without them our process would become sterile. I can't overemphasize the importance of these relationships.

It is especially important to realize the importance of the role of an organization like yours today—today, when the relationships between regulators and the regulated are under such serious attack in Washington. There is widespread misunderstanding of the crucial difference between improper fraternization of regulators with regulated, and the indispensable cooperation between them that is part and parcel of the regulatory process itself.

No one seems to have any difficulty understanding the need for this type of cooperation in the Board's safety work. The public would be shocked, and properly so, if the Board and its staff were to insulate itself from the industry in safety matters. Our job simply could not be done without close day-to-day contacts on all levels between the industry, the Board and its staff.

Why is the need for this same type of cooperation not equally apparent in our economic work? The reason, perhaps, is that the Board far more often assumes a judicial-type role in the economic field than it does in the safety field.

The fact remains, that the Board is not primarily a court with basic judicial power. Its powers are the limited legislative delegations given to it by the Congress, with adjudicatory procedure.

We adjudicate and we legislate.

When we adjudicate under the Federal Code of Administrative Procedure, we are quasi-judicial, and we should conduct business the way a court does, not only on the bench, but throughout the decisional process.

But equally important to remember is that our legislative duties—the developmental and promotional duties specifically imposed on the Board by Congress—these duties cannot be discharged without close cooperation between the industry and the Board. That is why I am here discussing some of our common problems with you today.

It is because one of your most important purposes is to achieve this close cooperation for the good of aviation and the American traveling public, and because you have been so successful in doing so during your first year of existence, that I want to congratulate you and wish you the same success in the future.

The third anniversary I want to mention is one of my own. On Sunday next I shall celebrate the beginning of my third year as member and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If I am a little the worse for the wear of 2 years on the job, it is perhaps understandable, because I think it is fair to say that the job gets tougher each year. I think I can also say, after 2 years in the job, that I understand why the turnover of CAB chairmen has been so high.

Also, after 2 years I have a fairly good idea of what the Chairman, the Board, and its staff are faced with. And, in a word, it is appalling.

There is a grain of truth, perhaps, in some of the recent comment that the Board is a 1938 model trying to handle 1958 problems. We are still 5 members, just as was the 1938 Board. Our staff has doubled since 1938, but the industry has grown, in volume of revenue passenger miles, to more than 70 times its 1938 size.

An even more meaningful comparison is with the Board of 1948. By that year the industry was taking shape as we now know it today. That year, just 10 years ago, we had 620 staff members. Since then the industry's volume has increased by 295 percent. The Board's staff has increased by 10 percent to 682 over the same 10-year period.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Board itself, and by that I mean the five members, is fast reaching the limit of what it can handle. In 1938 and for several years thereafter, the Board members could, I understand, afford the luxury of conducting hearings and taking evidence themselves in some cases. Today, because of the rapid increase in our business, we can ill-afford even the time that must be devoted to the extensive oral arguments we are often faced with.

If the Board members are to continue participating in steadily increased foreign-air negotiations, if we are to attend meetings such as this one today, if we are to get closer to the operational and safety problems that the industry and the Board will face during the coming years of the jet age and if we are to perform all the other special missions that Board members must undertake, to still have even a quorum of the Board available in Washington to do business will become increasingly difficult. To handle, in addition, the greatly increased volume of more complex work we face, will be a tremendous burden.

The Board has, in the past, done a considerable bit of remodeling and reorganization on that 1938 version Board I spoke of a moment ago. Efficiency has been increased markedly, as it has had to, for us to do the work at all. We are constantly on the watch for improvements in methods and procedures.

During the past 2 years Congress has granted substantial increases in our appropriations for salaries and expenses. We are asking Congress again this year for more personnel, but with the realization that another 50, even another 100 staff members will not enable us to meet all the demands on our time.

The next year, my third year will be devoted to meeting this ever-increasing challenge. Our own approach to our work will have to emphasize greater speed and efficiency, more than at any time in the past. Our techniques will have to be reexamined to see where we can find improvements.

I mention this problem to you because it is your problem as well as it is mine and the Board's. It is of vital importance to ALTA's second year, for the vitality of the Board's processes in meeting your problems, and the problems of the industry as a whole, is the key to your future as well. Your cooperation, and the industry's, are as important to our success as ours is to yours.

If the public is to get another 20 years of progress in safe and economical air transportation such as we mark in this anniversary, this 20th year must be not just a commemoration of the foresight that Senator McCarran and his colleagues showed 20 years ago, it must be a reaffirmation of that foresight.

Today's problems are no more imposing than the problems that fledgling industry and a fledgling Board faced in 1938. I am confident that we can face them today as then—and that the second 20 years of the act and the Board will be marked by the same progress in the industry and its service to the public as was the first 20 years.

Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre Builds Good Will Around World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of April 14, 1958, on the humanitarian program carried on by the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre throughout the world. This organization was founded 23 years ago by Mrs. Paul Bedford.

WHEEL CHAIR CLUB BUILDS GOOD WILL AROUND WORLD

Quietly and unobtrusively, a generous minded woman—always thinking first of the suffering needy—is building good will around the world for Wilkes-Barre and America.

This women, Mrs. Paul Bedford, who founded the Wheel Chair Club 23 years ago, is sending her wheel chairs—free—to leper colonies, to small hospitals in the jungles of Africa, Guatemala, Korea, India, Thailand, and the Philippines. In addition, walkers have been shipped to many countries in Europe.

More than 50 of the wheel chairs have been sent to far corners of the earth—to spots so distant as to sound almost legendary. "And," she added, "I have more ready to go."

From the flood of requests for chairs arriving from remote countries whose names crop up only in datelines of international stories, it won't be too long before Mrs. Bedford will be well along the way toward achieving her target—of seeing that "everyone who needs a wheel chair may have it."

The most veteran stamp collector couldn't help but be intrigued by the pile of colorful foreign stamps that carry the urgent and usually touching requests for chairs to the local woman's desk.

Operating on the theory "the field is the world," Mrs. Bedford makes it clear, "We'll send the chairs any place." She explained, "We pay for the chairs and transportation to New York and from there on the foreign missions and the overseas committees take over always paying the balance of transportation and sometimes the duty.

Originated in Wilkes-Barre with one chair, the Wheel Chair Club has had as many as 400 wheelchairs and 300 walkers in use at one time here. Demand from other towns for chairs has gradually developed 16 wheelchair clubs in Pennsylvania and 4 other States and new ones are being promoted.

All wheelchairs sent overseas are marked with plaques inscribed "This Chair Is Given by the Wheel Chair Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., U. S. A." The club founder emphasizes that the project is interdenominational.

Farthest outpost, perhaps, to hear of Wilkes-Barre through the Wheel Chair Club's latest expansion is Chiengmai, Thailand, formerly Siam in southeast Asia.

The words of the director of two hospitals in the French Cameroun sum up Wilkes-Barre Club's thoughtfulness of the stricken in other lands: "There has never been such a marvelous thing back here in these jungles before."

Besides giving the ill and disabled of other places the same break that shut-ins in this country have had for many years, the local club's newest arm has satisfied an urge Mrs. Bedford has had since Sunday School days—to do something for the lepers and those doomed to elephantiasis. "I've always wanted to do it—always heard about it," the club founder added. "So, nine chairs have been shipped to the Congo."

At Batouri in the French Cameroun, folks frequently are admitted to the hospital with elephantiasis, Dr. H. Wallace Creig, who is responsible for two hospitals there, writes. In this disease there is an abnormal swelling of the feet and legs—sometimes so that a man's ankle will be as big around as his thigh. These people have to be kept off their feet for months. Says the doctor, "Your wheelchair will be a wonderful help to them. You should have seen their eyes popping when first they saw it."

Putting down the letter, Mrs. Bedford said simply, "That's the kind I'm striving to help. We try to reach places that no one else does—the small out-of-the-way spots."

She added, "In 1 part of the French Cameron, South Africa, there are 8 and 9 operations going on simultaneously in the same big room in 1 hospital. The families come and live in tiny huts to care for their patient, thus learning of Christianity and modern ways."

First chairs shipped in the Operation Overseas were destined for American hospital in Tabriz, Iran.

"Off today," Mrs. Bedford went on, "are two chairs to Bundaim, southeast of Delhi, Central United Provinces, North Indian Union."

Dr. Marshall P. Welles, who received a chair at Bangkok Christian Hospital, describes his facility:

"The 40-bed hospital, a comparatively young one—8 years old—has a special baby department of 45 babies from 1 week to 2 years of age. These are not orphans but are all boarders as their parents work. All have been born in the hospital. This is a very strange situation and quite unique for most places."

Another faraway link touched by Mrs. Bedford's seemingly endless chain is the Wanless Hospital, Miraj Medical Center, Miraj District, South Satara, founded by Dr. William Wanless in 1894. The hospital has treated 3,500,000 out-patients and 200,000 in-patients. Bare facts give only an inkling of the suffering that has been relieved. "Patients come from many parts of India and even from Arabia," Dr. Wanless tells the local club founder. "I'm sure many patients will benefit from the use of the chairs and will thank God for your thoughtfulness."

It was not until the wheelchairs were in use at the Wanless Hospital that Mrs. Bedford learned the gift had a personal significance to her. At the farflung center there is a clinic. The Goheen Clinic, named for a missionary surgeon, the father of President Robert F. Goheen of Princeton. The university head spent some of his younger years there. The local club founder's husband is a trustee at Princeton.

Turkey is another country which will hear of Wilkes-Barre through a wheelchair. Seeking a chair for his aged father who was returning to Turkey, a physician in Danville called the local club founder. Since the man had to have a chair to make the trip, Mrs. Bedford quickly agreed. "We'll do it." Later, the club head asked the physician's wife how the father's name was pronounced. The young woman freely admitted she's been married for 10 years and still can't pronounce it. "But I can spell it," she added, and she did—"Edir Yozgatiloglu."

The Family-Type Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, is to be highly complimented for his address to the Senate on April 2, 1958, to be found on page 5411 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I know, firsthand, of many cases happening in my home State of Missouri which are exactly as the Senator de-

scribes them. Farmers who were born, reared, and trained on the land and who wish to make farming a career are being forced to seek employment in the cities. Many of these young men are driving for distances as great as 75 miles one way each day, working 4 or 5 days per week in a factory, and at the same time they are trying to operate a farm which they originally purchased as a home with the intention of operating the land as their sole business. These men are working in the cities not because they desire to do so, but in order to make enough money to avoid losing the equity in their land and country home.

Mr. Benson would probably say that these young farmers are submarginal and inefficient. Probably 75 percent of all farmers were submarginal and inefficient by the Benson standard when they began to farm.

How is a young man going to make a start in agriculture if he must have sufficient capital to purchase 320 acres of land, $20,000 worth of implements, and a minimum of $30,000 worth of livestock before he can commence his farming operation?

America has always been considered the land of opportunity—a place where a young man could begin at the bottom and grow up in any business. Is that opportunity to be forever denied to the young men and women of this Nation who want to make agriculture their careers? Must conditions be allowed to develop which will make it forever impossible for a young couple to begin life on an American farm unless they are born rich? Mr. Eisenhower and Benson have demonstrated over and over in the past 5 years that it is their firm determination to replace family-type farming in this country with corporate landownership and labor-camp operation.

The time is short. Wake up farmers. Wake up farmers' sons and urge your Congressman and Senators to protect the remaining remnant of family-type agriculture in America today.

Senator MURRAY addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. President, for some time I have been interested in the formula by which Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and his staff are aiding family farmers through their much publicized rural-development program.

The other day Under Secretary True D. Morse sent us all, bearing his personal signature, copies of the monthly magazine Extension Service Review, which is issued by the Department of Agriculture. It is the March 1958 issue, and is devoted entirely to glowing articles about the rural development program.

Mr. President, I combed this magazine almost line by line to find an example of a farm family that had been saved by the program to get some clue about how it really works. My efforts were finally rewarded. On page 58, in an article entitled "Keeping Them on the Farm," which is about Choctaw County, Okla., I finally found this clear example of the operations of the program. The article reports:

"Farm people in the county were quick to take advantage of the opportunities provided through the rural-development program. Floyd Berry and wife are good examples. Berry operates a 280-acre farm and has a small grade A dairy and a commercial beef herd. To supplement farm income Mrs. Berry drew on her experience as a housewife to get a job cooking in a local cafe. She works from 6 a. m. to 2 p. m., daily. Her husband is working at a filling station from 3 p. m. until midnight.

"Berry handles the farm chores in the morning and his wife takes over afternoons."

This, then, is the formula for successful farming under Benson. Get your wife a full-time job in town. Get yourself a full-time job in town.

If you are lucky, the husband's in-town wages will pay the losses resulting from farming under Benson and you will still have your wife's pay as a fry cook to buy some groceries and clothing.

Mr. President, I think other Members of Congress and the farmers of America are entitled to have this shining example widely publicized and know that this is the pattern of family farm life being promoted by the Benson regime.

I want it to be entirely clear, however, that this shining example of the results of one of Mr. Benson's programs simply reinforces my own conviction that he should be fired before sundown—a conviction I have had for the past 1,896 days, which goes back to the day after his appointment.

Fire Ant War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, unknown to many people despite our efforts to familiarize them with the facts, there is a great war being waged in a number of our southern States. The combatants are, on the one hand, a small battalion of farmers and other people who recognize the existence of the conflict. On the other side is a mighty army of vicious, imported fire ants, intent on attacking and destroying if possible agriculture, cattle, dairying, and trucking in several Deep South States.

Unfortunate for the whole Nation and particularly for the immediately affected areas is the fact that the insects have lost only a few skirmishes in this fight and are far from defeat in the total war. To turn the tide, there needs to be an all-out eradication program, with leadership for this program coming from the Federal Government.

The Congress started the job in the right direction last year by approving a $2.4-million authorization for combating fire ants. This is not much, considering that vast job that must be done, but it is a start. I have no doubt that in the not-too-distant future we will have to appropriate a good deal more before we are done with these pests.

Another step in the right direction is the quarantine announcement from the Department of Agriculture. My feelings on this subject coincide with those of the Selma Times-Journal as expressed in an editorial of recent date.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial from the Times-Journal of Selma, Ala.:

FIRE ANTS MUST BE ELIMINATED

Starting May 6, parts of eight Southern States will be placed under quarantine by the United States Department of Agriculture as a means of checking spread of the destructive fire ant.

The regulated area will include 92 counties and parishes and parts of 49 more in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas.

Regulations will restrict interstate movements from the quarantine areas of soil, plants, grass sod, forestry and timber products, and other items which help spread the insect.

The areas to be under quarantine regulation in Alabama are counties of Autauga, Baldwin, Bibb, Bullock, Butler, Chilton, Choctaw, Clarke, Conecuh, Covington, Dallas, Elmore, Escambia, Geneva, Greene, Hale, Houston, Jefferson, Lee, Lowndes, Macon, Marengo, Mobile, Monroe, Montgomery, Perry, Pickens, Sumter, Tuscaloosa, Walker, Washington, and Wilcox, as well as parts of Barbour, Calhoun, Crenshaw, Dale, Etowah, Henry, Limestone, Morgan, and Russell.

Although this quarantine is going to be costly for the areas affected, nobody familiar with the agricultural peril presented by fire ants is likely to challenge the soundness of it, because something drastic must be done to check the spread of these deadly invaders.

It is in order, however, to point out that Federal Government has been a great deal quicker in applying drastic quarantine methods than it was in recognizing the peril of the fire ant in the first place, and that adequate steps to eliminate the threat entirely still have not been taken.

Quarantines may curb the fire ant in some degree, but the only certain method of protecting infestation-free areas of the Nation is to stamp out the insect entirely and take steps to prevent reentry from other countries.

This would cost a great deal of money, but it would cost even more to daily along with the problem while maintaining sectional quarantines, which cannot be expected to really curb what easily could become a national infestation.

Results of Questionnaire in Sixth Congressional District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed questionnaires to several thousands of voters in my congressional district asking their views on a number of issues pending before Congress. The response was most gratifying. More than 6,000 persons have already completed the questionnaires and have returned them. In a majority of instances these people expressed opinions on additional matters either on the questionnaire itself or on an attached sheet. Their views will certainly be most helpful to me. I am inserting a tabulation of the views herewith for the information of other Members of Congress. They are as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. To cope with the international situation, the President's budget asks Congress for $73,900,000,000. Should Congress appropriate that sum even if it means that the Government will operate in the red?	46	49	5
2. If it appears that the Government will operate in the red during the next fiscal year should—			
	Percent		
Taxes be increased?	30		
The national debt be increased?	41		
Undecided	29		
3. Because of increased defense expenditures should Federal projects throughout the Nation (including perhaps some in your area) be postponed?	50	43	7
4. Do you favor a continuation of our mutual security foreign aid program? If yes, at present cost? (17 percent.) At reduced cost? (50 percent). Increased cost? (4 percent)	71	29	------
5. Should the Federal Government provide 40,000 science and engineering scholarships to selected high-school graduates?	56	38	6
6. Do you believe in direct Federal grants to States for school construction?	49	46	5
7. Should Congress increase postal rates to help meet postal deficits?	66	30	6
8. Do you think that Congress should vote pay increases for postal workers and other Federal employees?	58	36	6
9. Do you believe the Government should continue to expend funds to support farm prices?	22	71	7
10. Do you believe American industry should be protected from imports of cheaply produced foreign products by imposing tariffs on those imports?	77	18	5
11. Should labor union welfare funds be regulated by law?	85	11	4
12. Should private enterprise be permitted to join with the Federal Government and local agencies in building hydroelectric power projects in the Pacific Northwest?	60	34	6
13. Do you believe that permission should be granted for the construction of a ski lift or aerial tramway in Rainier National Park?	73	21	6
14. If new overnight facilities are built at Mount Rainier should they be located—			
	Percent		
Inside the park boundaries?	81		
Outside the park boundaries?	12		
Undecided	7		

Quack Recession Cures Perilous to Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Chicago Daily News of March 29 comes an editorial which emphasizes the danger of apparently fallacious political remedies.

While so many are insisting that Congress attempt the impossible, a little consideration of this editorial may, in the end, be helpful.

The editorial reads:

QUACK RECESSION CURES PERILOUS TO OUR ECONOMY

The recession, depression, or whatever you choose to call it, will not be cured with the quack remedies being offered by the political medicine men in Washington.

On the contrary, dosing the economy with these palliatives may temporarily alleviate the pain, but could ultimately kill the patient.

Because this is an election year, both parties are vying with each other to see which one can produce the most attractively packaged antirecession pills.

President Eisenhower, for instance, has proposed extending unemployment compensation by 50 percent. This would mean that a man who drew $25 a week in a State with a maximum of 26 weeks, would, if he had used up his 26 weeks, continue to draw $25 for another 13 weeks.

However, the gimmick is that the States will be expected to reimburse the Federal Government for money advanced to meet these additional payments. If the States fail to repay the Federal Government, the Federal tax upon employers would be increased until full repayment was made.

What this actually means is that once such a "temporary" plan has been adopted, it will become a permanent part of our social welfare structure.

Under union and political pressure, the companies which provide the job opportunities will be even more heavily taxed in the future.

TAX CUT OVERRATED AS TRADE STIMULANT

In the current recession hysteria, there is a growing agitation for tax cuts.

Many economists contend that a tax cut is the quickest way to stimulate purchasing power and the economy in general.

The administration and the Democrats have both toyed with this idea, but are now said to be wating until the March economic indexes are available before making a decision.

While everyone would like a tax cut, I agree with economist Paul E. Belcher, who argues that the economic efficacy of tax cutting in the present situation is being vastly overrated.

Belcher contends that reasonable tax reductions simply aren't powerful enough and couldn't act fast enough to do us much immediate good.

A convincing case can be made for a long-range program of tax reduction. Taxes have reached the point of confiscation—punishing initiative and forcing smaller firms into mergers or absorption by their more powerful competitors.

But it is strange indeed that those who clamor most vociferously for tax reductions are frequently the same people who favor greater expenditures of your money both at home and abroad.

They cry for more foreign aid, broader welfare measures, Federal scholarships, and larger appropriations for education.

It apparently never occurs to the big spenders that they cannot have it both ways and retain any stability in the economy.

The President's budget is already headed for a huge deficit. If we continue on the theory that we can spend more while taking in less, the outer planets may have to organize a Marshall Plan for the United States.

SELF-INTEREST RULES PROPOSED REMEDIES

The trouble with most of the antirecession nostrums is that they are brewed in the pot of self-interest.

The politicians of both parties vote for continuing subsidies to the farmers, even though it costs the taxpayers a million dollars a day to store surplus farm products, plus another million a day for interest on money borrowed to carry out the farm program.

The unions demand, even in a recession, higher wages and other benefits which contribute to the price spiral already burdening their members.

Business, particularly in the automobile industry, is so price-conscious that it contends reduced prices would not sell more cars.

But in the same breath, the automakers call for the reduction or elimination of excise taxes, which would make cars cost less.

This is the sort of "double-mindedness" which is so typical of every special interest group.

Even Secretary Dulles is using the recession as an argument for increased foreign aid. To cut it, says the Secretary, would mean more unemployment in the United States.

RECESSION CAUSES CLEARLY FORESEEN

The paladins of panic, in their furious search for an economic wonder drug, show too little understanding of the basic malady.

The recession was not unexpected. Cutbacks in capital outlays, a marked drop in exports, holdbacks on defense programs, inventory reductions, the tightening of credit and pronounced consumer resistance all contributed to an economic slowdown.

We are passing through what economists call a classical recession, neither permanent in character nor foretelling a major breakdown in our profit-and-loss economy.

While a tax reduction and other stimulants such as public works might create a more optimistic psychology, these remedies cannot cure the infections in our economic system.

As Mr. Belcher has said, "Psychology can't correct such items as a rigid wage system; high prices necessitated by high costs, the frequent use of artificial price props, arbitrary limitations on productivity, and the threat of strikes in the auto industry."

The politicians never talk about it, but a crucial factor in the economy today is the ever-growing cost per unit of labor.

When times were good, annual wage increases were passed along to the public in higher priced goods. The recession began when the consumer—to protect himself—stopped buying.

But neither the unions nor business paid the slightest heed to the President's several appeals for restraint in wage demands and the pricing of goods.

By asking for trouble, they got it.

UNCONTROLLED INFLATION COULD SINK OUR NATION

The present danger, as I see it, is not that the Government will do too little, but that it may do too much.

One school of economists is actively advocating reflation (to reinflate) on the theory that it may not cause as much additional inflation as feared.

Walter K. Gutman, of Goodbody & Co., observed that if we seek to go back to the dollar value of 1940, only one thing can happen—an economic collapse.

Mr. Gutman says "our problem is to adjust to the fact of the one-half dollar, stop fussing about the $1 and make sure that we have enough one-half dollars in people's hands so that the price level established since World War II can be maintained."

He says also that "the authorities—meaning the Government—are coming to this point of view with regret, but there is every indication that they are coming to it."

I profoundly hope that Mr. Gutman is wrong. But the political weathervane points to high deficit spending, cheaper dollars, and running—not creeping—inflation.

This is the same course that has marked the decline of every nation which has en-

braced inflation as a solution for its economic ills.

Shrewd European investors are betting it will happen to us.

When it does, you will have seen the end of the United States as a great power.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Knifing the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, despite unanimous opposition from the House Armed Services Committee and a good many others of us in the Congress, the Army has proceeded to order a reorganization of the Reserve forces which would eliminate 6 National Guard divisions, 4 Reserve units, and some 1,100 company-size supporting units.

I find it hard to justify any consideration of a plan to slash the very backbone of our defense. To curtail the strength of these forces at a time when we must maintain the strength of our Nation is completely out of harmony with our objectives.

Like many others here, I have long contended that the National Guard must not be crippled and I speedily protested the Army's reorganization order in a letter to Secretary Brucker.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my letter to the Secretary of the Army, as well as a very fine editorial on this subject which appeared in the Anniston (Ala.) Star on April 9, 1958:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR H. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have read with very deep concern of the announced reorganization of the Reserve forces which would eliminate some 6 National Guard divisions and some 4 Reserve divisions.

This action, in the face of the resolution adopted by the House Armed Services Committee and the opposition of the governors' conference, does not seem to be in the best interest of the Nation.

For many years it has been the policy of the Defense Department to maintain a nucleus in the Regular service and to depend on the National Guard and the Reserve forces as the backbone of our defense. To curtail the strength of these forces at a time when we must maintain the strength of the Nation does not appear to be in harmony with our objectives.

It is true that new weapons may require modernization of units to conform to present conditions, however, we must never lose sight of the fact that the evaluation of a successful battle is that of obtaining the objective and holding it. Up until this time it has been, and I believe, in the future it will always be, necessary to take and hold our objectives and we must rely on the soldier. Therefore, we must maintain the Ready Reserve and National Guard units.

I strongly oppose any proposed reduction in these forces and sincerely trust that the Department of the Army will reconsider its position in the matter.

Very sincerely,

KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

KNIFING NATIONAL GUARD

Alabamians have every reason to be alarmed over proposals now being considered in Washington which would cut the strength of the Army National Guard from 400,000 officers and men to 360,000 during fiscal 1959, and eliminate 6 of the 27 guard divisions and approximately 25 percent of company-sized units in the next 30 months.

These Pentagon-backed changes have been termed "the most serious threat to the guard's existence in many a year."

An ill-advised money matter, the manpower cut would be madness in this time of global unrest and actual fighting in north Africa, Indonesia, Cuba, and elsewhere.

The guard has proved itself in previous wars, and it is no secret that even if full guard strength were impressed into Federal service, our military manpower still would come nowhere near matching Russia's, numerically speaking.

A cut in guard strength also would ignore that organization's role as a State police force, available for service in natural disasters and other emergencies.

The stakes in the present fight are particularly high insofar as Alabama is concerned. For in only 4 other States—New York, California, Massachusetts, and Texas—did guard strength top Alabama's 14,518 officers and men, as of last January 31.

It sincerely is hoped that the Congress will show the good sense to vote the funds necessary for a 400,000-member guard.

The reorganization plan is something else, again. It would not save money, but it is supposed to modernize the guard and make it a more effective force.

Guard divisions would be converted to the modern "pentomic" structure recently adopted by the Regular Army. Manpower would be distributed according to the mobilization priorities of various units, and excess units—6 divisions and 1,100 company-sized groups—would be eliminated.

Congress has indicated it is willing to go along with the reorganization plan, but it still must be cleared with the governors of the affected States. The law provides that "no unit of the National Guard * * * shall be withdrawn from any community or area * * * until the governor * * * shall have been consulted and shall have consented. * * *

Theoretically, then, a governor could block—or at least soften—the reorganization blow, and indeed it could be borrowing trouble to surmise that in any reshuffling, the powers-that-be might consider doing away with the famed 31st Division, made up of units from Alabama and Mississippi.

If past record, esprit de corps and present battle readiness means anything, this outfit surely will weather any conversion deemed necessary in this atomic age.

But, again, the Pentagon has an ultimate weapon in reserve. If negotiations reach an impasse, it can cut off Federal financial support for units it considers unnecessary.

In a word, changes are being proposed that could weaken, not strengthen, the guard for its role in national defense. It stands to reason that more strength would not be gained by cutting 40,000 officers and men from guard rolls.

The Army National Guard must needs be kept intact for the vitally important dual role it plays—as part of the Federal Army and as an emergency force within each State.

How the Times-Herald Was Born and How It Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Thirty Club, a group made up of former employees of the Washington Times-Herald and its two predecessors, the Washington Times and the Washington Herald, recently held its fourth annual reunion here in Washington, D. C.

The Times-Herald, the voice of conservatism in the Nation's Capital, for years occupied the building at 1317 H Street NW. It was bought by Eugene Meyer's Washington Post and closed on St. Patrick's Day, 1954. At the reunion, Mr. Speaker, congratulatory telegrams and letters from many persons high in Government life were read. Among them were messages from Herbert Hoover, who formerly owned the Times; Vice President Richard M. Nixon; and Senators Lyndon Johnson and John Kennedy.

On the occasion of the fourth annual reunion, Mr. Speaker, the Thirty Club inaugurated an award, to be given each year to America's outstanding newspaperman. The award is unusual in that it recognizes the value of factual and excellent reporting and has, as a club spokesman said in making this year's presentation, absolutely no social significance.

The award to Bob Considine was made in recognition of his reporting in three distinct fields—international, national, and sports. Cited were his interview with Nikita Khrushchev, his handling of the controversial Little Rock integration disorders, and his coverage of the 1957 world series. The committee which selected Mr. Considine as the Nation's outstanding newspaperman and winner of the Thirty Club Royal ivory typewriter award described his writing as factual, lucid, and free of personal bias.

That the selection was a wise one was borne out a few days later when Mr. Considine also won the annual award of the Overseas Writers' Club.

Much has been said both for and against the Times-Herald, Mr. Speaker, but no one can deny that it crusaded for its principles with a vigor seldom displayed by today's newspapers. I can think of no group better qualified to make an annual award for excellence in journalism than the former editorial employees of this newspaper.

Although it traced its beginnings to the latter part of the 19th century, the Times-Herald attained greatness in the 1930's under the leadership of Eleanor Medill Patterson, a distinguished member of the Chicago family which gave the Nation its two largest newspapers.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

She was the granddaughter of Joseph Medill, who convinced Abraham Lincoln that he should run for the office of President of the United States. Mr. Medill also was one of the founders of the Republican Party and published the Chicago Tribune. Mrs. Patterson's first cousin, Col. Robert R. McCormick, late publisher of that newspaper, built it into the second largest in the country. Her brother, Joseph, founded the New York Daily News with surplus funds from the Tribune and built for it the greatest circulation on this continent.

In tribute to Mrs. Patterson, whose blood was generously mixed with printer's ink, and to the hundreds of newspapermen and women who worked for and with her in the golden age of Washington journalism, I ask that the following article, which appeared in the program for the Thirty Club reunion, be inserted in the RECORD.

HOW THE TIMES-HERALD WAS BORN AND HOW IT DIED

The Times Herald had its beginning on March 18, 1894, when a group of unemployed printers founded the Washington Times.

Fifty years later, it did not publish a story about the anniversary.

Ten years after that, it did not publish at all.

That, for the sake of journalistic brevity, is the history of what often has been referred to as the damndest newspaper ever to hit the streets.

In all, the Times-Herald was an institution which lasted exactly 60 years. It died when Col. Robert McCormick, who claimed Irish descent, observed St. Patrick Day in 1954 by selling out to his political enemy, Eugene Meyer.

It was more than just the end of a newspaper. It was the culmination of an era of blazing journalism and blistering crusades, of tough and efficient reporters.

What really made this great institution was the ability of its personnel and the genius of the men and women who owned, at one time or another, the Times, the Herald, or the Times-Herald—Frank Munsey, Herbert Hoover, Arthur Brisbane, William Randolph Hearst, the beloved Eleanor Patterson, Colonel McCormick, and the "Seven Dwarfs"—Bill Shelton, Ed Jewell, Frank Waldrop, Mike Flynn, Mason Peters, Happy Robinson, and Irving Belt.

There were hundreds of others, most of them equally a part of the Times-Herald, and to them all the Washington area paid its debt on the newsstands and in home circulation.

From Hearst, Mrs. Patterson inherited her personnel and the intrafamily competitiveness developed by such hatchet wielders as "Long John" Hastings, who would fire an entire staff just because he didn't feel well on a particular morning.

Cissy never eliminated all the factionalism, but it was a healthy sort of bloodletting. Reporters afraid of a falling ax somehow worked harder and produced better results.

Cissy did put a quick and efficient halt to one of the biggest rivalries soon after she leased the Times and the Herald, August 7, 1937. For years, the two papers had operated as separate and bitter foes under the same roof. Cissy merged them February 1, 1939, 3 days after she bought the entire property.

The effect was electric. Washington went for the combined product like a trout for a fly. From that day until the closing, 15 years later, the Washington Times-Herald led all other newspapers in the city in circulation. In addition it was, typographically and from a standpoint of makeup, one of the outstanding newspapers in the country.

When Cissy passed on, the seven trusted employees to whom she left the Times-Herald continued her policies, but the Times-Herald just wasn't the same. Soon after Colonel McCormick took over, the makeup was changed to resemble the Chicago Tribune. The many fonts of Ryerson, a type which almost was named Patterson in Cissy's honor, and the other faces that had made the newspaper so readable, were junked. Shorts on page one were banned. It should have been obvious then that the Times-Herald would never be the same.

But it thrived vigorously, nevertheless, until that St. Patrick's Day 4 years ago when a notice was pinned on the city room bulletin board, announcing that there would be no edition the following day.

It was just as well that a certain redhead who sported an equally red pedicure and a temper to match was not around. She would have made a story the likes of which she had never published.

The newspaper she lived, fought, and died for would not have gone so easily.

And the building at 1317 H Street NW. would be something more than a warehouse for office furniture belonging to the Washington Post.

A Do-Nothing Administration—Far From It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the independent Newsweek of March 31, 1958, comes this statement—well worth reading—an answer to the unjustified criticism that the administration is not moving forward.

The statement reads:

THINGS DONE, NOT JUST PLANNED, FOR A STEP-UP

THE ACTION

August 5, 1957: Housing Adminstration lowers downpayment requirements on FHA-insured home loans. Example: The required downpayment on a $12,000 house cut from $1,200 to $600.

THE OBJECTIVE

Stimulate the sagging housing industry. Note: By January 1958, new FHA loan applications were up 64 percent over previous January.

THE ACTION

November 14: Federal Reserve System lowers bank discount from 3½ percent to 3 percent, easing administration's hard money policy.

THE OBJECTIVE

Spur home, commercial, and municipal borrowing; encourage capital investment.

THE ACTION

December 23: President Eisenhower unfreezes $177 million in Federal funds for military housing, cooperative home building, and slum clearance.

THE OBJECTIVE

Get stalled housing developments around missile bases and co-op projects moving again.

THE ACTION

January 7, 1958: President asks Congress for $1.2 billion supplemental defense appropriation for current fiscal year. Request approved by Congress, signed by President February 11.

THE OBJECTIVE

Primarily to catch up with advances in Soviet war capabilities, but indirectly to help construction industries with accelerated spending on missile and SAC bases.

THE ACTION

January 13: President submits $73.9 billion budget, increasing defense outlays but putting moratorium on new public-works projects. Democratic and Republican Congressmen rebel, pass resolution calling for speed-up in public works.

THE OBJECTIVE

Again primarily to match Russian advances, but also to pour more money into defense industries and stem unemployment.

THE ACTION

January 21: Federal Reserve lowers bank discount rate again, from 3 percent to 2½.

THE OBJECTIVE

Further to stimulate credit and capital investment.

THE ACTION

February 11: President asks 5-year, $1 billion Post Office modernization program. Plan calls for improvement or replacement of 2,500 Government-owned buildings, 12,000 leased structures. Passage by Congress doubtful.

THE OBJECTIVE

Stimulate construction, encourage investment by stipulating that $1.5 billion of the fund come from private money.

THE ACTION

February 20: Federal Reserve Board lowers bank-reserve requirements by one-half percentage point.

THE OBJECTIVE

Free $500 billion in cash reserves and $1 billion in lending power, thus offsetting a seasonal decline in bank loans.

THE ACTION

March 6: Federal Reserve cuts bank discount rate for third time—from 2¾ to 2¼ percent.

THE OBJECTIVE

Ease up on credit still more.

THE ACTION

March 7: President releases $200 million to Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase of mortgages on low-cost homes.

THE OBJECTIVE

Enable builders to arrange financing of homes under $10,000; boost low-cost housing projects.

THE ACTION

March 8: The President orders a speed-up in all Federal construction including highways, dams, and Government buildings, but holds the line against new public-works projects.

THE OBJECTIVE

To accelerate the flow of already obligated Federal funds to builders and contractors.

THE ACTION

March 12: Pentagon speeds up defense expenditures, freeing money that was idled by the hold down of last year.

THE OBJECTIVE

Spur defense industries and get some of the unemployed factory workers back on the job.

THE ACTION

March 18: Federal Reserve Board cuts bank reserve requirements another half percentage point.

THE OBJECTIVE

Free another $490 million in cash reserves, another $3 billion in bank credit.

THE ACTION

March 19: President orders Housing Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture to

expedite $2.2 billion worth of college-housing, urban-renewal, public-housing, and rural-electrification projects.

THE OBJECTIVE

Boost business and provide employment (but the plan is dependent upon $1.7 billion in State, local, and private funds).

THE ACTION

March 19: Congress passes new $1.8 billion emergency housing bill.

THE OBJECTIVE

Further encourage low-cost housing development; provide jobs; distribute money to builders and suppliers.

THE ACTION

March 19: Army announces it will order $100 million in trucks and trailers within 30 days.

THE OBJECTIVE

Help auto and parts makers in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania; restore jobs.

THE ACTION

March 19: President outlines plan for extending State unemployment compensation an additional 13 weeks with $200 million in Federal funds. States now pay benefits for from 6 to 30 weeks.

THE OBJECTIVE

Sustain the unemployed during their idleness and put purchasing power in their hands.

March 31, 1958.

George Harris Collingwood—Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the other day many of us here in this House and thousands in the field of forestry and conservation in which he had made his career, were appalled by the sudden and unexpected death of George Harris Collingwood, the Chief of the Natural Resources Section of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. It is a pardonable tendency and an altogether fitting custom to speak only good and put the best possible aspect on the life and character of the dead. I feel that in the case of George Harris Collingwood one can be severely austere in words of eulogy and yet emerge with a sublime epitaph.

There are achievements that can be measured in the life of Harris Collingwood such as his printed works, his original procedures in teaching forestry, and even more concretely the mass of his reports and analyses that helped inform and guide the Congress on legislation in the area of farm forestry and conservation. But these are statistical paragraphs in a coldly abbreviated biography. Collingwood's singular contribution was no particular detail of his accomplishment, however worthy. It was rather in the quality of his personality—gentle, firm, utterly selfless—which lent to everything he did a kind of purposeful goodness that made life happier and easier for those around him.

Yet in his 67 years the sheer substantive quantity and quality of his work was immense.

If I inject a personal note it is only because this illustrates what I mean by the quality of his personality giving so much extra value to his worth as a scholar, an administrator, a teacher, and a very special mentor, for example, to those of us here in the House who felt the need for calling upon his knowledge, his experience, and his technical guidance. As a freshman Member of Congress, I was buttressed and defended many times by his great depth of knowledge in the fields which, because of my district—the fourth—in Oregon, meant the most to me. Here, so to speak, through this Chief of the Natural Resources Section of the Legislative Reference Service, I had at my elbow instantly, or within reach of my telephone, or by report and special analyses prepared for me, the lessons I needed to do best my job as the representative of my district.

The technical data, the information, the summary of a complicated conservation problem, that I got from Collingwood I knew was the last word on the subject told in depth with clarity and simplicity. When I speak of the quality of his personality I mean too the character, the integrity, and the diligence he invariably applied to any question in hand. Here from Collingwood was something I knew I could go out on the floor of the House with and use to corroborate my point of view. Or the information I had from him might have the effect of disabusing me of an impression his expert research showed was inaccurate.

Collingwood's formal education and background was an index to the depth of his scholarship. He was born in Fayetteville, Ark. His schools included: Michigan State College and Muenchener Universitaet. Before he returned to the United States he had studied forest practices in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. For 2 years he was a ranger in the Apache National Forest in Arizona. He was a professor of forestry in Cornell University in 1916. In 1923 he was an extension forester in the Agriculture Department. Always his unique training and background had a continuing influence on the character of forestry education in the United States because he invested these with the fire and dedication of his personality.

What made him, I would say, especially outstanding was his love of his subject.

From this love, in the field he had chosen for his career, stemmed a love of people which was genuine and all-inclusive. This made him an ideal teacher, mentor and lecturer, a schoolmaster, in his way, who was also a friend, philosopher and guide. People loved him so that it was he who was quite apt to be elected to be the chairman or toastmaster or head of a committee to make an award, or offer a tribute to a fellow worker, or express an encomium on some associate's long service in the Library of Congress. Not aptitude alone but respect and affection as well played some part, I am told, in his rise to head the forest conservation division of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association from 1940 to 1946. He was the author of the association's industry program. Among other task force jobs he served as an agriculture expert on the Hoover Commission for executive department reorganization, and was forestry consultant to the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The Government of the United States owes a profound debt to Collingwood and people like him in the Government service. It is on the occasion of the death of a public servant like Collingwood that I think it is highly appropriate to extol the vast amount of top-level work that people like him perform for us, the Congress, and for the people of the United States. I think it is not only fitting but a duty for us to stand up, as I am doing now in this place to testify to this extraordinary dedication and fruitful productivity of the people who work for the Government. It makes immeasurably for a better United States in the age when this country is called upon to take the leadership of the free world. And it is precisely correct for these words to be spoken in the House because we who allocate the expenditure of the people's money are the people's agents, and the people are the true employers of brilliant, competent, and effective Government employees like the man in whose honor and memory I speak. Whatever pay Collingwood got could hardly be said to constitute any kind of balance for the achievement he gave in return.

Government servants like Collingwood—anonymous, without self-interest, ambitious for their tasks and not for themselves—are the Nation's most outstanding operational economy and one of the mightiest forces for the progress and strengthening of free government.

In the epitaph of George Harris Collingwood there must remain a very special place for his role as a hubsand and father. For something of the glory that came to his wife, who survives him, Mrs. Jean Cummings Collingwood, must redound to him. Mrs. Collingwood was named Distric tof Columbia "Mother of the Year" by the local American Mothers Committee in 1955. It is significant of this magnificent family that all of the Collingwood sons and daughters are engaged in some form of service for the betterment of mankind, ranging all the way from helping retarded children to advancing public education. One of their sons is the distinguished Charles Collingwood, CBS television and radio news analyst, now in London. Another is the Reverend G. Harris Collingwood, Jr., of Junction City, Kans. The other children and grandchildren are a credit to American home life, and the high standard of upbringing and education often overlooked in the flood of news about the more spectacular aspects of the American family.

George Harris Collingwood, as a citizen, as a man dedicated to his career, as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a father, and as a friend of his fellowman, deserves the highest commendation from his generation.

The Present Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter discussing the present recession and our present economic condition which letter I recently received from Dr. C. O. Jayne, of Centralia, Ill.

The logic of Dr. Jayne, in discussing the present recession, I feel, largely typifies the thinking of the great majority of the people who are solely interested in the welfare of our Government and are free from political bias.

I believe many Members of Congress will find the logic of Dr. Jayne's letter of interest to them:

CENTRALIA, ILL., *March 12, 1958.*
HON. CHARLES VURSELL,
Congressman from 23d District in Illinois.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: I am prompted to write this letter mostly because of my anxiety over what the administration and Congress may do to relieve the current recession.

* * * * *

I know our recession is serious enough to make us all want something done to relieve unemployment. I fear that our administration and Congress may do too much, rather than not enough, to relieve unemployment. I note there is talk of huge public-works program and cutting of taxes. Our National Government needs revenue so much to meet all expenses that I would hate to see taxes cut any at this time unless it becomes absolutely necessary to do so. A reasonable sized works program seems wise at this time but I feel that care should be taken not to go too strong on such a program.

Fundamentally, I believe our economy is such as not to go into a deep depression. The buying power of our people is even now, of I am correct, at an almost all-time high. The inflation spiral had to be stopped. Of course we all enjoy to some extent the prosperous times of inflation, but I cannot enjoy such, much, knowing full well that the opposite must come and the greater the inflation spiral, the greater the depression must be when it comes, and with much inflation, depression will surely come as night follows day.

It is most likely that some will play politics with this recession, but I trust that Congressmen and Senators of both of our great parties will rise above politics in this matter. I admit that too much negative talk scares people sufficiently to keep them from buying, but I do not believe that is going to hurt our economy much this time. When people stop buying except what they must, it hurts by cutting down production and employment.

With our economy as good as I believe it to be, I consider there are at least two fundamental causes for this recession other than fear, and sooner or later had to bring on a recession, if not a depression, depending on how long and to what degree those causes go unrestrained. First, I wish to mention installment buying of so many things by so many people and that has been carried to almost the limit with car sales, some of which have obligated the buyer for 36 months, more or less. It made good business while it was going on, but sooner or later it had to stop for there is a limit to how much the general public can obligate itself financially and have a sound economy. For this condition we will have to blame to a great extent businessmen and industrial leaders In due time, after many months, this condition will right itself when people get caught up with those monthly obligations. No optimistic talk now will relieve this condition we find ourselves in and that part of the recession caused by overbuying on the installment plan. Public works can give some relief, but will not cure this situation.

The second fundamental cause of our recession which can and will lead in time to a great depression preceded by uncontrolled inflation is caused by the misleaders of organized labor and industrial leaders are to a great extent to blame for this condition by permitting wages to rise time after time to pass the cost on to the public. To my knowledge, prices have never failed to rise when there has been a round of wage rises and this keeps causing more inflation. Any labor leader or any industrial leader should have known long before now that after each general wage raise, the worker who got increased wages is no better off within 2 or 3 months as prices rise accordingly and those who have fixed incomes and the workers who are not organized have less and less buying power. That which is not good for us all in the long run cannot be good for any group for long. Prices have now risen to such a level that those who need machinery can ill afford to buy it and materials have become so high that all construction must sooner or later come almost to a standstill, except such building that has to be done. I am not optimistic over this situation in which we find ourselves in this respect. I know no solution except ultimate depression preceded by uncontrolled inflation unless labor leaders and industrial leaders act with commonsense and stop this mounting spiral of wage increases and ever higher prices. Just confidence, alone, in our economy will not correct this condition in our national economy. It is time, and that time is long overdue, that men in high places talk and write concerning this matter and make it unpopular for labor leaders to ask for more and more, and industrial leaders to grant more and more higher wages and thus make prices higher and higher. Instead of organized labor asking for higher wages, it should voluntarily reduce some wages and I especially have in mind the building crafts. Most people just cannot afford to pay the present high wages to build or repair. I am not sure what can be done in this matter, but something must be done to stop this foolish rise in wages and prices, or else.

In this election year, some Congressmen and Senators may favor making increases in social security taxes and liberalizing social security payments. That tax may have to be increased some but I wish it might not be done and if it is increased any, I trust it will be increased as little as possible. I would suggest that instead of increasing social security benefits, that Congress permit one who gets his social security be allowed to make considerably more each year than the present $1,200 without being penalized by taking from his social security. This would increase the buying power of a great number on social security without added taxes and there is a need of the kind of work they will do.

We must not be taken in by the Russians any more. We know them now and we know their ultimate aims. Their policies change to meet changing conditions but their ultimate goal of world domination has not changed and will not change, in my judgment, until they know that they can no longer fool us and they know we can and will resist them in their aggressions. Their economy, as well as ours, cannot stand the stress and strain of armaments. Such a stalemate will, in my judgment, bring the Communist leaders to thinking differently. We must not be moved by smiles and pleasantries of Russian leaders.

We must not in any sense give up atomic weapons. Without such, the Communists will be far superior to the free world in men and conventional weapons and then the "brush fires" they meant to start here and there to conquer parts of the free world in pieces will begin as they intended it from the beginning. Atomic weapons have made such unlikely now and we must keep it so with those weapons. They do not want a big war for they know it will mean destruction to them as well as to us. Let us keep "brush fires" unpopular with them. I have written much to say but little, perhaps. I trust I may not burden you too much in reading this letter.

My best wishes are ever with you.

Your friend,

C. O. JAYNE.

John Gray Exemplifies Finest in Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding citizen of the Second Congressional District of Texas and a longtime friend, Mr. John Gray, of Beaumont, has been selected by the East Texas Chamber of Commerce for its man of the month award for April 1958.

This selection has been acclaimed throughout southeast Texas and the people of Beaumont, I feel sure, join unanimously in this exceptionally well-deserved tribute to a civic leader who has made community progress his personal responsibility.

Versatile, hard-working John Gray has the vision and courage to provide effective leadership needed to weld together all parts of a community to provide better opportunities for all its people. As president of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce this year, Mr. Gray is continuing his tireless work for Beaumont and Jefferson County.

It is with genuine appreciation for his years of service that I include an editorial about Mr. Gray which was published in the Beaumont Journal of April 5, 1958, in today's RECORD:

ONE HONOR FOR ALL

All Beaumonters, we believe, are proud and pleased that the East Texas Chamber of Commerce has chosen one of their most outstanding fellow citizens for its Man of the Month honor for April.

The regional chamber would have to reach a long way and perhaps make several reaches to find another man as deserving of the signal recognition as John E. Gray.

It would be repetitious to set down here all the things John Gray has done and is doing

for the betterment of Beaumont. It would be an old story to our readers, even as his name is old and familiar. But it is the kind of old that, like gold, brightens and shines with use.

East Texas, official publication of the aggressive and far-reaching chamber, recounts how Mr. Gray entered junior college, graduated with honor, returned as a professor, helped make it into a 4-year college and became its first president. It tells, too, of how the college president switched from a successful career as an educator to banking and has become executive vice president of the First National Bank in Beaumont. It also, and proudly points out that he is now president of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce.

This, of course, is only a brief summary of Mr. Gray's interests and accomplishments. In church, in civic work and in all phases of community betterment, Mr. Gray has left hardly anything untouched. And he has touched nothing that he has not improved.

The regional chamber's official publication says "thorough" is the word for John Gray. It is. He is so thoroughly a part of everything worthwhile in Beaumont that the whole city shares in the thoroughly deserved honor.

Coal's Top Role in Power Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial "Coal's Top Role In Power Picture," which appeared in the April 14, 1958, issue of the Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL'S TOP ROLE IN POWER PICTURE

Coal and steam turbines will be here for a long time, a gathering of 600 or so electric-utility executives from the Southeast were told the other day in Boca Raton, Fla.

Bearer of this important news to mines and miners was Fisher Black, editor of Electrical World, and our information came from the New York Times, whose Gene Smith covered the session for the New York big print.

Mr. Black predicted that coal would be the predominant factor in the fuel picture between now and 1975, while Dr. C. Guy Suits, vice president and director of research for General Electrical Co., agreed with Black on the importance of nuclear and fusion power in the future and at the same time held that neither development would cut into the overwhelming influence of coal and steam turbines.

Dr. Suits for his part said there was nothing on the technological horizon that gave promise of replacing rotating machinery (steam turbines) for generating electricity—not on a big scale or in the near future, as he put it.

He pointed out, reported the Times, that there was an interval of 15 to 20 years between the point of technical feasibility of fission (nuclear) power proved in 1942 and the economic feasibility "which we are now approaching but have not yet reached."

And, continued the General Electric man: "The technical feasibility of fusion power (harnessing the hydrogen bomb reaction) has not yet been proven. From our studies we have proposed that practical fusion power should not be anticipated until at least 20 years have passed."

Analyzing the future sources of energy for the electric utility industry, Mr. Black said he was not very bullish on nuclear energy through 1975 and "not going wild over fusion, with commercial fusion powerplants anywhere from 20 to 50 years distant."

Both speakers at the Boca Raton session dismissed the possible application of solar energy to power generation, but Dr. Suits said it and fuel costs, semiconductors, converters, and other new laboratory methods should be investigated as "interesting further technical possibilities."

Mr. Black described coal as being in "the most optimistic reserve picture of all fossil fuels." He placed overall remaining coal reserves at the vast figure of 943 billion tons, plus 525 billion tons of lignite.

Based on present annual consumption of about 500 million tons, coal reserves east of the Mississippi River alone (152 billion tons) would provide 300 years' supply, he explained.

Further impetus to the use of coal for power generation stems from an expectation that coal prices will rise in the coming years at a much slower rate than will prices for gas and oil, Black said, concluding:

"Not only will the use of coal increase over threefold in the next 18 years, but its share of power generation will rise from 55 percent of annual production in 1957 to at least 66.5 percent in 1975."

No matter what happens in the field of nuclear power, he said, utility thinking must center around coal.

Forestry Yesterday and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is with a great deal of pride in the talents of Mr. Ben Massie, of Ellington, Mo., that I include a copy of his speech which was entered in the subdistrict contest of the Future Farmers of America. His speech and timely subject, Forestry Yesterday and Today, merits thoughtful consideration:

FORESTRY YESTERDAY AND TODAY

(By Ben Massie)

From the time explorers began to visit the North American shores, they recognized resources which they could use. They began at once to harvest timber and carry it home to Europe.

Forests continued to play a vital part in American history as the young Nation grew. Wood and more wood was needed, wood for covered wagons, bridges, ships, poles, railroad crossties, and mine timbers. Houses, stores, schools, and churches had to be built.

To pioneers moving westward from the Atlantic seaboard, the forest seemed more like an obstacle to progress and safety. Wherever their covered wagon took them except on the prairies—the land had to be cleared of trees to make way for farms, roads, and settlements. Although most of the trees thus cleared were burned, a lot of them were used for fuel or lumber.

People sometimes look at this period of exploration and settlement and shake their heads over the timber and land clearing. But in those days there was a tremendous surplus of timber. Trees were in the way for homesteading and farming. The easiest and fastest means of cleaning land of trees was to burn them. It was the accepted answer to the problem of to many trees. Consequently forest fires ranged unchecked. Forest protection was unheard of because almost no one could see that there would ever be a need for conservation of trees. These same practices are still carried on in some instances today in the United States.

By the 1870's, however, when settlement had reached the Pacific Northwest and there were no more frontiers to explore, men began to think about taking steps to insure a future timber supply. The United States Government appointed men to study the forest situation, and in 1905 the United States Forest Service was founded to improve and protect Government-owned forest lands. Many of these first foresters employed to do this job were German foresters.

At the same time lumbermen were learning about conservation from the cutover forests of New England, the Lake States, and the South. They saw young new forests springing up where the old trees had been harvested. Men learned that trees grow and actually replace themselves. Seeing the potential in these young forests, lumbermen stopped moving about and settled down to grow crop after crop on their own lands.

In recent years, sound forestry practices on privately owned and Government woodlands have become widespread. Today most industrial forest owners are growing trees as a crop under the guidance of professional foresters.

The great variety of trees in America astonished the early settlers. Even today, all of Europe—not counting Russia, has only 85 species of trees. The United States has more than 1,000. Although there are 1,000 kinds of trees in the forests of the United States, only about 100 have commercial value; that is, they are suitable for manufacturing into lumber, paper, and other products.

Trees grow in all parts of our country except in grasslands, the desert regions of the Great Plains, and the arid basins of the West. Nevertheless, there are rather definite groupings of trees into six different regions, determined by the climate and the lay of the land. The groupings are northern, central hardwood, southern, western, and west coast and a small area of tropical forests.

Fire, insects, and disease along with men are the forests' worst enemies. In some sections fire is enemy No. 1. In others, such as old growth forests, insects and disease do the greater damage. All make heavy raids upon our forest capital.

Fire means a tragic loss of wildlife as well as timber. Birds and animals try to escape, but fire has been known to move faster than even a deer can run. Even the animals which escape may die later from starvation because their food supply has been destroyed.

A farmer would soon be out of business if he did not grow crops over and over on his land. Forest land should be used the same way. Trees can be grown as a crop just as cotton or corn.

A wise farmer would not let his cattle graze in his unripened corn or let fire burn his cottonfield. Nor would he let his cattle destructively graze his woods or permit fire to run through his forest.

As a farmer cultivates his corn to keep out the weeds and thins his vegetables as they will grow faster and larger, so should he keep the decayed, deformed, and diseased trees out of his woodland and thin his young stands to give the trees more room and sunlight.

Before a farmer's grain crop ripens, he carefully explores the market so he can get the best price. He should do the same for the products his woods can yield.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There are still people who misunderstand the basic purpose of forests overlooking entirely the great contribution trees make to the American economy. They would have the primeval forests remains as they are, when nature has different plans. Like people, trees age and die. Modern forest management has demonstrated that the forest must be used or eventually it will be lost. This means that a thrifty forest is never idle and to keep healthy it must keep busy and productive. Conservation of the forest is wiser use of the forest.

Most farm woods do not contain enough trees to fully utilize the soil. Due to this understocking, together with inadequate protection and poor management, farm forests are producing only from one-fifth to one-third the amount of wood products which could be grown under good management. The quality of the material which is being produced at the present time is so low that many of the large wood-using industries in the State will not buy Missouri timber. As long as this situation exists and as long as woodland owners make no effort to determine the actual value of their timber before making sales, stumpage and log prices will remain too low in many sections of the State to encourage intensive woodland management.

Few people realize that overgrazing of woodlands by livestock causes damage very similar to that caused by burning. But rot in older trees, the complete lack of seedlings and young trees of good species, compacted soil, eroding soil, and slow tree growth are as prevalent in grazed woods as they are in burned woods. Furthermore, efficient livestock production requires better pasture than Missouri woodlands produce. The farmer who owns a small woodland will make more money from both his timber and his livestock if he fertilizes, limes, and otherwise improves his open pasture and fences livestock out of his woodlands.

On many farms in the central and southern parts of the State the timber and pasture acreage is out of balance. Again, small tracts of woodland which are expected to provide both pasture and timber usually fail in both respects.

The most valuable timber species should be encouraged. In some cases where no reproduction is present, it may be desirable to introduce such species through planting.

Insofar as is known at the present time, in small woodlands where frequent harvests are expected, management should be directed toward the development of uneven aged stands. In other words the ideal woodland should contain trees of all sizes ranging from very young trees to mature sawtimber. Therefore, the owner who attempts to keep his woodlands free of all undergrowth and in a park-like state is actually creating unnatural conditions and doing a poor job of timber management. In such a woodland when the trees which are now present reach maturity and are harvested, the area is either through producing timber, or there will be a gap of several decades before another harvest can be made.

The Central States region in spite of being highly industrialized, densely populated, and extensively farmed, is 20 percent forested. The forests are predominently hardwood—chiefly oak. Most of the forest land is located in the southern part of the region—along the Ohio River, in the mountains of eastern Kentucky and in the Missouri Ozarks. Missouri has 15 million acres of timberland.

Generally, these forests are in poor condition; understocked, and containing many cull or worthless trees. The potential for producing more and better timber is there. In fact, the average acre of forest land in the region is considered capable of producing three times as much usable wood per year as it is producing now.

The better timber is scattered throughout the northern part of the region. This is farming country and many of these small woodlands are owned by farmers who do not depend upon timber as a primary source of income. Such an ownership pattern complicates the instruction of farm woodland management since the land is spread among so many owners who have various interests.

Near the center of the State is the headquarters for the Columbia Forest Research Center, which is maintained in cooperation with the University of Missouri. There are more different kinds of research going on there than at any of the other centers. Research is being done in the fields of forest management, fire, economics, range, watershed management, and forest insects and diseases.

Burning forest land in an effort to eliminate brush and tree sprouts in order to improve forage has been a common practice in the Missouri Ozarks for years.

On recent experiments at Sinking Experimental Forest in southern Missouri, they found that burning an area with a hot ground fire is a very inefficient way to control the undesirable woody growth. After 1 year, the hardwood cover had been reduced by only 5 percent.

On a similar area that had been treated with a herbicide, the cover was reduced 40 percent the first year and should be reduced by another 50 to 40 percent the second or third year. Production of planted little blue grass was 3 pounds per acre on the burned area and 250 pounds per acre where herbicides were used.

Because the production of cattle is an important industry in certain parts of the Missouri Ozarks, they have been carrying on experimental work along this line for some time. They have been trying to reconcile the interests of both forester and cattle producer so as to provide for the best and fullest use of every acre of wild land.

Some of the forested land in this area may be more suited for growing forage than trees. One of the important problems is to determine which is more important economically, trees, or forage. Where the land is more suited for growing forage, one of the rangeman's big tasks is to keep the land free from brush and trees. For years it has been common practice throughout the State to attempt to control this undesirable vegetation by burning the range every spring. But fire is a dangerous tool and an inefficient one. So they have been trying in recent years to find ways to do this job cheaply and effectively with herbicides.

Mr. Hilterbrand, our vocational agriculture instructor, and Mr. Fred Whitt, district forester, took us to Van Buren on a wood-industries tour to Nichols Stave Co., Beamer Handle Co., and Levitt Fallet Co. At the stavemill, Mr. Nichols showed us a bolt containing a nail that had ripped several teeth from the barrel saw. When we arrived at the handle factory, Wayne Keathley greeted us and pointed out fire scars on some of the blocks which were culled as unfit for the manufacture of handles. He also explained that 95 percent of the timber, which is hickory and ash, is transported from Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi. Thirty-three years ago when this plant was established it had a plentiful supply of timber from this locality. Now it must transport its timber from another State. This emphasizes that we have witnessed a deterioration in the management of our timber that must be corrected if we are going to continue to produce timber for our wood-using industries.

What could we, as FFA members, and others do to correct the conditions that exist today in our timberland?

First we must cooperate with the agencies that are promoting conservation today. These agencies include the Missouri Conservation Commission, the United States Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and many allied agencies.

This cooperation should extend from the farmer to the businessman and from the commercial worker to the professional man. In other words, all people should be vitally interested in the conservation of our forestland and the time to begin is when we learn of the importance of our timberlands. FFA boys can own forestry projects. To begin with, the plots should not be over 5 acres in size because caring for them requires considerable work. Some of the practices that should be done are inventories, culling and girdling of undesirable trees, keeping out fires, and fencing out the livestock.

We believe conservation is of primary importance today, not only to supply the necessary food and fiber we need to live but to produce enough for the generation to come.

On field trips we have seen stumps of virgin pine trees relics of a bygone era. We have seen examples of good forest management such as practiced in Deer Run State Park. We have seen many acres of cutover, burned forest which cannot yield any timber today.

Our job today and our future of tomorrow will depend upon our decision to correct the thinking of the past and work together for better forests and conservation of our land.

Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1958, I asked and received unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, to the President. This letter gave a brief analysis of the President's recent directive to Secretary Benson to encourage REA cooperatives to spend their loans faster.

Mr. Ellis concluded his letter with a request that these important matters might be discussed with the President in person. Since then, one of Mr. Eisenhower's assistants informed Mr. Ellis that such an appointment was unnecessary.

Pointing out that rural electric systems can play an important role in fighting the recession, Mr. Ellis once again has urged the President to take time for a discussion on these REA matters with grassroots representatives of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Ellis' letter to Jack Z. Anderson, Administrative Assistant to President Eisenhower.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 10, 1958.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President, The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am very sorry, indeed, that you do not think it is necessary for the President to talk with me about the crucial REA matters covered in my letter of March 21, 1958. These are tremendously important to those of us concerned about the welfare of rural electrification and rural America, and, therefore, I would like to request an opportunity for our Board of Directors and me to talk with the President at his early convenience. These men are elected by the rural electric systems in 43 States and

Alaska and understand well the problems we face.

In view of the constantly deteriorating farm situation and the drastic migration away from the farm, many rural electric systems are in critical times. For example, the systems have built power lines to 335,000 rural homes that now stand vacant. This construction cost about $100-million and the remaining consumers have to pay this back, along with the rest of the funds borrowed to build rural lines. I am sure all this must be of concern to the President as part of the recession picture, if for no other reason.

Our rural electric systems do want to help fight off a depression. And there is much they could do if Mr. Eisenhower should choose to give them the sympathetic understanding and consideration of their needs he has so often expressed.

These are the things our Association Directors would like the opportunity to discuss with the President. As farmers and officials serving local rural electric cooperatives they know that the President's directive to Secretary Benson to urge REA borrowers to speed up expenditure of loan funds is simply bad advice from every standpoint.

At the same time they are aware of the fact that the President, in his budget request, asked for less than half the amount of funds needed by the rural electric program during the next fiscal year. As you know, he asked for only $150 million. Department of Agriculture officials have admitted during recent appropriations hearings that the need is about $325 million. Our own NRECA survey, which has always been conservative, shows that this need is $359 million.

Our directors would like the opportunity to talk with the President about this matter, also, because uncertainty over adequate loan funds is bound to lead to a slowdown in new construction. Furthermore, they would like to seek his assistance in expediting new loans rather than old loans because this would help rural electrification as well as the fight against depression. And finally, they would like him to know how Mr. Benson's stop orders on $74½ million of loans already made to 55 cooperatives are slowing down the rural electrification program.

None of us can understand why the President on the one hand apparently is pushing the rural electric systems while holding them back on the other. Neither can we understand how you can claim for the administration that it has been responsible for the REA and water resources development progress over the last several years when the record clearly shows that it has been Congress which has set the pace and provided the leadership. We know, for instance, that there have been times when REA would not have had enough funds to make needed loans had Congress not increased the administration's budget requests.

On behalf of the Board of Directors, I respectfully request the opportunity for them and myself to present to the President these matters which are of utmosst importance to rural America.

With personal regards.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, wise counsel comes from many sources: Indeed, there are times when wisdom may be distilled out of wit. As evidence of this, I include in the RECORD a short verse, written by Richard Armour, which appeared recently in the New Leader magazine:

SURVIVAL

(Able to take 100 times as much radiation as man, insects may be the only survivors of atomic war.—News item.)

Insects, which men long have plagued
With doses of insecticide,
Now under stones, in holes and cracks,
Await the turning of the tide.

—*Richard Armour.*

Navaho Dam and San Juan Chama Units of Upper Colorado River Storage Project Opposed by Colorado River Board of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter under date of April 10, 1958, from the Colorado River Board of California, an official agency of the State of California, setting forth that State's official objections to the San Juan Chama and Navaho Dam units of the upper Colorado River storage project. The letter sets forth the reasons for the opposition in each instance. So that my colleagues may be informed thereof, I have asked that the letter be reproduced as follows:

COLORADO RIVER BOARD OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, April 10, 1958.

The Honorable CRAIG HOSMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: The construction program currently proposed for the upper Colorado River storage project includes the Navaho Dam storage unit, which in the opinion of the Colorado River Board has no reasonable justification since it would serve no useful purpose at this time.

The Navaho Dam was authorized as a unit of the Colorado River storage project in 1956 under Public Law 485, 84th Congress, 2d session. The record indicates that $1½ million was appropriated to start construction. However, no construction contracts were awarded, as far as is known; and the President in his budget submitted in January 1958 recommended that the $1½ million previously appropriated for this storage unit be transferred to and used for the construction of the Flaming Gorge unit of the storage project.

Subsequently, during the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill by the House at the current session, an amendment by Congressman DEMPSEY, of New Mexico, was approved directing the Secretary of the Interior to use the $1½ million previously appropriated for Navaho Dam to start its construction during the current year. The bill, as passed by the Congress, retained this directive. In addition, the accelerated reclamation construction program submitted by the President to the Congress on March 12, 1958, recommends a further appropriation of $7 million for the Navho Dam unit for the fiscal year 1959.

The primary and almost sole purpose of the Navaho Dam and Reservoir would be to serve the proposed Navaho Indian irrigation project. There is no power development in connection with this dam and the reservoir capacity is not needed for hold-over storage in the upper basin. In preliminary storage project bills introduced in 1954, the Navaho Dam and Reservoir were included as an integral part of the Navaho Indian irrigation project. However, the Indian irrigation project was subsequently eliminated; but for reasons unexplained, the Navaho Dam was authorized in Public Law 485.

Public Law 485 directed that further investigations and planning reports be made for the Navaho Indian irrigation project, and also for the San Juan-Chama project in New Mexico, which proposes a transmountain diversion of Colorado River Basin water into the Rio Grande Basin. The Bureau of Reclamation report on these 2 projects was completed a few months ago and submitted by the Secretary of the Interior to affected States for review and comment under the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The Colorado River board, as the State agency responsible for protecting the interests of California in Colorado River system water, has made a careful review of the report on these two projects. The board's comments will in due course be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior through the State department of water resources and the Governor, in accordance with etsablished procedure on review of Federal reports.

It is concluded from the board's studies that neither the Navaho irrigation project nor the San Juan-Chama project as proposed in the bureau's report is economically feasible. The Navaho irrigation project, including the necessary storage which would be provided by the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, would cost $1,550 per acre, according to estimates in the report. The capital subsidy, including interest up to start of full operation, would amount to $2,500 per acre, or about $240,000 per farm family. The San Juan-Chama project, as proposed in the report, is infeasible because of the high cost of the irrigaton development ranging from $200 to $1,200 an acre to provide a very small supplemental water supply. In addition, these projects would adversely affect the water supply for the lower Colorado River Basin either as to quantity or quality, or both, unless proper safeguards can be secured.

It is the position of the Colorado River Board that neither the Navaho Indian irrigation project nor the San Juan-Chama project, as proposed in the bureau's report, should be authorized by the Congress at this time for construction as Federal undertakings.

Since the primary and almost sole purpose of the Navaho Dam storage unit would be to serve the Navaho Indian irrigation project, and since the irrigation project proposed in the report is infeasible, construction of the Navaho Dam should be deferred until such time as it may be proved to be necessary as a unit of a feasible project for some useful purpose. To construct this reservoir at this time, when it would serve no useful purpose, would only result in an unnecessary waste by evaporation and other reservoir losses of the limited Colorado River system water supply, and in an unwarranted expenditure of $42 million of Federal funds. Furthermore, since the only useful purpose of the dam would beto store water for the Navaho Indian irrigation project, the building of the dam at this time would no doubt be used as an argument to persuade the Congress that the costly and infeasible Navaho Indian irrigation project should be built in order to use the storage created by the dam.

Parenthetically, it is believed there is no need for expenditure of Federal funds in this area as a deterrent to recession, since the general community is thriving with the rapidly expanding development of minerals, oil, and natural gas.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In view of the information presented herein, it is respectfully requested that you use your influence and take such action as you may deem proper and effective to stop any additional appropriations for the construction of Navaho Dam at this time. Your cooperation in reaching this objective will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND MATTHEW,
Chief Engineer.

DAR Resolution on the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Daughters of the American Revolution at their national meeting in Washington, D. C. Said resolution was passed on Thursday, April 17, 1958. House concurrent resolution 205 is also included.

The resolutions follows:

PANAMA CANAL—DAR RESOLUTION PASSED APRIL 17, 1958, AT NATIONAL MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Whereas widespread propaganda of Communist origin has, and still is, aimed at wresting ownership and control of the Panama Canal from the United States and its internationalization; and

Whereas radical elements in the Republic of Panama are carrying on active and highly provocative propaganda on behalf of fantastic demands for (a) further, and impossible, annuity and other benefits, and, (b) the impairment and practical destruction of the absolute and exclusive sovereignty, in perpetuity, of the United States over the constitutionally acquired territory of the Canal Zone, and over the Panama Canal, constructed at the cost of the American taxpayer and maintained and operated by the United States on terms of equality for all nations as required by treaty; and

Whereas these sinister and demagogic agitations have, as their purpose, the liquidation or fatal weakening of such sovereignty, altogether indispensable for the maintenance, operation and protection of the canal, and this without the slightest suggestion of reimbursement to the United States for its vast investment in the canal enterprise: Be it

Resolved, That the 67th Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution respectfully, but most earnestly, urge upon the Congress of the United States, the prompt passage of House Concurrent Resolution 205, now pending, which has for its purpose the reaffirmation of the complete and exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity of the United States over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal in accord with basic treaty agreements.

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

Statement in Support of National Defense Education Bill, H. R. 10381

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the present status of public education in the United States is of great concern and alarm to me as I am sure it is to all the Members. As you are aware, the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor has held lengthy and exhaustive hearings on various Federal aids to bolster our educational system.

It was my privilege to speak out in the cause of public education before the subcommittee. Under leave heretofore granted, I include my statement in support of H. R. 10381, the national defense education bill:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 10381

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very grateful to you for your courtesy in permitting me to make a statement at this vital hearing. In my opinion, the appalling state of education in the United States today is a matter of paramount importance. At a time when an enlightened educational system should provide the vision to lead our Nation onward, it becomes the Nation's duty to revitalize our program of public education and lift it from its present low level.

The public neglect and ultimate decline of education presents a very distressing picture. Our schoolhouses are bulging with millions more schoolchildren each year and our school officials must search harder and longer to find good teachers. Rather than an alibi, however, this must serve as a challenge to our educators. The role of education is more diversified, more complex, more exacting than ever. As a result, the American educational system has almost Gargantuan responsibilities to the youth of our Nation and time. If America is to maintain its position of world leadership, our graduates of tomorrow must be a most imaginative citizenry, ably prepared to assume its responsibilities.

In addition to being a distinct privilege of far-reaching significance to each individual, education is a long-term investment in our future security and independence. To this extent, education is a matter of national concern although primary responsibility for our educational system must rest with the individual States and school districts. In preparing for the age of space, adequate education is of the utmost consequence. As Benjamin Franklin so aptly stated, "The good education of youth has been esteemed by wise men of all ages, as the surest foundation of the happiness both of private families and of commonwealths."

The Federal Government most certainly has a responsibility, therefore, to make sure that American schoolchildren receive a suitable education to assure our Nation's intellectual preeminence. This is the purpose of H. R. 10381, which is sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Alabama, Mr. CARL ELLIOTT, who is also chairman of this hard-working subcommittee. Particularly am I impressed with the provisions of title III of his bill, entitled "National Defense Student Loan Program." This program would allow loans of as much as $1,000 a year to prospective teachers in order for them to attend college. These loans would be canceled, however, at the rate of 20 percent per year for each year's service as a full-time teacher in an accredited school.

Unfortunately, we are not training nearly enough teachers to meet the needs of our school population, but numbers alone fail to give the complete story. In addition to teachers in quantity, we need teachers who are well trained and amply qualified. Our society demands, rather than supermarket-type schooling, what might be called "quality education" or education in depth. No student should ever be skipped over in our educational processes, but every outstanding student should certainly be educated to the fullest capacity. If we are to receive maximuch benefit from our system of education, there is no place for mediocrity in teaching.

For generations, teaching has been one of the noblest and most honorable professions. In terms of service to humanity, it is beyond doubt one of the most rewarding. Yet a critical shortage of teachers now confronts our country. In almost every section of the Nation the supply of competent teachers falls far short of the increasing demand. More importantly, there is every indication that this shortage will grow much, much worse. This, in itself, is probably the most pressing problem facing education in this Nation today.

Good teachers have become scarce for a number of varied reasons. To some extent, the present teacher deficit reflects the low birth rate of the 1930's. True, the impact of World War II and the Korean conflict have had an adverse effect on our educational systems. Perhaps the heaviest teacher loss, however, is due to the growing demand for college-trained specialists in business, industry, and Government. The exodus from the teaching profession in the last two decades has been unparalleled in our history.

Why teachers choose to leave the classroom for shops and offices is indicative of the present decline of our educational system. In a sense, the system has fallen victim to a vacuum of trained manpower which it has failed to fill. Numerous teachers leav-

ing the classrooms have plunged us into an educational depression. What is worse, at least 20 to 35 percent of our potential teachers who have received a well-rounded and general education are lost to other occupations before ever reaching the classroom. Interest in teaching is sadly waning. If we are to reverse this trend and revive the desire to teach, the economic and social position of our teachers in the community needs immediate bolstering.

The immediacy of this problem is borne out by the rapidly increasing school population. In the fall of 1957, the United States Bureau of the Census estimated that some 32.9 million pupils were enrolled in full-time elementary and secondary public schools. This comprises almost one-fifth of our entire national population. By 1960, officials figure the school population will total 37 million and by 1965 it is estimated that there will be 41 million pupils—representing an increase of almost 25 percent within 7 years.

Speedy adjustments in our educational system must be made to handle these bumper classes in our elementary and high schools. These are the formative years and an efficient education is all important. The current shortage of elementary and secondary teachers has been placed at 120,000. This mere figure is misleading, however, since teachers skilled in the instruction of science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines—the courses so necessary in our preparation for tomorrow—are extremely limited in number. It is quite imperative, therefore, that the Nation's overall teaching staff be augmented to accommodate increased student loads, to replace substandard instructors, and also to provide training especially in science and technology which is not now generally available.

In studying the need for teachers in our public school systems, emphasis must be placed on the quality of the educational program. There must be assurances that each school child will have adequate opportunity to acquire an education to the limit of his capabilities. Obviously our educational system cannot operate with maximum efficiency by attempting to utilize unprepared teachers. More than 91,000 full-time teachers, or 7½ percent of all United States elementary and secondary teachers, hold substandard certificates.

After the less competent are weeded out, our educational system can be further improved by the addition of new teachers to offer special instruction and services. Specialized teachers might give remedial help to the handicapped, encourage talented students in neglected fields, and generally fire pupils' imaginations. This Nation is one of specialists, and there is certainly need for specialized training in our public schools.

In addition, our schools must have more teachers to replace those leaving the teaching field, to relieve overcrowding conditions and to serve added enrollments. In each of these categories, the teacher demand is ever growing.

The national defense student loan program, such as proposed in the bill now under consideration, would do much to rectify this unfortunate teacher supply situation. By affording worthy and deserving students the monetary means to attend college, it would help them to help themselves. A loan program of this type is, in my considered opinion, highly justified at this time.

As I have mentioned, public education is a basic responsibility of the various States and school districts. Local control of education must be maintained, but the Federal Government has a definite obligation to ensure the quality of public education. In these crucial times, Federal grants for educational purposes are vitally needed to stimulate interest and awaken the desire to learn.

A Federal loan program as proposed in the Elliott bill would, in effect, serve as a type of local recruitment program for teachers. Communities and school districts might well plan ahead for their teaching needs by encouraging potential teachers to attend college on Federal loans. In providing that the total loan might be canceled if the recipient returned to teach in the public school system, for 4 or 5 years, this legislation provides assurances that a large number of college graduates trained in the teaching profession would, in fact, return to teach school in their hometowns and sections.

There would be many other benefits to a Federal loan program to prospective teachers. It would make possible a college education for the student who was academically qualified but financially unable to go on his own. Once in college on a Federal loan, a student would be encouraged to earn high marks in order to keep his loan. After graduating and entering the teaching profession, the loan recipient could well look on the subsequent cancellation of his loan as a portion of his "salary" from teaching. Indeed, if he were to enter any other profession, he would have to pay back $1,000 or so per year, taking away from his net salary.

It is apparent, therefore, that the national defense student loan program has numerous long-term educational advantages. It provides the necessary machinery to produce the additional qualified teachers we so desperately need. It would set in motion a process which could result in a steady upgrading of our educational level.

Unless something is done, and that speedily, in the interests of public education, all of us will suffer. Certainly a student loan program allowing Federal grants is meritorious in its scope and fully warranted by the present status of public education. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge its adoption.

Thank you.

Plight of the Small Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 14, Mr. J. B. McMillan, president of the Texas Broiler Association, directed a letter to me, and I am glad to note that Mr. McMillan realizes the dead seriousness of the present situation. The administration of the agricultural policy, under the leadership of Secretary Benson and with the wholehearted support of President Eisenhower, is forcing the American farmer off his land at a rate never before equalled in the history of our country.

Our giant corporations already own or control most of the national resources of our country. Corporations control the oil, natural gas, coal, iron, aluminum, forestry products, and the fisheries. Multi-million-dollar corporations buy and pack the meat and process the cereals. Other giant corporations manufacture the trucks, automobiles, farming implements and appliances. The private merchant as we once knew him is almost extinct, and the giant food chains have taken over the retail field.

The soil of the United States, where the food and fiber which feeds and clothes this Nation is produced, is the only great natural resource still owned in a considerable part by individuals. But the heat is on to displace these individual families with corporation-production, with farmers doing the work in a state of peonage which would rival anything that may have been found in the old world.

More strength to the good right arm of men like Mr. McMillan. Let us tell the story from one end of this land to the other so that the farmer may know the facts. The time is short—the conditions critical—it is later than you think.

The letter follows:

TEXAS BROILER ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Garrison, Tex., April 14, 1958.
Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHRISTOPHER: Through the courtesy of Mrs. Stetzel of Paris, Ark., I have read copies of some of your letters and wish to commend you for your fine attitude and broad grasp of the situation.

I thoroughly agree with you that only the Federal Government can do anything for farm folks and that Benson has kicked out all farmers from the USDA and installed yes men from the food, feed, and milling industries. Such unjust handling only adds insult to injury, since no other group in America are denied the right to have their own men represent them in Government departments. As a matter of fact, I have long felt that the so-called farm problem is largely manufactured by the predatory interests of big business for their own exploitation of farm folks and deeply believe that, there is nothing whatever wrong with American farms which farmers themselves can not remedy, provided the antifarmers are driven out of USDA and position of dominance in agriculture. Only Congress can do that.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER, as I see it, we farmers today face the greatest crisis in the entire history of American agriculture, since 5 million farm folks have been driven from their farm homes and the land they love while the remaining farm population are doomed to the most galling economic slavery of modern times with the ruined millions forced to live on the land that was once their birthright and to work for absentee landlords they never see. * * * Thousands today suffer that terrible bondage at wage rates ranging from 12½ cents to 25 cents an hour. Just think of such appalling conditions in our enlightened day and in a country where the policy of Government has set $1 per hour as the minimum wage. But alas, the farmers have been excluded from the benefits of law while exposed to all the severity of the law just as the Plebians were in ancient Rome. Where is the justice? Where is the reason for such shameful exploitation, robbery made all the more galling because it is done under Government sanction? Why are the farm folks left naked and alone at the mercy of vast combinations of greed-crazed monopoly? Why is USDA allowed to pursue its cruel and inhuman antifarm policies solely in the interests of malefactors of big business and to the grievous injury of both farm and country?

And in our poultry industry, the great enemy is evil, unbridled monopoly, hiding behind the fancy facade known to infame as vertical integration, the most vicious and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

destructive monopoly in American history and far more vicious than anything Teddy Roosevelt had to fight in the dawning years of the century. But this unmitigated, indefensible evil is backed, endorsed, and encouraged by the moguls of big business, currently running USDA and enforcing cruelly unfair and unjust policies deliberately designed to enthrone corporation farming and to destroy the last vestiges of the traditional family farm which has, since colonial times, been the backbone and mainstay of the Nation.

And this hell on earth, vertical integration, having enabled vast combines of wealth to dispossess thousands upon thousands of farm folks and to absorb an estimated 90 percent of the broiler industry in its deadly grasp, is now moving into other fields of agriculture, notably swine production, where it has already moved in the first stages of vertical integration, so-called contract growing which always comes just ahead of the paralyzing mass production against which nothing under heaven except the might of Congress can now stand. This vile and utterly evil monopoly made a mockery of free enterprise and completely unhinged the law of supply and demand, thus making economic slaves of thousands upon thousands of once independent small farmers.

There, on the very verge of farm catastrophe, we poultry farmers look to Congress as the only power now capable of arresting the arrogant billion-dollar monopoly, vertical integration, and hope that you will arise and restrain the evil so that thousands may survive on the farm.

Assuring you that we are grateful for your fine sentiments and trusting that you will join with others and do something about the most deadly economic evil of the 20th century, I am,

Sincerely,

J. B. McMILLAN,
President, Texas Broiler Association; Also a Director and Member of the Executive Committee of United States Poultry & Egg Producers Association, Inc.

Experiments by Teen-Age Rocketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MANY HAVE EARMARKS OF KEEN SCIENTISTS

(By George N. Allen)

Who are the amateur rocketeers who have caused many public and private agencies to commend teen-age experiments with live rockets?

Are they children playing dangerous games with "candlestick" rockets? Or are they serious young scientists?

A club of six Bronx boys is typical of the advanced groups. Aged 15 to 19, they are building a 17-foot rocket designed to reach 100 miles altitude and a speed of 2,000 miles an hour. It will carry a full payload of instruments to measure temperatures, cosmic rays, meteorites, engine performance and will be powered by professional fuel.

The boys have nearly all won prizes in their separate fields of physics, chemistry, radio, and medicine. One has already fired about 250 smaller rockets. Their knowledge, displayed in a 2-hour discussion of their project, is awe-inspiring. They rattle off complicated formulas and equations with the same certainty that other boys recite baseball statistics.

Their rocket cannot be fired anywhere except a fully-equipped professional launching site. Capt. Bertrand Brinley, news chief of the First Army, said he would attempt to get Army permission for them to use official facilities.

ASK TO STAY ANONYMOUS

The boys asked to remain anonymous to avoid undue publicity before they complete their project.

This group became known when they wrote to Captain Brinley, in response to an appeal he made through the press for amateur rocketeers to write him of their projects. Boys deluged him with letters pleading for aid, advice, supervision, facilities. The Army man says the letters indicate a widespread, serious interest in space technology. He estimates that about 3,000 boys in the metropolitan area currently are experimenting with rockets and that about 5,000 will be doing so by summer.

Many letters show a surprising knowledge of the scientific complexities involved in fuels, instruments, and design. This one from a 16-year-old is typical of the serious experimenters:

"I am aware of most of the dangers of rocket testing and firing and my mother and father are helping to the best of their ability toward my safety. In the rockets that I am going to send up there will be instruments to radio back the effects of aerodynamic heating. I am experimenting with various metals and alloys."

To check on whether their ideas were matched by their abilities, a reporter interviewed a number of the stripling space men.

ENGINE BUILT

One, George Berger, 16, of Far Rockaway, has on his drawing board blueprints for a 12-foot rocket designed to reach an altitude of 5 to 10 miles and a speed of 1,000 miles an hour. He already has built the engine, a high-pressure fuel tank, a fuel-control system, and a launching panel.

"The panel is designed," George explained, "to insure safety during the countdown. If anything goes wrong I can pull a plug and everything does dead. I am planning to use liquid oxygen and alcohol for fuel. The rocket will have a guidance system, an emergency system to blow it up if it gets out of control, a radio transmitter, and a device to report on engine performance in flight."

George is a high-school sophomore and hopes to go on to a technical college to study missiles. He has been studying rockets for 3 years. Total cost of his rocket will be about $100.

A less-advanced group in Brooklyn has reached the stage where they are firing 2- and 3-foot rockets without instruments. Robert Hall, 15, is a leader of the group. His mother explained that the parents of the boys have formed an informal group to supervise their activities.

USE DESOLATE AREA

"We take the boys out to a desolate area of Long Island," she said, "where they can fire their rockets without hurting anyone. We gave them notes so they can buy the chemicals they need for fuel."

Asked if she was aware of the potential danger involved in handling rocket fuel, Mrs. Hall replied:

"We recognize the danger. But we believe many other things boys do are more dangerous. We supervise all their fuel handling and don't allow them to mix chemicals where anyone might get hurt. And isn't it true that a bit of danger always makes a thing more attractive to a healthy boy?"

Higher Prices Attracting Foreign Beef Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Eric Johnston's committee is out over the country trying to drum up support for his completely bogus foreign-trade program. The American farmer is a particular target for false slogans, innuendoes, and fear psychology. They do not dare tell the American people that foreign exports are falling off except where we are paying the other country to buy our goods. They do not dare tell the American people about the hundreds of thousands of jobs that could be added to those presently engaged in foreign commerce through a truly mutually advantageous reciprocal trade program.

A desperate attempt is being made by Eric Johnston, Charlie Taft, and company to mislead, bamboozle, and hornswoggle the American tobacco farmer. This present attempt smacks of sheer chicanery and fraud in that in a few years they will do the same thing to the tobacco farmer and the tobacco industry that they have already done to the cotton farmer and the textile industry.

While trying to fool and temporarily brainwash the tobacco farmer, the ICA, under the table and behind the tobacco farmer's back in the secret recesses of distant lands, are teaching the people the art of American agriculture with the American taxpayer's dollars. I might remind the American tobacco farmers that this same Mr. Taft is listed as an official in the International Cooperation Administration. Their policy is to play one industry against the other, to play one segment of agriculture against the other until their nefarious scheme of growing our crops takes roots all over the world in foreign lands.

We are exporting less tobacco under Johnston and Taft's policy of "trade for the benefit of foreign countries" than we did in the year 1920.

I might remind our tobacco farmers that the millions of employees of the coal, oil, lead, zinc, plywood, and textile industries could purchase millions of pounds of tobacco and smoke the cigarettes if they could be placed on full time with time and half for overtime which they formerly enjoyed before Johnston, Taft, and company started all their one-world treatment.

Every segment of American agriculture, as it reached a climax of prosperity, has in turn been beaten back by fallacious administration of foreign trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the livestock industry is enjoying the best prices in years, their turn is next. Here it is for the American beef producers to see.

The following editorial was taken from the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal:

HIGHER PRICES ATTRACTING FOREIGN BEEF COMPETITION

As many cattlemen had feared would be the case, cattle returns are attracting stock from outside the continental United States to compete for a share of the market. And despite what domestic cattlemen think about such competition, there is not really much of a barrier against it.

Thus a current item in the West Coast New heralds the fact that beef from New Zealand cattle is to be available in butcher shops out there by summer. And cattle from Australia are definitely slated to be imported here in the near future.

Word received here is that a cattle importing firm has been organized for the purpose of bringing over both New Zealand and Australian cattle. A shipment of New Zealand cattle suitable for further finishing was due to arrive on the California coast around April 1. Most of these will go into feedlots, although a few may be fat enough for immediate slaughter. Included are around 1,700 head of steers 2 years old and older, and the report is they were bought in New Zealand for 9 cents a pound. Freight and other charges will probably add at least that much to their laid-down price here in the United States.

Another report tells of another firm having contracted for 6,000 New Zealand steers averaging over 1,000 pounds at around $10 a hundred. Freight would add around $11 a hundredweight to that price, making them cost around $21 a hundredweight laid down. The importers hope to realize $2 to $3 a hundred on them. It is reported that the boat trip from New Zealand takes 22 days and that shipping charges run about $7 per 100 pounds on cattle.

The tariff barrier does not offer domestic cattlemen much protection against such competition. The rate on cattle over 700 pounds is 1½ cents a pound on the first 400,000 brought in. After 400,000, rate rises to 2½ cents. There is no rate break on lighter cattle weighing 200 to 700 pounds, and all come in at 2½ cents. On calves under 200 pounds the duty rate is 1½ cents on the first 200,000 head and beyond that, 2½ cents.

It is possible for any domestic group to increase its protection against foreign imports under an escape clause in the tariff laws. This may be done by appealing to the United States Tariff Commission in Washington. If the relief is granted, the President has the power to change duties and quotas immediately to provide for such.

Despite the favorable level of prices prevailing on cattle in this country, there is certainly no shortage, and definitely no excuse for bringing in a flood of cheaply-produced foreign beeves to help drag down market prices. Producers of beef in the United States are capable of turning out all the Nation can use, and even at this moment are increasing their herds for larger output in the years ahead. Thus it would appear that they deserve adequate protection from foreign competition through a realistic tariff rate.

All in Favor Say "Aye"—We Like Miller, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, my second of the Davis motion that Fishbait Miller is one of the "most" and/or "greatest." Fishbait does things for you as if it were his entire pleasure. His care, attention, understanding, and help in any and all problems, large and small, is way above and beyond the call of duty, and done always with the best humor. No wonder he is so popular. All in favor say "aye." Aye.

Speech by Gordon H. Scherer, 67th Continental Congress, Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, April 14, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by GORDON H. SCHERER, 67th Continental Congress, Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, April 14, 1958:

Practically everything that the Daughters of the American Revolution said and did at its Continental Congress a quarter of a century ago, I am certain was applauded by the great majority of our countrymen. What you do and say here this week, however, will bring wide and varied reactions. They will range from approbation by the great veteran organizations of this country and your sister patriotic societies to ridicule, contempt, and hatred by the Communist conspirators within our American community. The ill will of the latter, our sworn enemies and would-be destroyers, we expect. They are the challenge we must face in our time. They are the Concord, the Bunker Hill, and the Valley Forge of today, tomorrow, and God only knows when after that.

Then there is that fast-growing, cynical segment of the populace which scorns and scoffs at any mention of patriotism. To them patriotism represents immaturity, narrowness, and old-fashioned sentilmentalism. To them reverence for the flag is a childish emotional display for those who relish silly rituals and ceremonies. To them Americanism is not even secondary to one worldism. To them the American heritage and basic constitutional rights should be chipped away and even surrendered when political expediency—treaty by executive agreement—demands.

Then last there is that group of self-styled loyal citizens to whom the word "Americanism" is distasteful although they do not admit it. They are the extreme left-wing, who for one reason or another have lost faith in the American system. They believe in a qualified loyalty to this Government which leaves room for socialism and communism. They are the people who through the years, wittingly and unwittingly, have given their names, money, and prestige to innumerable Communist-front organizations and causes. Among them are those who are the foolish and naive puppets of the Communist agents within. They are the people to whom Georgi Dimitrov, one of the top world Communists, refers when he says:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground: Let our friends do the work."

Dimitrov continues:

"We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A univeristy professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, is worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police."

Dimitrov concludes:

"Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

So spoke this member of the Communist hibrarchy just a few years ago.

These are the people who will vehemently oppose and attempt to discredit and distort what the 67th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution will do and say in the Nation's Capital this week.

It is the same group which has been attempting over the years to strangle or destroy the FBI, the investigating committees of Congress, and those who have stood in the forefront of this fight, stalwarts like Pat McCarran, Joe McCarthy, Martin Dies, J. Edgar Hoover, Bill Jenner, Francis Walter, and Dick Arens. I know these men; thank God, they are on the same side as the DAR and the Legion in this battle.

The tragedy of this hour is that, in spite of all that has been revealed, so few Americans—in fact, only a handful—understand the Communist mind and the strategy used by the Soviets to reach their goal of world domination.

Such lack of knowledge is understandable when even the Supreme Court of the United States, by a series of disheartening decisions, has demonstrated that it too has failed to grasp the modus operandi of at least one phase of the total offensive new being waged against the free world by the Kremlin.

As long as the Supreme Court has violated all precedent by going beyond the record and consulting the dubious writings of foreign Socialists as authority for its decisions, may I suggest that the High Court take a look at a book written by E. H. Cookridge, an authority on the Communist conspiratorial apparatus.

The Court might learn that the Communist Party is not a political party as we know political parties in the United States—that we are not dealing with an economic or political philosophy, as the Court's recent decisions suggest. It might at long last find out, as Cookridge says, that "we are dealing with the sordid story of theft of atomic and NATO secrets, of arson, sabotage, poisoning, assassination, infiltration, and subversion, plotted in Moscow and carried out all over the world."

It was the investigating committees of the Congress which finally brought to light the penetration of this fifth column in the United States. They recommended law after law to deal with this threat from within.

With one fell swoop last year, the Supreme Court seriously weakened, if not destroyed, most of the weapons that have been available to deal effectively with this conspiracy.

Our committee was commencing hearings in San Francisco on the day the Supreme Court handed down the Watkins decision, dealing with congressional investigations of Communists, and the Yates case freeing the convicted California Communists. On that day—Red Monday—a former chairman of the Communist Party in California rejoicingly exclaimed:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"It was the greatest victory the Communist Party has ever received." She continued: "It will mark a rejuvenation of the party in America. We have lost some of our members in the last few years, but now we are on our way."

The committee saw and felt that rejuvenation at the San Francisco hearings. During the last few years, the Communist hangers-on at such hearings had diminished. Enthusiasm had been dampened. The witnesses exhibited less confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Communist cause.

All this was changed in San Francisco. The Communists filled the large hearing room and overflowed into the corridors. Their snide and vituperative remarks to Committee members as they passed through the halls were again in evidence. The witnesses and the lawyers were jubilant as well as arrogant. The delaying tactics, the evasiveness, and the long Communist propaganda speeches returned.

Yes; it was a great day for the Kremlin but an ominous one for the people of the United States. So few, including the Supreme Court, understand that there is more to save than the geography of the United States.

Since these frightful decisions of the Court last year, what has been the Communist strategy in the United States?

On September 20 last in Carnegie Music Hall, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, heartened by the "Red Monday" decisions of the Supreme Court, started a nationwide campaign to abolish the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the investigating committees. Meetings in cities all over the United States were set up. Congressmen were to be contacted in their home districts and urged to vote against the forthcoming appropriation for the operation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Our Committee placed in the hands of every Member of Congress a publication entitled "Operation Abolition," which revealed the long Communist and Communist-front records of practically every leader in the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. While the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee's Operation Abolition failed in its effort to destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities by cutting off its appropriation, I am sorry to report that the campaign for abolition goes on unabated among the left-wing crowd.

Since your 1957 DAR Continental Congress, the Communists have started a clever and subtle propaganda offensive, contending that the Communist Party is shattered and dying in the United States, that Americans need have no further concern, and, therefore, investigating committees are institutions of the past which are beating dead horses for personal political aggrandizement.

They are holding out the olive branch. A worldwide peace offensive is now in progress. All we have to do is sit down at summit conferences and enter into a few executive agreements with the gangsters of the Kremlin, the slaughterers of the Hungarian freedom fighters, and we will be on our way toward peace. But the kind of peace, I assure you, that we would buy at a price, even at the sacrifice of truth, honor, and righteousness.

I need not remind you that the United States has already had 19 top-level conferences with the schemers of the Kremlin. Forty agreements resulted; only three—which the Soviets felt were to their advantage—have been kept. In all, the butchers of the Kremlin, in the short span of their 40-year history, have entered into nearly 1000 treaties, nonaggression pacts, and agreements with other countries. In every single instance when it served the interest of the Soviet Union to do so, these pacts were flagrantly violated in its drive toward world domination.

Another compelling objection to continued dealings with the masters of the Kremlin is the effect such meetings have on the people inside the Soviet orbit, the great majority of whom are anti-Communist. Eugene Lyons, in his book entitled "Our Secret Allies," dramatically points out that, if we are ever to win this conflict, we will need these secret allies—the people behind the Iron Curtain.

We have just given $225 million to neutralist India, yet Nehru, among other things, tells the world that Russia's occupation of Hungary is no different from our position in Japan.

A short time ago we sent $63 million in farm surpluses to Communist Yugoslavia after we cut off military aid to Tito at his request because such contributions were embarrassing both to him and to his bed partner, Khrushchev.

Of the $193 million doled out to Communist Poland in less than a year, $98 million was given as late as February. It did not go to the Polish people in their fight for freedom, but to Gomulka. As Senator STYLES BRIDGES said:

"We merely made it possible for Gomulka to quiet the natural unrest in opposition to his Communist regime. Far from helping free people along the road to self-determination, we are actually forging stronger chains for their bondage."

What has become of the honor of this Nation when we attempt to bribe our sworn enemies and betray those whom they hold in bondage? Is this the price we must pay for so-called peace?

The recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations—for which, I am sorry to say, there is a growing sentiment—would mean the death knell of anti-Communist resistance on the part of some 500 million Chinese, who, historically and traditionally, have been friendly to this country. The DAR is to be congratulated on the resolution it adopted last year, recommending that the United States withdraw from the United Nations if Red China is admitted. This great organization was quick to see through the Communist line—parroted by dupes and soft heads—that recognition of the Red clique in Peiping was the same as recognition of the millions whom they have enslaved.

Before Americans are seduced by the current Communist peace offensive, they should reflect upon a statement by Dimitri Z. Manuilsky, made in 1931 when he was instructor in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow. He said:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable * * *.

"To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions."

Ladies, does this have a familiar ring today?

Manuilsky continued:

"The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

And now listen to J. Edgar Hoover, the greatest authority on internal subversion, in his latest Independence Day warning to the American people. He said:

"Public apathy is the sure way to national suicide—to death of individual freedom. It allowed the Communists to penetrate and make satellites of once-free countries, and it is presently enabling them to honeycomb and weaken the structures of the remaining countries, and there is today a terrifying apathy on the part of Americans toward the deadliest danger which this country has ever faced. Some of that apathy is deliberately induced."

Hoover continued:

"The Communist Party in the United States is not out of business; it is not dead; it is not even dormant. It is, however, well on its way to achieving its current objective, which is to make you believe that it is shattered, ineffective, and dying. When it has fully achieved this first objective, it will then proceed inflexibly toward its final goal * * *.

"Those who try to minimize its danger are either uninformed or they have a deadly ax to grind."

Do I hear someone say that no one pays attention to the Communist-front Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in its current campaign to subvert our security agencies? Listen to how a newspaper in the Nation's Capital has been brainwashed (and I am being charitable when I say "brainwashed"). The Washington Post, in an editorial designed to influence Congress against voting for the appropriation to the Committee on Un-American Activities this year, said:

"For 20 years the committee has been disclosing and reporting on the pattern of Communist infiltration of American life; this part of its function has long since been completed, and the pattern of the past no longer has much application to the present."

The editorial then continued with a plea to strangle the committee.

If time permitted, I could give you example after example of subversive activities being brought to the cold light of common day by the committee—activities revealing a diabolical pattern of the present, which even the Supreme Court ought to be able to comprehend. Let's take a look at just two cases which are as current as today's newspaper.

We have been worried about sputniks in outer space. The committee uncovered a sputnik right in the Congress of the United States—not 5 years ago, not 2 years ago, not 1 year ago, but just a few months ago.

The Communist record of one Wilfred Lumer was recently brought to light. Now who is Wilfred Lumer? He is the man who was doing research for Members of the House and for at least two committees of this Congress. The results of his handiwork found their way into reports on legislation that is being considered by this present Congress.

Let me quote just two questions and answers from his testimony which will clearly illustrate my point.

Mr. Arens (counsel for the committee): "Have you reported your activities on the Hill, on Capitol Hill, over the course of the last several years to a person known by you to be a Communist?"

Mr. Lumer: "I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments."

Mr. Arens: "We have information, and I want to be absolutely frank with you, Mr. Lumer—we have information that in the recent past you have been in contact with, and under discipline of, Sam Abbott, a ranking Communist in the District of Columbia. We want to give you an opportunity now while under oath to deny it."

Mr. Lumer: "I must decline to answer that on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments."

Just a month ago today in hearings in Boston, Mass., the Committee on Un-American Activities heard the testimony of a man who was then—at that moment—an undercover agent of the FBI in the Communist Party. He had served in that capacity for over 8 years in several key posts in the conspiracy. "The Communist Party today in the United States," he said, "is a greater menace than ever before. It is deeper underground, is more disciplined, more determined and more effective than it has ever been."

Let's take a look at still another current operation of the conspiracy. Some 10 million pieces of subtle, effective Communist propaganda from Iron Curtain countries are coming into this country annually through the United States mail. Let me describe one of a series of committee hearings dealing with Communist political propaganda.

Our committee met in Buffalo a few months ago. On the courtroom floor were dozens of large sacks of mail. They were opened at random and their contents dumped on the tables.

Eighty percent of the mail in those sacks was pro-Russian propaganda in one form or another, addressed to people in the Buffal community. Part of this propaganda, printed in 11 different languages, is directed to various nationality groups, often to individuals who have migrated to the United States or who have families still living under the Kremlin's heel.

The propaganda is cleverly and subtly presented in magazines, newspapers, and pamphlets which from a casual perusal do not reveal the poison therein contained. Expensive magazines, comparable in size and format to our Life and Look publications, are sent free or sell for only a small fraction of the cost of printing. They are obviously subsidized by the Communist propaganda agencies since they carry no advertising whatsoever.

Those who want you to believe that the Communist Party is shattered, ineffective, and dying, and that the investigating committees are beating a dead horse for headlines point to the recent folding-up of the Daily Worker to sustain their charges. The Daily Worker's demise was not a natural death. It was a well-planned suicide. So let's not be too jubilant over the Daily Worker's sham burial rites. The conspiracy has only switched its strategy by flooding this country with a more subtle propaganda.

When the Communists want to influence the attitude of certain nationality groups in this country on current political and other issues, there appears a rash of concentrated mailings to these groups.

People who receive these mailings often become greatly disturbed when they find that the Communists know their addresses in the United States. Some were so upset that they changed their residences and their names. Some became panic-stricken when within a few weeks mailings arrived at their new addresses with their changed names.

Our committee determined how these addresses were obtained by the overseas Communist propagandists. The findings illustrate how effective one Communist can be. The argument made by the leftwing that there is nothing to fear because there are so few Communists in the United States is again negated.

Let's take a look at one method used. A member of the Communist Party joins, say, a Polish singing society. His Communist connections, of course, are unknown to the members of the group. He surreptitiously obtains the mailing list of the organization. One of his obligations to the Communist conspiracy is fulfilled when he sneaks that list behind the Iron Curtain.

Let me give you a few excerpts from the record of the hearings. A woman writes to a postal official as follows:

"Lately I have been receiving propaganda from abroad. I do not know who sent my name in or how they found my address."

A former resident of Berlin has this to say:

"I would like to advise you that I do not want any mail sent to me sealed from Berlin. This is black, dirty Communist Party literature to return us new Americans to our native countries. I am loyal to my new home, the United States of America."

A group of displaced persons wrote as follows:

"We, the displaced persons, been getting by mail, Communist propaganda here in five different languages. * * * We are very sorry we cannot give our names and addresses in this letter; we are in fear of danger same as five Russian seamen been kidnapped from here. * * * All we ask kindly to stop the propaganda mail coming over so we can live peacefully."

A professor at one of our universities, as late as January 1 of this year, wrote to the committee in part as follows:

"I am enclosing a bit of East German literary work. * * * I am concerned about the influence of this propaganda upon the average person in this country. * * *

"This is obviously a government-subsidized venture. * * * They take unfair advantage of the absence of censorship by the United States mail to further their shady cause, which is to cast doubt upon the United States position toward Russia. They provide additional eyewash for those who are eager to forget the Hungarian struggle for freedom, and to break down American morale by 'proving' that the Russians aren't so bad after all. * * *

"It is an example of the new twist in Red psychological warfare. * * * The stuff is poisonous and, even if the reader is critical, too many of the facts are out of his reach. Maybe some education by your committee of potential recipients of such propaganda would help."

So wrote a college professor.

There is another facet to this Communist propaganda offensive. Some months ago the country was flooded with what purported to be scientific radio journals from the Soviet Union. Great prominence was given in these journals to a quiz for ham radio operators. A series of prizes were offered to the winners.

It is significant that, after the contestant had answered the questions, which in themselves were filled with propaganda, he was asked to give his address, the call letters of his radio station, and other pertinent information about his activities as a ham operator. It would be presumptuous for me to detail how highly valuable such information is, not only to the propagandists but also to the Russian secret police.

Of the tremendous number who participated in this contest, it is significant that not one person but several thousand won the second prize. It was a copy of a publication entitled "Radio Moscow." The Communists certainly got a lot of mileage out of the rubles spent on this one.

Under the first amendment this propaganda cannot be barred. The committee does, however, want a law with teeth which will require this Communist propaganda to be labeled as such. If our pure food and drug laws can require that certain foods, medicines, and poison, which go into our stomachs, be properly labeled, then certainly the law should provide that poison for the mind should also be unmistakably labeled.

The straw that broke the camel's back in these hearings was the development of the fact that the taxpayers of the United States who are subsidizing our tremendous postal deficit, help to pay the heavy cost of delivering this propaganda which would destroy us.

As I said in an article in this month's American Opinion, today there are those who still think of war in terms of military aggression—of planes, guided missiles, and nuclear projectiles. So few understand that firepower—destructive force—is only one of the weapons, one phase of the total offensive being waged by the Soviets against the West.

Here is the appraisal of Gen. Albert Wedemeyer who, you will recall, served as chief of our World War II planning operations. Testifying recently before the Committee on Un-American Activities, he said:

"The Soviets are obtaining their objectives without the use of military force. If I were the senior planner in the Soviet hierarchy, I would advise Khrushchev to continue to do exactly what he is doing now."

Just a few weeks ago the Washington Star, in headlining the latest statement of Allen Dulles, Chief of our Central Intelligence Agency, said: "Subversion, Not Arms, Is Chief Red Weapon."

All of the credible evidence indicates that the firepower and destructive force of the East and the West are fairly well balanced. The Russians are not dumb. They know that an all-out nuclear war will mean the total destruction of their cities—that today the United States would win such a conflict. Consequently, we are not going to have a nuclear showdown in the foreseeable future.

The Kremlin is not going to sign its own death warrant—and why should it? So few understand that in the last decade the Communists have been incredibly successful in expanding the Soviet empire by the use of a weapon far more effective than sputniks or nuclear missiles and certainly less costly.

So few understand that the insidious and diabolical weapon of infiltration and subversion has done the job of taking approximately one-third of the earth's surface and one-third of its people into the Communist orbit and that another one-third, in the so-called neutral bloc, is fast drifting toward Russian satelliteism.

So few understand that, while the near equality of firepower between the East and West creates the present military stalemate, the effective weapon of infiltration and subversion is the deadly cancer at work on the institutions and governments of free men everywhere.

We are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system. We are not merely faced with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government. We are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy whom we can ignore, appease, negotiate with—only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or face slavery and destruction.

Robert T. Hartmann Honored for Excellent Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would not hazard a guess as to the amount of copy filed by the Washington press corps each day, but the true figure would astound all of us.

Seldom do we stop to judge the quality of Washington reporting as we read the thousands of words moved daily by capital correspondents. The reporting actually is excellent considering the tremendous pressures under which the press corps must operate in the biggest news-producing city in the world.

Probably the most competent authority for judging the excellence of news

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

reporting is Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity.

Recently Sigma Delta Chi announced its awards for excellence in the numerous categories of the information and communications media of the United States.

Selected for excellence for Washington reporting was Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Bureau in the Capital.

I know Mr. Hartmann personally and I know of the tireless effort he puts into digging out the news. This energy, combined with exceeding talent, has earned Mr. Hartmann this well-deserved honor.

I congratulate Sigma Delta Chi and Mr. Hartmann for the high standards they insist upon in reporting the news to the American people.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, last month the Alaska Statehood Committee, an official agency of the Alaska Territorial Government, met at Juneau, Alaska. At that meeting a resolution was adopted requesting immediate statehood for Alaska.

The resolution sets forth a case for Alaska statehood. I am glad to present it here for the information of the House:

RESOLUTION

To the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, and Presiding Officer of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; Members of the Senate, Congress of the United States; Members of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States; and the Honorable Secretary of State; Secretary of the Interior; Secretary of Agriculture; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Secretary of Commerce; and the Attorney General of the United States:

We, the members of the Alaska Statehood Committee, an official bipartisan agency of the Alaska Territorial government, in formal session assembled at the capital city of Juneau, Alaska, respectfully request that you support and urge the immediate passage of Alaska Statehood enabling legislation by the Congress of the United States, and submit for your consideration the following reasons:

ALASKANS DESERVE AND ARE READY FOR STATEHOOD

The ideals of self-determination and self-government constitute the foundations of our American system of democratic government. The treaty under which the United States acquired the Territory of Alaska from Russia on March 30, 1867, guaranteed the resident of Alaska the rights of full citizenship in the United States.

Alaskans have demonstrated over a period of many years their ability to govern and administer their own affairs even under the inadequate and cumbersome governmental structure and authority inherent in their present Territorial status.

Consecutive Alaskan Legislatures have established and now maintain all branches of government essential to the operation of a State, with the exception of a judiciary system, which area is now reserved to the Federal Government. These departments include education, health, welfare, social security, taxation and revenue, Finance, highways and public works, fish and game, mines, police and many boards and commissions essential to the effective operation of a modern State government.

Alaskans have amply demonstrated their desires and abilities to govern themselves and to support the costs of operating and maintaining an adequate level of State government. Alaskans are ready for statehood now.

ALASKA NEEDS STATEHOOD; THE UNITED STATES NEEDS THE STATE OF ALASKA

Alaska is a vast area with rich natural resources of undetermined extent. To induce private exploratory capital to enter Alaska in sufficiently large quantities to explore, locate, and later bring into production such natural resources, a stable local government at the State level is needed.

Large amounts of Federal Government money have been and are being expended in Alaska for military and defense purposes; however, private investment capital is available in only limited amounts for short periods at high interest rates.

Private capital in large quantities is loath to enter an area where, by the actions of a Federal Government, not elected from its people and sitting over 4,000 miles away in Washington, D. C., can upset and, by failure to appropriate adequate funds, can overturn Alaska's economy in the course of one fiscal year.

In contrast to Alaska, governed and controlled as a Territory by the United States Federal Government, Canadian provinces in the same latitudes, with local provincial governments similar to our State governments, are prospering and developing their natural resources rapidly under the impetus of private capital investments. Alaska, as a Territory under the United States Federal Government, with equal or even greater resources, is lagging far behind in this respect.

The Dominion Government of Canada states that in 1957, $3 million of American private capital was invested in Canada every 24 hours, a large percentage of which was invested in exploration and development of natural resources and needed minerals. Alaska is lagging behind in economic development because of its cumbersome, nonrepresentative, relatively inefficient, and unstable Territorial form of government.

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS ALASKA AS A STATE

In the course of the military and defense program in Alaska some highly intelligent and well-informed United States military leaders have recognized the need for a representative State form of government. They have based their reasoning on the facts that a State would have a more rapid economic development and a more rapid increase of population, and that a well-developed economy functioning normally is more easily converted to a military and defense program than a barren, undeveloped land. They further reasoned that an economy with supply, communications, and transportation facilities developed and supported by, and for, everyday civilian needs was more economical to convert and use for military and defense purposes than a complete parallel military development constructed through the exclusive use of Federal military funds.

Under statehood, Alaska's economy would prosper and offer added opportunities and employment for American citizens and American capital.

The population of the United States is increasing rapidly. The United States Census Bureau estimates that at the present time the United States has a population of 172 million people. They estimate that by 1975 the population of the United States will approach 200 million people. At the present time there are an estimated 600,000 added employable people annually seeking employment in the United States labor market. If encouraged and allowed to develop under statehood and with private investment capital, Alaska's vast resources could assist in offering employment to and absorbing substantial numbers of these employables.

With the United States economy at its present level, those States that have substantial production of natural resources are showing the least unemployment and suffering. The most notable example is the State of Texas; however, States with similar natural resources in the Rocky Mountain group indicate like economic health in comparison with the greater unemployment in the industrial and industrial-processing States. Alaska's economy under statehood would be that of a natural-resource State and could be expected to induce investment and the development of its resources by private capital and the subsequent employment of greater numbers of United States citizens.

At the present time Alaska contains known commercial deposits of oil, gas, coal, iron, nickel, lead, tin, tungstenite ores, mercury, sulfur, magnesium, manganese, copper, cobalt, silver, gold, and radioactive ores, including uranium. Under the added impetus of State government, the exploration, development, and bringing into commercial production of these and other natural resources of Alaska would be accelerated. For rough processing of our natural-resource materials into a form that would permit their shipment to the United States and world markets, Alaska has the greatest untapped reserve of potential hydroelectric power remaining on the North American continent. Waterpower development would make more rapid progress under statehood.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD SHOW THE WORLD

In the field of foreign affairs at this time, when the United States is seeking by many means to insure the support and confidence of other nations, and at a time when confidence and respect for the American democratic ideals and principles is threatened, the granting of statehood and self-determination to Alaska would most effectively show the world that the United States practices the principles and ideals upon which it was founded.

We again request that you support and urge the immediate passage of Alaska statehood enabling legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Alaska Statehood Committee: R. B. Atwood, chairman; M. Stepovich, Governor of Alaska and ex-officio member; E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska and ex-officio member; Mildred R. Hermann, secretary and delegate to constitutional convention; Victor C. Rivers, president, Alaska Senate and delegate to constitutional convention; Warren Taylor, member of the house of representatives, Alaska Legislature, and delegate to the constitutional convention; Percy Ipalook, former member of the house of representatives, Alaska Legislature and Alaska Statehood Committee member; Jack Hinckel, delegate to constitutional convention and Alaska Statehood Committee member; Mike Walsh, delegate to the constitutional convention and Alaska Statehood Committee member.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *March 8, 1958.*

United States Trade Policy Hit by Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest dangers to the free world today is the maladministration of the great reciprocal trade program in the United States. During and after World War II, America was known as the arsenal of democracy. The products of American labor and industry influenced the decision on every battlefield and stemmed the tide of Communist infiltration. America's high standard of living was an example and model for the world. Now, this great American arsenal of freedom is being gravely threatened by the undermining of our wage and hour benefits by placing American labor in direct competition with labor in foreign countries with no beneficial labor legislation.

This policy is just as detrimental to the welfare of foreign countries as a direct Communist threat simply because it is weakening American industry and American labor. It is undermining our capacity to withstand the Communist threat throughout the world. It is subordinating essential defense industries such as coal, oil, lead, zinc, plywood, and textiles to the development of competitive industries in easy reach of the Red army and Red air power. Nothing suits Communist plans better than this dispersal of American industries close to the periphery of Russia.

One of the most qualified men in America today to speak on this subject, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, made a great speech recently. I commend to this Congress the following newspaper account of this speech which appeared in the Washington Post:

UNITED STATES TRADE POLICY HIT BY RUSSELL

HOLLYWOOD, FLA., April 12.—Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, said today the State Department has turned the once-useful reciprocal trade program into a device for doling out more foreign aid. He said that it has helped make the cotton industry a sick business.

"I supported reciprocal trade and also the Marshall plan to restore the ravages of war and get Europe back on its economic feet," RUSSELL said.

"I still believe in the original concept of reciprocal trade but I shall not support a program to liquidate vital American industries, to throw thousands of American citizens out of work in order to create an economy in some foreign land suitable to some dreamer in the State Department * * *" RUSSELL said in a speech at a concluding session of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute.

"Time will not permit a discussion of the details of cotton's contributions to American world leadership," RUSSELL said. "Yet, cotton today is a sick business. A careful study might indicate that many elements of the present recession are attributable to the distress of the cotton industry."

RUSSELL said the cotton industry expects to cope with normal problems of technical demands, investments and competition, but is saddled further with taxes for foreign aid, plus foreign competition generated by this aid.

"Unless the present policies are changed or the Congress can be persuaded to take steps necessary to prevent it, this great industry is threatened with liquidation," RUSSELL said. "It will become the No. 1 casualty of a foreign policy which in some cases seems dedicated to the building of unfair competition for American business to develop the economy of foreign nations."

RUSSELL said reciprocal trade originally meant that the United States would export goods it produced or could produce in surplus quantities, and that the United States would import goods or raw products which either it did not produce or produced only in negligible quantities.

With the end of World War II, we have seen a change in the purpose of the reciprocal trade program," he said. "Instead of being used purely to stimulate trade, the State Department has now seized upon it as a method of extending additional foreign aid."

No Commitment on Summit Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star, Tuesday, April 15, pretty well expresses my feeling relative to the proposed summit conference. Ever since it was originally proposed, I have never been enthusiastic about it simply because there are very definite possibilities of pitfalls along the way. Unfortunately, a number of our allies in this cold war believe there is some sort of magic about a summit conference and that nothing but good can come from it. Actually, our Ambassadors and Foreign Ministers are espousing the policies and positions of their respective heads of state. I cannot help but recall how this country came out on the short end in those conferences held at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, and I am confident that our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, is bent on getting some concrete results that will inure to our benefit before finally agreeing to a meeting at the summit:

NO COMMITMENT ON SUMMIT MEETING

If diplomatic talks start with Russia within a few days, as indicated by Secretary of State Dulles, we hope our Government holds firm to its refusal to make a clear commitment for the holding of a summit conference regardless of the outcome of these conversations.

Russia has insisted that any talks like those which now are expected to be held be the preliminary to a full-scale summit meeting whether or not the first conference be productive of any agreements.

Acquiescence to any such arrangement would be folly on our part. President Eisenhower could find himself tied up in a meeting which would serve only as a Russian propaganda device. Mr. Eisenhower should agree to meet with the Russians only if there is a definite indication that such a meeting could be productive in the case of world peace.

If the ambassadors who conduct the preliminary talks are unable to agree on procedure or on the subjects to be discussed at the summit meeting, the chances of anything fruitful coming out of the top conference would be mighty small. It much more likely would result in damage to world disarmament efforts than anything else.

The Russians also want to be free to bring up any subject they desire at a summit conference. Such a wide-range agreement would permit the Russians to propose any subject they desired and the conference easily could bog down in a lot of general and pointless discussions as most previous meetings with the Russians have done.

Mr. Dulles is hopeful that the preliminary talks will lead to substantial steps toward disarmament. We hope so, too, and although we have little confidence that they will, we are in favor of their being held. We are not in favor of any blank agreement being given that these meetings, regardless of their outcome, will lead the way to a summit meeting. We must not agree to a summit conference unless there are sound assurances that it will be helpful.

Social Security and Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the RECORD a letter from one of my constituents. The clear and concise statements contained in this correspondence, in my opinion, merit the consideration of every Member of Congress and in particular those who have jurisdiction over social security and railroad retirement. The letter follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 14, 1958.*

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PELLY: May I inquire what progress, if any, is being made on the various bills to amend the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts to lower the age limit to 60 years in lieu of 65? Do you suppose that any of these bills will be enacted at this session?

The average American although not an intellectual is fairly intelligent and he knows that grave and serious problems confront the Congress, the administration, and the Nation. However, the average citizen does not understand why so little or nothing is done to bring these two statutes in conformity with present day realistic conditions.

Vigorous efforts are being made to combat the recession and to help employment. This is fine but it is futile so far as the middle aged man or woman is concerned, people over 60 and under 65 years of age. No private employer will give these people jobs regardless of what is done to alleviate unemployment.

So why does not the 85th Congress act during this session take this class of citizens off the labor market for good and all. The facts are easy to develop and no extensive hearings should be necessary as it is well known that middle aged workers ar not desirable employment risks any more.

Revisions in the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts would be a help. Why cannot this be done at the present session and thus assist a large segment of our poputions which needs it. No other legislative palliative will do it.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Would it be too presuming to request that this letter be read on the floor of the House, or as an alternative mimeographed copies be placed in the hands of every Member of the House of Representatives?

I know that one lone individual does not constitute mass thinking but yet if the real facts were known many thousands of citizens feel this way. If any Member of Congress doubts this, let him canvass his constituency to see how individual voters feel on this matter. I am sure his volume of mail will corroborate what I have stated. After all, the Federal Treasury is not being tapped as the funds held in these two administrative agencies are the withholdings of the employers and employees, not public tax moneys. It is their money so why not give it to them a few years earlier.

Yours most respectfully,

PHIL W. BOWMAN,
1419 Madrona Drive, Seattle, Wash.

Basic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the interesting letter from and address by Dr. Ernst Weber, president of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, at the Engineering Societies Building, 33 West 39th Street, New York City, April 8, 1958.

POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE OF BROOKLYN,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 16, 1858.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to send you the enclosed copy of an address which I recently gave as the introduction to a 3-day international symposium organized by the Microwave Research Institute of Polythechnic Institute of Brooklyn, and cosponsored by the Office of Naval Research, Office of Scientific Research of the Air Force, and the United States Army Signal Engineering Laboratories, with the commanding officers present at the meeting, namely, Rear Adm. R. Bennett and Brig. Gen. Earl F. Cook. Brig Gen. H. F. Gregory was represented by Col. William Bowers.

The symposium had an attendance of nearly 500 scientists and engineers from all over the United States as well as from Canada and abroad. Six foreign scientists, including two Russian, gave outstanding contributions.

I thought you might be interested in two of the points that I mention in my address: One, the need to keep basic research within present universities and engineering educational centers rather than establish new national research institutions and two, the need for long-range funding of basic research in order to make possible a stable operation within universities.

As an example, we are now making appointments of faculty members for the year September 1958 to September 1959. It is obviously impossible to plan on basic research programs if funding runs from year to year, with the uncertainty of renewal. Our commitment is real and extends over a minimum of 18 months. The ideal funding for basic research should extend over a period of 3 years to provide adequate stability within university operation, to permit faculty members to plan ahead and engage in searching investigations, unworried by approaching expiration dates of funds. Perhaps you are familiar with this situation, but I thought it opportune to bring it to your attention.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ERNST WEBER, *President.*

I am very happy, indeed, to welcome you to this eighth symposium of the Microwave Research Institute. The title, "Electronic Waveguides," might deserve some explanation inasmuch as it had its origin here and has so far not been widely used. We are all familiar with the more restricted term "waveguide" in the passive sense, meaning a metallic tube or a coaxial cable confining the propagation of very high frequency electromagnetic waves to essentially plane wave modes. If we make the mode concept of propagation the essential aspect, then we can speak of guided waves very generally and the confinement becomes less essential. We can, in fact, consider all propagation as guided either along a single interface between two mediums, such as a solid and air, a solid and a liquid, etc.; or between two interfaces of various geometrics, spherical, conical, or otherwise. If we admit now free or nearly free electrons in the spaces in which the electromagnetic waves propagate, we have new systems of modes justifying the designation electronic waveguides. Examples are all traveling wave tubes whatever their structural details; ionized spaces either natural such as ionosphere or manmade as in rocket propulsion; and leading right into the tremendously interesting field of magnetohydrodynamics.

To study the new phenomena that interactions of fast-moving electron and ion assemblies can produce when subjected to magnetic and electromagnetic fields, requires a judicial combination of theory and experiment, of creative scientists and engineers, of facilities and appropriate financial support. Unfortunately, the happy days of the individual scholar surrounded by eager pupils and undisturbed by worries about continuity of effort are fairly well gone. Few, if any, universities can afford today the means and the facilities to provide the appropriate atmosphere for creative research without calling upon outside sponsorship and support. It is to the everlasting credit of the Navy to have created at the end of World War II the Office of Naval Research to assure continuance of several of the university research centers which grew up during the war. It is also gratifying that the other services followed the example and that several Government agencies, notably the National Science Foundation, have provided stimulation for academic research. I say stimulation, because recent events have clearly demonstrated that the total basic research effort is far too small and subject to intolerable vagaries of funding to assure this Nation continuance of its hard-won scientific and technological leadership.

What is urgently needed is truly adequate, genuinely long-term national support of basic research in the universities where capable faculties already exist and where graduate teaching and research is conducted at a high level. There is a bill before the Senate (S. 3126) called the Science and Technology Act of 1958, which proposes the creation of a Department of Science and Technology, headed by a Secretary with Cabinet rank, and which also includes the proposal to establish National Research Institutes. Though one could envisage a specialized institute for oceanography, for example, it is hard to see how such institutes detached from universities can contribute in the long run to the scientific potential of our Nation. In fact, if these institutes are to be newly created and run by Government agencies, I fear that the results will be the exact opposite of what is intended. Such a move might well mean the disintegration of graduate study in science and engineering.

For where would the staffs for these institutes come from, except from the universities, since industry certainly will not give up its leading scientists and engineers. And if the universities should lose more of their capable and indispensable faculty members, how could graduate teaching continue? How could we secure the increased number of young engineers and scientists we profess to need to keep up with large-scale research efforts conducted elsewhere in the world?

I am certain that it is not necessary to underline here the importance of intensified efforts in graduate teaching and basic research. They are inseparable in any field of study. The quickest and safest way to increase the basic research potential in the country, now when we need it, is to give genuine support to the centers of graduate study and research that now exist and to make possible for these to retain their outstanding faculty members and preferably to augment their ranks; to make sure with a liberal national fellowship program that an adequate number of full-time students enter the graduate schools rather than that too many be syphoned off into industry.

Creative research cannot be commanded, it cannot be induced by offering lavish facilities. It grows where individuals are involved with the thirst for knowledge, where they have an atmosphere of congeniality, and where they can teach and guide their pupils. Is it not a fact that most of the outstanding scientific discoveries have been made in university laboratories, often with rather simple means, though surely not because of the lack of funds and facilities? I might, indeed, support my argument by pointing out that of the 25 papers on basic research that are included in this program, 14 came from universities, including 2 from abroad, 9 came from industrial organizations, again including 2 from abroad, and 2 came from Government institutions in the Soviet Union. University research is indeed the ideal setting for creativity as it always has been, but it now needs more tangible support than we have been able to give it, than the country has been willing to give it.

This discussion of the broad problem of continuity of basic research, is rather pertinent to the ability of organizing symposia such as the one we are about to open here. Symposia should alway remain integral activities of centers of graduate teaching and research, being part of their inherent educational function; they provide channels of communication and facilitate interchange of scientific results on national and international levels. At this point I should like to take the opportunity to acknowledge the cosponsorship of the scientific offices of the military services; namely, the Office of Naval Research, the United States Army Signal Engineering Laboratories, and, in particular, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, which has provided the transportation of our visitors from abroad with the exception of Mr. O. Doehler who was sent by the Compagnie Generale de T. S. F., from Paris, France. We are happy to also enjoy the cosponsorship of two of the professional groups of the Institute of Radio Engineers, namely the Professional Group on Electron Devices and the Professional Group on Microwave Theory and Techniques.

Complying with a delightful custom established at our first symposium, I take great pleasure to call upon the sponsor representatives in turn for a few words of greeting.

Decatur's Economy Fails To Turn the Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, like most other Members of this body, I am deeply concerned about the economic situation throughout our country. Most of us were hoping for a spring upturn which would relieve the strain on our economy but this upturn has evidently failed to materialize.

Mr. Speaker, I have just received an alarming report concerning the economy in central Illinois and a report of new layoffs in the Decatur, Ill., area. Decatur is not in my district, but many of my constituents have been employed in this city since I represent several of the adjoining counties. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Decatur Herald, which gives a realistic report on the Decatur situation. The editorial is as follows:

DECATUR'S ECONOMY FAILS TO TURN THE CORNER

It is difficult for most persons to be downhearted in springtime, the season of hope. But, unfortunately, there is much to be discouraged about in Decatur this spring. For Decatur's industrial economy has not yet rounded the corner. The hoped-for spring upturn has failed to materialize. Rather, with April have come new layoffs.

While it is unquestionably true that Decatur's long-range economic outlook is good—as evidenced by the announcements within the last month of plans to build two new shopping centers, a supermarket, and a motel—it cannot be denied that Decatur has been hit hard by the recession which started last fall and as yet shows no real signs of abating.

In Decatur the recession began with a layoff of 625 Caterpillar employees at the end of November. Another 225 workers at the Decatur Caterpillar plant were let go Friday. From November to April Caterpillar has hired only 80 persons, which means that its layoffs have thrown a total of 770 persons out of work.

The Borg-Warner plant has reduced its work force by 500. Wagner has let out 180 employees, the Wabash shops 100.

Nor is that all. A month ago Western Electric disclosed that it would close down its Decatur plant, which has been employing 400 persons, by the end of June. And Friday the Navy announced that the Macon Arms plant would be out of production by the middle of May and then operated on a standby basis. This means that 350 of the plant's 375 workers will be thrown out of work.

Plants like Caterpillar, Borg-Warner, and Wagner have their slack periods, even in good times. Nevertheless, it is sobering to note that while unemployment in Decatur a year ago amounted to only about 2,000, a total of 1,550 persons have been thrown out of work by the major layoffs here since November. And during the next 2 months another 750 will be seeking work when the Western Electric and Macon Arms plants end their production.

In March unemployment in Decatur was estimated at 4,200, or more than 9 percent of the area's labor force of 44,800. The spring weather will undoubtedly result in an increase in employment in construction and other outdoor work largely dormant during the winter. But it now seems doubtful whether the usual upturn in these areas will offset the continuing industrial layoffs.

What can Decatur do? There simply are no easy answers. Unemployment compensation and the State and local relief programs make certain that people unable to find work are able to eat. Some persons who have lost their jobs have dropped out of the labor force. Some have moved to cities where there is work for them to do. And so on.

But it is time for Mayor Sablotny, and other members of the city council, the Association of Commerce, the Allied Industrial Workers, and other labor unions in the Decatur area and everyone else concerned about Decatur's future, to take a hard look at the city and see whether Decatur can do more than just wait for its industrial economy to turn the corner.

How 4-H Club Work Contributes to Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that the future of our country depends upon the proper education and preparation of our youth. The 4–H Clubs of Virginia are doing a wonderful work in preparing our young people to assume their proper place in society upon reaching maturity.

On April 12, a 4–H public speaking contest was held at Longwood College, Farmville, Va. This was a district contest with the winner to be given a trip to the 4–H short course at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va., to participate in the State finals. The 4–H short course at VPI is a wonderful affair and gives the young people of Virginia an opportunity to receive worthwhile training in making themselves better citizens.

Miss Penny Abbitt, of Appomattox, Va., who is 16 years old and a sophomore in high school, represented Appomattox County at the contest at Longwood College on April 12. Penny is an outstanding student at Appomattox High School who participates in practically all extracurricular activities and is a leader among her associates. She is a member of Liberty Baptist Church where she participates in Sunday school, Baptist Training Union, youth choir, and church work.

Miss Abbitt, in competing at the Longwood contest delivered a splendid address on How 4–H Club Work Contributes to Good Citizenship, which won first place in the contest and entitles her to participate in the 4–H speaking finals at the short course. The address is a splendid analysis of the good accomplished by the 4–H Clubs of Virginia as well as the importance of the proper training of our youth.

The address is as follows:

HOW 4–H CLUB WORK CONTRIBUTES TO GOOD CITIZENSHIP

(By Penny Abbitt)

America's future success, at home and abroad, depends upon the training and experience that the young people of today receive in regard to citizenship. I know of no better way to develop the qualities of a good citizen than through participation in 4–H Club work.

4–H Club projects provide great opportunities for development of skills and interests which may often guide a conscientious member in choosing his vocation. Those who take part in club activities learn how to take full advantage of all the opportunities of life by learning how to work and plan in a variety of fields. Such habits of industry formed early in life lay the foundations for a productive citizen.

4–H Club work hastens the maturity of the member who applies himself diligently. Many of the projects require detailed planning, skillful management, and knowledge of economics. Emphasis is placed on perserverance and the completion of a task once it is begun and recognition is given only when the work is one's own. Activity in 4–H soon teaches the member to recognize and acquire standards by which to measure good habits in all phases of life. Thus through club activities a member prepares himself to accept his responsibilities as an adult in society. It is readily recognized that these adult responsibilities surely include a concern for an interest in welfare and civic activities.

Members in 4–H learn to measure their successes in life in terms of their ability to accomplish their ambitions. This conclusion is fully justified when we observe how successfully the various club projects are planned and accomplished by the individual 4–H Club members. These activities lead directly to a deepening concept of the close relationship between the young citizen and his community and civic affairs. In working on their projects, members learn how to strive intelligently to satisfy their worthwhile goals and desires. The good citizen is one who always has worthy ambitions and works to attain them.

4–H strengthens family ties as most of the projects are concerned with activities in the home and on the farm. Although the 4–H member accomplishes his projects personally, he soon forms the habit of discussing with his family, particularly his parents, the problems that arise in connection with his project. As a result of this, a broader and more practical fellowship is brought about between the club member and his family. He will soon learn the advantage of seeking advice from experienced persons and discover that his parents are anxious to be helpful in all areas of his life. Wholesome home life contributes to the development of well-balanced citizens, capable of worthy accomplishments.

Giving demonstrations and, of course, participation in the 4–H public-speaking contest develops the ability to express our views and to explain ideas before large groups. The preparation of an original speech also encourages serious, constructive thought. A good citizen must be able to form and express opinions in public.

Leadership is one of the qualities of an outstanding citizen. Through the examples set by the 4–H leaders, our own qualities of leadership are developed. We receive practical experience in this field by serving as officers in our club or as junior counselors at camp. The annual presentation of leadership awards in 4–H provides a goal which members strive to attain.

Of course, the success of any leader, no matter how good he may be, depends upon the cooperation of his followers. By working together in small groups on 4–H projects, in

planning programs, and in serving on committees we learn to get along with others. Surely you would readily agree with me in the observation that the willingness to cooperate and the virtue of being able to live peaceably with your fellow citizens is one of the most valuable traits of good citizenship. Just as the achievements of our club are the result of teamwork, so America progresses through the cooperation of all her citizens.

In closing, I would like to leave you with these words, spoken by Raymond C. Firestone, president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.: "4–H * * * will help you become a better American and therefore a more valuable citizen in this great worldwide community of nations."

Map Know-How Can Make H-Bomb Surplus in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted an excellent statement on the importance of a modern and progressive mapping system from the pen of Monte Bourjaily, Jr., in the Army Times of April 12, 1958. It is entitled "Map Know-How Can Make H-bomb Surplus in War." This article contains significant information and I feel that it should be called to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

Ignorance, indifference and inability to communicate between components within the vast edifice of the Defense Department have caused not only the great propaganda defeat inflicted on the United States when Russia announced its unilateral suspension of thermonuclear tests, but alo threatened, if continued, the health of our grandchildren.

Evidence on which to base the above charge has just come to hand.

These facts, combined with conservative military reasoning, are proof of the need for reorganization of the channels of communication between operating agencies and policy-making bodies.

The evidence implies names. No individuals are blamed below, for two reasons: the facts speak for themselves. And the individuals are, it seems, products of and perhaps vicitims of the system.

The facts are these:

Testifying before a congressional committee before retiring as chief of research and development, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin said that there will soon be available to the United States intercontinental ballistic missiles with a circular probable error of less than 1 mile.

"It is nonsense, however," he said, to expect accuracy from these missiles because "we do not know within 5 miles the relations of the major land masses of the earth."

This is partly true, although there is no reason to believe that General Gavin was aware that his statement was almost out of date or that it could have been untrue had certain easy and inexpensive steps been taken within the last 6 months.

Shortly after the launching of Explorer I, the Army put out a press release quoting Dr. John O'Keefe, Army Map Service geodicist, as saying that by using accepted techniques of measurement, errors in maps in the Pacific could be reduced from three-quarters of a mile to 300 feet.

Use of the Explorer measurements for mapping will "ultimately lead to a precision on the order of 30 feet throughout the world," the release said.

Congress has since been told, in other committee hearings, that there is no need for additional satellites to determine distances between points on the earth's surface. If only "good orbits" are produced for Explorers I and III and for the sputniks, distances can be accurately determined to within a tenth of a mile or less.

At the moment the trouble is that this good orbit has not been determined for any of the satellites because of failure to process the hundreds of sightings of all these satellites from points throughout the world through the computers available to the Navy Research Laboratory and other Government agencies.

Once such computations are made—and it takes programers, men who can translate information from human into machine terms so that the computers can handle it, and who also tell the computers how to process the information—determining the distance from United States launching sites to targets in potential hostile areas becomes a simple matter.

This is because true distances between various parts of the United States are accurately known now. Likewise the distances between various points in Europe as far east as the Ural Mountains are known. The error in these distances is less than half a mile. This has been proved not only by chaining distances when drawing maps but also by using both lunar and astral observations.

Thus, since late last fall, it has been possible to know within less than half a mile, and in the near future it could be possible to know within 300 feet or less, the distances between any two points on the surface of the earth, with the possible exception of the interior of Asia.

It is accepted military doctrine and established American policy today to seek in war to destroy military targets, wherever located. The great argument in favor of the hydrogen bomb—thermonuclear weapons—is that because of errors in maps and in the accuracy of weapons which combined could throw a shot 15 miles off target, we must have weapons of massive destruction to be sure we get the military target. The fact that nonmilitary areas will suffer has been accepted as one of the unfortunate hazards of war.

But according to some public testimony and to other testimony that is not classified but which, because given behind closed doors to congressional committees, has not yet been made public, these errors need no longer exist.

With pinpoint accuracy available, atomic rather than thermonuclear weapons would fulfill all military requirements. And atomic weapons, according to all competent witnesses, do not carry with them the long-range genetic dangers of thermonuclear weapons.

With the need for thermonuclear weapons gone, the United States could safely suspend further thermonuclear tests—not with a proviso that the suspension of tests would continue only so long as no other country tested hydrogen weapons but absolutely.

From a national standpoint, the tragedy is that the necessary information to justify such a decision was not developed as soon as possible, so that Russia could not have scored its recent propaganda victory. From the human viewpoint, it continues to be tragic that this information has not yet been worked up and passed along to our policy-makers so that tests can be suspended now.

Why hasn't it yet been done?

Partly it is a hangover from the "what good is it?" attitude toward satellites that typified statements by former Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson and administration officials after Sputnik I was launched. This has generated indifference to, even resistance to, supporting satellite activity not only on the top levels but also among politically minded junior supervisors.

Another reason is that the Army Map Service budget is being cut by $8 million this year. It will not be able to process information so that though we could be accurate in maps, we will continue not to be for months, even years.

In addition, accurate measurement of distances and accurate orbital figures on the various satellites has been given a low priority. The military necessity has been subordinated to other considerations.

From General Gavin's testimony, it is obvious that the possibility of map accuracy in feet over distances of 5,000 and more miles was never presented to him. It has also not been presented to his superiors.

Yet officials of the Army Map Service know that it is possible. How has this failure in communications come about?

It is not my purpose to argue the politics of continuing or suspending thermonuclear tests. All who have engaged in the discussion, however, agree that there is a possibility of danger, especially to those as yet unborn. The argument is as to the degree of danger.

If any danger at all exists, and if the military necessity for thermonuclear weapons either no longer exists or can be ended within a short period, then it is the duty of those who can to bring about the situation where this is possible.

This requires two things: The first is to spend whatever money is needed to revise maps to the accuracy possible from information available today which simply needs processing. The second is to continue to devote American ingenuity to increasing the accuracy of long-range weapons, a field where the United States is preeminent.

The result of this could be that our efforts in the field of thermonuclear research could be devoted to peaceful goals, thus eliminating the genetic danger of strontium 90 and other radioactive fallout material.

Last Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appears in the April 21, 1958, issue of the New Republic:

LAST WORDS

A fine young man was David Dalrymple Jones. Eisenhower said "buy." and Jones bought. It was the thing to do. "Buy anything," said Eisenhower. "Buy anything," Jones told his wife. He was counteracting mass discouragement. Fine stuff was Jones. Even when he lost his job and joined the 5.2 million unemployed he kept his chin up. As he queued for jobs he was sustained by heartfelt expressions of sympathy voiced at the White House or Augusta. He had no patience with those who noted unemployment had increased in March. "Don't you see the rate is slowing down?" demanded Jones testily.

They repossessed his car and foreclosed his mortgage and Mary and the children went back to her parents, but Jones was of stout heart. He applauded Budget Director

Stans' attack on Congress for "turning on vast new programs for spending." Cried Jones—"That's the stuff." His enthusiasm for Bernard Baruch was unrestrained: "Let us not unbalance the budget," said Jones. "What an estimable young man." said businessmen to whom he unsuccessfully applied for work. Sleeping in cheap boarding houses, Jones yet found pennies to buy the editorials applauding Eisenhower for rejecting unwise tax cuts.

Yes, a fine young man was David Dalrymple Jones. His last words were (at the hospital where they brought him with acute malnutrition)—"Doctor, keep me going just a little longer. I must vote Republican this fall."

Now It Is Up to Congress To Halt the Flood of Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today the Judiciary Committee of the House reported to this body and I strongly supported it in committee, the bill of the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER (H. R. 6239) which is a measure to further control the heinous distribution of obscene literature throughout the Nation. This measure is similar to one introduced by myself (H. R. 11185) and several other Members of this Congress. Action by the Judiciary Committee of the House now places directly into the lap of the Congress itself responsibility for a proposal to bring to a halt this growing and insidious tool of the perverted and criminal element that is subverting the youth of the Nation today.

By the wording of the bill reported to Congress the F. B. I., Postal Inspectors, and other law enforcement agencies will be armed with the proper tools to better enable them to provide the protection so necessary to development of moral strength in our Nation today. Because of inadequate and inoperable legal tools law enforcement agencies have not been able to do the job we expect of them. I hope that both the House and Senate will promptly rise to defend the minds of the youth of the Nation today.

The bill approved today simply permits prosecution where obscene literature is received as well as where such material is mailed. In this fashion, and within the ability, jurisdiction, and interest of local prosecuting officers and officials will the question of obscenity be determined and the power to prosecute lie. It is my opinion that prosecution on the site where impressionable adults and, what is worse, the youth of our Nation are attacked by the cohorts of crime and filth is the place where penalties will promptly be inflicted that will halt this surge of obscenity.

At this point in my comment I would like to include two statements by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover describing the situation in regard to obscene literature as he sees it:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., SEPTEMBER 19, 1957

The peddlers of obscene pictures and writings have so flooded the market with this toxic trash within the past few years that to find a news rack without samples of it is the rare exception. The trade in this printed poison is big business and a lucrative one. A single smut dealer, for instance, can produce at small initial cost obscene photographs or publications which can then be copied by the thousands. Unlike the narcotic cigarette which is reduced to ashes after degrading one unfortunate victim, the obscene photo, film, or book can be transmitted on an almost endless round of moral destruction. The activities of the muck merchants are national in scope and are closely organized. These moral degenerates draw no line of age distinction when it comes to customers. Your child can easily become one of their tragic victims.

An aroused public is necessary—one that will not countenance the placing of this trash on public display. Parents and other guardians of the young must be aware of what is being read by those in their care. Guidance and concern for a child's mental and spiritual development are just as important as regard for its bodily needs. Stiffer legal penalties, particularly in local and State courts, are needed to replace the frequent wrist slap given those convicted of this vile trade. Not until longer sentences and heavier fines remove the financial advantages of this traffic will the producers, distributors, and dealers of filth be driven out of this sickening business.

There is today a vicious movement to undermine the traditional spiritual and moral principles of our Nation. Freedom, divorced from authority and discipline, is a frightening thing and is the first step toward total moral degeneration.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1957.

To All Law Enforcement Officials:

At the approach of the warm months and the beginning of the seasonal rise in sex crimes, there is a special need to focus public attention on a despicable business—the sale and distribution of obscene material. The serious danger of this big business criminal enterprise lies in its degrading influence on youth and American communities. Too often the purveyor of filth in the form of movies, playing cards, books, photographs, and other devices, reaps a rich reward as a result of lackadaisical public opposition to his evil occupation. The carefree hours of school vacation time afford these parasitic peddlers of ugly wares many opportunities to claim the inquisitive and impressionable minds of the Nation's youth.

The most effective means of preventing juvenile crime is proper adult guidance and practical moral training in the home, school, and church. A breakdown in this basic phase of adult responsibility, however, is clearly evidenced by the spiraling youth crime statistics. The shame of this problem lies in the fact that all too frequently the clean-living majority of our youth seek in vain for guidance through the pitfalls of this modern era. Many letters which I receive from the younger population implore help against these temptations, particularly the obscenity bombarding them from all sides. One 17-year-old stated that even though lack of family life and absence of religious training were seeds of the youth problem, certainly sordid literature, pornography, and other forms of obscenity acted as fertilizers to nourish these seeds into juvenile crimes. His cry, typical of the respectable youngsters across the country, was "Please do us American teen-agers a big favor and get rid of the trash that is trying to kill us."

Only with disastrous consequences can adult America disregard this plea of young citizens. Although statistics are not available to compute the exact influence of the illicit traffic in obscene material on the incidence of sex crimes, it would be naive indeed to assume that there is no relation between the mounting deluge of such filth and the increase in sex crimes. In crimes reported by police in cities over 2,500 population, the crime rate of persons involved in sex offenses, excluding rape and prostitution, rose from 38.5 per 100,000 population in 1953, to 41.7 per 100,000 in 1954, to 45.3 per 100,000 in 1955, and reached 47.5 per 100,000 in 1956.

The weapons for combating this menace must be found or forged in the arsenal of local, State and Federal laws. One major blow at these dealers in indecency was the amendment of the interstate transportation of obscene matter statute in June of 1955, giving the FBI additional jurisdiction in cases involving the use of personal automobile or any other form of transportation, as well as express or common carier, in such interstate trafficking.

What are the next steps? There must be cooperative public and police effort to assure that local ordinances against obscenity are adequate and rigidly enforced. While these sewage salesmen prosper in the loopholes of weak laws and license-fee type small fines, heavier sentences or jail terms upon conviction serve as strong deterrents to their trade. Parents, school authorities and law-abiding citizens interested in the welfare of youth must share the duty of reporting sources of obscene material to the proper officials. Most certainly, local civic leaders and legislators have a responsibility to their communities in the matter of controlling this pollution problem. It is indeed an obligation of police officials to enforce the law to the maximum limit to rid their localities of this vermin.

Public opinion and coordinated action can sound the death knell for the obscene material peddler. Assuredly, each and every citizen must contribute to the fight against filthmongering or suffer in the contamination spread by this diseased busines.

Very truly yours,
JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, *Director.*

Mr. Hoover has further said that "distribution of pornographic literature is now so efficient that it is quite accurate to say that no child is beyond its reach." He continued, and pointed out, that "the peddler will be halted and his merchandise disappear only if an aroused public now goes on the alert."

Gentlemen, I believe that each of us has had impressed upon us the fact that an aroused public does now exist. I am sure that the Judiciary Committee of the House, after due deliberation, has presented us with a bill that will give legal backbone to our law-enforcement officials who wish to stamp out this evil. The responsibility now lies with us. I hope that we shall answer the call of the churches, the public officials, the mothers and fathers, and all good people of this land and act promptly to halt and prosecute those who would prey on and try to subvert the healthy minds of our American people and particularly upon

our youth to whom we look for the sound, moral, God-fearing future of this Nation. We dare not delay.

Steel Imports and Our Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American citizen and American industrialist, the Honorable Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., has recently delivered a speech in Cleveland, Ohio, in which he ably presents the problem that confronts our domestic steel industry with respect to growing competition from steel imports. I do not entirely agree with Mr. Blough's suggested solution to this problem. It is my own view that the tariff protection that Mr. Blough perhaps rejects is an effective answer, at least in part, to the need for protecting our American standard of living. Another answer in part to this question of what to do about growing imports is for us to hold our trading allies accountable for their tariff and trade practices that have effectively kept international trade from being truly reciprocal as the Congress of the United States has intended as repeatedly expressed by Congress in extending the trade agreements authority.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that I do not subscribe entirely to the remarks of this distinguished industrial statesman, I believe the substance of Mr. Blough's Cleveland speech should be available to the membership of the House and for that reason I include his remarks in the RECORD:

A TALK OF TWO TOWNS

(Speech by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp., at the annual meeting, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland, Ohio, April 17, 1958)

For the opportunity to be with you here—for your generous hospitality and for your warm and cordial welcome—I am deeply grateful. And by way of reciprocity, let me assure you—right at the outset of these remarks—that I do not come before you today as an expert on subjects economic.

An expert, as you know, has been defined as a man who is able to avoid all minor mistakes as he sweeps on to the grand fallacy. And judging from all the divergent and contradictory panaceas that are currently being offered as a cure for the present economic recession, it occurs to me that another expert with another plan of that kind—added to those which already afflict us—could set our business recovery back indefinitely.

So for the sake of your business and mine, I shall prudently refrain from unveiling before you the Blough prescription for the care and feeding of prosperity. And instead, I should like—very simply—to talk of two towns. * * * Two towns which are many thousands of miles apart, but which—in this shrinking world—are exerting an ever greater influence upon each other and upon the business conditions which now confront us.

And much to your surprise, no doubt, one of these towns is Cleveland.

Now a lot of things have been happening in Cleveland. Its population has grown, its industries have been expanding, and 50 new ones moved into greater Cleveland last year. Thus its job opportunities have been growing too. And so have the many cultural advantages which it affords. In short, then, it is a good town in which to live, to work, to raise a family, and to engage, generally, in the pursuit of such happiness as we are privileged to seek in this topsy-turvy world.

The other town I have in mind is Duesseldorf, in Germany, and in many respects it's a lot like Cleveland. It, too, is a great industrial center which has been growing rapidly in recent years. It is attracting new industries, providing new jobs, building new schools, adding twelve to fifteen thousand housing units per year, and enlarging still further the many cultural and artistic aspects of its community life.

True, it is only about two-thirds the size of Cleveland; but still its transportation facilities have to handle some 380,000 persons in the rush-hour traffic; and the number of passenger automobiles on its streets has multiplied by 2½ times in the past 2 years. And if there remains in your minds any lingering doubt as to the similarity between these two delightful communities, let me simply quote a sentence from Fortune magazine which reports that "Dusseldorf, today, is noted for its rich and beautiful women and for its hard-working and ambitious men."

So we must conclude, definitely, that Dusseldorf, too, is a good town in which to live, to work, to raise a family, and to engage in the pursuit of happiness.

Now by a curious coincidence—which is by no means unintentional—it happens that a major industry of both of these towns is steelmaking. Steel is one of Cleveland's largest single industries; and Dusseldorf is the center of an industrial area which produces 85 percent of all the steel that is made in West Germany.

But right at this point the similarity between Dusseldorf and Cleveland gives way to a number of significant differences which provide considerable food for thought. Let's look at a few of them.

First and foremost, perhaps, is the fact of the recession. In Cleveland many steelworkers—together with many men and women from other industries—are currently unemployed; and the primary concern of all of us in this room here today is to get these people back on the job and to find markets for the products they once made. But in Dusseldorf, steel and other industries are humming along at much higher rates of operation. There is no marked unemployment, and they are managing very well with the markets for their products.

Next is the fact that virtually all of the market for Cleveland's steel lies here in the United States. At best, only a minor percentage of your steel is sold in foreign markets. But 27 percent of the steel that is made in the Dusseldorf area is exported; and these export markets for German steel have been growing considerably in recent years. So the prosperity of Dusseldorf's steel mills does not depend on the ups and downs of their domestic demand to nearly the same extent that yours does here in Cleveland.

Then, too, most of the steel mills here in the Cleveland area are modern and highly efficient; and while it is true that great strides are being made in improving the Dusseldorf area mills, it is also true that a steelworker in Cleveland—using its modern, highly productive tools—can turn out more high quality steel with the expenditure of less time and effort than his German counterpart can. There is, however, another major difference; the weekly wage of a steelworker in Cleveland is more than three times as high as the corresponding pay of the steelworker in Dusseldorf. So the cost of producing finished steel products there is substantially lower than it is here.

Now what does all this mean to you in Cleveland? What does Dusseldorf matter to you?

Well, let me give you just one example which concerns a reel of barbed wire.

The one I am talking about is a very ordinary reel of barbed wire—one of the types most commonly used for fences. It was manufactured by our American steel and wire division; and it was delivered to a jobber whose warehouse is right here in Cleveland.

But in the jobber's warehouse it was placed alongside another reel of barbed wire that had been manufactured in Dusseldorf. That German wire was of exactly the same type, and it had come from a mill many thousands of miles away. It had been shipped from Dusseldorf to the sea, and across the ocean to New York. It had been freighted to Cleveland by rail, and hauled from the freight yards to the warehouse by truck. Yet, delivered to that warehouse, it still cost the jobber $40 a ton less than the reel of wire sold right here in Cleveland.

Now next spring of course, the people of Cleveland will celebrate the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway, and Cleveland itself will become a great inland seaport of the United States. Perhaps the people of Dusseldorf will have reason to celebrate too. Their wire will no longer face the costly overland haul from New York to Cleveland. It can be shipped by boat direct to the docks on your Lake Erie waterfront, and thus it can be sold here even more cheaply than it is today.

Now it is certainly true there must be give-and-take in order to have international trade. It is also true that many Americans had jobs in the last few years because our exports of steel were considerably greater—primarily because of availability and quality—than our imports although the historic pattern is changing. Nevertheless had this foreign wire—some 64,000 tons of it last year—been produced at home as much of it formerly was, it would have provided hundreds of thousands of man hours of work in the steel industry alone and kept coming those most important pay envelopes to the American steelworkers who formerly made that wire; pay envelopes to the tune of about 6 million dollars.

So when a farmer comes into this city to buy wire for new fences, what is he going to do? He likes progress in America, and he is just as anxious as you and I are to buy the products of American industry and to support the jobs of American workmen. But he has his problems too, and the high cost of building fences is one of them. Does he buy the imported wire then?

Well, a great many farmers certainly did last year—for while barbed wire is as American as blueberry pie—while it was first patented and manufactured right here in the United States, and while it is little used in Europe and in other countries of the world—the fact remains that more than half of all the barbed wire sold in America last year was imported from abroad.

And barbed wire, of course, is only one small, but an important, example of what is happening in steel—just as Cleveland and Dusseldorf are merely symbols of the many steel-producing centers, at home and abroad, which are vying with each other for markets.

Out on the west coast, the industrious Japanese have bought scrap metal at premium prices, hauled it back to their bills in the Orient, manufactured it into finished products, shipped them back across the wide

Pacific, and still undersold American producers by such substantial margins as $29 a ton on reinforcing bars.

To show how serious offshore competition has become, I understand cast iron soil pipe is being imported for sale at $100 per ton in California where the price of the domestic product is $175 per ton.

And so it is with a wide variety of imported steel products which are rapidly moving into the American market not only on the west coast, but on the eastern seaboard, at the southeastern seaports and along the gulf coast as well. For the year 1957 total steel imports into the United States were about a million and a quarter tons—considerably less than we exported but still a lot of tonnage. And let us note in passing that the production of 1¼ million tons of steel here in American would provide direct employment for some 11,000 people, and that indirectly it would provide jobs for thousands more than that number in supporting industries.

So we must acknowledge the fact, I think, that what is happening in all of the Dusseldorfs of the world is profoundly affecting the welfare of the people in all of the Clevelands of America. But I do not wish for a moment to leave the impression that the steelworker is the only loser—or even the principal loser—of this new influx of goods from abroad. He isn't.

The same situation prevails to a greater or lesser degree in industries like lumber, chemicals, textiles, watches and many, many others. Until very recently, for example, this Nation has been a leading exporter of automobiles; but now it is a net importer. I noticed a news report the other day which stated that Great Britain had already exported more autos in the first 2 months of this year than she did in the entire 12 months of last year.

Now why is it that foreign industries can turn out some of the very products thousands of miles to our shores, and sell them in our markets at a price so low that we can no longer compete, even here at home—let alone in the far-away markets of other countries of the world?

Gentlemen, nobody loves a fact man. But there are times when facts—like spinach and taxes—must be faced with fortitude, and this, I believe, is one of them. So I would like to lay before you today, two simple and undeniable facts—however unpalatable their implications may be in certain political circles.

First is the fact that when an American consumer buys any average American product—whether it be a reel of barbed wire, an electric toaster, or a pair of pajamas—very little of the price he pays for that product is for the actual, tangible materials out of which it is made. More than three-quarters of the purchase price goes to pay the wages and salaries of the men and women who transformed the raw materials into the finished product, brought the product to the market place, and sold it to the consumer. In other words, what you and I are really buying when we spend a dollar at the store, is a few cents worth of materials and more than 75 cents worth of the time of some worker or group of workers.

So much for fact No. 1. Fact No. 2 is that in almost every country of the world today, the American dollar will buy more of a workman's time than it will here at home. The same American dollar which will buy 20 minutes of working time here in America, will buy more than 60 minutes of working time in Germany, nearly as much in England, and considerably more than that in Japan.

That situation, of course, is nothing new. It has prevailed in varying degree ever since America's industrialization began. And despite this disparity in wage rates, we have been able to remain competitive in many markets because of what we call American ingenuity, "know-how" and because of capital investment in machinery and equipment.

By providing the most efficient tools of production that the world has thus far seen—by devising American methods of mass production, and by devoting billions of dollars annually to unending research and improvements, we have made it possible for the American worker to produce considerably more in an hour's time than his foreign competitor can. And that kept the cost of our products competitive.

But since the end of World War II a great change has been taking place. The technological revolution that began in America in the early part of the present century is sweeping across the face of the globe at a vigorous pace; and happily so. And American know-how is being exported from our shores in even greater degree, I suspect, than are the products of our factories.

Fine new steel plants are being built in Europe and Asia—some of them with American financial assistance.

When United States Steel built its Fairless works only a few years ago, it was the last word in steelmaking efficiency. Today its counterpart can be found in Wales; and I am told that an equally modern—and perhaps just as efficient—plant is now operating in Poland.

Moreover, much of our marvelous machinery—like the electrolytic tinning lines that were developed and perfected by United States Steel—is now being installed in European plants under licenses which we have readily granted to all comers. It can produce just as efficiently in Europe as it can in America; and with foreign wage rates far below the American level, these new machines can be installed—and these new steel plants can be built—at far less of a capital outlay than we, here at home, must make for our new and improved facilities.

Beyond that, too, is the program of technical assistance through which American steelmakers, for example, are helping, under Government auspices, to train technicians from India and other countries. It is hoped that by this exporting our American know-how, we can enhance greatly the prospects for world peace; and as long as there is any possible chance of progress in this direction, then certainly no one of us would have it otherwise.

But meanwhile the fact remains that we are rapidly losing the technological margin that we have had over other nations, and that has thus far supported American wages at levels high above those prevailing elsewhere in the world. And this situation has been gravely complicated by the fact that not only have American wage rates risen enormously in recent years, but that the wage costs in almost every American product have gone up as well.

If an American worker gets three times as much pay as a German worker, but produces three times as much steel per hour, the direct wage costs per ton remain about the same in both countries and the products of the two workers are fairly competitive in world markets. That is obvious.

But when the wage costs in the American product keep rising—as they have—farther and farther above those in the foreign-made product, the area in which the two can still compete begins to shrink alarmingly—first in foreign markets, then in our own coastal markets, and finally, ever-farther inland from our shores.

And as our market shrinks, so too does the number of jobs that remain in American industry. That is obvious also; and while I do not know how much of our unemployment today can be attributed properly to the inability of American workmen to compete, wage-costwise, with their foreign competitors, there can be no doubt, I think, that this is a significantly important factor in the present business recession.

Certainly it accounts for the growing clamor for high tariffs, rigid import quotas, and a general scuttling of the trade agreements program—a clamor that comes these days not only from a number of distressed businessmen, but equally loudly from a number within the ranks of American labor.

Now while I realize that some of you here in this room may disagree with me profoundly on this point, I must say to you frankly that increased tariff protection, in my opinion, is not the basic answer to this problem.

If experience can teach us anything, then certainly we have learned that the power to erect tariff walls or other trade barriers is not one which America enjoys a monopoly. We can shut foreign imports out of our markets only by shutting our exports out of foreign markets. And if we look at markets in terms of people—as we must if we are realistic about it—let us remember that only 6 percent of the world's population would be inside our tariff wall, while the other 94 percent would lie outside it. And don't forget that the raw materials so necessary to our Nation's production may also recede beyond our reach.

Nor can I see the wisdom of spending millions and millions of dollars to build a seaway that will transform Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and other Great Lakes cities into seaports, and then building tariff walls around those cities to keep their ports in idleness.

Presumably such a policy might—as a temporary expedient—restore a substantial number of workers to their jobs in manufacturing industries; but it would also throw out of work a large part of the 4½ million other Americans who gain their living in foreign trade. So in the end, we should merely have exchanged one group of jobless Americans for another.

Tariffs, then, provide no permanent solution, as I see it.

An equally doubtful solution to our difficulties, I think, is to be found in the realm of direct Government subsidy.

We know today that ships built in American shipyards at American wage costs can compete with foreign-built ships only because our Government subsidizes American construction at the expense of all of us as taxpayers. It supports these high wage costs out of taxes primarily because the maintenance of a shipbuilding industry here is essential to the security and the defense of the United States.

But many other industries are equally essential to our national defense and security—steel, oil, chemicals, motors, and dozens and dozens of others—and should the day ever come when these, too, must be subsidized by the Treasury, the resulting burden would soon bankrupt the American taxpayers.

So it seems to me that recognizing the value of such expedients as tariffs, quotas, subsidies, controls, freezes, and all of the other ways out sooner or later we will have to face up squarely to one undeniable fact: That American workmen today are pricing themselves out of the market, or—to put it even more accurately—that America, as a Nation, is costing itself out of the market.

There is, I believe, an inexorable law which can never be defied, nor escaped, for long. I won't call it an economic law, because—as I say—I am not an economic expert. But it is a fundamental law of business, and every businessman knows it. That law is: "Compete or die."

There is no other choice. Twist, turn, squirm as we may, in the end we are going to have to compete with our foreign friends or else resign ourselves to the fact that America

would soon be on its way to losing the industrial leadership it now possesses.

Yet if we are to be competitive—and remain competitive—we have today the greatest opportunity, and the greatest potential market for the products of our people, that we have ever had in our history. With European production, and standards of living rising at a rapid rate, millions of western Europeans are eager to buy for themselves and their families all the luxuries of life that have become so commonplace to our people here in America—the very products that we have so long excelled in producing. This is also true in other areas of the world.

To serve these new markets, and to be able to compete with foreign producers, a number of American companies have established factories abroad where the combination of American productive efficiency and low wage costs provides a solution to at least some of their problems. Indeed I have seen figures recently which show that a growing number of these companies are shipping their foreign-made products back here to the American market. And this, of course, is a logical and natural development dictated by the present disparity in wage costs at home and abroad. But carried to its ultimate extreme, it too becomes self-defeating; because without a job, the American workman has no money with which to buy anything, and there is then no market in America for the products of these factories overseas.

So again we come back to the one, inescapable fact that nobody wants to face: That the only practical way to keep foreign-made products from overcrowding our markets here at home is to compete on equal terms in quality, in price and in service; and that the only practical way to reach foreign markets successfully is to keep our costs—which means primarily our wage costs—competitive.

And right here is where I think that the American workman is being misled in a big way by some of his most vocal and most powerful leaders.

He is being told that his wages in recent years have not kept pace with rising output per man hour—that he is entitled to more than he is getting, and that he can get it without increasing the wage cost in his product.

Such statements, unfortunately, are not even within shouting distance of the truth, either in the steel industry or in industry as a whole.

The latest official reports of the United States Government show that during the first 6 years of the present decade, average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries as a whole went up more than 35 percent; while output per man hour in these same industries rose less than 19½ percent. Thus wages have gone up more than 80 percent faster than output per man hour in these 6 years alone.

Now raising the standard of living for everyone in this country, by producing more of the goods which everyone needs and wants is one thing. But raising the cost of producing those goods, so that the producer and his employees are placed at a competitive disadvantage, is quite another thing. And when those who profess to speak in the interests of the American working man advocate raising wage costs as a means of increasing consumer purchasing power, they are seeking to perpetrate what is, in my opinion, the most dangerous hoax of our times.

They know that higher wage costs can only be met by higher prices, so in the end no increase in purchasing power results. Meanwhile the ability of American workmen to compete with their industrious counterparts abroad is further diminished, thus shrinking the market for American products and diminishing the number of available American jobs.

To me, then, the perpetrators of this hoax are labor's one-way philanthropists. They would take jobs away from our workmen here and give them to workmen abroad. And that kind of labor philanthropy is in my idea of economic crime on the waterfront.

Let me sum it up this way:

We are all striving, as I have said, to get our people back on their jobs by finding markets for the products of their labor. The only way to find those markets is to make our costs competitive and to keep them that way. How then can this be done?

Well if it is done, then we as businessmen must do everything in our power to maintain our technological advantage over foreign producers by replacing as rapidly as we can every obsolete and obsolescent machine, technique and facility we have, with new, better and more efficient methods and facilities. That is our part of the job.

Government, too, has a vital role in this task as I see it. If we are to maintain our technological superiority, then Government must certainly reexamine some of our antiquated and misbegotten tax laws which discourage investment, penalize the productive use of wealth, and treat as taxable profits what is really the excess cost of replacing our wornout tools and equipment.

But despite all that we and the Government may do to promote our competitive position, the final decision rests with the American working man, and with his delegated leaders. For the fact remains that in the last analysis the only one who can fully protect the American workman is the American workman himself. If he can keep wage costs from mounting while rising productivity brings our total costs into competitive balance with foreign costs, then truly I believe that he can expect to see the greatest era of prosperity our Nation has ever known.

But if, on the other hand, he permits the vast economic and political power that he now possesses to be used to force wage costs ever higher, then I am very much afraid that the great St. Lawrence seaway—when it opens next year—will be nothing more than a one-way street, westbound.

The Farm Freeze Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere intention to lend my full support to the House movement to override the President's veto of the so-called farm freeze bill, should this body be afforded that opportunity on the basis of successful Senate action.

During this period of economic recession, the farmer of the Nation should be given as much purchasing power relief as any other segment of our economic structure. If the President's veto of Senate Joint Resolution 162 stands, the wheat farmers of the State of Kansas will suffer an average 22-cents-per-bushel cut in the price of wheat, thereby causing a reduction in their purchasing power of between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000.

To illustrate the seriousness of this impending drop in most farm production prices, particularly wheat, I am including in the RECORD pertinent letters from Mr. R. L. Patterson, president of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, and Mr. Floyd Root, president of the National Association of Wheat Growers:

KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Dodge City, Kans., April 10, 1958.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BREEDING: Shortly after Congress reconvenes following the Easter recess, the Senate will vote on the question of overriding the President's veto of Senate Joint Resolution 162, a measure to freeze price supports and acreage of certain farm commodities at the same level as they were in 1957. In the event that the veto is overridden in the Senate, the matter will be before the House for its consideration.

Kansas farmers are vitally interested in this measure, and I am writing you on behalf of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers. With costs and expenses on the farm still going up, we feel that the very least that should be done is to maintain support prices at last year's level.

If the veto stands, it will reduce the purchasing power of Kansas wheat growers by fifty to sixty million dollars, and the wheat growers of the Nation by $250 million on wheat alone, not counting all other commodities of agriculture.

In addition we desire to call attention to the fact that this joint resolution is a very modest proposal compared with the far-reaching measures which have already been adopted or are now under consideration in Washington for the purpose of stemming the recession. It is effective for 1 year only. It doesn't increase price supports, acreage or production, but merely leaves them where they were in 1957. It will not increase the price of food or other articles made from farm products.

It is consistent with the antirecession program in every respect. By increasing the buying power of farmers for steel, farm machinery, automobiles and other commodities, it will put men back to work wherever substantial unemployment exists.

I urge that you give this matter your most earnest consideration, and sincerely hope that after doing so you may see your way clear to vote to pass this joint resolution over the President's veto.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

R. L. PATTERSON,
President,
Kansas Association of Wheat Growers.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WHEAT GROWERS,
Pendleton, Oreg., April 9, 1958.

To: Members of the Executive Committee,
National Association of Wheat Growers.

GENTLEMEN: Last night, a telegram was sent to the representatives of each of the member State organizations, requesting that you contact your Senators and urge them to override the veto by the President of the farm freeze bill.

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter and a statement which were mailed to each one of the 96 Senators encouraging them to override the presidential veto. If you have not contacted your Senator, may I suggest that you do so immediately, since the attempt to override this veto will be made soon after the Senate convenes on April 14, following the Easter recess.

In addition to the letters to the Senators, encouraging the veto, may I also suggest that your organization contact Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Marvin McLain, and urge him to support including a barter provision in the bill to extend Public Law 480. As you know, a mandatory barter provision was removed from the Senate bill, when it was approved extending 480. The manda-

tory barter provision does not have the support of the Department of Agriculture, because they say they have permissive authority to barter anyway. However, last year, barter sales of wheat were only one-tenth of what they were the year before when emphasis was placed on barter deals.

The State Department has opposed emphasis on barter sales which were so successful during the marketing year 1956–57. Apparently, the pressure from the State Department has influenced the Department of Agriculture. It is reported that Marvin McLain told a Senator from Colorado that the Department was not interested in a mandatory barter provision for wheat and had not been contacted by any wheat growers about barter sales of wheat.

On another matter, may I bring to your attention the fact that according to the constitution and bylaws of the national association, all officers of the national are to be elected from the voting delegates. Several vice presidents now members of the executive committee are not State voting delegates. Therefore, it is necessary to conform to the constitution and bylaws for all officers of the national, including the vice presidents, to be voting delegates from the State associations.

Your consideration of these requests and suggestions will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD ROOT,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WHEAT GROWERS,
Pendleton, Oreg., April 8, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: The National Association of Wheat Growers strongly urges you to support the move in the United States Senate to override the Presidential veto of the measure passed by Congress in March, calling for a 1-year freeze on farm-price supports.

Please find enclosed a statement explaining why the veto should not be allowed to stand.

Unfortunately, current increases in farm prices are a temporary situation due to the loss of vegetable and fruit crops this winter, and to a cycle rise in cattle and hog prices as a result of herd depletion during drought years in the Great Plains.

Your consideration of our position would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD ROOT, *President.*

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS SUPPORTING AN OVERRIDE OF THE PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF THE FARM FREEZE RESOLUTION

(By Floyd Root)

APRIL 1958.

The National Association of Wheat Growers strongly protests the veto by President Eisenhower of the measure passed by Congress in March calling for a 1-year freeze on farm-price supports. If the veto stands, it will mean that price supports on wheat for the 1958 crop will be sharply reduced by an average of 22 cents per bushel. The reason that we are protesting lowering the loan rate to this extent is not that we favor high fixed price supports for wheat, but rather that our experience leads us to believe this action will in no way solve the wheat surplus problem of the United States.

The 1958 wheat crop is estimated nationally at 1,200,000,000 bushels. This will be an increase in production of approximately 250 million bushels over the harvest of the last 2 years. However, the increase is not due to higher price support or a higher price in the market, but to the best overall weather conditions which the United States wheat producing areas have had during the past 10 years.

Lowering price supports by 22 cents a bushel at a time when the Department of Agriculture is carrying a surplus of more than 750 million bushels of wheat, can only result in the market following the support price on down. This will mean that all the farmers in the United States who grow wheat will collectively lose approximately $260 million due to the action of the Secretary of Agriculture.

It is an inconsistent policy for the administration to be responsible for reducing income by this large an amount to one segment of the population while working vigorously with other segments to stimulate the economy and reverse the recession. In these times of increasing farm costs, lowering the price of wheat only accentuates the cost-price squeeze, and accelerates the movement of people off the farms, which in turn adds to the national unemployment and increases the need for additional relief and welfare funds. If the income of the wheat farmer could be increased he would in turn start buying some much needed equipment. This would lead to more employment in our factories and would help our present unemployment problem.

It is most unrealistic to lump together all farm commodities when the farm problem is considered. With some commodities, lower prices to the farmer will reflect lower prices to the consumer. Such may be the case with food products which have an elastic demand. The United States Department of Agriculture has determined, however, that the price of wheat has little effect on the price of bread. At the present time, there is less than 4 cents worth of wheat in a large loaf of bread costing about 31 cents. You can see why wheat growers have a feeling of bitterness toward statements to the effect that lower farm prices mean lower food prices. As far as wheat is concerned, a 22 cents per bushel reduction in the loan rate at this time means a loss of $260 million to the wheat farmer which will be absorbed by the processors and bakers in an expanded profit margin and will not benefit the consumer.

We feel it is also inconsistent for the Secretary of Agriculture to urge lending agencies to expand credit to farmers and allow them to go further into debt. Wouldn't it be better for the farmer to obtain his income in the market place even if it is dependent, due to surpluses, largely upon the Government loan rate?

The officials of the Department of Agriculture would readily recognize that lowering the loan rates on the 1958 wheat crop will not reduce the wheat production this year due to the excellent weather conditions in the High Plains area of Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and Colorado. It is questionable that in future years lower prices will decrease the production of wheat because in the commercial wheat areas there are few alternative crops. At the present time there are no alternative crops which will produce anywhere near a profitable return on wheat land.

The National Association of Wheat Growers does not favor high fixed price supports, but we know that as far as wheat producers are concerned flexible price supports are also not the answer to the problem. Therefore, we respectfully request your support for overriding the Presidential veto to allow the continuation of price support for the 1958 wheat crop at the same level as for the 1957 crop, as a temporary measure until a long-range wheat plan can be developed.

Raise Postal Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials. The first is from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph relating to postal wages, and the second from the Pittsburgh Press, deals with the space program:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of April 13, 1958]

RAISE POSTAL WAGES

It is no secret that the Nation's postal employees have long been one of the most neglected groups in the entire Federal employment structure.

For many years the Hearst newspapers have championed the cause of these hard-working, faithful, and conscientious public servants in seeking pay standards to keep pace with the living costs.

Since July 1951 they have received only one salary increase, and that was a modest one.

They have amply earned another increase at this time.

But they are now being deprived of their long-overdue pay boost because of a parliamentary snarl in Congress.

This is due to the fact that the Senate chose to tie up postal pay and postal rates into a single package, which was clearly a mistake from its inception. President Eisenhower had recommended a pay raise of $165 million a year, but the Senate upped this to $309 million.

As far back as last August the House passed a postal rate-increase bill without tying in any postal-pay provisions. Meanwhile, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported an independent postal pay-increase bill which is now on the calendar awaiting action.

The postal pay raises in the Senate bill run from 7½ to 12½ percent, whereas the House pay bill provides raises from 10 to 14 percent.

The bills as passed by both the Senate and House are now in conference. They also differ radically in the scale of higher charges for carrying all four classes of mail.

As a matter of simple justice to the inadequately paid postal workers, we strongly recommend that the congressional conferees divorce the pay raises from the bill and pass them independently.

The unfortunate coupling of postal pay and rate increases in the one bill has created the impression that the rate increases are necessitated by the proposed salary boost. This is not true.

Postmaster General Summerfield has been seeking rate boosts at every session of Congress since 1953 without regard to whether postal-pay legislation was being considered.

There is no valid reason why the Post Office, of all the Government's vital agencies, should be singled out for operation at a profit at this time. We don't expect our defense forces, our health, and other protective agencies to return cash dividends.

But there is every reason to demand that the injustice being done to the Nation's postal workers is not prolonged by the wrangle over the merits and demerits of the rate increases.

The Hearst newspapers believe that this injustice will be compounded if Congress does not give priority to passage of a decent living wage for postal workers.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of April 14, 1958]

OFF THE GROUND

Six months after the Soviet sputnik shocked us into despair and frustration the United States seems ready to launch an organized program of space exploration.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress to set up a new civilian agency to direct all aeronautical and space science activities except those which are chiefly of a military character—such as missiles. This climaxes a series of recent steps obviously aimed at overtaking Russia in the space race.

Only recently the President disclosed the initial framework of a program laid out by his science advisers for this grand adventure. At the same time he repudiated those in his own administration who don't think going to the moon is worth the effort—or the cost—by giving the Defense Department a green light to try as soon as possible.

Thus the stage is set for the United States to embark on what the President terms "an imaginative and well-conceived space program" devoted primarily to peaceful and scientific purposes.

No doubt about it, the years ahead hold great promise and excitement. But only if we have the vision and the courage and the determination to pursue the growing opportunities of the infant space age as vigorously as did the explorers of the earth itself 400 or so years ago.

As this exploration of space proceeds it will be well to bear in mind that many of the discoveries and achievements may seem of little immediate practical value. For such is the way of science.

The basic scientific work that makes it possible today for us to send satellites whizzing outside the earth's atmosphere, for example, was not done yesterday. The groundwork for space flight was laid back in the 17th century by scientists like Johann Kepler and Sir Isaac Newton.

So it will be with much of the work in space. The results will add up to a legacy for future generations to put to full practical use.

The important thing right now is to get a coordinated space program underway. Happily, this seems to be in prospect.

Under the President's proposal the program will be directed by a new National Aeronautics and Space Agency which will absorb the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—an organization that has played a key role in developing America's airpower as well as our commercial aircraft industry.

However, no agency can be any better than the men who run it. Once the new agency is created we must make sure it is placed in charge of people who not only exercise good judgment but also make quick decisions.

For we cannot travel in space at a snail's pace.

The Community Facilities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just approved an antirecession bill to provide Federal loans to cities and States for public-works projects. On March 10, 1958, I introduced H. R. 11279, a similar bill, in the House. The communities in my district are in favor of this legislation as is certainly indicated by the following letter I received from the city manager of the city of Plymouth, Mich.:

PLYMOUTH, MICH., *April 1, 1958.*

Hon. MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GRIFFITHS: Local units of government are constantly plagued with tax limitations, debt limitations, and limitations on sources of income. As a result, many local units of government have delayed construction and paving programs from year to year, with the hope that the financial picture for them will be somewhat brighter. At the moment, the financial picture looks more dim than ever. Half of the streets in the city of Plymouth remain to be paved. It is hopeless to appeal to our State government for financial aid because it, too, is plagued by debt limitations and limited sources of income.

It is proposed that the Federal Government undertake a public-works program, which will benefit not only the economy of this area and the Nation, but also provide, for the citizens, improvements sorely needed. Attached is a memorandum from our supervisor of planning and engineering, dated January 25, 1957, in which he submits a summary of street-improvement costs, which, for 75,000 linear feet of pavement, will cost almost $2 million. About one-half of the total cost could be recovered by the city by special assessment from properties abutting the improvements. The other half of the cost would be city share for intersections, city-owned parcels of land, and corner-lot improvement costs absorbed, in part, by the city. It is proposed that the Federal Government underwrite the whole program, that the special assessments be collected and returned to the Federal Treasury over a period of 9 years, and that the city's share of the program be repaid over a period of 15 years. It is recommended that in order to accelerate the program, a letter of intent be executed both by the Federal Government and the city of Plymouth, which will authorize the immediate preparation of plans and specifications and the taking of bids at the earliest possible time.

Rather than stimulate business by way of tax cuts, it would seem more reasonable to stimulate business by increasing the durable-goods industry, which, at the moment, is relatively inactive. In addition to the road program, the city of Plymouth needs 3 underpasses, estimated to cost $400,000 each, a new city hall, and has about 2 miles of creek to enclose at an estimated cost of one-half million dollars. There is plenty of work to do. It is a matter of distributing the labor and money to accomplish the job.

Very truly yours,

A. F. GLASSFORD,
City Manager.

Eric Johnston's Foreign-Aid Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, in an editorial in its April 10 edition, properly argues that private groups such as Eric Johnston's foreign-aid lobby should not have access to Government funds with which to stage promotional affairs. The Courier also questions whether contributions to Johnston's lobby, known as the Committee for International Economic Growth, properly are deductible for income-tax purposes.

As part of my remarks, I desire to include the Courier editorial, which follows:

When the United States House of Representatives was considering a bill appropriating funds for the executive office of the President, Representative H. R. Gross, of Waterloo, offered an amendment providing that none of the money could be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat pending legislation. The amendment was accepted on a voice vote.

The amendment was designed to prevent the use of special White House funds to finance such activities as the recent gathering in Washington to promote the President's foreign aid recommendations. While citizens' groups and interested individuals have an obligation to promote the legislative causes in which they believe, they should not have access to Government funds with which to stage promotional affairs.

Much the same issue is involved in the question of whether a business contribution to the foreign aid lobby is deductible for tax purposes. Eric Johnston, who has been directing the efforts to build public support for foreign aid, has declared that such contributions are deductible. Presumably he has consulted with the Internal Revenue Service on the question.

Yet such contributions are not logically deductible under previous Internal Revenue rulings. For example, the department has ruled—under pressure from public power advocates—that utilities cannot even deduct as a business expense the cost of advertisements to present the advantages of stockholder-owned powerplants. This tends to restrict the right of a business to advertise the facts necessary for its own survival. Yet Johnston declares that businesses can deduct contributions for political agitation in the foreign aid field.

Foreign aid should be weighed objectively by Congress on the basis of the public interest. A sorry aspect of the pressure for large foreign aid appropriations is that some of it has come from businesses which see foreign aid as the only way of retaining foreign markets. If such businesses can deduct money spent to promote foreign aid from their taxes, then utilities should be given the comparable right to deductions for money needed to present their case to the public.

The Federation of the West Indies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Federation of the West Indies, comprising the islands of Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada, Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Antigua, Barbuda, St. Christopher, Nevis, and Anguilla and Montserrat, came into existence on January 3, 1958, when Lord Hailes was invested as the first Governor General of the federation. Members of the upper house have been appointed by the Governor General in consultation with the political leaders in the islands. On

March 25, 1958, the members of the lower house were elected as representatives for each island in the federation. The federal legislature will officially convene for the first time at Port of Spain, Trinidad, on April 22, 1958, and will be inaugurated by Princess Margaret, of Great Britain.

April 22, 1958, will be an important day in the lives of the 3 million inhabitants of the islands of the West Indies which have an area of more than 8,000 square miles. It will be a day of historic occasion for them to achieve self-determination by taking this forward step toward dominion status. The formation of this federation offers the possibility of sound economic development of the territories for the welfare of its people. The United States is always interested in the welfare of its neighbors and always benefits when our neighbors grow more prosperous. Difficult political and economic problems face the Federation of the West Indies, but the knowledge of the advantages which can emerge from successful solutions provides a powerful incentive.

The newly organized federation comprises an area that is strategically located in the Western Hemisphere.

Our country has enjoyed the various tropical fruits and vegetables that are produced in this area. Pioneer industries thrive and multiply because the people of the West Indies take readily to new ideas and are skillful; especially in the commercial trades. Tourism has always played an important role in the development of the islands.

The United States is keenly interested in the people of the West Indies and wishes for them continuing success in their new status.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.....
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*, 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.....
Albert, Carl, *Okla*., 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.....
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.....
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.....
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*., University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*., 800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*., 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.....
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*., 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.....
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.....
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*., 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.....
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.....
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.....
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.....
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.....
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*., 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.....
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.....
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.....
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.....
Bates, William H., *Mass*.....
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.....
Beamer, John V., *Ind*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.....
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.....
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.....
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*., 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*., 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.....
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*., 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.....
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.....
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.....
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.....
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*., 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*, 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*., Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.....
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*., 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*., The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.....
Bray, William G., *Ind*.....
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.....
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.....
Brooks, Overton, *La*., 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*., 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*., Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*., Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.....
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.....
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.....
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.....
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.....
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*., 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.....
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Byrne, Emmet P., *Ill*.....
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.....
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*., 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.....
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.....
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.....
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.....
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.....
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.....
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.....
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*., 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.....
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*., 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*., 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*., The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.....
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.....
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.....
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.....
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*., 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.....
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*., 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.....
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*.....
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.....
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.....
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*., 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.....
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.....
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*., 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.....
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.....
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.....
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.....
Delray, Vincent J., *N. J*.....
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.....
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.....
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.....
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.....
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.....
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.....
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.....
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*., 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.....
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.....
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.....
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.....
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.....
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.....
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*., 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*., The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*., 3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla*.....
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*., 3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.....
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*., 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.....
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.....
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.....
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.....
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*., 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.....
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*., Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*., The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.....
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*., 3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*., 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*., 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.....
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*., The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*., Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*., 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.....
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.....
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.....
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.....
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*., 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.....
George, Myron V., *Kans*., 3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.....
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*., 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.....
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.....
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.....
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*., 2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.....
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.....
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.....
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.....
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.....
Hale, Robert, *Maine*., 2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.....
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*., 4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind*., The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.....
Harris, Oren, *Ark*., 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.....
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.....
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del*.....
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*., 314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*., 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.....
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*., 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.....
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.....
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.....
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.....
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.....
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.....
Hill, William S., *Colo*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.....
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.....
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.....
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.....
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.....
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.....
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.....
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.....
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.....
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.....
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.....
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.....
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*., 200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.....
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*., The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.....
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*., 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.....
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*., 3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.....
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*., 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.....
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*., 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.....
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*., 2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.....
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*., Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*., 1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.....
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*., The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*., 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*., 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.....
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.....
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.....
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.....
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.....
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*., 112 Schotts Court NE.

Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa*.....
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.....
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.....
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.....
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*...
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.....
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*...Sheraton-Park
Lennon, Alton, *N. C*.....
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*....
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill*.....
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn*.....The Congressional
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*..419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*..The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*...4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif*.
McFall, John J., *Calif*.....507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*...Mayflower Hotel
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*. 220 2d St. SE.
McIntosh, Robert J., *Mich*..
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.....1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.....The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*. 115 Dale Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.....
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.....
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.....
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.....
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.....Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*..
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.....
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass*. The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.....The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
May, Edwin H., Jr., *Conn*...
Meader, George, *Mich*.....3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*....
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.....
Michel, Robert H., *Ill*.....
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.....2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.....2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.....
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.....3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.....2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*..8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga*.....
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex*..
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va*...
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.....
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.....
Morris, Toby, *Okla*.....220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La*.....4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif*.....204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*....
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*...
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.....The Coronet
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.....
Natcher, William H., *Ky*....
Neal, Will E., *W. Va*.....
Nicholson, Donald W., *Mass*.
Nimtz, F. Jay, *Ind*.....
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.....
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.....2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.....
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.....The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.....The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*....2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass*..
Omers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*..
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*....100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.....
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.....117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*..
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*....
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.....
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*..
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.....
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.....
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.....
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.....2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.....
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.....
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg*....
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*...
Preston, Prince H., *Ga*.....
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.....
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*....
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.....
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.....
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.....
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.....
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.....The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.....1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.....6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.....5603 24th Ave. SE. Hillcrest Hgts. Wash., 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.....
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*..3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.....
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.....
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*...6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*..
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y*...
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*...1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*...
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.....
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass*. The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.....
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.....
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.....
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.....
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*....
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y*..
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif*..
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.....
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.....3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*...
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C*.....
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*....2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*...4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*. 433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*....203 C St. SE.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.....
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*...
Shuford, George A., *N. C*....Calvert-Woodley
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*...
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.....
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.....
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*...5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.....2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.....
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.....
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif*.....
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.....204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.....
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.....Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*....
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*..
Stauffer, S. Walter, *Pa*.....
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.....
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.....
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.....4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.....
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*...
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.....6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y*.....Mayflower Hotel
Tewes, Donald E., *Wis*.....
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.....2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*...Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*..
Thompson, T. A., *La*.....1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*....
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*....
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*...
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.....
Tuck, William M., *Va*.....
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.....
Ullman, Al, *Oreg*.....
Utt, James B., *Calif*.....
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.....
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*...
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*....Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.....4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.....2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.....110 Maryland Ave NE.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.....
Watts, John C., *Ky*.....
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.....9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.....
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*....
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C*.....
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*....5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*...
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.....
Wigglesworth, Richard B., *Mass*. 3257 N St.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*...1001 S. 4th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*..1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.....
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.....
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.....
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*...
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*..1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.....
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.....
Young, John, *Tex*.....
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*...4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*...
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.....

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*. 1718 33d Pl. SE.
Burns, John A., *Hawaii*.....

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.....2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Rd., Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Dr., Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Pl., SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Labor and Labor Policies and Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered last Saturday before the CIO–COPE convention, at Fresno.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Californians, I appreciate having this opportunity to come before California's CIO Council on Political Education to discuss with you in person my views in the field of labor and the policies and programs I recommend.

Frankly, this is a novel experience for me. My recollection is that when I was elected to the Senate in 1946 and reelected in 1952, I only heard from the A. F. of L. and CIO endorsing conventions when I read that they had recommended the election of my opponents.

There is no illusion on my part, nor I am sure on yours, that my candidacy for governor is about to receive the endorsement of this group.

You have a powerful and effective organization. In many States of the Union and in numerous areas within the several States, your efforts have elected governors, United States Senators, Members of the House, and State legislators. Many competent observers believe COPE has sufficient power, if not to nominate, at least to veto the nominee of the Democratic National Convention.

As one who has had a quarter of a century of public life in California, I believe I understand effective work in political affairs when I see it.

Your power in this State has become so great it is no longer realistic to consider your organization as a junior partner of the Democratic Party. As the dominant factor in the opposing political party to the one in which I hold membership, you have been doubly generous in inviting me here.

In some respects I understand how Daniel felt in the lion's den. My action in coming here, however, was voluntary. Compulsion was used to put him there. That, at least, is quite a difference in the manner of our respective arrivals.

Based on my record of public service to our State and Nation, I do seek the help and votes of the AFL–CIO members as individual Americans and as fellow Californians. Large numbers have already pledged me their support.

You can be assured that the comments and recommendations I make to you here today are the same thoughts and policies I submit to any other group in California or in any other section of the State.

You and the voters of this State will always know where I stand and why I stand there. The views I express in the northern part of the State are no different from those expressed in the south.

From the day, last October 3 (in Sacramento), that I announced my decision to be a candidate for Governor of this great State, publications sponsored by your organization and certain union leaders have continuously proclaimed that I am unfriendly to labor. Such is not the case.

The supporting statements that have been used to bolster this charge seem to me to be either inaccurate or incomplete.

I am not certain whether these claims mean that candidates you endorse must always support the policies you recommend or the programs you submit. Is this in the best interests of the union movement? Is this in the best interests of the people of California? I think not.

If this and other similar labor organizations are to claim to be educational, they cannot be narrowly partisan, for such partisanship destroys the very objectivity of education.

In the 1956 national campaign the record shows that of the reported $1,078,852 political contributions from labor, all but $3,925 went to Democratic candidates.

Of the candidates marked as antilabor at the national offices of COPE, 14 are Republicans and only 1 is a Democrat.

These facts hardly indicate a bipartisan approach to the endorsement of candidates.

In view of this background, I believe it would be constructive to separate my comments today on the things upon which we should be in agreement and the obvious matters upon which we apparently disagree.

Twenty-five years ago, I was a member of the State legislature. I participated in the drafting and subsequent approval of the first unemployment compensation law in California, and it still remains as the basic law of this State.

As an assemblyman I sponsored the antilynching legislation now on the statute books of this State.

As minority leader of the Senate it was my motion last year that brought the civil-rights bill before the Senate. It was the first such legislation to pass the Congress in 80 years.

As a member of the State legislature I supported legislation which made illegal the so-called yellow-dog contract. I took this stand because I believed then, as I do now, in the right of a worker to join a union.

In the United States Senate, I have supported the Government's unemployment compensation program and voted for legislation to establish a Government program to promote full employment.

I have supported minimum wage increases and legislation on establishing standards to govern employee health and welfare funds.

In 1946, I supported legislation to establish the Federal Mediation Board to encourage the peaceful arbitration of labor disputes.

Later that year I opposed a Democratic President's request for unprecedented peacetime authority to draft into the Army the railroad workers who were out on strike.

I have supported increased benefits for the Nation's railroad workers and their dependents. I voted for legislation starting on-the-job and on-farm training programs for our returning veterans.

My support has been given to increased social-security benefits and to bring millions more of our citizens under the protection of the law and millions more into our unemployment insurance system.

I do not believe there is anything in that record with which you would disagree.

To be sure, some of your leaders might have wanted to have moved at a faster pace and with more astronomical spending. But union members pay taxes, too. Together with their union initiation fees, dues, and assessments it makes quite a drain on their take-home pay. The worker and his wife know the economics of both government and union taxes.

One other point that I should like to mention is that I have participated with you and some of your national leaders in helping to maintain the moral, psychological, and physical defenses of this Nation against the godless menace of international communism.

I have not failed to express my convictions in opposition to policies of appeasement of communism, whether suggested by business or labor or political officials. Now, as at Munich, the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Whether in or out of public office, I intend to continue to frankly discuss the objectives of the men in the Kremlin and the Communist philosophy, whose only promise to the worker is to make him a slave of the state. I salute the president of the AFL–CIO, George Meany, for his outstanding leadership against international and domestic communism. He is no "Johnny come lately" to this crucial struggle.

I also voted for the Taft-Hartley bill, for which I was accused of being antiunion. I cannot believe, however, that my support of this legislation, which I believed then and now is constructive labor legislation, is a reason for your opposition of my candidacy.

The fact is that the Democratic Congressman from the Second District, who is receiving labor support for his senatorial contest, also voted for the Taft-Hartley legislation and also voted to override a Democratic President's veto of the bill. So this can hardly be the basis of your opposition to me. Or is there a double standard? If a Democrat voted for Taft-Hartley is he excused and endorsed? If a Republican does the same thing is he condemned and liquidated?

You will recall that the Taft-Hartley bill was misrepresented as a "slave labor bill." A great and expensive propaganda drive was undertaken to convince union members that it would destroy their organizations.

Of course, it did no such thing. In 1947 when the bill was enacted there were 15 million union members. Today there are an estimated 19 million. Union treasuries are, for the most part, larger than they have ever been before.

What sort of slavery and destruction of unionism is this? Now the same old refrain is being played over again.

I merely want workers and union members to have the protection against arbitrary power on the part of union officials that the Bill of Rights gives us as citizens against the arbitrary acts of Government officials.

The labor program I recommend may be the basis for your organization's opposition to my candidacy. This proposed legislation has been subject to distortion and misleading representations.

I believe in and support strong and free unions. I want them to be responsible to their membership and to the public. They

exercise great power and with power must always go responsibility.

I believe in and unqualifiedly support the right of every American worker to join a union. Any attempt to restrict the opportunity of an employee to participate voluntarily in a union, or to prevent a duly elected union organization from representing such employees in collective bargaining, will be vigorously opposed by me.

I believe in the right of every union member to have a free voice in the administration and activities of his or her union, and if the union does not act in their best interest I believe in the right to withdraw from the union without losing employment.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate, and support similar legislation in California, which will guarantee democratic control by union members over the officers and activities of their respective unions. This legislation does the following:

1. Guarantees the election of union officials by secret ballot and makes sure that the ballots cast are the ballots counted.

Is this against the best interests of the members?

2. Provides for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

Is this undemocratic or antiunion?

3. Prevents conspiracies between management and union officials that work against the welfare of union members.

Is there anyone here in favor of "sweetheart contracts?"

4. Protects union members' welfare and pension programs. (This provision protects the welfare programs of union members whether they are controlled by unions or management).

Does this threaten the intersts of the rank and file?

5. Requires that where unions, under the existing low, represent all employees in an industry or plant, then all employees are entitled to be admitted into the union if they should desire union membership.

Who here believes in class A and class B membership or in discrimination in union membership?

6. Provides that union members shall by secret ballot have the determining voice in the conditions, terms and duration of strikes.

Should not union members, who are called on to make the sacrifices in strikes have the right to determine the issue?

7. Prevents arbitrary control over local unions by trustees appointed by national or international unions.

Can this be considered detrimental to either the members or the locals?

8. Provides for regulation by union members of the actions of their unions on questions of excessive union fees, assessments or arbitrary actions.

Is this undemocratic or harmful to the rank and file?

Of course, I understand that there may be some of the provisions I mentioned on which some of you may recommend a different approach.

Those who completely opposed this basic bill of rights for the working men and women are the ones not serving the best interests of their members or the public.

A question has arisen as to where my opponent for governor stands on the workers' bill of rights. On February 26 in a speech at the Press Club in Los Angeles, he supported it in principle. On March 25 in a speech in Albany, he opposed it. I do not know if his southern view or northern view currently prevails in the matter of giving the members control over their own unions. If he doesn't support the workers' bill of rights, just what is his alternative?

Public minded citizens and organizations, whose support for organized labor is publicly recognized, have recently expressed themselves on the subject of democratic reform in union organizations.

The American Civil Liberties Union, which states it has been urging the organized labor movement for 15 years to adopt improved internal practice of civil liberties, last month recommended a labor union bill of rights. The areas covered by their proposal are in substantial agreement to those covered in the legislation I have just outlined. You certainly do not consider the American Civil Liberties Union as antiunion.

Clark Kerr has recently authored a report for the fund for the republic on "Unions and Union Leaders of Their Own Choosing." Mr. Kerr comments:

"The title of this paper suggests that national policy might move from the 'unions of their own choosing' of the 1930's to 'union leaders of their own choosing' and even, to a degree, to 'union rules of their own choosing.' But how is this to be accomplished? Action by the unions themselves would be most desirable and there has been a surprising amount of it during the past year. Experience here and abroad, however, suggests it will not be sufficient, that behind the good intentions of most union leaders will need to stand the power of the law, as in the case of corporations in the past.

"This is a troublesome issue. The pluralist will defend the private association from the control of the State. The individual, however, also needs defense against being controlled by the private government of the trade union, and ultimately this defense can be guaranteed only by the State."

Does anyone accuse Mr. Kerr, who is a member of the United Auto Workers Review Board, of being unfriendly to labor?

Mr. Clyde Summers, a labor expert and professor of law at Yale University, recently submitted an article for the New Leader magazine, a liberal weekly published by the American Labor Conference on International Affairs. Mr. Summers recommends a "bill of rights" affirmatively guaranteeing the rights of membership. He also recommends removal from union constitutions of those provisions which stifle the democratic processes. Is Mr. Summers antiunion or working against the interests of union organizations?

Mr. J. B. S. Hardman, former editor of Labor and Nation as well as the CIO Advance, has recently written:

"Unionism as a whole may well find it of advantage to itself, in the long run, to have the members' rights and leaders' responsibility bolstered by adequate legislation, carefully devised and properly administered under foolproof institutional setups."

Mr. Hardman concludes his remarks with the following:

"There still lingers in the recesses of union consciousness that ancient fear of government, of law, of the courts. That no longer fits the new state and status of the 20-million-member union movement in the democratic United States."

I have stated my position in support of voluntary unionism, and I intend to bring this issue to labor organizations and their members and to the people of California this year.

I believe that unions, in order to grow, prosper and function effectively, must induce employees to become members of their organizations voluntarily and not by compulsion.

The late Samuel Gompers, the founder and the father of the American Federation of Labor, pleaded the cause of voluntarism in unions. He also wrote in his autobiography printed in 1925, page 132 (this quote has been curiously omitted from the newly revised and edited edition of 1957):

"I held and I hold that if a union expels a member and he is deprived of a livelihood, in theory or in fact, insofar as he and his dependents upon him are concerned, it is capital punishment."

No permanent progress has been achieved in our society, or in any other civilized nation, where people are compelled to belong to particular organizations in order to exist.

The strength and contribution of our churches, parent-teacher associations, and fraternal, charitable, veterans, and civic organizations has been due to the free and willing participation of our citizens.

I believe in the right of an individual to decide, without coercion, his intention to become and remain a member of a union. Good leadership and promoting the real interests of the workers will produce stronger unions than trying to hold reluctant captive members who feel they have been coerced.

In voluntary organizations, there will always be some individuals who will not participate in the activities of institutions working in their behalf. But that is the price we must willingly pay for liberty. Its alternative is compulsion without cooperation.

This is not a partisan issue.

If we are to continue to make progress through our free enterprise system with its benefits flowing to all, responsible management and responsible unions are necessary to achieve this objective. We are all, in a real sense, each our brothers' keepers.

I have great faith in the ability of the citizens of California to independently see the difference between truth and falsehood. I am convinced that the recommendations and policies that I propose will be supported by the members of organized unions when they are fully and fairly informed.

Freedom and democracy must prevail throughout organized labor, for only responsible union organizations operate in the best interests of our society and their own membership.

Can any reasonable man believe that attendance at union meetings will be increased by compulsory membership in our unions? In the early days of our country, there was a requirement in some sections of the Nation, where the citizens of a community were compelled to belong to a particular church or religious group, and severe penalties in the form of exclusion from all community life were levied for noncompliance.

We must never forget that unions, as all other organizations, are a means to an end, not an end in themselves. Unions are a medium through which individuals are able to act not only in their own best interests but in the best interests of all the people.

I have stated in my public speeches in California and elsewhere that neither the record of the McClellan committee nor the legislation I have introduced in the Senate should be construed to constitute an indictment against all labor officials.

Many of these officials, past and present, have labored unceasingly in the best interests of their fellow workingmen. And I know they will continue to do so.

Despite the honest differences of opinion that may exist between us as to the merits of the proposals and objectives we seek, I want the membership of all labor organizations in this State to know that if I am elected Governor of California they will always have a fair hearing in matters coming before my administration. I will seek to the best of my ability to serve the people of the entire State.

In the meeting of the problems of our generation, we must show the same courage and commonsense as the men who gave us our Republic and have helped to maintain it.

As Republicans, Democrats, or Independents we can all join in subscribing to the oath of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Texas Editor Says Department of Agriculture Releases Misleading Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a Texas authority on the livestock industry, Mr. Grover C. Lee, Jr., editor and publisher of Livestock Marketing Journal, declared in a recent address that the United States Department of Agriculture is releasing out-of-date and misleading information to our country's livestock producers.

Mr. Lee cited a number of specific examples to back up his contention.

I ask unanimous consent that a report of Mr. Lee's address, as published in Livestock Marketing Journal, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR SCORES USDA REPORT ON MARKETING

HOUSTON, TEX.—The Nation's livestock producers are receiving "too much inaccurate, antiquated, misleading information from Washington," Grover C. Lee, Jr., editor and publisher of Livestock Marketing Journal, said here recently during a district meeting of the Texas Livestock Auction Association held at the Rice Hotel.

Attacking a marketing research report, Market Outlets for Livestock Producers, based on 1955 studies and released in March by the Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, in Washington, Lee charged that the conclusions therein were grossly misleading and added that "it should have been burned along with those other reports which we understand from the newspapers were labeled by USDA bureaucrats as being of questionable value."

The Livestock editor declared that "conclusions in the 2-year-old report are already outmoded and that it fails to give proper credit to the markets now selling most of the Nation's livestock—the livestock auctions."

Lee said that livestock auction markets now sell more of the Nation's volume of livestock than do centers. Industry-compiled figures for 1957, he said, show that the country's livestock auction markets sold about 53 percent of the Nation's livestock consigned to market.

"It is only logical to assume that the total volume of sales of 2,300 independent, conveniently located markets in areas of livestock supply are outselling the old, centralized terminal and public market centers.

"However, this latest USDA study even fails to define these 2,300 auctions as markets where all buyers and sellers of livestock are privileged to use facilities."

He quoted from the report, page 5:

"Terminal public market (also referred to as terminal markets, central markets, public stockyards, and public markets) are livestock trading centers having complete facilities for receiving, caring for, handling, and for the sale of livestock on a private treaty basis. The terminal public markets in this report are the 64 livestock trading centers for which the United States Department of Agriculture assembles market information. Various numbers of commission firms depending on size of market, sell livestock at these markets. All buyers and sellers of livestock are privileged to use these facilities."

Defining auctions, the report says on page 7:

"Livestock auctions (also referred to as sales barns, livestock auction agencies, community sales, and community auctions) are trading centers where anmials are sold by public bidding to the buyers who offers the highest price per hundredweight or per head."

The Texas livestock editor quoted Webster's dictionary: "Market: A public place for the sale or purchase of commodities."

"All livestock auction markets are open to the public and serve the public, and 'all buyers and sellers of livestock are privileged to use facilities.'

"Why," he asked, "was the word 'market' purposefully omitted from the definition of a livestock auction?

"Reference also is made to '64 terminal markets.' As a matter of fact, there now are only 60 markets included on the USDA's so-called 'public' or 'terminal market' list. Furthermore," he added, "10 markets selling all or 50 percent or more of their consigned livestock by the competitive, high-bid auction method are listed on the 60-market 'private treaty' roster repeatedly referred to as '64 terminal or central markets.'

"These markets include the world's largest cattle auction at Amarillo, Tex., Clovis, N. Mex., Richmond, Va., and Stockton, Calif., all 100 percent auctions; and Billings, Mont., Montgomery, Ala., Ogden, Utah, Spokane, Wash., Detroit, Mich., and south San Francisco, Calif.

"Around 3 million head of salable receipts moved by the outgrowingly popular high-bid auction system thus are being erroneously—or deliberately—tabulated with totals credited to the 'private treaty markets,'; that is, according to the markets which appear on its so-called 'public market' list.

"On page 5, this report also says—and we quote: 'The 64 terminal public markets vary greatly in size. The 10 largest markets handled between one-half and three-fourths of the combined total of various species of livestock sold during the period 1951–55.'

"We can't vouch for the truth of that statement in 1955. It could have been correct—but we don't know. We even have doubts, as a matter of fact. We can say, however, that it is a misleading and erroneous statement to issue in March, 1958.

"For example, let's have a look at Texas—the Nation's leading livestock State—and let's consider actual salable receipt totals, not the results of estimates or questionnaires, but actual head-by-head count by the United States Department of Agriculture and inspectors of the Livestock Sanitary Commission of Texas.

"In 1955, according to official USDA and ISC records, a total of 7,897,817 head of livestock were sold by all Texas stockyards, including more than 150 auctions and the 3 central markets at Fort Worth, San Antonio and Houston. Of that total, 5,205,012 head were sold at free, open, unrestricted, competitive auction markets—65 percent of the gross volume of the entire State;

"Now, then—in 1957, according to those same reliable and accurate sources, the share of Texas livestock auctions had increased to 71 percent. During last year, all Texas stockyards (auctions and centrals) had combined salable receipts of 7,155,317 head of all species of livestock. Fort Worth, San Antonio, and Houston handled a total of 2,054,208 head and the State's auctions moved a combined total of 5,091,109 head.

"To further illustrate the actual amazing gains and increasing popularity of the auction method of selling livestock, 10 years ago—in 1948—auctions were moving only 53 percent of the State's livestock. Today they are handling 71 percent.

"During 1957, the auctions' share of the State's total of cattle and calves climbed from 68 to 73 percent, hogs from 74 to 76 percent. They handled slightly less sheep and lambs than the prior year, slipping 2 percent to 64 percent.

"And don't think for a moment that this amazing progress has been made without stiff competition. In 1957, according to the United States Department of Agriculture itself, our 3 Texas central markets had these respective rankings nationally: Fort Worth, 11th in cattle, 6th in calves, 27th in hogs, 2d in sheep and lambs. San Antonio, 24th in cattle, 11th in calves, 19th in sheep and lambs. Houston, 38th in cattle, 4th in calves, 55th in hogs, and 56th in sheep.

"That is the picture in Texas. There is no reason for us to believe, on the basis of United States Department of Agriculture's own statistics relating to terminal and/or central market receipts—year by year—that auction marketing is not making similar progress in most other States over the Nation.

"It also is interesting to note that this latest Department of Agriculture report is based on sampling drawn from basic lists obtained from the 1954 Census of Agriculture.

"We, frankly, consider much of that information similar to the somewhat unreliable livestock data which appears on a Texas county tax collector's rendition rolls.

"In the introduction to this so-called report, its authors, Victor B. Phillips and Gerald Engleman, state on page 4:

" 'Estimates of sales of livestock by farmers through different types of market outlets in 1955 are based on data obtained in connection with a comprehensive survey in 1956 of farmers' expenditures in 1955 period. The survey was made under the supervision of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Census. A sample of approximately 6,600 farms was drawn from basic lists obtained from the 1954 Census of Agriculture.'

"Now, again taking a look at figures here in the Nation's No. 1 livestock State: In 1954, the United States Bureau of Census reported that livestock sales in Texas totaled 7,995,481 head; yet actual salable receipt totals show that 8,119,761 head were sold through the State's central markets at Fort Worth, San Antonio and Houston and 150 auction markets alone—and this figure, of course, does not include a heavy volume of direct sales or other transactions.

"In a speech delivered at Denver, Colo., on June 15, 1956, to the annual convention of the American National Livestock Auction Association, Mr. Engleman, one of the coauthors of this recently issued report on Market Outlets for Livestock Producers, said, and we quote:

" 'Because of some technical problems in making estimates for those auctions which did not respond to our inquiry, it is not possible at this time to give any precise figures on the number of livestock sold through auctions. However, a preliminary analysis indicates that about the same number of cattle were sold through the auction ring as were sold at terminal markets in the country as a whole. It appears that in 1955 approximately four times as many calves were sold at auction as at terminal markets. If cattle and calves are added together this would mean that more than one-third more cattle and calves were sold through the 2,322 auctions operating in the United States in 1955 than at the 64 terminal markets.

" 'Our preliminary estimates indicate that auctions sell about two-thirds the number of hogs that are sold at terminal markets. The auction also appears to be a very important market for the nation's sheep and lambs. Tenative estimates are that in 1955 nearly four-fifths as many sheep and lambs were

sold through auctions as were sold at the terminal public stockyards.'

"May I pause here to inject one more interesting Texas statistic: In 1955, the year to which Mr. Engelman refers, the Mills County Commission Co., a livestock auction market operating under regulations of the Packers & Stockyards Act which also govern the Nation's terminal or central markets, and located in a Texas community of slightly more than 1,500 population, sold a total of 582,974 head of sheep, lambs, and goats. And, on the basis of salable receipts listed on the USDA's own roster of 64 public or central markets, this Texas auction ranked 6th in the entire Nation in salable receipts of that species. Furthermore, despite lower receipts in 1957 the result of forced selling and liquidations of herds and flocks in our Lone Star State due to the severity of the 8-year drought in 1956, this Texas livestock auction—last year, 1957—ranked seventh among all markets in the Nation.

"Continuing now to quote from Mr. Engelman's speech at Denver:

" 'These preliminary figures have been surprising to those of us engaged in livestock marketing research. Although researchers have been aware of the growing importance of livestock auctions, few have realized the full importance of the auction as a livestock marketing institution.

" 'Some of the other estimates also are somewhat surprising. It has been commonly thought that the major function of auctions in many areas was to provide a market for interfarm sales. However, the tentative analysis indicate that over 50 percent of each of the species of livestock sold through auctions in 1955 were purchased for slaughter. The data also indicate that packer buyers and order buyers for packer accounts were the most important buyers at auctions. Livestock producers and feeders were the most important buyers of nonslaughter animals. Dealers and order buyers for feeder accounts, combined, bought about two-thirds as many animals as did livestock producers and feeders.

" 'There are preliminary results, of course. A more complete analysis of this survey with more precise and more detailed estimates will be published late this year. You gentlemen will all receive copies of the publication and will be able to compare the operation of your auction with others of different sizes in your own region and in the United States.'

"Today—21 months later—we still await this auction study report which Mr. Engelman said in 1956 'will be published late this year.'

"The United States Department of Agriculture spends millions and millions of dollars compiling central or terminal market information. Yet apparently, they can't 'afford' to publish this study of the industry which today is selling most of the Nation's livestock consigned to market.

"This outdated, misleading report, Market Outlets for Livestock Producers, is another forcible reminder that the Nation's livestock markets—both private treaty and auction—should conduct more private research.

"On the basis of this apparent 'too little and too late' marketing research by bureaucrats in Washington, there is a vital need—by both market operators and producers—for more responsible, more reliable, and certainly more timely livestock marketing information.

"Being quite human, we readily realize and admit that everyone makes mistakes. On the other hand, it should be purpose and policy to keep those mistakes at a minimum and to insure to all extent possible that errors be little ones. Nothing can be more damaging to industry—or even to Government—than an incorrect statistic.

"Which reminds us of this news story, widely published in the Nation's press earlier this year and which, incidentally, appeared in our own newspaper, Livestock Marketing Journal. And we quote:

" 'The headline reads: "Revised Figures Show Drop in 1957 Farm Income."

"And the story says, and again we quote:

" 'WASHINGTON—The Agriculture Department reversed itself and said net farm income in 1957 went down instead of up.

"The 1957 net, the agency reported, 'was probably slightly below' the $12.1 billion of 1956. Officials said the final tabulation would probably show 1957 net farm income at $11.9 billion, compared with the $12.2 billion originally forecast.

"Net farm income measures gross income—cash for marketings plus Government payments—minus costs.

"Agriculture Secretary Benson was clearly counting on higher farm income in 1957. Most of his recent public statements have excluded some such phrase as this excerpt from his year-end report: 'During 1957, farm income increased for the second consecutive peacetime year despite rising costs.'

"As we said, may all of our mistakes be little ones. And, with pride, painstaking care and diligence—our industry—on behalf of our growing number of satisfied customers, the livestock producers of America—should expand and improve its own private statistical research which, year by year, continues to show more and more progress for the auction method of selling the Nation's livestock."

Heights and Depths of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on yesterday there was published in the Washington Star magazine an article entitled "Heights and Depths of Unemployment." I am very happy to ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I believe that we talk too much in generalities and the statements we make tend to be colored by the views we hold on one side of the problem or the other.

The article sets forth the total amount of unemployment in 1929 and in the following years, up to the present time. The reasoning of the article is, I believe, definitely worth while.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEIGHTS AND DEPTHS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Doris Kanter)

"Unemployment" is a word with a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde personality. Much of the time, it's simply a statistic—a relatively mild, if slightly sad, statistic vaguely known to affect some anonymous citizens in some remote communities. Then, suddenly, by the alchemy of economics, it's a specific, immediate and ominous fact, a terrible threat to one's neighbors—even to one's self.

In January of this year, for instance, there was a variety of opinion on the state of the Nation's economy. You could find economists and/or politicians to support any of the following views:

1. A dark and foreboding cloud hovers over the Nation's economy.

2. There's a cloud, all right, but it's not so dark and foreboding.

3. It will soon pass.

And then it hit. Unemployment in mid-January, it was announced, was up, sharply and dramatically. If there were other, brighter factors in the overall economic weather picture, they were obscured by the fact that unemployment had climbed to 4,494,000, an increase of 1,120,000 in a single month. The figures invited comparisons with times past: It was pointed out that this was the highest monthly increase since 1950. The national unemployment total was to climb still higher and, thanks largely to the spector in the shape of an unemployment statistic, a dread word of the early thirties was back on the tips of American tongues.

How did unemployment in the first month of 1958 compare with times gone, good, and bad? If there any number of percentage of unemployed which serves as a standard to distinguish "normalcy," "recession", and "depression?" A lot of statistics and facts are presented to the ordinary citizen: How can John Q really tell when unemployment portends dark times and when it doesn't?

Sunday, the Star magazine, put these questions to Seymour L. Wolfbein, chief of the Labor Department's Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics. The accompanying graphs, showing the percentage of unemployment in relation to the total national labor force over the last quarter of a century, are based on statistics furnished by his office.

Briefly, here is background Mr. Wolfbein considers essential to an understanding of unemployment statistical developments:

Since World War I, three important changes have affected the Nation's wage and salary workers. One of these is a shift in job concentration from the "goods-producing" industries (coal, oil, gas, steel, machinery, food, feed, etc.) to "services" (all activities that involve buying, selling, teaching, transporting, government service, etc.). More persons now are engaged in the provision of services than in the production of goods. Some 60 percent of the increase in nonagricultural employment has taken place within three subdivisions of the general "service" category—Government, trade, and miscellaneous services. Even in periods when nonagricultural employment generally has declined, these three have shown increases. Weakest of all employment areas are the farms, which had 7 million workers in 1870 and which today, despite tremendous increases in the over-all labor force, claim the same number of workers.

The composition of the labor force has changed: There have been substantial increases in the number of women and older workers.

Still another change has been geographic. Employment is now much less highly concentrated in particular States and regions than it used to be.

January is momentous still as the month that brought in, as well as a new year, a rapidly spreading new fear. Using January as an illustration of what his office looks for in statistics, Mr. Wolfbein says:

"We were anxious to learn from the figures whether unemployment had spread. Certainly, you watch the totals to see the rate and magnitude of change. But from the past, we've learned to expect that unemployment, when it's on the rise, will hit the 'durables'—auto, steel, radio, television, refrigeration industries—first. So long as other sectors of the economy hold their own—even if unemployment goes up in the durables—things may not be so bad. But if unemployment is spreading to other segments of industry, that's definitely not good."

More significant sometimes than totals, too, the statistics chief says, are the characteristics of jobless persons and the durations of their unemployment. In January, half the unemployed were men 25 and over

and presumably married. Mr. Wolfbein says, "This was not a good sign," he adds, "because it was clear a good many breadwinners were caught.

"In a long period of unemployment, benefits are exhausted and savings threatened. So the question of how many unemployed have exhausted benefits is a most meaningful one.

"We also watch closely," he says, "what happens to the average number of work hours. Ordinarily, $1 out of $10 a factory worker earns is for overtime." In January, total hours and overtime hours were both down.

As for a norm or standard by which to measure recessions or depressions, Mr. Wolbein shrugs.

"What year would you call normal?" he asks.

He suggests the lowest unemploymen figure the Nation could expect is 670,000, based on 1944, when wartime employment reached its peak.

"Seasonal unemployment," he explains, "accounts for part of the statistics, even in the best of times. Then there's frictional unemployment—where joblessness can be accounted for by those just out of college and not yet settled, those between jobs, etc. "The lowest annual level since World War II was 1953, with approximately 1,602,000 unemployed."

What of the worst?

"Well, in 1933—"

Estimated total labor force and percent of civilian labor force unemployed, annual averages, 1929–57, compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics

Year	Total labor force	Percent of civilian labor force unemployed
1929	49,440,000	3.2
1930	50,080,000	8.7
1931	50,680,000	15.9
1932	50,280,000	23.6
1933	51,840,000	24.9
1934	52,490,000	21.7
1935	53,140,000	20.1
1936	53,740,000	16.9
1937	54,320,000	14.3
1938	54,950,000	19.0
1939	55,600,000	17.2
1940	56,180,000	14.6
1941	57,530,000	9.9
1942	60,380,000	4.7
1943	64,560,000	1.9
1944	66,040,000	[1] 1.2
1945	65,290,000	1.9
1946	60,970,000	3.9
1947	61,758,000	3.6
1948	62,898,000	3.4
1949	63,721,000	5.5
1950	64,749,000	5.0
1951	65,982,000	3.0
1952	66,576,000	2.7
1953	67,362,000	[2] 2.5
1954	67,818,000	5.0
1955	68,896,000	4.0
1956	70,387,000	3.8
1957	70,746,000	4.3

[1] Estimated lowest percent of unemployment Nation may expect.
[2] Lowest annual level of unemployment since World War II.

Comparison of unemployment figures for the month of January in significant years, in the period 1941–58 [1]

Year:	*Percent of unemployed*
1941	13.7
1942	7.9
1944	1.5
1948	4.0
1949	5.1
1953	3.5
1958	6.7

[1] Monthly figures were not kept by the Bureau of Labor Statistics before 1940. The monthly percentage figures before 1950, however, are assumed to be of the same general magnitude as the yearly percentages, according to the Bureau.

These are seasonally unadjusted figures; that is, the number of unemployed divided by the total civilian labor force. No account is taken in them of seasonally recurring factors, such as weather, which affects the construction industry, etc.

A Visit to Redstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the Association Press in Alabama had a State meeting in Huntsville. On this occasion a great many of the newspaper men of Alabama had their first opportunity to visit Redstone Arsenal and see some of the things that are taking place there.

Mr. Barrett Shelton, Editor of the Decatur (Ala.) Daily, was one of those who had that privilege. Upon his return he wrote an editorial in his paper entitled "A Visit to Redstone."

This is an interesting comment by one who had seen for the first time this great arsenal and its activities. I commend its reading to everyone. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VISIT TO REDSTONE

We had, during the past weekend, a chance to tour some of the inner sanctums at Redstone and to watch a static firing of the 1,700-mile Jupiter missile.

We came away with a strong knowledge of just how little do we who live within the shadow of this awesome enterprise know about it.

We have read the accounts of what the Germans and the generals are doing there. We almost daily catch a brief notice in the papers of some new construction plan.

And, still, a visit to the place provides a rude and frightening shock.

No imagination can picture the bewildering array of glistening concrete towers, the oddly shaped buildings housing laboratories and God knows whatever else.

Everywhere there are signs of new construction—they tell us at the present time $25 million worth in progress.

Antique missiles with their stingers gone dot the landscape much like Civil War statues dot southern courthouse lawns. A museum contains more of these antiques, the oldest of which is not yet 20 years off the drawing board.

Olive-drab missiles nestle on flatbed trailer trucks in fenced-in parking lots. The fronts of classrooms and barracks bear jawbreaking title signs like Ordnance Missile Command, Army Ballistic Missile Agency, and Antimissile Missile Agency.

Always, however, the word is "missile."

Even a GI chapel mirrors the work of this strange land. We passed the chapel en route to watch a Jupiter test. It was the usual Army-post type, complete with slender spire, except that from the base of this particular spire there protruded four small fins.

Another incongruity here amid the honks and squawks of test-warning horns, the blast and fury of missile engines is the livestock.

A guide explains that the arsenal still has considerable open land and this is leased to farmers.

Strange indeed is it to watch white-faced cattle contentedly grazing within the sight and sound of flaming, roaring test stands and to see sheep munching on the slopes near where technicians watch through foot-thick glass the performance of some missile monster.

And monster is the name. No picture we had seen, no story we had read quite prepared us for the world-tilting sight that is a big missile engine at full power.

We stood but a few hundred yards away while liquid oxygen and alcohol mixed and burned in screaming, steaming fury for 80 seconds. We were told that the force generated would have hurled a hydrogen bomb some thousand miles across the earth.

There are 17,000 well-paid personnel at Redstone, civilian and military. They seem to joke and laugh and go about their work as men do everywhere.

But somehow the big central heating pipelines that snake across the arsenal to every building site remind us of a fuse.

The feeling of tension and strain that lies underneath all activity here is as real as these same heating lines.

And we discover Redstone is not a happy place.

Promotion of Wheat Exports by Oregon Wheat Growers League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, from time to time, I have called to the attention of my colleagues significant news stories from Oregon newspapers which reported the work the Oregon Wheat Growers League is doing in introducing soft white wheat to additional thousands in the Orient. This story is now being told outside Oregon; and just the other day I discovered in the eminent Christian Science Monitor of April 16, 1958, a news release, over a Pendleton, Oreg., dateline, in which special correspondent Malcolm Bauer tells of the latest steps being taken by this organization of wheatgrowers. For the further information of my fellow Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE EAT OREGON WHEAT

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PENDLETON, OREG.—A few thousand Oregon wheatgrowers are changing the eating habits of literally millions of men, women, and children in the Orient. Three years ago the Oregon Wheat Growers League set about the considerable task of educating the Japanese palate to wheat products as a substitute for the basic food, rice.

So successful has been the promotional program that it will now be extended throughout southern and southeastern Asia, in India, Pakistan, Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia.

As the oriental taste discovers wheat, the objective of the Oregon wheat salesmen is being realized: The wheat surplus of the Oregon-Washington-Idaho inland empire is dwindling away. Shipments of wheat to

Japan and India from northwest ports have never been so great.

In 1955 the league took the first small step in its campaign to win a new market of a billion consumers. It dispatched to Japan an Oregon farmer, Joseph Spiruta, with instructions to make friends, influence people, and sell wheat. He did all three.

The program established so recently in such a small way has produced starting results and has been significantly expanded.

The league's chemists and home economists have devised new processes for wheat, resulting in grain products which cook much like rice. Under various trade names, these new wheat products have become popular in this country as well as in Japan and India, for whose tastes they were prepared.

In Japan, the league has taken its demonstration of wheat as a food directly to the people. A fleet of eight mobile kitchens has been operating throughout the rural areas of Japan showing Japanese housewives the uses of wheat flour and other wheat products. Recipes feature the combination of wheat products and foods available to families in Japanese villages and towns, such as fish sausage, whale meat, ginger, and beans.

The league's representatives are also helping with the Japanese school lunch program. More than 6 million Japanese school children—half of the entire enrollment of Japan's elementary schools—receive wheat rolls with their lunch. Prior to the Oregon-based experiment, few had ever tasted wheat rolls.

The school program is in the process of expansion to reach another 500,000 Japanese children. The campaign to win the hearts of the children's mothers also will be enlarged. Four new kitchen-equipped buses will be added to the demonstration fleet. The aim is to reach at least 45 percent of the population of Japan living outside the large urban areas with the hope that, once having tasted wheat products, these millions will become permanent customers of the Oregon wheat farmer.

The league also conducts a bakery training school in conjunction with the Japan Institute of Baking in Tokyo. Students learn to create a variety of products from Oregon wheat flour.

The impact of the league's Far East development program is apparent in statistics released here recently by Jack Smith, of Condon, Oreg., president of the league. In certain areas visited by the league's mobile kitchens in Japan wheat consumption has tripled, from 30 pounds per capita per year to 90 pounds. At the same time, average Japanese annual per capita consumption of rice has declined from 330 to 264 pounds. Mr. Smith credits the league's program with the remarkable inroads wheat has made on the traditional Japanese staple, rice.

Early this month Wayne B. Gentry, of Pendleton, a former United States Foreign Service officer, arrived in Japan for a period of indoctrination prior to taking charge of the league's program in India. The India program will be expanded to match that in Japan. And next will come other countries noted above.

Oregon has found that there is a better way than letting surplus wheat pile up in elevators and mothballed ships.

Frank R. Kent, Great Maryland Journalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Frank R. Kent, who was one of the greatest journalists in the State of Maryland and the country, died last week. He was an able columnist on the Baltimore Sun, and his sage comments were read by people throughout the country with a great deal of interest and with a sincere respect for his insight.

John W. Owens, a former editor in chief of the Baltimore Sunpapers, wrote an article about Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun for Sunday, April 20, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANK R. KENT
(By John W. Owens)

Acuity in perception. Audacity in execution. These were qualities which made Frank R. Kent notable in Maryland journalism and politics before he was 30 years old. These were qualities which brought him quick fame when, in his middle 40's, he moved into national and international journalism and politics. No newspaperman of his time was less hobbled by custom and usage. None was less cowed by preponderant opinion. What he saw with his own eyes and mind was there to be seen. When seen it called for treatment, swift, unhesitant.

Yet, unhobbled as he was, Frank Kent was not a rebel. At the core of him he was a regular of regulars. He loved and had faith in the old order, social, cultural, economic as well as political. His acuity and audacity ran to the treatment of the actions of men. To their sincerity or insincerity, and decency or indecency. In the field of ideas, he was a traditionalist, willing to entertain the new when it was sincere and decent, but preferring the old in which he had been reared. He liked the ideas which had been his heritage and he wished these familiar things to be stable things.

In part, his support of Woodrow Wilson and opposition to Franklin D. Roosevelt can be explained by his traditionalism in the field of ideas. In the somewhat hackneyed phrase, Wilson was evolutionary, than than revolutionary. He worked within and from the established order, which he treasured. In Roosevelt's policies, those which have survived and those which have passed with time, there was more than a tinge of the revolutionary. Frank Kent could be steadfast for Wilson; relentless against Roosevelt. Of course, it was more than the form and play of ideas. Both Wilson and Roosevelt stirred Frank Kent's interest in human behavior. He believed in Wilson as a man. He did not believe in Roosevelt as a man.

But acuity of perception and audacity of execution were not the full of Frank Kent's arsenal. He was a man of powerful emotion, which influenced all that he said or did in private or public life. In the presence of sorrow, emotion gave Frank Kent the impetuous directness of a child. Years ago, the adored wife of an old friend was killed in an accident. When we went to the home on a gray afternoon we were told that the husband was in bed but wished to see us. Entering the room, we found a man speechless in despair. Frank walked straight to the bed, threw his arms around the broken man and kissed him, as though he were a little boy who had been badly hurt. Life flickered back into the stricken face.

Frank's emotion could provide entertainment, too. When he became managing editor nearly a half century ago, women were breaking through the walls of journalism. As a responsible editor and a practical man, Frank thought the girl reporters should do their share of the work. But, as an emotional devotee of the old order, he had the duty to protect those girls. With knit brows he was found checking assignments. The girl reporters must not be exposed to the vulgar or the sordid.

Out of this guardianship grew companionship. Most of the girls, in that distant day, were feminists, that is, they fought for women's rights and, above all, the right to vote. Frank teased them about their cause; the girls teased back. After 2 or 3 years of this lighthearted nonsense, we realized that the traditionalist was having a good word for the feminists—in a half-embarrassed way and with no clear notion of how he ever got into such a position. There was no mystery. A lot of brave girls were fighting for a cause, without anger, and without asking us, and Frank's emotion had taken charge.

When this emotion, which could be so tender and so gay, reached Frank's work it was another story. Emotion took his acuity and his audacity and made them instruments of inflexible convictions. Frank himself never dreamed that emotion had anything to do with his opinions. He was sure that his opinions were the product of cool reason. But, as with many another strong man, emotion was the force that welded all else together and gave certitude. Once in a while this emotional certitude led to vehement arguments with men and women for whom he cared a great deal. Usually, the results were not serious. Always possessed of a great gift for friendship, Frank was as emotionally dedicated to those he loved as he was to his opinions. In his later years he was at pains to guard against even a ripple. One could see the outspoken man heading off and gulping down some opinions which he thought might be distasteful to a friend. After one of those gulpings down, his face always became serene as though he were saying to himself, "Well, I handled that one."

An extraordinary man. A vivid human being. He will not depart from the lives of the men and women who worked and played at his side, who argued with him and laughed with him.

William F. Knowland, Senator from California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The New 'Mr. Republican'," written by Joseph Alsop, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 21, 1958. The article is very complimentary of the distinguished minority leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW "MR. REPUBLICAN"
(By Joseph Alsop)

If you had to choose a single individual to typify the Republican Party, the best choice nowadays would surely be WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND. By the same token, KNOWLAND'S situation in California beautifully typifies the situation of all the Republicans who are running for election this year.

Over the weekend the Senator flew across the continent to appear, like a burly Daniel in a populous lions' den, before a Fresno

meeting of the California leaders of big labor. His chosen topics were the beauties of the two measures that AFL–CIO chiefs dislike the most, the right-to-work bill and Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN's new labor-reform bill.

"I expect," he said with a grin, "something less than an enthusiastic reception."

This defiantly tenacious adherence to established Republican attitudes is what makes BILL KNOWLAND the new Mr. Republican. In this troubled year, with the threat of joblessness on most workers' minds, another candidate might be inclined to de-emphasize the right-to-work bill. But KNOWLAND points out that Bob Taft beat the tar out of the Ohio labor leaders after he pushed through the Taft-Hartley Act, so he plunges doggedly onward, down the road he chose a year ago.

"I think," he says, with his peculiar confidence, "that I'll actually get a fair percentage of the labor vote. I'm going to work for it, anyway."

But what makes KNOWLAND's situation so typical of the situation of all Republican candidates is something that the hardest work by KNOWLAND cannot alter. To be blunt about it. President Eisenhower is by no means the great Republican asset that he used to be. No known Republican candidate anywhere is making his main pitch this year on the basis that he is a hundred-percent. Eisenhower man. A few Republicans, in the farm States of the Midwest particularly, are virtually running against their own President, and above all against their President's farm policy.

Nothing of that sort is to be expected from BILL KNOWLAND, whose party loyalty is as solid as his large physical frame. All the same, if President Eisenhower had sat up all night thinking about the best way to hurt BILL KNOWLAND's chances for the California governorship and Goodie Knight's chances for the senatorship, he could not have found a better method than his veto of the pump-priming rivers and harbors bill. The bill Mr. Eisenhower vetoed last week included no less than 29 California projects, estimated to cost just under $200 million of Federal funds. Furthermore, development and control of water resources are just about the hottest issues in California today by KNOWLAND's own frank admission.

Characteristically, KNOWLAND is no more than a bit rueful about the President's action. Of his visit to the White House to plead against the veto, he says (and one believes him, strangely enough), "I didn't put it on a personal basis—I just explained the viewpoint of Congress." And of the veto itself he says (sticking out his chin like a bulldog seeking a good, enduring grip), "It may hurt me for the time being; but the people of my State will remember my own 25-year record on water resources. That's what will count in the end."

You catch the same tone in a less marked way in BILL KNOWLAND's discussion of what is for him the real, life-and-death election problem, the recession. He admits that the Eisenhower administration is taking a bit of a gamble to adopt a wait-and-see policy toward the current lag in the economy. He personally forecasts an autumn upturn.

Ask him whether there is truth in the theory that the Republicans cannot carry crucial Los Angeles County with unemployment at 7 percent or above, as it is at present. Then he replies soberly:

"I don't necessarily agree with that. Furthermore, I think people will feel next fall that we are going ahead again. But if the economic picture gets very much worse, it will be pretty rough, I have to agree."

Yet nothing discourages KNOWLAND, who is already spending all the time left over by his Senate leadership on plans for "my intensive 90-day campaign." After the Senate session ends, he expects to make 6 speeches a day for 3 continuous months. He remembers all the other times when he ran against odds, beginning with the very first time in 1932, when he got an 1,100-vote majority in a State Assembly district that Franklin Roosevelt simultaneously carried by 6,000 votes.

KNOWLAND is not only solid; he is also tireless. He is not only naturally sanguine; he is also firmly convinced that every Republican campaigner is doing the Lord's work. Finally, he likes a fight.

"I think I'll win," he sums up, with stern conviction.

The Effects of the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Four United States Families in Ten Feel Recession's Effects," written by George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 20, 1958. The substance of the article concerns the result of a recent Gallup poll.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR UNITED STATES FAMILIES IN TEN FEEL RECESSION'S EFFECTS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 20—The current business slump has hit home with Americans in a variety of ways.

To a retired steel executive in St. Petersburg, Fla., it means that "I am getting no dividends on my investments." To a widow in Clinton, Iowa, it means that "I've had to take in roomers and because of that I've lost my Social Security benefits."

All told, about 4 out of 10 of the 50 million United States families have already felt the recession in one way or another.

The greatest number of those affected say that it's either a direct case of unemployment or a fringe effect of the job situation—a grocery store owner whose sales are off or a service station owner who's had to extend more credit than normal.

The institute corps of 162 reporters assigned to find out just what the recession means to the typical American asked the people they talked with this question:

"Has the present business situation affected you and your household in any way?"

The replies:

Yes, we've been affected: 42 percent; 22 million homes.

No, we have not been: 58 percent; 38 million homes.

Analysis of the reports from across the Nation reveals that the slum—so far as its effect on voters is concerned—has not been limited to any one group or any particular region of the country. In all groups, a sizable percentage reported that they had been affected.

From across the Nation comes reports of conversation such as these:

In Greeley, Kans., 70 miles southwest of Kansas City, a grain-elevator operator commented: "The prices these days are just too high for my income."

A young wife of Henderson, Ky., told a reporter:

"We run a trading post here; we buy and sell most anything. But our business is hurtin'; people are just tighter about their money."

Southwest of Wooster, Ohio, along State route No. 3, a Gallup poll reporter questioned a 65-year-old dairy farmer who, the reporter comments, "was a very angry man." The dairyman exploded: "It sure has hit me. I get less and less money for my milk; I've got no money to pay taxes. It wouldn't do any good if the Government gave me back any tax; I don't pay any to start with. There's no money in dairy farming."

The Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, recently I received from an old friend, in Cheyenne, a very interesting letter in which he discusses the current economic situation. I was very much impressed by his approach to the solution of the problem.

Because I believe he has considered the matter very thoroughly and has reasoned with great logic in arriving at his proposed solution of the matter, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO., *April 8, 1958.*

Senator FRANK A. BARRETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I believe the most important issues today are, keeping the peace, unemployment, and inflation. I further believe all three can be controlled by cooperation between government, industry, and labor.

An increase in wages and a reduction in personal income tax is not the answer, either one or both will only cause more inflation, the people who would benefit the most are those who do not need the help and would spend very little of the money received from a wage increase or a tax reduction, but those in the low income group, those who would not receive a wage increase, those with large families who pay very little if any personal income tax, our retired people and those on welfare would not be as well off as they are now on account of the increase in the cost of living.

In my opinion and it is the opinion, I would say of the majority of the working people that, after the expiration of the current wage contracts if labor would voluntarily agree not to demand an increase in wages for at least 2 years.

Industry not being faced with a strike on a wage increase could and I believe would reduce the cost of the product to the consumer the amount to be decided by what they could afford that would create a market for billions of dollars worth of the product, as those who are now unemployed, those who are now on welfare, the retired, and the low-income group of workers could and would buy so much more with the same amount of money they are now spending, also it is a proven fact the people who now have plenty of money to spend are not buying but are waiting for the price of the product to be reduced then they will start buying, we know this to be true, as an ex-

ample in Cleveland when the automobile dealers reduced the price of the cars what they could afford they sold 6,800 new and used cars in a week and a good percent were sold for cash.

Under this sort of a plan the unemployed would be returning to work in a very short time, spending more money, paying taxes, buying more goods thereby creating more jobs and it would not cost the taxpayers 1 cent.

If you people in Washington could get the idea that to spend less and pay a small amount on the debt each and every year it would restore confidence in our lawmakers and leaders starting a return to solvency instead of down the short road to bankruptcy.

I believe the above views are somewhat similar to the views of the majority of the people today.

Yours very truly,

FORREST MCBAIN,
Cheyenne, Wyo.

Proposed Investigation of Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most powerful intellectual forces in Wisconsin for several decades has been the Sunday radio editorial delivered every week by William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times of Madison.

In his broadcast a week ago, Mr. Evjue delivered an eloquent appeal for Congress to drive ahead with a thorough and penetrating investigation of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Evjue makes the point—with which I agree emphatically—that there are a great many extremely serious situations involving the FCC which still bear the sharpest public scrutiny. The investigations that have been held so far by the House committee have not touched on many of the most serious allegations.

Bill Evjue has always held public officials to the most exacting standards of integrity. He is consistent with his entire career as a leading newspaper publisher in his insistance that not even a shadow of doubt should be permitted to cloud the public's confidence in the integrity of public officials. When public officials are entrusted with such enormous powers, to give or to withhold grants from the public domain worth many millions of dollars, then it is all the more essential that every charge and every suspicion be cleared up quickly.

This should be the goal of Congress in respect to the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC should be beyond suspicion. If any suspicion or dissatisfaction exists, it should be cleared up promptly and vigorously.

Mr. President, because Mr. Evjue has set forth so clearly and forcefully the principle reasons for a vigorous probe of the Federal Communications Commission, I ask unanimous consent to have that portion of his Sunday broadcast printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hello Wisconsin. Broadcasting, the publication which has long been the spokesman for the Federal Communications Commission and the big corporate interests that control and own the 335 TV stations in operation today, makes this statement in the current issue:

"It's unlikely that FCC members will take their wives to the west coast this year to attend the National Association of Broadcasters Convention. As things stand now they will get only their traveling expenses and $12 per diem from Government and must pick up their own hotel bills, whereas the NAB has paid them in the past."

John C. Doerfer, the former chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission and now the Chairman of the FCC, is now going to forget about the American amenities with which he justified the acceptance of money from the NAB for the payment of expenses of any of these conventions in the past. The FCC members will again be starting on an across-the-continent trip to Los Angeles to fraternize with and be wined and dined by members of the National Association of Broadcasters who have received TV licenses in the past valued in the billions of dollars.

What would we think if the United States Supreme Court, desiring to take advantage of American amenities, would start out across the country to be wined and dined by interests having litigation before the court? The Federal Communications Commission is supposed to be a semijudicial body. For a number of years the FCC members have been chasing around the country picking up honorariums, generous expense tabs and other emoluments for attendance at these meetings. This year they are going without their wives and the amenities because an investigation in Washington has not been able to cover up the big sums of money received by Commissioner Mack in connection with the Miami scandal. Of course the committee quickly fired Special Counsel Schwartz when it became evident that Schwartz would bring a lot of things into daylight that powerful interests in Washington wanted to cover up.

Two weeks ago, Frieda Hennock, a former member of the Federal Communications Commission, charged that TV today is in the hands of a giant monopoly. We think it is too bad that Miss Hennock didn't bring this out when she was a member of the Commission. While the members of the FCC are being buttered up at Los Angeles, here are some of the things that they should be answering on the congressional investigation witness stand in Washington.

Who put the pressure on to bring about the granting of a TV license worth from $10 million to $15 million to the Boston Traveler, the largest Republican newspaper in New England? The recommendation of the examiner who conducted the hearings was overruled. Didn't Sherman Adams in the White House and Secretary of Commerce Weeks have a big hand in getting the license for the Boston Traveler? Victor Emanuel is a big New York financier and promoter who has been able to ingratiate himself in administrations in Washington whether Republican or Democratic.

Following the last world war, Emanuel was angling for some of the big German drug properties that had been seized by the alien property custodian. Emanuel then controlled a big utility empire and the alien property custodian who had charge of the disposition of the seized big German drug firms was made chairman of Emanuel's utility empire at a salary of $75,000 a year. Emanuel has now turned up as owning the controlling interest in the Crosley Corp., of Cincinnati, which owns several choice TV licenses. Again, the examiner's recommendation was overruled and Emanuel's Crosley concern succeeded in getting a choice license in Indianapolis.

Time and Life got into the TV scramble quite late but they have had enough influence to already get five choice VHF stations, which is the maximum. The TV empire of Time and Life was built up by a man named Coy, who resigned as chairman of the FCC to head up the TV aspirations of Time and Life. He died of a heart attack while leading the fight for a TV license in Indianapolis. Today, Indianapolis is complaining because all TV stations in that city are owned by big New York interests that have great influence with the administration.

Incidentally, the committee might take a look at two letters sent to the Commission by Senator McCarthy, stating that he wanted to be heard at the hearings when the application in which the Capital Times was interested was to be heard. In his letter, McCarthy stated that he wanted to oppose any license to any company in which William T. Evjue was interested. He never appeared at the hearing but his two letters were sufficient to line up three friends of McCarthy on the Commission.

Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the Daily Radio Roundup published by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION
DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP FOR APRIL 9, 1958

Some 25 years ago, during the great depression, the Division of Cooperative Marketing of the old Federal Farm Board prepared a history of the beginnings of cooperative grain marketing. We'd like to quote a few paragraphs from that history.

"Wisconsin farmers," the history relates, "were among the first to produce a superabundance of grain, and to attempt collective action in marketing their crops. Grain buyers had established themselves at strategic points on the larger rivers and the Great Lakes at an early date. The outlet for grain to eastern markets was through Milwaukee and other lake ports. To these the grain had to be transported by team and wagon, and the farmer who could cart a load to market and be back home in a week was considered fortunate. In 1855, the railroad was completed from Milwaukee as far as Madison, and in 1856 it reached Prairie du Chien on the Mississippi. Its advent was hailed with joy, which soon turned to indignation and condemnation of the giant monopoly that was fleecing the very farmers who had recently helped to finance the construction of the road.

"Freight rates were a major grievance. Another source of irritation was the evident combination of the grain buyers at various shipping points, and their unfair and high-handed methods. Against this monopoly a group of farmers in the vicinity of Madison decided to rebel. They organized the Dane County Farmers' Protective Union and built an elevator of their own at Madison. This was early in 1857, and so far as is known, was the first farmers' elevator ever built. Ten years after the Wisconsin venture, in 1867, Iowa farmers built an elevator at Blairstown. Within a decade, 42 farmers' elevators were built in Iowa and several in Minnesota."

Few of these early farmers' cooperative survived. The cards were stacked against them. But, they served a useful purpose. Through them the farmers learned something of organized effort. In the 1880's, this cooperative spirit swelled again into organized effort in grain marketing. The Federal Farm Board history related that "farmers were convinced that the railroads were leagued with the line elevator systems, to hold down prices on grain, and with the coal, lumber, and farm machinery companies, to hold up prices of farm supplies. As a result of their grievances, groups of grain farmers again launched cooperative enterprises in the grain-handling business."

We cannot relate here all the struggles against adversity that the farmers went through, or the battles with interests that time and again killed the farmers' efforts. But, as proof that farmers did succeed, we offer the evidence of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives in which today 24 regional grain marketing cooperatives work together, serving more than 1 million farmers, and 2,200 local cooperative elevators. M. W. Thatcher is president of that federation, and he is also general manager of our GTA, which serves some 600 local co-ops in Montana, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and handles nearly one-third of all the grain marketed from these States. It is one of the Federation's 24 members.

The final chapter in this inspiring co-operative history is far from being written. Farmers have a lot of co-op building to do yet, before they can call the tune in the market places. But, it is in the co-ops, where farm neighbor meets farm neighbor, to build their power into a mighty organized voice. That's why we urge all of you to join your neighbors and market your grain, GTA, the Co-op way.

Resolution Commending Col. O. Z. Tyler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution commending Col. O. Z. Tyler, who has served as chief of staff of the United States Army Infantry School and the infantry center at Fort Benning, Ga., during recent years, as adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of Muscogee County, Ga.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Col. O. Z. Tyler has served as chief of staff to the commanding general of the United States Army Infantry School and the infantry center at Fort Benning, Ga., during recent years; and

Whereas as chief of staff, it has been necessary for Colonel Tyler to take an active part in the relationship between Muscogee County, Ga., and Fort Benning, Ga.; and

Whereas Colonel Tyler, above and beyond the call of duties as chief of staff, undertook to take a very active interest in creating an excellent understanding and cooperation between Fort Benning and Muscogee County; and

Whereas Colonel Tyler's extremely courteous and friendly personality, his intense interest in community relationships, his immediate attention to community problems and his coordination between civilian community and the command at Fort Benning, greatly assisted in creating the outstanding relationship which now exists between Muscogee County, Ga., and Fort Benning, Ga.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of Muscogee County, Ga., That in appreciation of the efforts, interests, and abilities of Col. O. Z. Tyler as aforesaid, he is hereby commended by said board; and be it further

Resolved, That since Colonel Tyler has brought great credit and honor upon himself and the military services of the United States Army for the reasons aforesaid, the clerk of said board is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the commanding general of the Third Army, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the Secretary of Defense, the United States Senators from Georgia, the Representatives of Muscogee County in the House of Representatives, the commanding general of Fort Benning, Ga., and Col. O. Z. Tyler.

The foregoing resolution was introduced, read, and duly adopted at the regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Muscogee County, Ga., held this 8th day of April 1958.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at 49th Annual Meeting of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the 49th annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association in Philadelphia on Tuesday evening, February 25, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 49TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, IN PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 25, 1958

It is an honor to address this distinguished group of leaders of business and industry.

Your influence and example can accomplish great things for our country. In meetings such as this we can plan the defense of America on every front where danger threatens.

In the month of February patriotic Americans commemorate the birthday anniversaries of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. These greatest of all Americans guided the destiny of our Nation in the most critical periods of our history.

Washington's military genius led us to victory in the struggle for independence. His statesmanship helped to organize a Government dedicated to the ideals that we hold sacred.

Lincoln's great achievement was the preservation of the Union.

In our day we face another time of crisis and we are fortunate to have another great President, Dwight Eisenhower, upholding freedom of the individual against those who would enslave mankind under the dictatorship of the state.

The course of world history has made the United States the backbone of the forces fighting to retain God's greatest gift to the human race—freedom of the individual to choose for himself. This sacred right was never more wonderfully expressed than in the immortal words of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

On the other side of today's conflict stands the power and might of the Communist conspiracy to destroy those rights and to dominate the world. The Soviet Union, by terror and tyranny, enforces its unholy doctrine that every man owes everything to the state.

With such powerful forces arrayed against each other, armed with weapons of unbelievable destructive capacity, it would be folly to minimize the dangers confronting us—not only from beyond our borders but also within our own midst.

What is our job in this critical situation?

During my long career as a soldier and public official I have always advocated the most powerful defense preparations. We must have the best weapons that scientific knowledge can produce. These weapons must be in the hands of dedicated men and women who are imbued with the ideals of our Republic. They must be backed up by the patriotism and sacrifice of a people who have pride in our flag and our way of life.

At the same time I have always maintained that one of the great elements of our defense against aggression is a strong domestic economy. Keeping our economy strong, sound, and stable is no less important than building our military power—and, my fellow Americans, in striving for that goal your part is just as important as the part played by government.

For 5 years we have enjoyed the greatest and most widely shared prosperity our country has ever experienced. Now we have moved into a period of economic adjustment—call it a recession if you will. This condition calls for economic statesmanship of the highest order—yet there are some politicians who seem to welcome the rise in unemployment as a vehicle on which they can ride to political advantage.

These are the prophets of gloom who would rob people of their faith in the future. They criticize and seek to tear down the forceful program put forward by President Eisenhower to create new job opportunities. The President is to be commended for mobilizing all the power of Government to alleviate the plight of the unemployed. I am sure every one in this meeting will support his efforts to accelerate industrial and business recovery.

The point I want to make most emphatically is that this is no time to abandon sound principles.

No wishful thinking or political demagogery can upset the fundamental truth that

our system of competitive, private enterprise produces more jobs than any other system ever devised. It does not depend upon Government. On the contrary, when Government, through excessive taxation, burdensome debt, restrictive controls, and special privilege destroys individual initiative, it wipes out incentive, drys up venture capital and reduces job opportunities for our workers.

Those who are familiar with my record in public life know that I have always been on the side of economy in government. But I do believe that we are on safe ground when we favor the investment of public funds in the sound and constructive public works program launched by President Eisenhower. Such investments in highways, river, and harbor improvements, flood control, post office construction and renovation will not only provide immediate employment but will bring long-range benefits of a lasting character.

In order to carry out these programs it becomes increasingly important to exercise the strictest economy in other fields of Government spending. All unnecessary government must be abandoned. Overlapping and duplication must be eliminated.

As businessmen you can take leadership in that direction. You must work to bring about a proper balance between wages, prices, and profits. You must battle against inflation because a stabilized currency is the strongest foundation of a sound economy.

Working together, labor, industry, and Government can overcome the difficulty facing us today and can build a healthy, vigorous, stable, and expanding economy.

Housing Response Is Reported Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at the time we had under consideration in the Senate the recent housing bill which I sponsored, I stated that in my opinion it would put people to work, and that this could be done quickly.

A few days ago there appeared on the front page of the New York Times an article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in which he told of the activities within the first week of the signing of the bill into law. I believe the reading of this article will indicate to anyone that the prediction I made was justifiable.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING RESPONSE IS REPORTED GOOD
(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, APRIL 16.—The Government signed up for the purchase of $6,444,000 worth of mortgages in the first week of operation of the new antirecession housing bill.

This quick response of the building industry was reported today by officials of the Federal National Mortgage Association. They said the response to the bill had been good and that the number of applications for commitments to purchase mortgages had been considerably greater than the number the agency had been able to process.

The number of applications for mortgage purchase commitments approved by April 10, was 609, worth $6,444,000. Under the program, Fannie May will commit itself to purchase mortgages of up to $13,500 at par on homes that have not yet been started. Thus the program is intended as a stimulus to housing starts.

Under the new program $1 billion is provided for such mortgage purchases. President Eisenhower signed the bill reluctantly, on the ground that the mortgage financing would be a direct drain on the Treasury. He reserved the right to reexamine the program after $300 million had been used.

BULK EXPECTED TO BE GI

Officials said today that they had no breakdown on the number of GI mortgages, guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, included in the early purchase commitments. But they expect that the great bulk of applications for Fannie May purchase will be for these GI mortgages, which bear only 4¾-percent interest and thus are relatively unattractive to private lenders.

Related to today's report was an announcement from the Veterans' Administration that March showed the best volume since last September on applications for appraisal of proposed construction of GI housing.

These appraisal requests were 8,406 in March, compared with 5,301 in February and the recent low of 3,501 in December.

The new bill raises the GI interest ceiling from 4½ to 4¾ percent, removes discount controls and establishes the new program of Fannie May purchases.

Although the new legislation was not in effect in March, today's VA announcement said the increase "undoubtedly was due to the anticipated signing by the President" of the legislation.

Renewed Communist Repression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from time to time we hear statements that the Communist satellite countries and Communist Russia itself are becoming more liberal in their treatment of opposition elements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Prague Dismisses Foes of Regime," written by Sidney Gruson, and published in the New York Times of April 14, 1958; and an article entitled "Gomulka Curbs Workers' Rights," written by Sidney Gruson, and published in the New York Times of April 15, 1958.

The articles indicate quite clearly that both the puppet government of Czechoslovakia and the puppet government of Poland are curbing the rights of trade unions and of opposition elements. I think it is clear from a reading of these articles that Russia is returning more and more to the policies of Stalin, and that the liberalization which occurred in Poland in October and November of 1956 is rapidly being replaced by repression.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAGUE DISMISSES FOES OF REGIME
(By Sydney Gruson)

PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, April 13.—Czechoslovakia's program of economic reorganization and decentralization, now in full swing, has been made a vehicle for purging politically alien elements from even the minor jobs to which they had long ago been relegated.

Speeches by Communist leaders, press articles and privately acquired information had given western observers here a fairly clear picture of 5 classes of people considered by the Communists to fit this label. They are:

Former factory owners, managers, and businessmen, usually lumped together as unreconstructed bourgeoisie.

Persons with close relatives in the West. Official instructions were to dismiss only those whose western relatives were engaged in anti-Communist political activity. Playing it safe, the authorities in charge of the program now have tended to disregard the official qualification.

Former members and officials of political parties that existed between the two world wars.

Former members of the Communist Party, whether they had quit voluntarily or had been expelled.

Persons who served in official posts under the Austrian monarchy, between the two wars or under the German occupation of World War II.

FOLLOW SOVIET EXAMPLE

Following the Soviet example, the Czech Communists have aimed to shatter the rigid centralized administration under which the country has been run since they seized power in February 1948.

The reorganization was to have been completed by April 1, 1958. Rude Pravo, main Communist newspaper, recently conceded that the program was running behind schedule and warned responsible officials that it must be speeded up.

As outlined by the party, 38,000 administrative employees of economic ministries and other agencies were to be shifted into production. Most of these people lived in Prague and with their families total possibly 150,000, more than 15 percent of the capital's population.

The Communist leaders have not tried to hide the fact that politics has been made a primary criterion of judging who should stay on the job and who should be dismissed.

Oldrich Cernik, a secretary of the party's central committee recently wrote in Zivot Strany, the Communists' main ideological magazine:

"Many politically alien elements have filled various posts on the pretext of possessing professional qualifications. They must be eliminated. Such elements are bearers of bureaucratism, block the initiative of their Communist associates, are anti-Soviet, grovel before all things Western and are used by the class enemy for subversive purposes."

Such people, M. Cernik said, should be offered work in production or, on assembly lines "where they will be under the direct influence" of workers. A "Socialist state apparatus has no place" for the old intellectual and bourgeois classes, the party secretary declared.

UNDER WORKERS' EYES

The Communist effort to get people to take up jobs outside of Prague, particularly in hitherto neglected frontier areas bordering on East and West Germany, has run into trouble.

"Where to go?" Prace, the labor union paper, wrote recently. "That is the question that hundreds of dismissed workers are asking themselves. There are many opportunities, but there is one thing wrong with them. Everyone would like the vacant posts

in the frontier areas—if only they were in Prague."

"It will not be easy for some people to go to the frontier areas," the paper said. "However, it is necessary because industrial production is to increase by 56 percent by 1960, compared with 1955 and this will require every head and hand available."

GOMULKA CURBS WORKERS' RIGHTS

(By Sydney Gruson)

WARSAW, APRIL 14.—Wladyslaw Gomulka laid down today a new hard line for Poland's workers, and in effect ended the country's 18-month experiment with workers' councils.

Speaking at the opening of the Polish Trades Union Congress, the leader of the United Workers (Communist) party made these points in what appeared to be an important withdrawal to the classic Communist position on labor's rights:

The workers' councils, which sprang up in the October 1956 political upheaval that restored M. Gomulka to power, must give way to organizations more susceptible to party control and discipline.

Strikes are illegal.

The trades union cannot be independent of the ruling Communist party.

NEW INSTITUTIONS PLANNED

M. Gomulka told 1,000 delegates to the congress that new social institutions would be organized to carry on the limited venture into workers' self-government started during the 1956 political reformation. The new institutions will take over the rights granted to the workers' councils.

The party secretary did not discard the councils altogether, but simply dissolved them in larger bodies that would contain all the members of the factory party committees in every enterprise where workers' councils existed. M. Gomulka has been strongly criticized by the Soviet Union for trying to follow the Yugoslav lead in the establishment of workers' councils with responsibility for production and management.

The new policy on strikes took the party back to the position it held on the question before the 1956 upheaval. For the last 18 months strikes have been legal, though late last year, after a spate of short-lived stoppages, the Communists forbade party members from participating in them.

STRIKES LIKENED TO ANARCHY

M. Gomulka condemned sporadic strikes that had taken place since October 1956, as signs of anarchy appearing amid Socialist democratic freedoms or forms of class enemy action.

MOVE IS SURPRISE

The announcement on the works' councils by the party secretary came as a surprise. The party had permitted establishment of the councils grudgingly, under pressure from workers. The scope allowed the councils was nowhere nearly as broad as those in Yugoslavia. Even so, the principle had been considered here as one of the main gains of Poland's political reformation.

M. Gomulka disclosed that 5,600 workers' councils had been set up. He said they had proved useful but added that it had been shown that "workers' self-government cannot develop itself fully in this organizational form."

COMPOSITION GIVEN

The executive of the new body in each factory will be composed of the presidium of the worker's council plus the chairman of the trade union committee, a representative of the party committee and the factory director. M. Gomulka said the new organizations would be known as the conference of workers' self-government and that they would have the same competence as that previously accorded to the workers' councils.

M. Gomulka said strikes were the only weapon the working class had to defend its rights under capitalism. He said it was different under communism because the workers had organizations to protect them.

A slight modification of this was made later by Ignacy Loga-Sowinski, chairman of the trade unions central council and member of the party politburo. He said workers could refuse to work for a few minutes as a warning if all other efforts to satisfy their grievances failed.

M. Gomulka indicated the party would soon order increases in the production quotas that decide a worker's earnings. The aim would be to obtain increased production.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, at the Annual Awards Dinner of Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], at the annual awards dinner of the Jaycees, honoring the outstanding young farmers of the year, in Indianapolis, Ind., on April 16, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, UNITED STATES SENATOR, BEFORE THE ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER OF THE JAYCEES HONORING THE OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARMERS OF THE YEAR, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 16, 1958

It is a distinct privilege for me to come to Indiana tonight to participate in this tribute to the accomplishments of young Americans.

In attempting to appraise the future of our country, there is nothing more gratifying than the knowledge that such potential citizen-leaders as these are already recognizing and accepting their place in the continuing march of freedom.

Likewise, to those of us who respect the fundamental economic tradition by which our Republic has grown great, there is no place where more significant contributions can be made to the perpetuation and enlargement of those traditions than in the field of agriculture.

America was, first and foremost, an agricultural nation.

Through farming, and constantly improved farming techniques, we have been able over the years to feed, clothe, and house a people whose progress has been aptly characterized by our undisputed recognition as the breadbasket of the world.

Farming is basic to America's growth—not only economically, but morally and spiritually, as well.

It is inconceivable to me that there could be a more wholesome atmosphere than the American farm in which to nurture the qualities of character, morality, and love of God and country.

The crowded, bustling, smoldering cities of this land sometimes distort and undermine man's perspective upon his life and his responsibilities to the world into which he was born. But in the rich, bountiful, and untarnished atmosphere of our farmlands it is possible, even in the dizzy swirl of this age of space, to feel the closeness with the purpose of our existence and to discover our most real and lasting values.

Truly, America is suffering today from a grave imbalance in both personal and political standards.

We have allowed ourselves to relax too comfortably upon the laurels of material achievement.

We need to pause, as it were, beside the highway of life and decide just where we are going and why.

If human liberty is to survive, we must take stock of our own lives and ask ourselves whether or not we are following a course that will preserve the American system.

We must determine whether or not the America we leave to our children and our grandchildren will provide for them the same opportunities in freedom that we have had, or whether the twilight of human dignity and individual liberty is now actually upon us.

It is here, in this midwestern heartland of America, that the determination of these questions can best be made.

It is in the preparation and devotion of young Americans—young farmers—to the challenges of freedom that we can devise our best estimate of the shape of tomorrow.

Certainly, these issues will not be resolved in Washington.

Neither will they be resolved in the expedient promises and platitudes of any politician who is willing to compromise liberty for a headline or the welfare of the next generation for victory in an election.

Yet, in every front, and in both major parties, we find that political considerations are too often the criteria for actions which will reverberate upon the lives and fortunes of the American people for years to come.

And no area of our economy has been treated with less respect or more shockingly maligned and abused by political power enthusiasts than has American agriculture.

To my mind, the one American, above all others, who personifies our traditional spirit of individual initiative and personal incentive is Ezra Taft Benson, our Secretary of Agriculture.

He is a man who learned about farming by being a farmer.

He is a man who learned about free enterprise by operating in the field of agriculture when agriculture was able to function without federally instituted systems of price support—when the agricultural economy was strong and vibrant by virtue of its own genius in a climate of unrestricted opportunity.

If ever there was a man who unfailingly put principle above partisan advantage or personal popularity, that man is Ezra Taft Benson.

Still, today, and for the greater portion of his tenure in the high office which he holds, he is vilified and condemned by those in the Congress who would continue to shackle the American farmer with governmental restraints and phony profit stimulus.

Consider for a moment the impact of politics upon the American farmer.

Observe, if you will, the ridiculous imbalance of economic concepts which has brought American agriculture to the brink of a potentially disastrous revamping of its institutional structure.

Fundamentally, the farm policy under which we are functioning in this country today was developed during a period of economic stress.

Minor changes in this policy notwithstanding, Government planners have foisted upon us an acceptance of the illusion that the Federal Government should either fix prices on certain commodities or, at the very least, exert a maximum influence upon them.

During the periods of economic upswing following World War II and Korea, the farmers proved a significant and disturbing exception to the rule of general prosperity. The reason for this, I think, is that we followed too closely these policies of earlier years: We did not allow for readjustments in the agricultural economy as a result of improved conditions generally.

Since 1951 Government surpluses have been increased from approximately $3 billion to $8 billion. At the same time, the Government has bartered, sold, or otherwise disposed of an estimated $18 billion worth of farm commodities.

Forgotten, of course, has been the fact that some of the most important farm commodities are not under Government price supports. For example, our farm and range producers of beef have suffered because the props under grains have increased their feed costs without giving them any relief at the market place.

The result has been that, despite the application of practically every conceivable Government program for agriculture, farmers in the main have been more hurt than helped by Washington-inspired directives designed to inflate a prosperity balloon for them.

Added to this bureaucratic confusion, and perhaps aided and abetted by it, is the rapidly decreasing farm population. That such a confused and deteriorating situation should occur at a time when the technological revolution in agriculture offers so much hope and inspiration is a challenge to all who will but apply themselves to a rekindling of the fires of free farming enterprise.

There may be a host of answers to this problem. Not being blessed with an intricate knowledge of farming, I am unable to project any series of formulas which would satisfy the total agricultural needs of our country today.

This much I can say, however: a man who farms his land in order to provide crops to sell at the marketplace, and to reap a maximum of profit for himself, is no different from the shopkeeper, or the barber, or the restaurant owner, or any of the myriad of other types of people who derive their living from the provision of goods and services to the consumer public.

The farmer, like his small-business counterpart in the urban areas, depends for his livelihood upon the laws of supply and demand.

Logically, the Government's role in his affairs must be a minor one.

Subsidy "crutches" remove him from the competitive pattern of the economy and make him nothing less than a pawn of Government.

On the other hand, a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing will permit the farmer a maximum of dependence upon free markets as the best guides to production and consumption.

As Secretary Benson has said:

"Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for Government bounty rather than producing for a free market."

I would like to ask, therefore, just who in this country do those who abuse Ezra Benson suggest to take his place?

What kind of superman do they have in mind who can unscramble the unholy mess of planned agriculture so as to make it work and, at the same time, to enable the farmer to maintain his rightful balance in our total economic structure?

Or am I correct in assuming that those in both political parties who dispute the integrity and moral soundness of Secretary Benson deliberately desire to supplant economic principle with expedient measures whose only consequence will be the destruction of American agriculture?

The truth is—and this is a particularly basic lesson for the young farmers of this Nation—that politics and agriculture don't mix.

Politics means government, and whenever the Government starts doing things for people in any walk of life it automatically and unavoidably takes from them certain rights by which their initial opportunities were inspired.

Now you may be wondering why I, admittedly not a student of agricultural problems, should express such an intense interest in this critical issue, as well as such a devout respect for the thinking of Secretary Benson.

Well, there are several reasons. And not the least of these is the fact that Ezra Benson is a Mormon—in fact, one of the leaders of the Mormon Church—and I was brought up among these people out in my home State of Arizona. I know their intense strength of character, their abhorrence of governmental addicts and welfare-state handouts. I have seen their enormous contributions to the development of our Rocky Mountain West. In fact, the colonization efforts of the Mormons in Arizona have been a foundation and an inspiration in the progress my State has made.

Perhaps I should add, as well, that I have personally tried to part Ezra Benson from his adherence to principle on one matter which could have been of benefit to me politically and to Arizonians generally—and I have seen the immovable devotion with which he follows his creed of ethical, honest, objective, and selfless government.

Another reason why I, as an Arizonan, feel qualified to adopt this view of our farm situation is reflected in the attitude of Arizona agriculturalists toward the Government price support program.

Arizona still depends extensively upon farming for the development of its expanding economy. Particularly in the cotton and cattle industries Arizona exerts a forceful influence upon the national market. And our cattlemen and cottongrowers indicated opposition to Federal subsidy programs.

The attitude of the Arizona Cotton Growers Association, for example, is plainly and simply, "We want to sell our cotton to the mills, not to the United States Government."

And that, I suggest, is the kind of courage and economic know-how which built our farm economy. And it's the only way that economy is going to be spared the ax of socialistic annihilation.

We in Arizona are proud of this spirit of rugged independence on the part of our cottongrowers, just as we are proud of their development of the extra-long-staple Supima cotton which is the product of that wonderful Pima cotton that outwears, outlasts, and outshines all other cotton fibers.

But the Agricultural Act, under which we now operate, invokes heavy restraints upon the growth of cotton in the areas of the great Southwest where it can be grown easiest and cheapest—namely, Arizona, California, and west Texas.

The long-staple cottongrowers who comprise the Supima Association assessed themselves $3 per bale of cotton for the purpose of raising additional revenue for advertising and promotion; and, by this device, the demand for their product has been increased to a point where the Secretary of Agriculture has lowered the support price to 75 percent and, at the same time, allowed them to double their acreage.

Obviously, if cotton could be removed from the Agricultural Act, Arizona's farm income would at least double.

By legislation, we are controlling the law of supply and demand to the point where agriculture in Arizona, California, and west Texas suffers in order to support inefficient cotton farming in the Deep South.

The resultant expense is detrimental to both farmers and consumers.

To show you how strongly Arizona depends upon the free operation of our agricultural economy, and how adversely present unrealistic conditions affect the outlook in my own State, consider that between 1920 and 1950 the farm population of Arizona dropped from 92,000 to 84,000.

At the same time, the cash receipts from farm marketings in Arizona increased from $53.2 million in 1924 to $369.6 million in 1957.

Isn't this revealing testimony to great progress, scientifically and technologically, in Arizona farming, despite a farm population decline?

Isn't this a clear indication that Washington farm strategists ought to begin considering this problem from a point of view that is at least as up to date as the methods which have made such advances possible?

The plain truth is that Arizona farmers don't want their chance for prosperity crippled by restrictions emanating from Washington.

They don't want to be told what to plant and what not to plant; when to plant and when not to plant; and at what prices to sell their yield.

Above all, I suggest that it is contrary to the bent of our farmers—just as it is contrary to the bent of all Americans—to be given something for nothing, to be paid for not producing, to have their opportunity and incentive destroyed by being forced into a common mold where every individual's capacity is judged in terms of the lowest standard of production.

Now the sum and substance of what I have been saying is simply this: The farm problem, by itself, should be solved in terms of fundamental American economics, not in terms of political expediency.

Additionally, a great portion of the problem in agriculture today is the result of political misadventures of the recent past.

It is high time the swivel-chair farmers in the Congress of the United States stopped making American agriculture the "whipping boy" for their political dreams.

It is time to give the business of farming back to those who know what it's all about and who have the biggest stake in it—the farmers themselves.

It is time that all Americans stopped questioning, quarreling, and quipping about Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and started thanking their lucky stars that we finally have a man in the national administration—in the Department of Agriculture—whose dedication to the principles of a free economy is so great that he will not sacrifice the opportunities of the next generation for an illusory victory in the next election.

American agriculture can survive this present turmoil. But it can only do so when the Federal Government stops trying to legislate farm income through direct price supports, stops the idiotic flow of crops into the Government's bulging bins, undertakes the job of finding new uses and markets for our farm products, and gives the farmers of this Nation the freedom to produce in accordance with free market prices.

It is up to farmers—it is up to citizens generally—to understand the historic truths behind our present agricultural capacity.

It is up to all of us to stem the tide of that philosophy which would wreck the free institution of farming in this country.

Most of all, however, it is up to coming generations of Americans, today's young farmers and tomorrow's farm leaders, to recognize that the only sound course for our future, in any area, is one of a firm reliance upon the individual citizen for the accomplishment of our basic social, political, and economic needs.

That is why I am happy to join in this occasion of commendation to these young farmers for their outstanding achievements.

My charge to them, as I know it is yours, is that by holding fast to the concepts of human liberty they may ever be worthy of the high responsibility to the field of agriculture which is theirs.

Veto of Farm Price Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there has been much discussion relative to farm prices. The recent veto by President Eisenhower of the farm price freeze has caused many outstanding newspapers of the Nation to speak editorially on this subject.

The United States is a country where we may all express ourselves, and I ask unanimous consent that 3 editorials on this subject—1 from the Philadelphia Inquirer, 1 from the Philadelphia Bulletin, and 1 from the New York Mirror—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

FARM PRICE FREEZE VETO WAS NEEDED

President Eisenhower is to be commended for his veto of the thoroughly unsound farm price freeze bill. It was politically motivated for this crucial election year.

Both for the farmers and consumers in this country, there is need for wise, constructive—and permanent—efforts to give those who raise our crops and cattle stable positions in America's economy.

Programs afflicted with the malign influences of politics, of huckstering for farm votes, cannot achieve that end. Look again at what this freeze bill proposed to do. It intended to strike from the hands of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson the authority to adjust farm price support structures. The measure stipulated supports must be held at the 1957 level.

And for how long? Just 1 year. An important election year. The President was correct in his statement of the results: More farm products piled up in Government warehouses; further restriction of markets; extension of Federal controls.

For years just such conditions have plagued American agriculture and the American people creating vast, unwieldy surpluses, which have proved to be a weakening menace to our farm economy.

What happens now? There will be an effort to override Mr. Eisenhower's veto. Chances appear to be against it. That will leave the administration free to deal fairly and realistically with the price support situation. Fortunately, farm prices have taken a somewhat encouraging upturn through which, without excessive aid from the Government, the position of the Nation's farmers should improve.

The President was subjected to extraordinary pressures to sign the support freeze bill. It came from members of his own party, as well as from the Democrats. He acted not only with wisdom but with courage in resisting those pressures. The way is open now for worthwhile, earnest measures, on the part of the administration and of Congress—and both parties—to formulate sound American farm policies. That is the path that should be followed.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin]

FARM GRAB VETOED

President Eisenhower's veto of the bill which would freeze farm price supports at their 1957 level will probably come as a welcome action to many Senators and Congressmen who voted for it, and who will vote for it again when the two Houses are asked to override his veto.

They will welcome it on two counts. First, because many of them know as well as he does that this was a measure that would simply perpetuate a farm relief program that has proved itself worse than a failure. Second, because it will enable them, in the coming election campaigns, to picture themselves as the farmer's friend, and President Eisenhower as the farmer's foe.

The President's veto was an act of courage in a campaign year, when commonsense does not always pay off at the polls.

[From the New York Mirror]

THE FARM BILL VETO

It has been apparent for years that order could not be restored to American agriculture without some pain, strain, and political caterwauling.

High price supports resulted in large surpluses being dumped in the hands of the Government; high food prices for the city dweller and no real, long-range solution for the problems of the farmer.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson attacked this problem with courage and tenacity; President Eisenhower has been statesmanlike in backing him up, in the face of wailing despair from many Republican Members of Congress.

The President has just vetoed legislation that would have frozen present farm price supports for 1 year. "What the farm economy needs is a thaw rather than a freeze," the President said.

Freezing would add to the surplus stockpiles, restrict the development and growth of new markets, give little aid to the small farmer, maintain high consumer prices and continue to limit the farmer in the exercise of his own judgment.

We believe the President's action was sound and that it also was an exhibition of political courage.

Funds for School Construction Loans in Community Facilities Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last week some of us voted for the Bush amendment to earmark for long-term loans for school construction 50 percent of the funds in the worthwhile community-facilities bill.

Although the amendment was defeated by a margin of 60 to 27, the New York Times, a great and enlightened newspaper, and one of the most persistent and valiant editorial voices favoring Federal aid to schools, published, on April 19, 1958, under the title "Needed—More Schools," an editorial commending this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED—MORE SCHOOLS

By better than a 2-to-1 margin the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill to facilitate local public-works projects as a major antirecession measure. The proposal, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT and more than a dozen colleagues, would increase by 10 times—to $1 billion—the amount of Federal funds available for public-facility loans, lower the interest rates, increase the maximum term to 52 years, and broaden the provisions so the funds could be used for almost every kind of State and local public work.

Heretofore, the loans under this particular form of Federal aid, carried out through an agency known as the Community Facilities Administration, had been used almost exclusively for construction of water and sewer systems. Under the new legislation their use would be encouraged for a wide variety of useful projects including streets, bridges, parks, hospitals, libraries, water and timber conservation, and public schools. In his report Senator FULBRIGHT correctly noted that such projects are desperately needed in most sections of the country; and it was his hope that stimulation of construction activity along these lines would aid in economic recovery.

While it is gratifying that schools are explicitly mentioned in this bill, we ask again why amid all the talk of pump-priming through public-works programs the original objective of a large-scale federally aided school-construction effort has virtually disappeared. Some individual Members of Congress try to keep the issue alive. Senator BUSH, of Connecticut, for instance, offered an amendment to the Fulbright bill that would have earmarked half the Federal loans for school construction. He was voted down, 60 to 27.

Various Members have introduced bills to make Federal funds directly available to the States for school construction on a matching basis; but without support either from the Republican administration or the Democratic leadership they have gotten and will get nowhere. Yet new schools are still more important to America than any other kind of public work, and the quality of what goes on inside those schools is more important than any other domestic problem facing our country today.

Tass Agency Did Quick Job of Rewriting Khrushchev's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Tass Agency Did Quick Job of Rewriting Khrushchev's Report," issued by the American Committee for Liberation under date of April 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASS AGENCY DID QUICK JOB OF REWRITING KHRUSHCHEV'S REPORT—RADIO LIBERATION ANALYST REVEALS OFFICIAL TEXT OF SPEECH ON HUNGARY DIFFERS FROM ACTUAL VERSION

NEW YORK.—A striking illustration of how Nikita Khrushchev's extemporaneous remarks are doctored before they are released for broad dissemination can be seen in the handling of the Soviet dictator's recent Lenin Stadium speech by Tass, the official Soviet news agency.

According to Radio Liberation, only 14

sentences of Khrushchev's 50-minute speech—as recorded in Munich by the anti-Communist station's monitors—remained intact in the 3,700-word Tass version of the speech.

"It is doubtful that Soviet history has ever been rewritten faster than in the few hours between last Thursday's (April 10) live broadcast of Khrushchev's extemporaneous report of his Hungarian trip and the ensuing Tass release of the official text of his remarks," commented James Critchlow, Radio Liberation's top Soviet affairs analyst.

And, added Critchlow, most of what was left intact consisted of stock propaganda phrases with which Soviet orators interlard their speeches.

"The relatively few Soviet citizens present at Lenin Stadium to hear the speech, delivered during working hours, or who were able to listen to the live broadcast over the radio, must have been shocked the next day to see how the Tass version in their morning newspapers differed from what they had actually heard," Critchlow said.

Radio Liberation, the voice of former Soviet citizens who have found freedom abroad, is beaming Khrushchev's actual comments—including those censored by Tass—to all parts of the Soviet Union. Radio Liberation broadcasts around the clock exclusively to the U. S. S. R. in Russian and 17 other Soviet languages via powerful transmitters in West Germany and the Far East.

According to Critchlow, Khrushchev's original remarks supassed in incoherence, vulgarity, and sheer absurdity any of his past live broadcasts. Even making allowance for the fact his voice was hoarse from 8 days of exhausting speechmaking in Hungary, it is difficult to reject the idea that he may have been well under the influence of alcohol, coupled perhaps with the psychological impact of what apparently was an exceedingly frigid reception from the crowds he addressed in Hungary.

But, according to Critchlow, only a part of the discrepancy between Khrushchev's original remarks and the altered Tass text could be explained by the need to convert into a more literate document what was for the most part a tangled web of disconnected thoughts and incompleted phrases.

Whole sections of Khrushchev's remarks, places where he made unguarded admissions or advanced ill-advised formulations of Soviet policy, were removed from the Tass rewrite, according to Critchlow. At the same time, completely new passages were added, things Khrushchev never said, in an obvious attempt to render the speech coherent and to bring it into line with current policies.

Most revealing are the omitted passages. Here are some of the more conspicuous ones:

1. A reference to the now deposed Hungarian Stalinist Premier Matyas Rakosi as "guilty for what happened in Hungary" was deleted, as were all three other mentions of Rakosi's name. (It has been reported that Rakosi is now living in exile in Mongolia, but recent Soviet press treatment of him has been very restrained.)

2. Khrushchev's admission that the present Hungarian party leader, Janos Kadar, spent 5 years in prison under the Communist regime was also omitted.

3. His claim that Western correspondents "either distort the truth or don't report it the way they should to serve the people" was cut out, evidently because it implies that telling the truth and serving the people are not always the same thing in Communist philosophy.

4. At one point Krushchev burst into a song which he said he and Hungarian Government Chief Ference Muennich had sung together when they lived in the same tent while undergoing military training in Moscow in 1930. It is not clear whether this was taken out because Khrushchev's rewrite men considered it undignified for him to sing on the rostrum, or because the words of the song, "Our cannons roared, our machineguns rattled," were thoughts inappropriate in the context of his report on the situation in Hungary.

5. In discussing the international situation, Khrushchev said that the Communists are opposed to the capitalist order, just as the capitalists are opposed to communism, but admitted that—"it is not in our power" to destroy capitalism "anymore than the capitalists could overthrow communism." This remark was excised, presumably as a defeatist statement, although Khrushchev corrected his lapse in another portion of his speech by claiming that capitalism could be overthrown by "a flank attack," that is, through economic competition.

6. At one point Khrushchev threatened the West with an indelicate Russian idiom ("Mi pokazhem nashu russkuyu kuzkinu mat") which defies direct translation but corresponds in force—and vulgarity—to saying, "We'll show the bastards." This, too, was removed.

7. A statement that "we're going to open the door," that is, to more tourists so they would know "what fools" they had allegedly been to have misjudged the Soviet system, disappeared from the official version, perhaps because a more liberal visa policy is not really in the offing.

8. Several lengthy and rambling reminiscences by Khrushchev about articles he had read in prerevolutionary Russian publications also went out, possibly because they seemed pointless even to the TASS editors—or possibly because the reference to Russia's pre-1917 press, which by Soviet standards was relatively free in spite of Czarist censorship, seemed inopportune.

Also interesting was the way in which, in some instances, Khrushchev's basic remarks were preserved but slightly altered to change their meaning. For example, in referring to a meeting which he had addressed in Hungary, he said that the workers "had been brought there in organized fashion." In the Tass version he was reported as saying that his listeners "came out" to hear him.

In another passage, when he described a Hungarian factory which he had visited as "well organized," the rewritten version expanded this to a statement that "one feels a great upsurge, the desire to devote all forces to peaceful construction."

And in still another place, a thinly veiled reference to the Polish and Yugoslav Communists as "willing to accept any stale goods" (that is, Western aid) in order to "effect a break with the Soviet Union and lure followers" was changed to make it appear that he was attacking only Hungarian revisionists.

At several points in the test, a few muttered words by Khrushchev were expanded by the editors to lengthy lectures on various points of Soviet policy.

"There is no reason to believe that the revised version was composed without Khrushchev's knowledge and consent," said Critchlow. "At the same time, it is a striking illustration of the way in which his public utterances have to be doctored before they are considered fit for broad dissemination. Unfortunately, his speeches are rarely broadcast in his own voice, so that students of his rhetoric have few opportunities to compare his words with the altered text."

What the Founding Fathers Would Have Done With the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from from W. Fairfield Peterson, of Baltimore, which was published in the Union News, of Towson, Md., on March 28, 1958:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE FOUNDING FATHERS WOULD HAVE DONE WITH THE SUPREME COURT

Very probably, if at the time of the American Revolution there had been a Supreme Court like the one we have today, the Continental Congress would have abolished it. Knowing the resolution and vigor of the doughty patriots who freed the American Colonies from the yoke of England, it is certain that they would not have tolerated a Supreme Court which ruled:

1. That the several States or Colonies could not pass laws for the apprehension and punishment of Tories;

2. That Tory teachers could not be fired by local school boards;

3. That Tory lawyers were entitled to practice law in the State courts;

4. That the government established by the Continental Congress could not fire Tory employees of the Government unless they were in sensitive positions;

5. That the Continental Congress did not have the power to conduct investigations to determine who was a Tory.

There is no doubt that such fiery patriots as Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Sam Adams, John Hancock, and James Wilson would have laid far more violent hands upon the Supreme Court which made such rulings than the mild and moderate legislation now proposed by WILLIAM E. JENNER, the Senator from Indiana. The Jenner bill proposes only to have Congress withdraw from the Supreme Court the right to hear appeals involving the five matters of internal security we have mentioned. Under article III, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution, Congress has every right to withdraw those cases from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court which Congress thinks the Supreme Court is not properly deciding.

The power of Congress to withdraw certain cases of appeal from the Supreme Court is one of the checks and balances provided by the Constitution. Of it Alexander Hamilton said in the Federalist:

"This will enable the Government (Congress) to modify it (the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court) in such a manner as will best answer the end of justice and security."

Thus Hamilton, 170 years ago, recognized that this power to withdraw cases from the Supreme Court would have to be exercised by Congress in the interest of national security.

The realistic and effective way in which our Founding Fathers dealt with their enemies is in sharp contrast to the soft and tolerant manner in which we treat Communists today. Our patriot fathers did not let

fine-spun academic theories about liberty distract them from the necessities required to win independence. They would not have tolerated for 1 minute a twist in the meaning of the fifth amendment or the other equivocations used by the Communists today.

The liberals of today may argue that the patriot fathers were at war with George III, whereas we are not at war with communism. Not at war with communism. It may be called only a cold war. Many accept it as such. But our enemy knows it and is using it for what is really is—an initial phase in total war. In this total war our enemy hopes to achieve final victory without firing a shot—exactly as it did against Japan and Korea and as it has done ever since. The Soviets have proclaimed their determination relentlessly to force their will and the communistic philosophy into all parts of the world. So whether this war is labeled "cold" or "total," it is the most sinister, the most dangerous threat our country or the world has ever known or contemplated.

Or, the liberals may say that our patriot fathers fought a foreign country, England, whereas we are fighting a philosophy of government, communism. The answer to this is obvious. Is not the Soviet Union a foreign government? Is not monarchy, for which the Tories fought, a philosophy of government? It is most unlikely that the patriot fathers who used such forceful methods to establish independence, would have written a Constitution which the Supreme Court could, at any time, reasonably interpret as forbidding us to use similar forceful and effective means to preserve and keep that independence. This simple observation alone refutes the fine-spun theories by which the Supreme Court puts the rights of a Communist above our national security, liberty, and independence. Those who would use the freedom of our country to permit our enemies to destroy that very freedom will, if they have their way, end up by enjoying neither freedom, liberty, nor independence. And Communists enjoy no freedom in Russia.

The liberals say we must give the Communists liberty because everybody, including the Communists, has a moral right to liberty. Well, the patriot fathers who wrote our Constitution did not concede such a moral right to enemies of liberty—the Tories. How can it be argued that our enemies today—the Communists—are entitled to more liberty under that same Constitution than our patriot fathers gave their enemies—the Tories—at the time they wrote the Constitution.

As we said, our patriot fathers in the Continental Congress, if they were alive today, would abolish the Supreme Court. Surely the least the present Congress can do to preserve our way of life is to pass legislation to save us from a Supreme Court which, for reasons of its own, puts the rights of a Communist above our national security.

Dairying Strives To Meet Its Own Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great spokesmen of Wisconsin and American farming is Mr. Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives.

In an address delivered last month at the annual meeting of the Land O'Lakes Cooperative, at Minneapolis, Mr. Swanton analyzed America's dairy problems with his usual insight, ability, and constructive emphasis.

Those who are interested in becoming more familiar with the unique problems of dairying will, I know, be impressed by his illuminating statement.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE A POSTWAR CASUALTY—DAIRYING IS DIFFERENT

Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, told those assembled at the annual meeting of Land O' Lakes that "American agriculture is a postwar casualty. To meet the crisis of a global war, the farmers of this country expanded their production to meet the most critical food and fiber requirements this world had ever seen. Farmers met the life needs of our millions of military men, most of whom were on foreign shores. Also they took care of our allied armies and much of the needs of their civilian populations. When the war ended, 11 percent of our agricultural production was going abroad. During that time this Nation's farm area was expanded by nearly 26 million acres. With Federal aid, milk-drying plants were extensively built in the dairy belt of this country. Other expansions and changes came rapidly into being as American agriculture and the food industries associated with it rose to meet the worldwide war emergency.

"After the war, during the rehabilitation period from 1945 to 1948, truly we were our brother's keeper. During this period of rehabilitation, our agricultural production going abroad rose to 14 percent of total output.

"Then came the day of reckoning when this great expansion and stimulated production were no longer needed. These millions of added acres, as well as new and expanded food-processing plants, plus the advance of agricultural technology, resulted in a productive capacity far in excess of our ability to consume. Thus we became a postwar casualty.

"But with industry the picture was different. Americans at home were hungry for cars, household gadgets, and a multiplicity of things that they had been deprived of during the war. With the war over, the demand for industrial products was limited only by the customer's ability to pay.

"In this country, people are generally well fed. Because the human stomach is only so big, the demand for farm products is relatively inelastic. Therefore, here again agriculture differs from industry.

"Dairying is also different from the rest of this Nation's agricultural economy. Dairy farmers have a heavier investment per unit in buildings and equipment of a special type than is true of the producers of cash crops, meat animals, wheat and other cereals.

"Because milk and dairy products are so essential to the life and health of man, quality must be guaranteed all the way from the original producer to the ultimate consumer. This requirement means greater capital in buildings and equipment to meet sanitary stahdards, that are not required of other farmers.

"Dairy farmers, unlike most other agricultural people, work 365 days of the year. And the dairyman must be trained and highly skilled as a stock man.

"The dairy industry has maintained a better supply-demand balance than have the so-called basic crops. The percentage of total dairy production acquired by the Government, as compared with the basic crops, tells a significant story.

[In percent]

	Dairy	Wheat	Corn	Rice
1955	4.1	34	13.8	47
1956	4.0	25	13.8	50

"Because of this situation and for additional reasons, I believe the proposed reduction in dairy price supports is not justified and will not accomplish the anticipated results. For example, feed supplies are abundant and relatively cheap throughout the dairy belts of this country. Much corn is of high moisture and cannot be sealed, sold, nor stored. Lower supports will, therefore, have little or no influence on total milk production, nor, in my opinion, will lowered dairy price supports materially affect the amount of manufactured dairy products that will be acquired by the Government, even at 75 percent of parity.

"It must also be recognized that dairying is the only major farm industry subjected to a dual price-support standard. A reduction in price supports will fall heaviest on the manufacturing end of the industry and, at the same time, will have little or no effect on fluid-milk markets where Federal orders and strong collective bargaining will probably maintain milk prices at previous levels.

"In my opinion, there is much more that we ourselves can do. I believe that the dairy self-help proposal, if enacted into Federal law, could and would do much to stabilize the dairy industry. It would place a sense of responsibility upon producers themselves to maintain an even closer balance between supply and demand. It would eliminate, to a large extent, taxpayer responsibility for the present cost of the dairy price-support program. It would bring greater stability to the dairy industry and increase the income of dairy farmers.

"But if such a self-help program is to be accomplished, there must be a new sense of unity within the dairy industry. All phases of the dairy industry have a stake in this program, be they fluid-milk producers, cheese, butter powder, or any other segment of the industry.

"There are other vitally important forms of self-help too. I have in mind the type of self-help that you people in Land O'Lakes creameries have practiced for nearly 40 years. I refer to the constructive marketing programs that you people have built. You have built your marketing program on the cornerstone of quality. Your products are known throughout America for their uniformity. You have made quality your best salesman.

"But you didn't stop there. Your program of merchandising and advertising—your system of distribution and marketing have won nationwide acclaim. Internally, your sound business program has brought efficiency, fairness and excellent returns for your thousands of members.

"Your financial condition is a tribute to sound management and outstanding membership loyalty. Your 2.92 to 1 ratio between current assets and current liabilities for 1957 is a monument of success. Whatever reliance we may place upon national programs, let us not forget that nothing can really take the place of an outstanding cooperative-marketing program such as yours in Land O'Lakes.

"Yes, we can improve the situation for agriculture generally if in the future we will put more emphasis upon marketing. We should never turn back from our present high degree of production efficiency, yet the farmers of America generally have a long way to go to reach a comparable record from the standpoint of marketing efficiency. I believe

and I know that the farmers of this country can, within themselves through their own cooperative associations, meet the marketing challenge."

Mr. Truman's Memory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "They're Answering Harry," published in the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader of February 24, 1958; also an editorial entitled "Has Mr. Truman Forgotten?" published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of February 25, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader of February 24, 1958]

THEY'RE ANSWERING HARRY

Republican leaders are really excited over the speech by Harry S. Truman Saturday night, and today put forth a series of statements, indicating that they are going to prepare massive retaliation to his outgivings.

Frankly, we do not see any great point in it. We hardly think the American people will pay too much attention to the discredited charges of a discredited leader.

Mr. Truman can qualify as an expert on foreign policy, for under his administration nearly a billion (yes, billion) persons were lost to the free world, and critical situations were set up that are even yet plaguing the anti-Communist world.

He is also an expert on business conditions, for the overall business index right now during the current recession is higher than at any time in the Truman administration, except during a few months after the Korean war broke out and furnished an artificial inflation.

As to honesty and efficiency in government, his testimony is also valuable, for nearly everyone remembers Johnny Maragon, the 5 percenters, and other scandals of his administration.

He can speak with particular effectiveness on the lag in the guided missile program, for no less an authority than Dr. Wernher von Braun has characterized the later years of the Truman administration as 6 years lost in missiles development, while the Russians were going ahead.

So we do not see why political leaders are too excited about what "our Harry" says, plausible as he may be.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of February 25, 1958]

HAS MR. TRUMAN FORGOTTEN?

The politician's memory can be extremely short at times—as when Harry S. Truman embarks on one of his "Give 'em h—" jags to drum up a depression and foment security misgivings. He was in his element Saturday night; alongside him a colleague in convenient disremembrance, Adlai Stevenson.

If Mr. Truman's forgetfulness were not so complete—or if, to put it another way, his audacity didn't outrank his forthrightness when he steps up to a microphone—he might mention 1950 to his audience. Let's see now, that was a Truman year.

He was just starting his sixth year as President. What he said in marking that April occasion was that the country was enjoying record prosperity, and that "I intend to take full credit for it."

By the reckoning of his own Bureau of Labor Statistics there were 4,684,000 unemployed at the time. There were 42,263,000 at work on nonfarm jobs.

Today there are an estimated 4,500,000 unemployed.

There are 57,200,000 working at nonfarm jobs.

The total employed stands at more than 63 million.

Yet to hear Mr. Truman tell it, 1950, was a prosperity year; and 1958—under different auspices—is a "depression" year.

And, oh, yes, security, or foreign policy and war. Let's see again:

Mr. Truman just cannot have forgotten what happened in that same 1950, however conveniently he avoids mentioning it.

Just who was it—what administration was it—that conducted America over that brink? Surely Korea sticks in his memory; that which he called a police action, taking its toll of 33,629 American sons killed and another 103,284 wounded in action.

Since the windup of that adventure which Mr. Truman's policies neither won nor ended, there hasn't been a shooting war involving the forces of this country on any battlefield.

Does that suggest policy failure?

What is it that irks Mr. Truman so much?

Which set of policies—securitywise, and economywise—does he imagine the American people prefer?

Who does he think he is fooling?

The Corn Tassel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year I submitted a resolution to make the corn tassel the national floral emblem of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "America Grows Corn," written by Howard Zahniser, and published 10 years ago in the Scientific Monthly for May 1948. In Whitmanesque verse, the poem celebrates corn as the great basic element in the agriculture of the country.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA GROWS CORN
(By Howard Zahniser)

When spring comes to America
The farmers of forty-eight United States
Get up from their breakfasts
And plant a hundred million acres of Indian corn.
Out of the south into Texas
The corn-planting time moves into February,
Drifts northward thirteen miles a day,
Sweeps northward across a Nation,
Comes to March, to April, to May,
Comes to forty-eight sovereign and United States.
And in every State of the Union
The farmers get up and plant their Indian corn.
(Only man grows corn.)
In Iowa where the tall corn grows,
In Ohio and Illinois,
In Indiana, Kansas, and Nebraska,
In Minnesota and Dakota,
In Georgia, where more acres grow corn than grow cotton,
In Maine and California,
In Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Louisiana—
In every State of the Union—
The farmers of America plant corn.
(Only men and their women grow corn.)
Seed corn on a hundred million acres,
Planted with care and with pride
To rise into the rank and file
Of the greatest crop that man has yet mobilized.
Roasting ears, corn-on-the-cob, succotash,
Canned corn, dried corn,
Corn-meal mush,
Johnnycake,
Corn flakes,
Corn syrup.
Seed corn rising to feed,
The cows, the pigs, the poultry,
The livestock of forty-eight States.
Seed corn rising to feed
Men and women and boys and girls.
Seed corn rising to feed them
With as good food as the good earth grows.
(Only men and their women plant corn in the earth.)
Say "corn" to the English and they think about wheat.
Say "corn" to a Scotchman,
And he kens you're talking of oats.
Say "corn" to any man,
And he thinks of the greatest grain of his native land.
Say "corn" to the American, and he knows you mean corn.
Be English and call it maize.
Be scientific with Zea mays.
Call it whatever you will,
It grows on a hundred million American acres,
Grows and yields right well—
Yields corn enough
To give two dozen bushels to every man, woman, and child
In the United States of America.
Clear the living rooms of America.
Make way for Indian corn.
For every man, woman, and child in the United States of America,
Two dozen bushels of Indian corn.
Picture the baby
On the living room floor
And twice a dozen baskets full of corn.
Picture the preacher
In the pulpit
And twenty-four bushels of Indian corn.
Picture every man, woman, and child
In the United States of America
With twice a dozen bushels of corn.
Make it into succotash, corn meal, corn flakes, and sirup.
Feed it to the cows, the hogs, the chickens.
Feed 90 percent of America's corn
(And we do. We usually do.)
Feed 90 percent of America's corn
To the cows, the hogs, the turkeys, the chickens—
And taste the beef,
The pork
The milk, the cream, the cheese, the eggs,
And smell the bacon in a thousand kitchens.
And who grows the corn?
Only men and their women grow corn from the earth.
Columbus discovered America in 1492.
Columbus discovered corn.
Cortez marched on the Aztecs,
And he ate corn.
Pizarro pillaged Peru,
In 1532,
And the Incas were harvesting corn.
But no man knew
Where the wild corn grew,

And no man knows
Where wild corn grows.
(Only man grows corn from the earth.)
The scientists of America study corn—
Yet they don't know
Where the wild plants grow—
The scientists of America study corn,
And dreaming and scheming,
And plotting and planning,
With tall talk
Of chromosomes, genes, and megaspores,
The plant breeders of America
Do a new thing under the sun
With their old friend Zea mays.
And Indian corn is hybrid corn.
Sing the praises of hybrid maize.
Sing the praises of man.
Men with their scheming have managed to raise
More bountiful corn than Nature can.
Take if you will an inbred strain.
Make your selections again and again.
Do it some more
And choose out four.
Call one A, and call one B.
Call one C, and call one D.
Call them in rhyme.
(It's corn-planting time.)
It's corn-planting time
For A with his B
And C with his D.
Watch the summer winds sway
The tassels on A,
The pollen-rich tassels of A,
And at harvest time see
The kernels on B—
The full-ripened seed of detasseled B,
Predestined to mate with the seed of CD.
For C with his D
Has a way
You can say
Is like A's with his B.
(But the grain they both yield
In the seed-grower's field
Makes no johnnycake, cornmeal, or succotash,
Makes no chicken corn, cow feed, or hog mash.
Its fate
Is to mate;
Its deed is to breed.)
So call them in rhyme again
It's corn-planting time again.
And AB
With CD
Will cross and sublime again.
And the double-crossed grain that their harvest will yield
Is a new kind of seed for the corn farmer's field.
Thus Science discloses
Controlled heterosis,
And hybrid vigor
Makes corn yields bigger.
And Indian corn is hybrid corn.
And the farmers of America
In the Year of Our Lord Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-three
Rise up from their breakfasts
And plant a hundred thousand acres of hybrid corn.
And when harvesttime comes
They like it.
And ten years later
They rise up from their breakfasts
And plant fifty million acres.
Sing the praises of hybrid corn
To the tune of twenty percent
Hybrid vigor in Zea mays
Boosts the yield by twenty percent.
Yes, sir,
The corn growers of America
Get six hundred and fifty million bushels more
For their time and their trouble
Than they could have
Without the magic of hybrid corn.
Sing the praises of hybrid corn
To the tune of twenty percent.
Hybrid vigor in Indian corn
Boosts the yield by twenty percent.
Feed it to the hogs of America.
Fed six hundred and fifty million bushels of Indian corn
(And we feed them more than that. We certainly do.)
Feed six hundred and fifty million bushels of Indian corn
To the greedy, grunting, squealing, pork-growing pigs of America,
And how much pork do you get?
Brother, you get pork enough
To give three pounds
To every man, woman, and child on the face of the Earth.
Sing the praises of hybrid corn
To the tune of pork at your meals.
For seven billion pounds of pork
Is hybrid vigor in Zea mays.
But no man knows
Where the wild corn grows.
(Growing corn is a human thing.)
When spring comes to America
The farmers of forty-eight United States
Get up from their breakfasts—
They and their sons and their daughters too—
In every State of the Union
The farmers of America
Rise up from their breakfasts
And plant a hundred million acres of Indian corn.
And before
And behind them
Across the cornfields of America
A Nation moves with them.
America grows corn.

Wisconsin Research Cooperation With the National Heart Institution

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as an indication of the splendid program of scientific cooperation at the grassroots of America, in this instance in my own research-minded State of Wisconsin, I send to the desk a most stimulating compilation which has been forwarded, at my request, from the information office of the National Heart Institute.

The memorandum sets forth the facts on how the appropriations which we in the Congress provide to the Institute are translated, so to speak, into backing up research, training, and grant programs the length and breadth of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HEART GRANT PROGRAM

The National Heart Institute, established in 1948 by unanimous vote of Congress, is the focal point of the cardiovascular research and training program of the Public Health Service. As a unit of the National Institutes of Health, the principal research arm of the Public Health Service, the National Heart Institute conducts research at its laboratories in Bethesda, Md., and elsewhere. It also cooperates actively with the Heart Disease Control program of the Division of Special Health Services, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, in providing technical assistance and grants-in-aid to the States for the development of community heart programs.

Nationwide advances against cardiovascular disease are augmented by National Heart Institutes grants and awards for cardiovascular research and training. Funds for carrying out the work of the National Heart Institute are appropriated by Congress. The appropriation for this purpose for fiscal year 1958 (July 1, 1957, through June 30, 1958) is:

Research grants	$19,364,000
Research fellowships	1,600,000
Clinical traineeships and training grants	5,135,000
Grants-in-aid to States, $2-125,000, plus assignment of professional personnel, $144,-794	2,269,794

I. RESEARCH

Research grants

Research grants are awarded to investigators working in hospitals, laboratories, and institutions throughout the country. The research proposal is designed by the investigator and reviewed by study sections (panels of scientific experts) and by the National Advisory Heart Council. Research grants are awarded on a scientific merit basis and are not apportioned according to geography or formula. These grants make possible cardiovascular research that could not be carried on otherwise.

II. TRAINING

A. Research fellowships

Research fellowships provide training stipends to qualified predoctoral and postdoctoral personnel who wish to obtain research training in the preclinical and clinical sciences associated with the cardiovascular and related areas, including the area of aging.

B. Training grants

Graduate research training grants are available to institutions for the establishment, expansion, and improvement of research training programs in the cardiovascular and related areas, including aging. Graduate clinical training grants are available where a unique opportunity exists to meet a national need in these areas. Undergraduate training grants are being made to medical schools to assist in the improving of cardiovascular undergraduate medical training and to schools of public health for public health training in the chronic diseases.

III. HEART DISEASE CONTROL

State grants-in-aid

Through grants-in-aid to States administered by the Bureau of State Services of the Public Health Service, health departments are assisted in developing community programs against cardiovascular disease. These grants are awarded on the basis of population and economic need within each State.

Grants and awards in the cardiovascular area active Feb. 1, 1958

WISCONSIN

Location, institution, and grantee	Title of project	Amount
Madison:		
Department of Public Health: Kincaid, C. K.	Study of Incidence of Beta Hemolytic Streptococcus	$12,742
University of Wisconsin:		
Green, D. E.	Digitalis and Energy Transfer Systems of Heart	5,290
Green, D. E.	Enzyma Activity in Heart Muscle	50,000
Murphy, Q. R.	Potassium in the Production of Cardiac Arrhythmias	6,095
Crosley, A. P.	Kidney Mechanisms in Renal Disease	10,614
Shideman, F. E.	Energy Sources for Renal Tubular Excretory Mechanisms	13,110
Crumpton, C. W.	Ventricular Blood Flow and Metabolism	12,995
Morrison, P. R.	The Heart in Hibernation	5,163
Strawitz, J. G.	Irreversibility in Hemorrhagic Shock	12,822
Beck, S. D.	Cholesterol Acylase Functions	6,708
Gibson, D. M., and Wakil, S. J.	Fatty Acid Synthesis in Soluble Systems of Tissues	7,452
Kupchan, S. M.	Chemistry of the Veratrum Alkaloids	13,386
Lardy, H. A.	Interrelation of Estrogens and Thyroid Hormones	17,250
Youmans, W. B.	Vasomotor Adjustments to Arteriovenous Fistula	8,280
Meyer, R. K., and Emlen, J. T., Jr.	Physiological Stress in Natural Populations	9,757
Green, D.	Enzyme Chemistry—Particular Reference to Heart Muscle	53,200
Kupahan, S. M.	Chemistry of Biologically-Active Natural Products	14,547
Schilling, R. F.	Genetic Carriers of Hereditary Spherocytosis	16,100
Bowers, J. Z., and Crow, J. F.	Symposium on Genetics in Medical Research	21,275
Mossman, H. W.	A Study of Mammalian Placentas and Fetal Membrances	19,297
Rankin, J.	Alveolar Capillary Diffusion in Health and Disease	9,200
Gordon, E. S.	Effect of Adrenal Steroids on Lipid Metabolism	15,122
Brown, H.	Peptides of Human Adult Hemoglobin	9,200
Coye, R. D.	Protein Excretion by the Kidney During Inflamation	6,382
Green, D. E.	Training (graduate)	80,140
Crumpton, C. W.	Training (undergraduate)	25,000
Angevine, D. M.	Training (graduate)	10,600
Zile, M. V.	Fellowship (biochemistry)	2,625
Gubler, C. J.	do	7,500
Weinstein, A. B.	Fellowship (physiological chemistry)	8,000
Bowers, J. Z.	Post sophomore fellowship	6,767
Milwaukee:		
Marquette University:		
Belknap, E. L.	Publication Transact.—Wisconsin Conference on Work and Heart.	6,500
Correll, H. L.	Training (undergraduate)	25,000
Marquette University, School of Medicine:		
Quick, A. J.	Coagulation Defect in Hemophilia	10,000
Roll, P. M.	Biosynthesis of Nucleic Acids in Mammalian Tissues	10,491
Peterson, J. C.	Cardiopulmonary Research in Children	19,440
Brown, K. D.	The Anthrone Method and Blood Polysaccharides	6,440
Yard, A. C.	Regional Vasoconstriction in Development of Shock	2,300
Kory, R. C., and Murphy, T. R.	Cardiopulmonary Function in—Normal—Old Men	7,992
Stekiel, W. J.	Fellowship (biophysics and physiology)	4,196

	Estimated fiscal year 1958
State grant-in-aid allocation for heart disease control	$43,709
Assignment of professional personnel	7,499

Procurement of Lawyers for the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, regarding the procurement of lawyers for the Navy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. CHESTER WARD, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES NAVY, BEFORE THE STENNIS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE, ON THE PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT AND RETENTION PROBLEMS OF THE LEGAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE SERVICES, APRIL 17, 1958

The official position of the Navy Department and Department of Defense does not favor incentive pay for the military lawyer. In my official capacity as Judge Advocate General, I, of course, support this view.

The chairman of your subcommittee having invited me to appear and present my personal views, I am prepared to do so.

Shortly after assuming office, I caused a study to be made on the ways and means of improving legal services in the Navy.

I found:

1. A great and continuing increase in workload.

2. The number of lawyers available to me was inadequate to render the type of service to which I believe the Navy is entitled and needs.

Added to this, and of special significance, I found that I was unable to retain those presently on board.

The inability to retain lawyers in the program seriously affects my capacity, as Judge Advocate General, to perform my statutory duties.

Virtually every young lawyer gets out of the service as soon as his military obligation is fulfilled. This means, therefore, that he would not have come in at all but for the draft and that he would rather serve as an officer than an enlisted man.

Thus the Selective Service Act indirectly has the effect of drafting young lawyers for legal duty in the service.

These young men enter the service to fulfill their military obligation but by the time they have attained a modicum of experience their military obligation is completed and they return to the more lucrative civilian practice. With the draft law as it is, those departing are being replaced—but they, too, will depart when they have completed their military obligation.

A law degree and admission to the bar do not make a seasoned lawyer. The constant ebb and flow of these young lawyers in the military results in lack of continuity of service and, of even greater import, low experience level. The services in effect become training schools preparing these young lawyers to enter lucrative civilian practice at great cost to the Government. Also, it is difficult for servicemen being tried before courts-martial to believe that a young, inexperienced lawyer can fully protect their legal rights. This has a definite effect on the morale of those accused of offenses.

The Court of Military Appeals had this to say in the case of *U. S.* v. *Fisher* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 396, 24 C. M. R. 206):

"We are, however, disturbed by an apparent tendency at the higher appellate levels to give only 'pro forma' attention to the records of trial of inferior courts. Possibly the situation is due to an inadequate percentage of qualified professional personnel, and consequently the services are at a disadvantage in processing their court-martial cases. It is quite possible that the shortage of legally trained personnel particularly in the Navy is so great that the few are just physically unable to carry the heavy burden. Nevertheless, we must insist that the same careful attention be given to the inferior courts-martial records especially when a punitive discharge is imposed as is accorded the records of general courts-martial. A punitive discharge imposed by a special court separates the accused from the service just as effectively as does one imposed by a general court-martial; a period of confinement at hard labor adjudged by a special court is not different from the same period imposed by a general court. It is not a compliment to the system of military justice that the highest appellate court should be called upon by an accused to correct as many errors as appear in this record."

Admiralty claims, tort claims, and other claims grow out of the Navy's activities and involve millions of dollars a year. It is the Navy lawyer who represents the Government's interest in investigating, processing, and effecting settlement of these claims. I do not believe that I should be required to entrust the handling of such important matters to inexperienced lawyers. Nor can our increasing responsibilities in the important field of international law be met by inexperienced legal personnel. Substantial interests of the United States are constantly at stake even in dealing with our allies.

Efforts to retain junior law specialists on active duty to meet these needs have proved unavailing. A recent program offered eligible reserve law specialists in the grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) commission plus 3 years constructive service in return for a voluntary extension of 1 year of obligated service. Less than 10 percent of the officers eligible accepted. During the last half of fiscal year 1957, 20 Reserve law specialists came into the program but 24 left. During the first half of fiscal year 1958, 41 Reserve law specialists came into the program but 53 left.

As a consequence, the Navy has been forced to rely largely on a hard core of senior law specialists, whose contributions in terms of experience and legal ability have been outstanding. In 4 or 5 years, the large majority of this group—which now totals about 187—will attain eligibility for voluntary retirement. There is every indication that many will seek retirement because of the present dim prospects for pay and promotion. A recent poll of these law specialist captains and commanders revealed that 72 percent would seek retirement upon attaining 20 years' active duty. Of these 83 percent

indicated that they would remain on active duty if incentive pay legislation were enacted. This means that 5 out of 6 of those who would otherwise retire would stay on.

The younger Regular officers are resigning. Within the past few months 4 lieutenants and 1 lieutenant (junior grade) have either resigned or tendered their resignations. A vital factor which causes these young officers to return to civilian life is inadequate pay. As was stated by 1 young officer in submitting his resignation:

"I should like to express my gratitude and appreciation for the honor and privilege accorded me of having served on active duty with the Navy and particularly in the Office of the Judge Advocate General and I regret only that it is a luxury I can no longer afford."

The procurement program for Regular officers is not meeting with success. During fiscal year 1957, 10 officers were procured for the Regular Navy. Thus far in 1958, 6 have been procured. Prior years were less productive. It is apparent that relatively few are interested in making a career out of the Regular Navy, and of those who chose a career on entering many have changed their minds and resigned.

My Regular strength is also subject to depletion by proposed legislation which would render vulnerable to accelerated release during the next 3 fiscal years of 36 of my senior officers in the grade of commander who are failed of selection for promotion. Additionally, the legislation proposed could result in 37 of my 61 present captains facing consideration for retention within the next 3 fiscal years. How many will be retained, I don't know. If all categories of officers must take the same attrition, I can lose up to 13 experienced captains. Since these 36 commanders and 13 captains represent about 18 percent of my total Regular strength, it is serious.

I believe therefore that the Navy stands in present and increasing danger of not having experienced and competent legal officers to handle its large volume of legal business. This most disturbing situation can be resolved only by furnishing sufficient incentives to encourage some of the well qualified younger law specialists to make a career of the military service and at the same time to retain those senior experienced lawyers who have strongly indicated their intention to retire on attaining 20 years of active duty.

It seems clear the procurement and retention problems that exist for law specialists are comparable to those that existed for doctors and dentists. The Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1956 which provided career incentives in the form of pay and promotion advantages reversed the trend of losses of doctors and dentists from the Navy. I firmly believe that incentive pay legislation would achieve comparable results with respect to law specialists.

It is my opinion that:

1. There is a serious shortage of experienced military lawyers.
2. The services are unable to procure and retain lawyers in the numbers needed.
3. The services are unable to retain lawyers beyond their obligated duty periods.
4. The senior military lawyers will soon leave the services in large numbers as they become eligible to retire.
5. The lawyer is the only officer except for those in the medical department, who is required to have several years of graduate training to be commissioned in the services.
6. The enactments of the Congress require that military lawyers be provided.
7. Incentive pay solved the doctors' problem; it will solve the lawyers' problem.

In addition to these vitally important needs in numbers and experience, I wish to invite your attention to the need in the Navy for flag rank for the position of Deputy Judge Advocate General. There is presently a great disparity in flag and general officer rank between the Navy and the other Services in their legal organizations. The Navy is at a definite disadvantage in this powerful incentive to able lawyers to remain in the service to compete for flag rank and responsibility. There is pending before this Committee a bill—H. R. 8121, passed by the House at the last session—which would satisfy this need and which I urgently commend to your early and favorable consideration.

I am convinced that unless effective remedial action is taken, the Navy will be faced with the unacceptable situation of being unable to carry out within reasonable professional standards its legal duties demanded by the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Further, I believe we will be unable to render the legal services necessary to the proper administration of the Navy as a whole, and to conserve naval appropriations in areas such as tort and admiralty claims. Also, skilled and experienced lawyers are required to protect the rights of our servicemen overseas and to administer foreign claims.

A careful evaluation of all the factors involved has convinced me beyond doubt that the incentive pay for military lawyers will be the most effective and practicable course of action if the Congress desires to maintain military lawyers in sufficient number and at a sufficient experience level to carry out adequately the provisions of the laws already enacted by the Congress.

Safety With Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on April 19 there was published in the Salt Lake City Tribune a thoughtful editorial which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN TO GIVE UNITED STATES SAFETY WITH SOLVENCY

President Eisenhower's forceful speech in favor of his program for reorganizing the Pentagon puts his critics on the defensive. They will have to answer him. And they will find that hard to do.

For the President said plainly that he has no intention of setting up a Prussian-type general staff, or of merging the three armed services, or of depriving Congress of the power of the purse.

These are some of the horrible things that congressional critics have said would result from the Eisenhower program.

We agree with the President when he brands these claims as nonsense—partly misrepresentations and partly misconceptions.

The public is weary of bickering between the three armed services.

As a solution Mr. Eisenhower proposes expanding the authority of the Secretary of Defense and strengthening the hand of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This means that instead of three services, going more or less their own way despite so-called unification, there will be unified combat command and strategic planning.

It does not mean turning the Secretary of Defense into a czar or creating a Prussian-type general staff which could dominate the country. A civilian President would still be commander in chief. A civilian Congress would still have the responsibility of appropriating funds and making laws.

Indeed, it is absurd to contend that one piece of legislation could create both a civilian czar, in the person of the Secretary of Defense, and a military junkerdom, in the persons of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As for the claim that Congress would lose the power of the purse, that also is absurd.

The President wants the Secretary of Defense given authority to transfer some appropriations between the services. But Congress will still make the appropriations and will still be able to make its voice heard if it does not like what the Defense Secretary does. Moreover, a degree of flexibility in the use of appropriations should make for greater efficency and perhaps economy.

President Eisenhower promised to fight—and fight hard—for his reorganization program. He has made an excellent start, but the battle has hardly begun and he will have to keep on fighting if he is to win. The opposition is strong and determined.

Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee has made it plain where he stands. In an hour-long speech this week he lashed the Eisenhower program. Though Mr. VINSON's committee will begin hearings on the program next Tuesday, Mr. VINSON isn't looking for enlightenment. He has made up his mind in advance and his answer is a flat rejection.

There are other "Vinsons" in House and Senate. They have allies, both in the Penagon and in such unofficial organizations as the Navy League.

We are convinced, however, that the public wants reorganization. We believe also that the President's program, based on his own wide experience as a military man, will provide the right kind of reorganization—in Mr. Eisenhower's words, to give the Nation "safety with solvency."

A nation which spent $200 billion on defense in 5 years must have a defense organization which is both effective and efficient.

Pan-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, April 14 was the formal Pan American Day during Pan American Week. Celebrations of this anniversary recurrence take place in our own country and in our various sister nations to the southward. Ever since the days of James G. Blaine and the truth birth of pan-Americanism, the doctrine of western hemispheric solidarity has obtained; and, generally, with most salutary results. The importance of the practice of the principles thus involved cannot be overemphasized. In the official councils of the affected countries, and in the representative body of the organization of American States, reliance upon and application of those principles have been tremendously beneficial to all concerned.

True and successful pan-Americanism must stand on the firm, wise basis of mutual respect and esteem between and among the western nations. We know

that communistic influences are constantly striving to undermine the unioned strength of these lands, and to create dangerous frictions and fatal divisions. These subversive efforts require that, for the common good—indeed, for the interests of survival—they be met and mastered by the unfailing vigilance, and the timely and effective action of the Americas.

Anything that tends to emphasize and promote the cause of pan-Americanism is of value. In this connection, and as being apropos of this anniversary occasion, I take pleasure in including as a part of these remarks, a very fine poem written by Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which had charge of the construction of the Panama Canal, and, later, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, from Kentucky. He has always been a very firm believer in the spirit and purposes of pan-Americanism, and has done much, through the years, for the cause. As a result there have been bestowed upon him by Panama, Ecuador, and Venezuela their highest civic orders. In the course of a busy and eventful life he has found time to indulge an undoubted talent for poetic effort. Some of his poems deal with the Isthmus of Panama and the Panama Canal, and have been variously published. I ask unanimous consent that the indicated poem, which appeared some time ago in Colombia, a monthly magazine published in New York City under the auspices of the Colombian-American Chamber of Commerce, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAN-AMERICANISM

(Inscribed to the American Republics)

Join all your hands together,
  And bind your hearts as one;
In fair or stormy weather,
  Act ye in unison!
Ye face in like directions,
  Your pathways are the same;
Thru mutual affections
  Achieve a common fame!

In Northern, Southern reaches;
  In lands that lie between,
Preserve the faith that teaches
  Yourselves and sons to glean;
To glean the grain eternal,
  That bears the precious bread,
Wherewith your needs fraternal
  Shall be forever fed!

And never may ye falter
  In aught of purpose true!
Yours is a single altar,
  One aim ye have in view;
One aim and one ambition,
  Which in your souls must lie,
To keep the old tradition,
  That freedom shall not die!

Soft speeches may not solve them—
  The problems which arise,
But wisdom should resolve them
  To friendly enterprise.
Mistrust and fear will vanish,
  When all is understood;
And motives mean or clannish,
  Dissolve in brotherhood.

Blest Bunker Hill and Lexington
  To far Maipu call;
And Carabobo's field, twice won,
  Hears and re-echoes all.
Yorktown and Ayacucho,
  And San Juan's Hill and Tree,
Point the way for all to go,
  Who search for liberty.

E'er linger Clay and Bolivar,
  In spirit, to inspire;
Each shining on, a deathless star,
  Ringed with celestial fire.
Strive ye to reap the vision
  These matchless leaders saw,
A Western World, Elysian,
  Ruled by a Western Law!

Remote from foreign faction,
  Begirt by oceans twain,
Bar ye, by unioned action,
  The alien bit and rein!
So, "All for each, and each for all,
  Yet each forever free!"
The Earth shall heed your cry and call,
  Thru all the years to be.

—*M. H. Thatcher.*"

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Support Prices on Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Long View," by Hugh Casline, which appeared in the American Agriculturist for April 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONG VIEW

You cannot expect a man to be happy over a reduction in the price of what he has to sell. The only way he can honestly approve of such action is through a belief that in the long run he will gain more than he will lose.

There is no question about the short-time effect of lowering price supports on dairy products. For a few months—no one knows exactly how long—milk checks will be about 10 cents a hundredweight lower than if dairy supports had been frozen at last year's level. Any further decrease in your price as compared to last year will be due to other factors, especially to higher production so that a smaller percentage will be sold as fluid milk.

Many dairymen do believe that the President's veto of the price-freeze bill will benefit the dairy industry in the long run. Therefore, they approve the veto—and I agree with them.

I realize that the approval is far from unanimous. My own feeling, after talking with many dairymen, is that the sentiment is fairly equally divided. Those who are disappointed with the veto may feel that prices during the next few months are more important than for the long pull, or they may sincerely believe that Government has the responsibility of guaranteeing profitable prices.

Some who keep their fingers on the pulse of milk marketing believe that manufactured dairy products will be selling above support levels before next winter. They (and many dairymen) feel that supports have failed to improve prices, that they prevent desirable changes in farming, that they increase surpluses, and that they inevitably lead to more Government controls.

It seems reasonable, if price supports are the solution to unsatisfactory prices, that the problem should have been solved by this time. Also that growers with price-supported products should be more prosperous than those without supports—which definitely is not true.

In the February 15 issue I expressed the belief that supports should have been reduced more gradually, preferably starting a year ago. I still believe that. Yet I also believe that in a few months an overwhelming majority of northeastern dairymen will agree that freezing supports at last year's level would have been a step backward, and therefore, that the President's veto was wise and in the interest of the men who milk cows.

Decision in the Trilling Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in yesterday's Sunday Star—the issue of April 20—there is an excellent and thought-provoking editorial discussing the United States court of appeals opinion in the case of John Trilling. The editorial is self-explanatory, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I heartily concur with the reactions of Judge Burger. He is an able and respected jurist. Judge Burger has a high sense of duty and a feeling for the obligations inherent in the letter of the law.

Able Judge Burger has called for a full reexamination of Federal rule 5, either by the rulemaking process or by Congress.

The fact that a man can be freed of a serious crime, even though he has confessed to it, by a rule which calls for his arraignment without necessary delay, can well become a loophole freeing dangerous men, and allowing them to move about in our society.

The Congress should review the necessity for Federal rule 5. We should do this now and without delay.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of April 20, 1958]

HELP! HELP!

A Solomon would stagger away, talking to himself and shaking his head, if called upon to explain what the Mallory rule means in the Nation's Capital today.

It has been almost a year since the Supreme Court handed down its unanimous decision in the Mallory case—a ruling which threw out the confession of a convicted rapist and resulted in his release. Mallory had been held by the police for 7½

hours. The reason for the reversal was that he had not been arraigned without unnecessary delay as required by Federal Rule 5 (a).

We thought from the beginning that the Supreme Court's decision was unreasonable in the circumstances of the Mallory case and that its meaning was unclear. Others disagreed, contending that the opinion was both proper and its meaning clear.

Now, almost a year later, comes the opinion of the United States court of appeals in the case of John Trilling, an eager-beaver safecracker. This appellate court is composed of nine able and conscientious judges. Yet they are in hopeless disagreement with respect to the meaning of the Mallory rule as applied to the Trilling case.

The division among the judges is cited here, not in any needling spirit, but to illustrate the massive confusion which prevails. Judge Danaher wrote what becomes the opinion of the court, affirming Trilling's conviction on 1 count in 3 indictments. Trilling, in three trials, had been found guilty under all of the indictments. Judge Danaher was joined in full only by Judge Burger, and we will return to Judge Burger later. Judge Bazelon, joined by Chief Judge Edgerton, would have thrown out all confessions and reversed the one conviction. Judges Washington and Fahy came to this same conclusion, but, perhaps significantly, they did not join in Judge Bazelon's free-wheeling opinion. Judge Prettyman was joined by Judges Miller and Bastian. He agreed with Judge Danaher as to the correctness of the one conviction, thus supplying a majority of the court on this point. But Judges Prettyman, Miller, and Bastian thought that all of the confessions were valid and that all of the convictions should have been affirmed.

This, then, is the prevailing state of the law in the District with respect to the Mallory ruling. How can any policeman, prosecutor or trial judge be expected to know which end is up?

Let's get back to Judge Burger. In a brief statement he said he agreed reluctantly with Judge Danaher because he thought he was compelled to do so by the Mallory ruling. He would have preferred to join Judge Prettyman because what he said makes sense and ought to be the law. Then Judge Burger said this: "Rule 5 (a) should be reexamined by the rulemaking process or by Congress."

To this we say "Amen" although we believe action by Congress is preferable. This community, in which the Mallory rule hits with full and crippling impact, is in desperate need of help. That help can best come through enactment of pending legislation which provides that mere delay in arraignment shall not serve to invalidate voluntary confessions. We earnestly hope the decision in the Trilling case will furnish the extra push needed to get the bill through Congress.

A South Dakota Editor Appraises Walter Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the leaders of American labor have been in the national limelight. Because of the controversy which swirls about some of these labor personalities, it is difficult for the general public to evaluate properly the individual men who lead labor. There are those who flatly deny and wrongdoing at all on the part of labor's leadership. There are others, equally blind, who lump all labor leaders together and falsely assume that because a few individuals have been revealed as corrupt, the entire labor leadership is corrupt.

Objective evaluation of our principal labor leaders is a rare article today. For that reason, I am very grateful to the editor of the largest daily newspaper in South Dakota for setting forth an honest and discerning evaluation of Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. Mr. Fred C. Christopherson, editor of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, set forth his reactions to Reuther after hearing the labor official outline his views at the International Press Institute in Washington, D. C., last week.

Mr. Christopherson's appraisal of Reuther which follows is a portion of an excellent editorial of April 18, 1958, entitled "Two Men of Controversy," which gives the editor's reactions to addresses by both Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and Reuther:

REUTHER SPEAKS WELL

(By Fred C. Christopherson)

Reuther's power can be readily understood. He speaks easily and simply. He has a good sense of humor and he knows how to use the kind of language that illustrates effectively his own ideas.

He is not in the same class, or so it seemed to me, as labor leaders such as Beck and Hoffa. The committee of the United States Senate investigating him has found no trace of personal graft in his records. It also has learned he has been vigilant in ferreting out communistic influences in the unions under his direction.

SOUND ECONOMICS

The economic policies that Reuther stressed in his speech to the editors seemed fundamentally right. And he said much that is entitled to respect by both organized labor and management.

The problem in earlier years, he pointed out, was how to manage scarcity. Now, he explained, our problem is how to manage abundance.

We should use, he said, the most productive and labor-saving tools we can devise but we should learn how to share our benefits.

"We have learned how to create abundance," he explained, "but we have a long ways to go in arranging for its adequate distribution."

EASY TO LIKE REUTHER

Reuther, of course, is condemned in many circles. He is regarded in some quarters as a ruthless man determined to attain his objectives through vigorous methods.

But certainly there was nothing in his appearance or in his remarks to the editors to suggest that he was, as some persons say, a dangerous man. He was even-tempered, good-humored, and logical. About what he said was an air of sincerity.

He battles in a rough game, to be sure. Across the table from him at conferences are the best brains that management can assemble. He tries to get as much as he can for the men whom he represents. That, of course, occasionally, annoys management.

To be honest about it, nevertheless, I must say that I liked him. And, if the United States economy has nothing more to fear than men such as Reuther, I'm not too much worried about it.

Water Needs To Meet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a rather significant course of action taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce sometime ago. This action was rather poignantly pointed up by an editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, one of our leading southern newspapers.

More recently this great newspaper called to the attention of its readers a valid reason for Stewart's Ferry Dam on its editorial page.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has recognized that a national policy covering water supply, reclamation, navigation, flood control, and power programs is a must in industrial planning.

The mayor of the city of Nashville, the Honorable Ben West, has recognized the need for future planning of a supplementary water supply for Greater Nashville and he has called attention to the need for the construction of Stewart's Ferry—Percy Priest—Dam on Stone's River, just outside the city of Nashville.

Consulting engineers for the city, as well as its own director of waterworks, Robert L. Lawrence, Jr., have recognized and anticipated the water needs of this great city. These experts point out that this water-resource project is most desirable and needed. The two editorials, under the unanimous-consent rule, are herewith inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend their reading to my colleagues as being most convincing and enlightening:

WATER NEEDS TO MEET

The assurances of abundant—or at least adequate—water resources is a recognized must in industrial planning, a fact leading to efforts for a consistent national water and power policy. To that end, the United States Chamber of Commerce reports, legislation is being drawn, for such a policy covering water supply, reclamation, navigation, flood control, and power programs.

Significantly, Tennessee has not waited for such a program to confront its own problems. The 1957 legislature created the water resources division, operating within the framework of the conservation department, to set up a workable policy before the well runs dry.

Actually, of course, the well has not run dry—or nearly so. But the necessity of conserving these resources long ago was seen. Where water in tremendous quantities is wasted, or where it is made unusable by stream pollution, etc., action is needed to end these practices—and that is within the scope of the policy sought.

In the national picture, uniform policy is desired to determine the exact role of the Federal Government in these programs, and so make it easier for States, local governments, and private citizens to fit their program into national planning.

Industry stands to gain most from water supply improvement, it is pointed out, be-

cause it uses more water than any other sector of the economy. Total industrial water consumption now is about 77 billion gallons daily, and by 1975 it is predicted this industrial demand will double. Yet in many areas industrial water consumption has reached the capacity of local water resources.

It is for the future, meaning years ahead, especially, that Tennessee is laying the groundwork for assured available supply. The State is growing industrially. While it hasn't waited for joint action by all the States, through formulation of Federal policy, it will stand to benefit from that. Meanwhile, the efforts now being undertaken nationally underline the value of the steps Tennessee already has taken. The water resources division can render an immeasurably important service.

A VALID REASON FOR STEWART'S FERRY DAM

Recommendation for construction of a vitally important supplementary water plant for greater Nashville on Stone's River provides additional and compelling support for the construction of the proposed Stewart's Ferry dam.

Nashville Waterworks director Robert L. Lawrence, Jr., has successfully anticipated Nashville's growth in terms of its water needs and expansion of its distribution and purification facilities for many years.

His full agreement with the survey, estimates, and recommendations of the Chester engineers for locating a new waterworks facility on Stone's River in conjunction with the proposed Stewart's Ferry dam should leave little doubt in the minds of citizens of this community as to the desirability and need for this project.

Mayor West is certainly thinking in terms of the long-range future needs and progress of this entire metropolitan area when he renews the fight for the Stone's River project.

Nashville needs, and must have a supplemental water supply. This community is, and has been in the past, extremely fortunate in having an almost unlimited source of water. Looking into the future it now appears that the industrial growth of this community, the needs of its growing urban population and its safety in time of record floods make more than feasible the projected impoundment.

Nashville's competent consulting engineers and waterworks director Lawrence have presented a strong case. It remains for Mayor West, other public officials, and the citizens of this middle Tennessee section to make their wishes known to their representatives in Washington.

This is the time for the community to get behind Mayor West and other officials who will join him in this endeavor and bring the Stewart's Ferry dam into reality because of its importance to the orderly and progressive development of this metropolitan area.

Population Increase and Growth of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and interesting editorial which was published in the Salt Lake City Tribune on April 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADING FOR A MILLION

A Utahan doesn't have to be very old to remember back to the days when the State's population was less than half a million. It was that through the 1920's. It was only 550,000, in fact, just 18 years ago.

And yet population analysts are already confidently predicting a Utah population over a million by 1965.

This forecast, just made by the Utah Foundation, is based on various official and unofficial studies. One of these is the comprehensive analysis made each year by the Utah Population Work Committee. This committee recently made its January 1, 1958, estimate of Utah population, the figure being 858,000. This represents a gain of 25,000 the last year, which seems to assure that the 1960 census will see the Utah total over the 900,000 mark.

Since 1950, the report showed, Utah's population gain has nearly doubled the national rate.

An article in the Utah Economic and Business Review says Utah is the eighth fastest growing State in the Union, with its population increase the last 7 years equaling the gain of the previous 17.

Of course, population gain of itself doesn't make a better Utah. There must be gain also in opportunity and general individual and community well-being. But there is reason to believe Utah is making such gains to go along with its population increase. The State is shifting to an industrial economy, with more jobs and better paying jobs. This in turn adds to governmental revenues and makes possible the financing of many improvements.

Perhaps the best news of all for Utah in these population analyses and forecasts is not the rapid growth or the prospect of a million-plus State in the very near future. The best news is that after some 20 years in which Utah failed to keep pace with its natural population growth (excess of births over deaths), for the last 7 years the State has had a net inmigration of people from other States and foreign countries.

This simply means ample opportunities and jobs for all native Utahans who want to stay here—plus something extra to attract those of energy and ability who want to follow the trail of the pioneers in seeking new life and new opportunity in Utah.

Procurement of Lawyers for the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon, Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, regarding the procurement of lawyers for the Air Force.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. REGINALD C. HARMON, THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, USAF, BEFORE THE STENNIS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ON THE PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT AND RETENTION PROBLEMS OF THE LEGAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE MILITARY SERVICE, APRIL 17, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the beginning, I should like to state that it is indeed gratifying to me to learn that the members of this committee are interested in the procurement and retention of qualified legal personnel in the military services. As briefly as possible, I shall present to you those facts which are available to me and are relevant to this problem. In the interest of conserving the time of this committee, I have prepared a written statement which, with your permission I shall read at this time.

In presenting the facts which concern the maintenance of an effective legal department in the Air Force, I should like to mention, first, the magnitude and importance of the legal work in that service; second, the problem of procuring and retaining qualified legal personnel in the service to do that legal work; and, third, the reasons given by the officers in my department for their lack of interest in seeking or continuing a military career in the legal profession.

In regard to the magnitude and importance of the legal work in my service, I shall not take too much of your time or burden you unduly by going into detail to describe the countless fields of legal activity within the Air Force. I shall mention only a few of the principal ones.

(a) During the fiscal year 1957, the lawyers in my department reviewed for legal sufficiency procurements valued at more than $8 billion and rendered legal advice in approximately 44,000 contractual actions of various kinds in the negotiation, execution and administration of Government contracts. The Government was represented by members of my department in 280 appeals before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals in matters involving over $26 million and the patent lawyers reviewed for legal sufficiency or rendered service in about 12,000 patent matters involving more than $3 billion.

(b) During the same fiscal year, the Air Force alone adjudicated and settled 11,000 claims involving payments of approximately $3 million which now is primarily and almost exclusively the responsibility of the legal department.

(c) In the field of international affairs, in the year 1956, there were over 3,100 trials of Air Force personnel by foreign courts; in more than 2,500 of these cases, waivers of jurisdiction were obtained. One of my legal officers was present at every trial in which no waiver was granted to safeguard the rights of our citizens as guaranteed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Status of Forces Agreement.

(d) In the field of criminal law, which comprises about half of the work of my department, in the calendar year 1956 the Air Force conducted over 37,000 trials which is 5,500 more than it is reported by the Attorney General as having been filed during the same year in all of the United States district courts in this country. As you know, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the duty of the military lawyer does not end with the trial. He is responsible for the appellate review of these court-martial proceedings to see that both the rights of the Government and the rights of the accused are protected in accordance with our system of Government. While it might be a little self-serving for me to say so, I am obliged to state, since it is relevant here, that I believe the Air Force record in the fair and equitable administration of criminal justice is second to none in the Nation today either military or civilian and State or Federal. I further believe that the Air Force has been equally well represented in its manifold civil activities. I would not be completely frank with you if I did not also state at this time that in my judgment, this high quality service cannot possibly continue unless something is done immediately to solve the personnel procurement and retention problems which are the subject of the second part of this discussion.

Of 1,272 judge advocates on duty on July 31, 1957, 573 were lieutenants. The author-

ination of manpower legal spaces took into consideration, of course, experience requirements and provided for only 149 lieutenants. Due to the fact that the Armed Forces have not been able to retain their lawyers in the service, we have been compelled to rely on inexperienced lieutenants to do a lot of the important work which should be done by experienced military lawyers. Let me cite a concrete example. Strategic Air Command provided spaces in its legal staff for only 11 lieutenants and has said concerning its requirements that all of its judge advocates except 11 must have experience levels of captain or above. SAC has over 100 lieutenant judge advocates today, because we are having to fill requisitions for captains, majors, and even lieutenant colonels with comparatively inexperienced lieutenants. Unfortunately, this is only a part of the picture. Of those over 100 lieutenants, not more than 3 or possibly 4 will remain on active duty after their committed 3-year tours are completed. Between 95 and 100 percent of all of our lieutenants on duty today will return to civilian life as soon as their obligated tours are completed. The reason I say between 95 and 100 percent is that our experience of the past shows that at least 95 percent returned to civilian life, and a poll conducted by the American Bar Association indicates that about 99.1 percent of those now on duty expect to return to civilian life when their obligated tours are over. Our present judge advocate strength is 1,196, a reduction of 76 since last July. Our turnover last fiscal year was nearly a third of our department meaning that our level of inexperience is very high, and in the future we are going to be unable to fill our vacancies even with inexperienced personnel. This is indicated by the fact that in fiscal year 1958 we will get only between 100 and 125 against a requirement of 287. The reason we are getting far fewer in 1958 than we did in 1957 is because of the relaxation of the draft pressure and the fact that an individual can now enlist in the Army for a period of 6 months and discharge the remainder of his military obligations in the inactive Reserve.

As you know, our department is made up of Regular officers and Reserve officers on extended active duty, sometimes called career reservists. Our present authorized strength of the former is 749 officers. Prior to the augmentation program which is now being completed, we had actually assigned to fill those 749 spaces, 360 officers. In the augmentation program, we had 389 vacancies which is the difference between 749 and 360. For those 389 vacancies, we had 238 applications or 3 for every 5 vacancies. After stretching the qualification standards as far as possible, we could accept only 193 of those applicants. Assuming that each of the 193 will accept the commission and pass the physical examination, this will bring our Regular strength up to 553, still about 200 short of the authorized Regular strength. After the augmentation program is over, it seems very unlikely that we will have very many applications for Regular commissions during the next 4 years because during the past 4 years we have gained only 26 Regular officers or an average of 6½ per year. In order to compare our success in the augmentation program with the Air Force at large, I should like to point out that the Air Force had approximately 60,000 applications for 19,644 spaces or 3 applicants for each vacancy or 15 for each 5 vacancies, whereas we had 3 for each 5 vacancies or one-fifth as many per vacancy as the Air Force at large. Between now and 1962, we will lose by retirements approximately 180 senior officers, including both Regular and career reservists. This does not include losses by disability retirements and death which will probably bring our losses to around 200 with almost nothing coming in from the bottom. Our present strength is 1196 officers, a reduction of 76 in less than a year. Of that number, 504 are lieutenants, leaving a total of 692 in grades above that of lieutenant. Of the number of such officers, we will lose in the next 4 years approximately 200 which will reduce our Regular and career reservist strength to 492 by 1962. Assuming by that time the number of lieutenants coming in will be reduced to nearly zero, our number of Judge Advocates in the Air Force cannot be much over 500, which will be less than half of the number required to do the legal work in the service. This simply means that in the short period of 4 years we are not going to have an effective legal department in the United States Air Force unless something is done immediately to solve our personnel procurement and retention problems. You might ask the question "What about the people in the Air Force who have been legally trained but who are not actually doing legal work or who are doing work of a semilegal nature." Those of you gentlemen who are lawyers know full well that not all people who are legally trained can be classified as lawyers capable to render effective legal service in important matters. I also believe that anyone who has practiced law for any substantial period of time knows that after a man has been out of the law business for a good many years, it is very difficult for him to get back into it again. This is especially true in the military where a man's rank and accompanying responsibility because of that rank increases with age. After he has been out of the law business for years, he is not capable of carrying the responsibilities of his rank in the field of his profession. In 1952, we lost 98 lawyers because of a decision by the Air Force to take Judge Advocates off flying status. Inherent in that decision, was the determination that Judge Advocates would remain Judge Advocates and specialists in their field similar to the medical doctors, thereby eliminating any possibility of ever going into a command position. These 98 elected to retain their flying status and forsake the law rather than continue in the legal business and give up their flight pay. The 98 who retained their flying status have collected over a million dollars in flight pay since 1952. While these officers are now performing effective service in other fields of activity, their use to the legal department is lost forever because the professional parade has moved on down the street while their grades have increased. In the legal department, they would have to be assigned to positions commensurate with their grades and nothing can be more damaging to morale than to have a senior officer supervising the work of junior officers who know more about the business than their supervisor. It would be a most extravagant policy to allow legally trained people who have been away from the law for several years to try now to perform the important legal work which they would be required to handle if an attempt were made to utilize their services in the legal field at this time. The Air Force also would lose their effective service in fields where they are now able in an effort to rejuvenate them in the law where their effectiveness would be lacking for years if not forever.

While it is virtually impossible to compute with any degreee of accuracy the value of effective legal service to an organization with as much law business as that of the Air Force, that value is sufficiently high to justify every private corporation in the land to employ legal counsel of the highest quality at tremendous cost to represent it in all transactions of any importance. I stated earlier that the lawyers in my department had reviewed for legal sufficiency procurements valued at $8 billion during the fiscal year 1957. This did not include the review of local purchase contracts made by commanders in the field in amounts not in excess of $100,000 each. The importance of having qualified lawyers to represent the Government in its vast procurement program for defense is readily apparent.

Even in the field of military justice where the advantages of effective legal service would not ordinarily be expected to result in money savings, substantial losses occur when criminal cases have to be retried.

During the calendar year 1957, 37 court-martial cases were either dismissed or returned for rehearing by the Court of Military Appeals and boards of review. The average cost of a court-martial in the Air Force has been determined to be $3,674, therefore, the 37 cases represent a cost to the Air Force of $134,938, a substantial portion of which was a result of inexperience at trial level. In calendar year 1958 to this date, 21 cases have been remanded for rehearing or dismissed representing a total cost during the first 3 months of this year of $77,154. This does not reflect the number of cases ordered reversed, dismissed, or reheard by convening authorities because of error during the course of the proceeding.

This now brings me to the third part of my discussion, which concerns the reasons given by the officers in my department for their lack of interest in seeking or continuing a military career in the legal profession. Many months ago, I made an inquiry through my staff judge advocates in the field in an effort to obtain an answer to this question. The answers I received were almost universally confined to three reasons:

(a) Inadequate pay as compared with civilian opportunities. Official statistics reveal that during the year 1957, the average income of civilian lawyers was $11,390, while that of military lawyers was $7,460. Even under the new pay scales which you are now studying, the average total income of the Air Force lawyer would be only $8,100 based upon authorizations.

(b) Lack of prestige. The officers feel that the position and rank of the Judge Advocate on the staff in all echelons of the Air Force from the top to the bottom are not as high as they should be when his responsibility is compared with that of other staff officers whose position and rank are higher.

(c) Promotion. The officers believe that due to the fact that a graduate degree or its equivalent with the accompanying 3 years of additional college training which are required to enter the legal profession should be compensated for in the way of constructive service for pay and promotion rights, just as are the members of the medical profession.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my written statement of the facts concerning this subject. I thank you very much.

Report of the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan for the Security Council

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished United States Representative for India and Pakistan. Dr. Frank P. Graham, has been patiently and tirelessly engaged for a long period of time toward trying to bring about a peaceful settlement by an implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of August 13, 1948 and of January 5, 1949.

On March 31, 1958, Dr. Graham made his report to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the report prepared in pursuance of the Security Council Resolution of December 2, 1957.

The report shows how tirelessly and, with diplomatic skill, Dr. Graham worked in an effort to solve the differences, or to relieve the tensions, or to make some progress toward an ultimate peaceful solution.

The report, which I include in my remarks, with his accompanying letter, and particularly the last six paragraphs thereof shows where responsibility rests on the Government of India for no progress being made. I am confident that the efforts of Dr. Graham laid the foundation for the success, in whole or in part, of future efforts.

Dr. Graham is to be congratulated for his statesmanlike efforts.

The report follows:

LETTER DATED MARCH 28, 1958, FROM DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM, UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE FOR INDIA AND PAKISTAN, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, TRANSMITTING THE REPORT PREPARED IN PURSUANCE OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION OF DECEMBER 2, 1957 (S/3922)

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL,
March 31, 1958.

I have the honor to transmit to you herewith the report I have prepared in pursuance of the resolution of the Security Council of December 2, 1957 (S/3922).

Accept, sir, etc.

FRANK P. GRAHAM,
United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan.

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE FOR INDIA AND PAKISTAN TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I

1. On December 2, 1957, at its 808th meeting, the Security Council adopted a resolution (S/3922) by which it requested the United Nations representative for India and Pakistan to make recommendations to the parties for further appropriate action with a view of making progress toward the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, and toward a peaceful settlement. He was further authorized to visit the subcontinent for these purposes and instructed to report on his efforts to the Security Council as soon as possible.

2. In pursuance of this resolution, I proceeded to the subcontinent. I arrived in New Delhi on January 12, 1958.

3. Discussions were held with the Government of India between January 12 and 17, between January 23 and February 1, and again between February 7 an 13; with the Government of Pakistan between January 17 and 23, between February 1 and 7, and again between February 13 and 15. I departed from Karachi on February 15.

4. The principal participants in these discussions for the Government of India were the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the Minister of Defense, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, and the Commonwealth Secretary, Shri M. J. Desai. The Government of Pakistan were represented by the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, Mr. Malik Firoz Khan Noon, the Foreign Secretary, Mr. M. S. A. Baig, and the Adviser on Kashmir Affairs, Mr. Din Mohammed.

5. The two Governments extended to me their complete cooperation. Our conversations were marked both by frankness and cordiality.

6. The Secretary-General of the United Nations placed at my disposal the services of Mr. J. P. Engers of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs; of Mr. Elmore Jackson as Special Consultant; and of Mrs. Daisy F. Lippner of the Department of General Services.

II

7. In the debates in the Security Council, held between September and December 1957, the Governments of India and Pakistan affirmed that they continued to be engaged by the resoluitons of UNCIP of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949.

8. In my initial discussions with the 2 governments I addressed myself to certain obstacles which appeared to stand in the way of progress in the implementation of these two resolutions. Foremost among these was the procedure for the withdrawal of the Pakistan troops and the withdrawal of the bulk of the Indian Army, as provided for in part II of the resolution of August 13, 1948, of the UNCIP. I therefore embarked on discussions with the two governments to ascertain their views on how these difficulties might be overcome. In following this approach I was of course fully aware of the fact that the Government of India had not accepted the resolution of the Security Council of December 2, 1957, and of their position regarding the sequence of actions contemplated in the resolution of August 13, 1948, but I believed that they would be interested in finding ways and means to facilitate the implementation of those elements which were standing in the way of the withdrawal of the Pakistan troops from the state.

9. In my conversations with the two governments I could not fail to note that while the objective envisaged in part II–A, namely the withdrawal of Pakistan troops from the state, was clear enough, the method and machinery to be pursued to this end would be likely to create its own problems.

10. As I envisaged the situation that would obtain after the withdrawal of Pakistan troops, I foresaw, as provided by the first resolution of the UNCIP, an area administered by the local authorities under the surveillance of the United Nations Commission, or, as, it had now developed, of the successor organ, the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan.

11. It should be noted that the position of this territory is of a peculiar nature. Its sovereignty rests with the State of Jammu and Kashmir but the full exercise of that sovereignty would be limited under the resolution by (a) the surveillance of a United Nations organ, and (b) the commitment by India that their forces would remain within the cease-fire line.

12. Furthermore, the degree of United Nations concern with the administration was left undetermined by the Commission by using the term "surveillance". Such problems as the logistics, economics and supply, to mention only a few, have never been fully considered, though they could hardly be expected to be met satisfactorily without due preparation.

13. Thus it would appear that the execution of section A in part II might create more serious difficulties than were foreseen at the time the parties agreed to that clause. The determination as to who are the local authorities, might not be an easy matter. Whether the United Nations Representative would be able to reconstitute the status quo which had obtained some 10 years ago, would seem to be doubtful.

14. I therefore came to the conclusion that prior negotiation with the parties on these problems would not only be essential but imperative. Otherwise the evacuated territory might be left in an unsettled condition.

III

15. Since I was aware that the Government of India were concerned about the security of the evacuated territory, and more particularly, were apprehensive that the Pakistan Army, after its withdrawal, might return to the territory, I felt it my duty to give serious consideration to ways and means to allay this concern on the part of India. I therefore proposed that the feasibility of placing a United Nations force on the Pakistan side of the Pakistan and Jammu and Kashmir border should be explored. If this conception in principle were to meet with approval, agreement might be sought from the Pakistan Government for receiving such a force and negotiations might be initiated within the United Nations on the size, composition and functioning of such a force.

16. Other suggestions were also discussed informally with the two Governments. In view of the urgency, however, of what I considered the most immediate requirement of the situation, namely, a resumption of direct negotiations—under United Nations auspices—I decided to make my formal proposals with as little detail as possible.

IV

17. In order to create the proper framework for these negotiations, I asked the 2 Governments to give prior consideration to 2 undertakings which I considered an essential prerequisite for their success.

18. In the first place, I suggested that the two Governments should consider the possibility of a renewed declaration in line with the resolution of the Security Council of January 17, 1948, and part I of the resolution of August 13, 1948, of the UNCIP, under which they would appeal to their respective peoples to assist in creating and maintaining an atmosphere favorable to further negotiations and in which they themselves would undertake to refrain from statements and actions which would aggravate the situation.

19. In the second place, I proposed that the two Governments reaffirm that they would respect the cease-fire line and that they would not cross or seek to cross the cease-fire line on the ground or in the air, as established in the cease-fire agreement, ratified by the Governments of India and Pakistan respectively on July 29 and 30, 1949.

20. Thus, on the day of my departure from the subcontinent on February 15, 1958, I submitted to the representative of both Governments the following recommendations:

I. That they should consider the possibility of a renewed declaration in line with the January 17, 1948, resolution of the Security Council and of part I of the August 13, 1948, resolution, under which they appeal to their respective peoples to assist in creating and maintaining an atmosphere favorable to further negotiations and in which they themselves undertake to refrain from statements and actions which would aggravate the situation.

II. That they reaffirm that they will respect the integrity of the cease-fire line and that they will not cross or seek to cross the cease-fire line on the ground or in the air, thus further assisting in creating a more favorable atmosphere for negotiations.

III. The withdrawal of the Pakistan troops from the State of Jammu and Kashmir is provided for in part II of the August 13, 1948, resolution. Pending a final solution, the territory evacuated by the Pakistan troops is to be administered by the local authorities under the surveillance of the Commission. Part II of this resolution also provides for the withdrawal of the bulk of the Indian forces from the state in stages to be agreed upon with the Commission.

In an effort to speed the implementation of these actions provided for in part II, the United Nations representative is suggesting that a prompt study be undertaken, under his auspices, of how the territory evacuated by the Pakistan troops could, pending a

final solution, be administered in accordance with the provisions of the resolution.

With a view to increasing the security of the area to be evacuated, the United Nations representative recommends that consideration be given to the possibility of the stationing of a United Nations force on the Pakistan side of the Pakistan and Jammu and Kashmir border, following the withdrawal of the Pakistan Army from the state.

IV. If progress is to be made in the settlement of the Indo-Pakistan question there is need for an early agreement between the two Governments on the interpretation that should be placed on part III of the August 13 resolution and those parts of the January 5 resolution which provide for a plebiscite. In this connection the United Nations representative would call attention to the communique of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan issued following their meeting in New Delhi in August 1953, which recognized that a plebiscite had been agreed to and expressed the opinion that a solution should be sought "causing the least disturbance to the life of the people of the state."

The United Nations representative will be considering with the two Governments the means and timing under which agreement might be sought on these questions.

V. The United Nations representative, believing that further negotiations on the questions which he has been considering with the Governments of India and Pakistan would be useful, and believing that it would facilitate progress if these negotiations could be undertaken at the highest level, proposes to the two Governments that a prime ministers conference be held under his auspices in the early spring.

If the latter recommendation would not be agreeable to either or both Governments, the United Nations representative recommends to the parties that they keep the general proposal, or any reasonable variation thereof, under consideration and that such a conference be held at the earliest practicable date.

V

21. The Government of Pakistan agreed to these recommendations in principle. They informed me that they were willing to make a renewed declaration as suggested by me and that they were prepared to reaffirm that they would respect the integrity of the cease-fire line.

22. They informed me further that they were prepared to withdraw the Pakistan troops from the State of Jammu and Kashmir simultaneously with the withdrawal of the bulk of the Indian forces from the state in stages to be agreed upon with the Commission, as provided in part II of the August 13, 1948, resolution.

23. They also agreed with my recommendation that a prompt study be undertaken under the auspices of the UNCIP of how the territory evacuated by the Pakistan troops could, pending a final solution, be administered by the local authorities in accordance with the provisions of the resolution.

24. The Government of Pakistan also informed me that they were agreeable to my recommendation to consider the possibility of the stationing of a United Nations force on the Pakistan side of the Pakistan Jammu and Kashmir border, following the withdrawal of the Pakistan Army from the state.

25. In the matter of the interpretation that should be placed on part III of the August 13 resolution, and those parts of the January 5, 1949, resolution which provide for a plebiscite, the Government of Pakistan indicated that they were prepared to abide by the terms of the prime ministers' communique of August 1953.

26. Finally, the Government of Pakistan agreed to my proposal of a conference at the prime ministers level, or any reasonable variation thereof, to be held under my auspices, adding that they would hope that this conference be held as soon as possible.

27. The Government of India declared themselves unable to agree to my recommendations. They based their position on the ground that my recommendations were made without regard to the failure to implement the Security Council resolution of January 17, 1948, and clauses B and E of part I of the UNCIP resolution of August 13, 1948, for which they held Pakistan responsible. In their view the sole onus of performance was on Pakistan and the United Nations, which both had the responsibility and the capacity for taking steps toward a peaceful approach to the situation and for making a contribution to resolving the difficulties between India and Pakistan.

28. While, therefore, the inability of India to accept my recommendations primarily followed from their contention that my approach was not feasible, since in their view it tended to bypass the implementation of what they considered to be the preliminary question, they also informed me that they did not look with favor on the substance of my recommendations.

29. Thus, they felt that a new declaration regarding a peaceful atmosphere and the cease-fire line might denote a displacement of the previous engagement. They further contended that such a declaration would imply that Pakistan had not violated their previous engagements and that the consequences of them would thereby stand condoned.

30. The Government of India could also not see their way to accept the study I had recommended in my third recommendation as they felt that it would tend to bypass and evade what they considered to be the main issue, namely, the illegal occupation of Indian Union territory by Pakistan. In their view that territory was an integral and inseparable part of the Union of India and the recommendation was based on a misconception that Jammu and Kashmir were a no man's land. Further, the study, in their view, would not be relevant since, according to the UNCIP resolutions and the assurances given on behalf of the Security Council to the Government of India, they alone, with the United Nations, were concerned in this matter and Pakistan would not seem to have any place whatsoever in these arrangements.

31. With regard to the recommendation on the stationing of a United Nations force on the Pakistan side of the Jammu and Kashmir border, the Government of India were taking cognizance of a concern of the United Nations representative in this matter which they understood to be conditioned by the previous conduct of Pakistan. They would on their part, however, consider it as highly improper and indeed an unfriendly act to promote a suggestion which would involve the stationing of foreign troops in a neighboring sovereign state with whom they desired nothing but the most friendly relations. Since, however, this was a matter for decision by the Government of Pakistan in their sovereign competence, they would not be in a position to object to this proposal, though they would regret it.

32. With regard to recommendation IV, the Government of India informed me that they regretted that they could not enter into any such discussions in view of their preliminary objections.

33. Finally, the Government of India declared themselves unable to accept my last recommendation since it would in their view place the aggressor and the aggressed on the same footing. They therefore considered it contrary to the Charter and all considerations of international ethics and equity.

VI

34. I should, however, inform the Council that the Government of India, at the same time as they declared themselves unable to accept my recommendations, also informed me that they have been and are anxious to promote and maintain peaceful relations with Pakistan. They stated that they firmly held the view and belief that there should be a constructive and peaceful approach to every problem and that they firmly adhered to their determination to pursue paths of peace, while placing their faith in the United Nations and its Charter.

35. In keeping with this spirit expressed by India, which I know is shared by Pakistan, I still express to the Council the hope that the two Governments will keep under consideration the proposal for a high level conference. I trust that, in their further consideration, they will find it possible promptly themselves to make, without prejudice to their respective positions on the Kashmir question, preparations for holding, within the framework of the charter of the United Nations, such a conference at the earliest practicable date, covering questions of time, place, auspices, and agenda. The agenda, as the parties might choose, might include the basic differences which the parties find to stand in the way of a settlement and such other matters as the parties might find would contribute to "progress toward the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, and toward a peaceful settlement."

VII

36. However wide the differences and deep the distrust, and however bad the situation in the opposite views of each other's position, no situation is completely and forever beyond the redemptive power of the development of reciprocal faith and the creative interchange of views and proposals for a peaceful settlement as alternatives to the deepening differences in an age of unprecedented peril and hope. Better than talking at long distances across the sub-continent is, on occasion, to talk directly to each other in a conference at the highest possible level. The holding of well prepared direct talks with the desire for a settlement is more than talk: it is itself an act of potentially creative faith which might lead to steps for a fair and peaceful settlement.

37. These unsettled and unsettling differences between two great peoples have long corroded their relations, continuously drain off their resources, and cut deeply into their hopeful programs for education, health, production, and welfare. Instead of continuing endlessly the corrosive polemics of all blame on one side and the other, the conference might, with sound preparation and resolute will, work out present steps toward a settlement; set in motion a higher release of the productive capacities of the people; and give an effective impetus to the world's floodtide of the yearning of the people for freedom and peace amid the hazards and hopes of this age.

38. In this age, any situation engaged by U. N. sponsored resolutions cannot be isolated from the dynamic currents of the world's concern even by the highest mountains, whose pinnacles rise in comparable grandeur from the topmost "roof of the world." Though bright rays of light shine through the overhanging clouds of our time, thermonuclear power casts its lengthening shadows across the earth, darkening the homes and hopes of man. As alternative to the sudden extinction of the human race and the destruction of the precious treasures of the heritage from all peoples in all ages, there rises above the authentic fears, despair and tumult of the times the unconquerable aspiration of the human spirit for the sublimation of thermonuclear power in the cause of peace and the equal freedom, dignity, and opportunity of all people, East and West.

40. The light of faith and the fires of the inner spirit, which, in dark times in ages

past, were lighted among Asian, African, and Mediterranean people for people in all lands, have shone most nobly in our times in the heroic struggles, liberation, and universal aspirations of the people of the historic subcontinent for a free and fairer life for all. With their twofold heritage of faith in the moral sovereignty, which undergirds the nature of man and the universe, and with a reverence for life challenging the violent trends of the atomic era, those peoples, in the succession of their prophetic leadership and great example, may again give a fresh lift to the humane spirit of people everywhere. The peoples of the world might in high response begin again in these shadowed years to transform with high faith and good will the potential forces of bitterness, hate, and destruction, step by step through the United Nations, toward the way of creative cooperation, economic, social, and cultural development, responsible disarmament, self-determination, equal justice under law, and peace for all pepoles on the earth as the God-given home of the family of man.

Mr. Gromyko's Timing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic magazine of April 7, 1958:

MR. GROMYKO'S TIMING

The smiling gentleman who commutes from Washington to Gettysburg told his press conference last June that he "would be perfectly delighted to make some satisfactory arrangement for temporary suspension of tests while we could determine whether we couldn't make some agreements that would allow it to be a permanent arrangement."

He might have been delighted, but his advisers who decide these matters in Washington were not. They did not then want, nor have they ever wanted, a ban on nuclear testing. They had their excuses: No test ban, said they, could be enforced. When the absurdity of that argument became too apparent, they added that perhaps a ban could be enforced but it would require aerial and ground inspection unacceptable to the Russians. Then, after the Russians said on June 15, 1957, that they would be willing to consider the monitoring of a test ban by international inspection teams, the administration retreated to the unprepared position that inspection was not after all enough—the Soviets must also suspend production of fissionable material.

This evasive and deceitful dodging has gone on for a long, long time, and when Adlai Stevenson suggested nearly two years ago that we should face the fact that the Russians too were making progress in nuclear armaments and that an end to testing at that time would be to our national advantage, he was practically accused of serving Moscow. We must continue testing, said the administration; there is always something more to be learned.

Last week we learned from Mr. Gromyko that the Russians intend to suspend further testing of their own. They invite us and the British to go and do likewise. It was a brilliant political move, even in an era when almost anything reasonably astute looks brilliant by comparison with the sleepwalking that passes for American diplomacy.

The Russians, understandably, are themselves now perfectly delighted to rest awhile on the high ground that they have won, for it is reliably reported that they have conducted 56 nuclear tests, 14 in the 9 months since the breakup of the London disarmament talks, including the long series just completed in which they tested warheads for their rockets. The timing of the Gromyko announcement was perfect, coming just before the United States begins a lengthy series of new nuclear tests.

What can be done? It is not pleasant to say, but our answer is: Nothing substantial while this administration remains in office. But as for what should be done? A frank and uncomplicated reply to the Gromyko announcement on test suspensions would:

Welcome it.

Point out that the tests we are about to run are similar in purpose to those the Russians have just finished, and that we intend to carry on as planned in the absence of any mutually acceptable plan for controlling testing.

Announce our desire to begin negotiating an agreement to cease all further nuclear tests for 2 years, this agreement to be monitored by U. N. inspection teams based on United States and Soviet soil, and agreeing to divorce this issue from that of the production of fissionable material.

Ask the Soviet Union to join us in the U. N. Disarmament Commission to negotiate not merely methods for assuring an end to nuclear testing, but the internationally supervised elimination of all nuclear weapons from the arsenals of all nations.

Procurement of Lawyers for the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Maj. Gen. George W. Hickman, Jr., Judge Advocate General of the Army, regarding the procurement of lawyers for the Army.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I am Maj. Gen. George W. Hickman, Jr., the Judge Advocate General of the Army. I am honored to have been asked to appear before your subcommittee.

I have a brief prepared statement I would like to present to the subcommittee. In the absence from the city of Secretary Brucker, Assistant Secretary Milton has stated to me that I should tell this subcommittee everything that my heart dictates. The views I shall express are my own and not necessarily the official views of the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense.

I have become increasingly concerned over our military lawyer procurement problem. Unless an effective method is devised to procure able lawyers for military service and to retain those experienced in military law, the ability of the Army's Judge Advocate General's Corps to perform its mission will be seriously compromised. As a consequence, servicemen will not be properly represented and the interests of the Government will not be adequately protected in the mutibillion dollar operations of the Army. At present, 1,061 officers are on duty in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. Of these, 502 are in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army, and 559 are in the Judge Advocate General's Corps Reserve.

Of the latter category 424, or 40 percent of the entire total are lieutenants who were commissioned generally upon graduation from law school with concurrent call to active duty. In other words, they are under pressure to serve because of the operation of the selective service system and are serving what we call obligated tours of service.

As of August 31, 1957, our Regular Army authorized strength was 645 and our actual Regular Army strength was 489. As of today, Our Regular Army authorized strength is 645 and our actual strength is 502. Regardless of these figures our situation has not improved. This increase in Regular Army strength does not represent the recruitment of military lawyers from outside sources, but merely a transfer of 13 career reservists, nearly all in the senior grades, to the Regular Establishment under the current Regular Army Augmentation program. Even more serious is the fact that our Regular Army lieutenant strength is only 36.

In connection with the problem of our corps being attractive as a career, it is significant that under the officer augmentation program the Department of the Army received approximately 19,500 applications, but only 175 applicants indicated any desire to be appointed in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. Of that number only 80 indicated our corps as first choice, a smaller response than any other branch of the Army except the Veterinary Corps.

In the past few years it has been possible to alleviate the overall shortage in lawyers to some degree by commisisoning law students upon graduation with concurrent call to active duty. However, over 40 percent of the entire active duty strength of the corps is comprised of lieutenants. Even this source of manpower, which is dependent upon pressure resulting from the operation of the Selective Service System, is fast disappearing with the advent of the 6-months' Reserve program. In any event, it provides no method of procuring, either for the present or the future, career officers of proper experience and maturity. It supplies no input of career lawyers at the bottom.

Nevertheless, in the past several years, we have paid special attention to inducing these young Reserve officers on active duty to make a career of our Corps. However, of the 1,242 law-school graduates who have been granted commissions with concurrent call to active duty since 1950, only 9 have accepted commissions in the Regular Army and less than 1 percent have remained on active duty in any status.

From what I have stated it becomes obvious that we are not procuring even a minimum number of young lawyers for the Regular Army. At this rate it will soon be impossible to man a large number of the responsible positions in the Judge Advocate General's Corps with officers of proper experience and maturity. In fact, that inability is already becoming apparent.

During the last 4 fiscal years we have procured officers for the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army, at the annual rate of only 11, whereas to merely hold our own (and for the moment to ignore the large number of vacancies which have accrued) we should be procuring such young officers at the annual rate of not less than 27. Future Regular Army losses through retirement alone through fiscal year 1963 are projected at the rate of 13 per year. During the last 4 fiscal years resignations have been at the annual rate of 6. We have had 5 resignations so far this year. For every 2 highly experienced career officers lost since

July 1, 1953, we have been able to recruit but 1 inexperienced officer to replace them. The survey conducted by the American Bar Association indicates that resignations may be expected in the future at a much higher rate.

I emphasize that since July 1, 1953, 20 percent of our officers have left the service each year. It is obviously inefficient and uneconomical to operate a Judge Advocate General's Corps under a system which results in a turnover each year of approximately 20 percent of the corps.

Let me emphasize that we have at all times made use of every reasonable opportunity to obtain qualified lawyers from other branches in the Army. For instance, following World War II lawyers in other branches were encouraged to integrate in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army. Army regulations and other directives, setting forth in detail the career possibilities in our corps, have at all times been widely circulated. In addition, members of the corps have constantly been alert to our recruitment difficulties and have as individuals endeavored to encourage those who might be qualified to apply for transfer to, or apply for a commission in, our corps. Those lawyers in other branches who might be useful to our corps are in the other branches through choice. Also, some qualified young lawyers are drafted as enlisted men, preferring to serve the shorter period in that status to the longer period commissioned as a lieutenant with concurrent call to active duty as a Reserve officer in our corps.

Moreover, we believe we have exploited all reasonable means of procuring Regular Army replacements from sources outside the Army. For example, some of the actions we have taken during the last year include the sending of letters and recruitment information to the deans of about 125 accredited law schools, to the law student associations at those institutions, and to about 1,500 State and local bar associations, as well as placing recruitment announcements in publications of the American Bar Association, those of numerous State and local bar associations, and other legal periodicals. Also, our officers have personally appeared before senior law classes in an effort to recruit applicants for commission in the Regular Army. I have personally written sincere recruiting letters to some 300 young lawyers who served 3 years with us since 1950 and then went into private practice. Only two have responded with applications for the Regular Army.

The United States Court of Military Appeals has expressed some dissatisfaction because of the lack of experience and maturity on the part of some military lawyers engaged in courts-martial work. I agree that lawyers just out of law school, lacking experience in both life and law, are not as well qualified as they will be 10, or even 5, years hence. I do want to make clear, however, that about 95 percent of these young lawyers we commission do remarkably good work. Among them in twenty years or so will be many of the leading lawyers of the country. The trouble is that they just do not stay with us beyond their obligated tours. Just when they are becoming well able to carry competently a full load, they go home or elsewhere to engage in private practice. Obviously, if military lawyers of more experience and maturity were available, very substantial advantage to the Government could be effected in procurement, courts-martial, and other fields of military law. In fact, today we administer the Uniform Code of Military Justice with its mandatory requirement for three lawyers on each general court-martial and yet have no satisfactory method of procuring the essential military lawyers.

I would be remiss in my duties to our corps if I did not state that we are in grave danger of losing all semblance of a strong and properly staffed Regular Corps.

Sadie P. Delaney: Bibliotherapist and Librarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, since 1923 Dr. Sadie P. Delaney has served as chief librarian at the Veterans' Hospital in Tuskegee, Ala. In 1956, after 33½ years' service, she received the top award of the United Sttaes Veterans' Administration for the excellency of her work and for her service to humanity.

The story of Dr. Delaney's life and work recently appeared in an article written for the Southeastern Librarian by Clyde H. Cantrell, director of libraries, Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article herewith:

SADIE P. DELANEY: BIBLIOTHERAPIST AND LIBRARIAN

(By Clyde H. Cantrell)

Dr. Sadie P. Delaney, of Tuskegee, Ala., has ahieved State, national, and international recognition for her work as a librarian, but more especially as a bibliotherapist. It seems appropriate, therefore, that the life and workers of this tireless and energetic person should be recorded for the readers of the Southeastern Librarian.

Mrs. Delaney, chief librarian at the Veterans' Hospital in Tuskegee, was born in Rochester, N. Y., in 1889. She attended the Poughkeepsie, N. Y., High School, the College of the City of New York, and received her professional training in the New York Public Library system.

In 1920 Mrs. Delaney was assigned to the 135th Street Branch of the New York Public Library, where she provided library service for Negroes, Chinese, Jews, Italians, and many other races. While employed at this library, she was active in civic and literary circles; and her work with delinquent boys and girls and with the foreign-born drew worldwide recognition. A beginning was made in helping delinquents through the use of bibliotherapy. The story-telling hours attracted public and parochial schoolchildren, and special work was carried on with parent-teacher groups. Boy Scouts, YMCA leaders, social workers, and others were brought into the library. The first Negro art exhibit was held and a booklovers club was organized for bringing authors and readers together. Mary Austin, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Clement Wood, Bobbette Deutsch, and other writers came to the library to speak and meet library patrons.

Because of Mrs. Delaney's great interest in books dealing with Negro life and literature, she placed special emphasis upon building a Negro collection at the New York Public Library. As a result of this interest, she came to know Mr. Arthur Schomburg, Puerto Rican-American historian, who later gave his valuable collection on the Negro to the New York Public Library.

While working with various groups and individuals, Mrs. Delaney became interested in work with the blind. This interest was so great that she learned Braille and Moon Point.

In 1923 Mrs. Delaney was called upon to organize the library for the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Tuskegee, Ala. At first she was reluctant to accept the appointment because she was not sure she would ever want to live in the South. However, after considerable deliberation she asked and received a leave of absence for 6 months from the New York Public Library to allow her to organize the library at Tuskegee. At the end of this half year, seeing the demands and opportunities for library service so great, she accepted as a permanent appointment the position of librarian, where she has achieved a reputation which has gone far beyond the boundaries of the United States.

Not until January 1956 did this writer see in a library periodical an advertisement seeking the services of a bibliotherapist.[1] Yet this is an art and/or science which Mrs. Delaney has practiced since her period of service at the 135th Street library in New York City.

What, then, is bibliotherapy? It has been defined and discussed in a recent article in our professional literature.[2] The term is taken from biblio, meaning book, and therapy, designating treatment. Hence, bibliotherapy means book treatment. It is, therefore, the art or science of curing or improving the state of health of the ill and infirm, either physically or mentally, through the skillful selection and reading of appropriate books and use of other media. Mrs. Delaney has defined bibliotherapy as meaning "the treatment of a patient through selected reading."[3]

Gladys Oppenheim has published, in South Africa, an illustrated article on the bibliotherapeutic activities of Mrs. Delaney. Miss Oppenheim writes that in Tuskegee "one can see bibliotherapy in practice at its very best * * * and its success in this hospital is entirely due to the gifted and devoted librarian, Mrs. Sadie Peterson Delaney * * * every book in the hospital library has to be read by the librarian, who has to be familiar with the case history of each patient * * *."[4] A bibliotherapist, according to practices at Tuskegee, looks upon a patron as a patient who is entitled to receive the same individual attention as that given to him by his physician and psychiatrists. It is in this area of activity that Mrs. Delaney has been lauded at home and abroad.

What was the sequence of events leading to the establishment of an adequate library and development of bibliotherapy at the veterans' hospital in Tuskegee, Ala.? To answer this question, let us consider the entire scope of Mrs. Delaney's work there, the problems she found and her achievements in their solution.

A very interesting record of the first year of the veterans' hospital library has been recorded by Mrs. Delaney herself.[5] She arrived in Tuskegee the first day of 1924, and on the third day of January the doors of the library were opened to patrons. There was only 1 table and the book collection numbered a mere 200 volumes. She decided to begin with equipment and books on hand rather than waiting for deliveries. The library room had formerly been used as a place for the sale of cigarettes and candy; when the candy was about exhausted, stories were substituted. At first there were no books for mental patients, so fairy tales borrowed from the Tuskegee Institute Library were used. Within 2 weeks the library was moved to more adequate quarters and read-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ing tables, chairs, and an office for the librarian were provided. Flowers, plants, wall maps and posters were used to good effect. Within a few weeks, Mrs. Delaney began carrying books to the wards of the hospital so patients confined there might begin to read them. A medical library was begun on a small scale on January 15, but has continued to grow from year to year.

A book wagon was received in April of the first year of operation, and it tended to increase the reading interests of patients in the wards. Monthly book talks by the librarian and weekly story hours in the wards did much to stimulate patients to read more and more. Although the circulation at the end of the first month was only 275, by the end of the year it had increased to 1,500 monthly, about 90 percent being nonfiction. By 1953 the circulation of books from the general and medical libraries was more than 10,000 per month. The organization of a literary society, which met in the library, gave the librarian further opportunities to work with the reading needs of patients. At the end of the first year there were 4,000 volumes in the hospital library and about 85 volumes in the medical library for the use of doctors and nurses. When one considers that the libraries were catering to 500 patients and about 300 employees, the first year of operation seems phenomenal.

After this beginning, every conceivable means was used to stimulate further the interests of patrons in the use of books. By 1925 the number of patients had increased from 500 to 1,000; and reading increased proportionately. In 1926 a special library binding service was organized to give patients vocational experience. In 1930 a Disabled Veterans Literary Club was formed, becoming the nucleus for the active Literary Press Club at this time. Patients are the officials of the club, and meetings are held Monday mornings and Thursday evenings in the library. In 1933 a special bibliotherapy unit was organized so patients might attend the library rather than having it brought to them. A department for the blind was started in 1934. It is concerned with book fairs, exhibits, projected books, talking books, Braille group therapy, stamp and coin clubs, radio broadcasts, binding service, and trips of book carts to the bedsides of patients.

In 1934 a library debate club was organized and 1935 saw the beginnings of a special numismatic club and a philatelic club, both started to give the patients good, wholesome hobby and recreational activities. The clipping service (1936), the nature study group (1938), and the historic forum (1939) have supplied other avenues of interests for those in need of library and bibliotherapeutic attention. These activity groups and the various services provided for patients and patrons have, without doubt, given the Veterans' Hospital Library at Tuskegee the highest circulation per patron of any library in this area. It is all attributable to the planning and forethought of Mrs. Delaney.[6]

It is doubtful that any other Southern librarian has ever been praised for his (or her) humanitarian work more than Mrs. Delaney. She has thriven in a life of devotion and service to others. Thrilling indeed have been her experiences in assisting in the rehabilitation of the mentally and physically ill. Seeing the spark of interest kindled in the minds of neurotic persons who thought the world offered no reason for living; assisting the blind to learn to read and to come to fill useful roles in society; showing the permanently disabled how, despite their handicaps, they may develop hobbies and vocations for their own amusement and profit; and advancing the general cultural and specialized educations of hundreds or even thousands of citizens have been self-satisfying experiences which Mrs. Delaney looks upon with great joy. Such a life lived in the interest of suffering humanity has earned for her the appellation of "Great Humanitarian."[7] It is not surprising that she should have received numerous honors and awards.

One of the most significant tributes paid to Mrs. Delaney was written by Morteza D. Sprague,[8] who has been acquainted with her and her work for the past 26 years. He points out that, whereas there is much ado about bookmobiles today, Mrs. Delaney has been carting books to patients since 1924. In New York, says Sprague, Claude McKay, Langston Hughes, and others were given their initial push by Mrs. Delaney. At the Veterans' Hospital in Tuskegee, her program has been so successful that library schools such as Illinois, North Carolina, and Atlanta have sent students to study her programs and methods. The Veterans' Administration long ago adopted the policy of having its hospital librarians study the policies and practices of Mrs. Delaney. People who have paid distinguished tribute to her include Dr. F. D. Patterson, Dr. Charles S. Johnson, and Dr. George Branche. She has been acclaimed by librarians such as Dr. Keyes D. Metcalf, Dr. Luther Evans, Dr. E. W. McDiarmid (now a dean at the University of Minnesota), and Dr. Virginia Lacy Jones.

It would require too much space to list the numerous citations of merit and the honors which have come to Mrs. Delaney during the last 32 years, so only some are mentioned in this article. She and her work are included or discussed in 51 publications. The United States Department of State sent to 100 USIS units in 75 countries information on Mrs. Delaney, citing her life and work as an example of what is great and good in "The American Way of Life." In 1934 she was listed in Principal Women in America, edited by Mitre Chambers (London, 1934). In 1938 Mrs. Delaney's work was discussed in an illustrated article published in South Africa.[9] In 1949 she was cited by the American Legion "for meritorious service to veterans"; and the same year she was selected as Woman of the Year by the National Urban League, the Iota Phi Lambda sorority, and the Zeta Phi Beta sorority.

In 1950, Mrs. Delaney's work as librarian, humanitarian, and bibliotherapist was discussed and lauded by Look magazine (September 26, 1950), the American Medical Association Journal (May 6, 1950), Military Surgeon (June 1950), and the Book Trolley Hospital Librarians Guild of London, England. In 1951, a sketch of Mrs. Delaney's work in Alabama up to that time was published by Sprague.[10] In 1952, she was honored at Howard University as one of the National Council of Negro Women honorees. Closer home, the Montgomery Advertiser selected Mrs. Delaney as one of Alabama's outstanding women in 1953. In December 1955 she was honored in Washington, D. C., by the 200 chapters of the Zeta Phi Beta sorority as national honorary member, based on her accomplishments in library service.

Mrs. Delaney has taken an active part in the work of the hospital librarians division of the American Library Association. She is also a member of the Southeastern Library Association. The high esteem in which she is held in Tuskegee was shown when she was invited to become a member of the Neuropsychiatric Journal Club, composed largely of resident psychiatrists.

Of all the honors which have come to Mrs. Delaney, there is none of which she is happier than the honorary doctor of humanities degree conferred upon her by Atlanta University in 1950. On that occasion she was cited as a "great humanitarian, who has labored tirelessly with courage, fearlessness, patience, and love."[11]

After 33½ years of service, Dr. Delaney received the top award of the United States Veterans' Administration for the excellency of her work and for her service to humanity. This award came in the form of a certificate completed in Washington under date of June 8, 1956; and it reads as follows:

"Commendation: This certificate is awarded to Sadie P. Delaney in recognition of her outstanding contribution to the rehabilitation of veteran patients. Through the use of bibliotherapy and braille she has had particular success in aiding the mentally ill and the blind. Her many years of service have brought universal renown and gratitude.

"Given at Washington, D. C., this 8th day of June, 1956.

"[SEAL] VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
"WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON,
"Chief Medical Director."

This honor is indeed appropriate and signifies to the world the admiration in which Dr. Delaney is held, because of the patience and love she has showed in administering to those who have needed her Christian assistance.

Dr. Delaney's philosophy of life and her eagerness to be of service to mankind were illustrated in her speech at the Atlanta University commencement banquet, held the evening after she received the honorary doctorate. She began by stating that "Were I a poet tonight, I might put my emotions in verse; were I an artist, I would paint a picture and title it, 'for those who serve'; were I a singer, I would sing 'Hallelujah'; but I am only a servant and can say, this is my finest hour."[12] Dr. Delaney spoke at length on the joy she has had in administering to the needs of those who could not help themselves, but she pointed out that it was she herself who was benefited. "We feel that we are enriching the lives of those we serve," she said, "but we are the benefactors; we are enriching our own lives. The faith, hope, and tenacity which they taught us might tend to inspire others." She added that "The more one works with people in trouble, the greater his confidence in human kind and his respect for human beings becomes. * * * Let a man be free to be himself and his success is almost assured. * * * Concluding her speech, Dr. Delaney said that "Out of life's very difficulties; out of our own frailty comes renewed appreciation of all that living means and the privilege that is ours to practice."

Dr. Sadie P. Delaney's story can never be written completely, because her assistance and kindness to those in need may have set up chain reactions which will be passed on from one person to another for years to come. However, this much we know: Dr. Delaney has wrought well, her work has been a blessing to the South and to the Nation, and the various honors which have been bestowed upon her have been deserved. May her good work continue for many years, because she has been a candle in the darkness for countless individuals who desperately needed to have light shed upon their pathways.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Library Journal 81:200, January 15, 1956.

[2] Ruth Hannah, Navy Bibliotherapy, Library Journal 80: pp. 1171–73, May 15, 1955.

[3] Sadie P. Delaney, The Place of Bibliotherapy in a Hospital, Library Journal 63: 305–08, April 15, 1938.

[4] Gladys Oppenheim, Bibliotherapy—A new Word for your Vocabulary, Cape Times (Bloemfontein, South Africa), January 15, 1938, p. 3.

[5] Sadie Delaney, United States Veterans' Hospital Library, No. 91, Tuskegee, Ala. The Crisis, 20, pp. 116–117, January 1925.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[4] For a brief outline of the development of the entire program of the library to 1940, see Sadie P. Delaney, Library Activities at Tuskegee, United States Veterans' Administration Medical Bulletin, 17:168-9, October, 1940.

[5] Morteza D. Sprague, Dr. Sadie Peterson Delaney: Great Humanitarian. Service 15: 17-18, June 1951.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Gladys Oppenheim, Op. Cit.

[8] Morteza D. Sprague, Op. Cit.

[9] From Atlanta University, 81st commencement, June 5, 1950

[10] Passages so indicated are quoted by permission of Dr. Delaney.

Federal Reserve Surrenders; It Pulled a Blooper in 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Leslie Gould, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of April 18, 1958, is most timely and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

FEDERAL RESERVE SURRENDERS; IT PULLED A BLOOPER IN 1957

(By Leslie Gould)

The Federal Reserve Board's retreat on its tight-money policy is now a complete surrender.

The Board has made its fourth cut in the rediscount rate in 6 months and the third reduction in reserve requirements in 2 months.

The new discount rate is 1¾ percent. The cut in reserve requirements by one-half of 1 percent is the same as the two previous reductions, making the total 1½ percent and providing additional credit of around $9 billion.

The cut in reserve requirements is a full 1 percent for the New York and Chicago banks, in two half-percent changes, one effective now and the second on April 24. For the other reserve cities, the reduction is only a half percent, effective April 24.

This is the first move by the Federal Reserve to reduce the spread between the New York and Chicago banks and the other reserve cities. The requirements for New York and Chicago will be 18 percent after April 24 and for the reserve cities 16½ percent. The spread formerly was 2 percent.

No change is to be made in the reserve requirements of the country banks which remain at 11 percent.

BASE FOR $9 BILLION CREDIT

Today's action frees about half a billion of such deposits, which in turn will provide a base for about $3 billion in additional credit. Thus, the three reductions in reserve requirements will provide $9 billion in additional credit.

Both actions are additional shots in the arm for the lagging economy.

It was only 8 months ago that the Federal Reserve, insisting money had to be tightened, jacked the discount rate to 3½ percent—the highest level in 24 years.

That was a mistaken move, coming at a time when the stock market was faltering and business beginning to slide.

HELPED BRING ON SLUMP

This untimely—or more correctly dumb—action gave the market and business the extra shove that brought on the slump.

Another arm of the Washington Government helped worsen the two pictures in fumbling on the defense contracts. This was the stretchout of payments and cancellation of some contracts by the Defense Department.

When it increased the rediscount rate to 3½ percent last August a Reserve spokesman made the reassuring statement that if business did turn down the rates would be changed as "the situation warranted."

The action and that statement showed what poor pulse feelers as to the economy's health the experts of the Federal Reserve are. They are bungling economic doctors. Yet, the Federal Reserve is the agency that is supposed to have the best and most immediate figures on the changing economy.

COULDN'T DIAGNOSE DATA

The kindest thing that can be said for the Federal Reserve doctors is that they had the information but didn't know how to diagnose it.

Today's change in the discount rate applies only to 5 of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks, but the other 7 will follow.

The new discount rate of 1¾ percent is the lowest since 1954. The reserve requirements at 18½ for the central Reserve cities—New York and Chicago—are the lowest since 1936, when they were raised to 19½ from 13 percent.

The requirements still are too high. A more realistic requirement would be 10 or 12 percent. The Federal Reserve, still living in the past, has 3 schedules for requirements—2 percent difference up to now between the central Reserve cities—New York and Chicago—and the other Reserve cities. Rates in San Francisco, for example, which is headquarters for the world's biggest bank, will still be 1½ percent lower than New York and Chicago.

NOT A CREDIT INFLATION

The Federal Reserve erred because it treated the business boom and the accompanying inflation as if it were similar to that of the late 1920's—a credit inflation. The inflation of this era is a wage-price inflation. It is not the result of any feverish bidding for credit for speculation as in 1929. Nor is it the result of any shortages, with consumers vying for scarce goods. There were no shortages last year. Nor are there any today.

Wages were going up then and are continuing to rise, without any offsetting increases in worker productivity.

It looks like a new set of doctors are needed.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following winning essay in the Ohio American Legion contest, a very thoughtful effort by this young man from my district:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

(By 12th grader Mark S. Hanna, 881 Scott Boulevard, Bowling Green, Ohio)

To be worthy of the title of citizen, I believe that it will be necessary for me to be a good steward. A good steward not only preserves that which he receives but improves and increases the trust he has been given. I have received a great and costly inheritance—a free and democratic Government. How can I improve and increase this gift for future generations?

As a good steward I must develop mentally, physically, morally, and emotionally to the utmost of my abilities. To think clearly and to make wise decisions, I must have a knowledge of the past as well as the present. I must be strong physically, not only to do my daily work but also to help others and to defend my country from aggressors. Morally, I must learn to know right from wrong and to have the courage to do the right. Emotionally, I must be stable and not be swayed by false fears.

A good steward preserves that which has been entrusted to him, so I must guard zealously the liberties and freedoms my country insures. I must preserve the Constitution with its checks and balances and be reluctant to let it be changed unless with great care. I must not let trouble, discouragement, panic, sputniks, or enthusiasm for any person or group induce me to give up my freedom.

A good steward must be alert to any influence which tends to divide this country by race, creed, or class prejudice. I must watch for those who slyly work to undermine my Nation and if it is attacked I must defend it with my life. It is my duty to obey the laws, know how the Government operates on all levels, and determine the qualifications which candidates for office possess. I must help get out the vote so that those who govern are truly representative. I must support my country with my loyalty, taxes, service, and my life if necessary, remembering that my personal interest is secondary to the good of all. I must so live as to be a credit and honor to my family, school, community, and Nation.

As a good steward citizen I will work for conservation of our natural resources, balancing of the budget, equal opportunities for all, greater emphasis on learning and science, and better international relations. Also as an individual I will keep myself free from prejudice, and be a good-will ambassador for my country.

Playing the part of a good steward I will renew my allegiance to God and pray for my country—that its leaders may be guided by God, freedom be preserved, and that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

A good steward is also his brother's keeper, so I will use my resources to spread the blessings of our free Government around the world—to make democracy work so well that it can be recommended to every nation. I must help to keep this light of freedom burning to show the way to the rest of the world and to offer a haven to those whose freedom has been restricted. I must work for good will and peace among nations by sharing with them and by practicing the golden rule. I will not become panicky for I know the true strength of a country is in its beliefs, philosophies, and ideals—not in sputniks.

As a citizen of the United States of America I shall play the part of a good steward. I will merit the judgment, well done, good and faithful steward.

Results of the Questionnaire in the Second Congressional District of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the results of a questionnaire I recently sent out to the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota.

Since this district is about equally divided between agricultural and nonagricultural interests, I made a special effort to obtain the benefit of the views of those in the agricultural area.

In the counties outside of the Black Hills area, I sent the questionnaire to all boxholders. In the Black Hills area I sent it to a more limited group. For that reason I believe the returns on agriculture are of particular interest.

In compiling the agricultural returns, I have divided the results into three groups, those who indicated their occupation as farmers, those who indicated their occupation as farmer-ranchers, and those who indicated their occupation as ranchers. I am setting those returns out separately because I believe it will be of special interest not only to the people of South Dakota, but also to the Members of Congress.

All other returns and all other categories are included in the final tabulation.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this questionnaire has been most valuable to me, not only because of the answers to the various questions submitted, but also because more than 8 out of 10 returning the questionnaire gave me the additional benefit of their thinking at the foot of the questionnaire in the space provided for remarks, and probably half of those answering the questionnaire included a letter explaining their ideas and their philosophy of government.

The tabulation on agriculture is as follows:

FARMER ONLY

	Percentage		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Soil Bank program as presently operated?	21.0	70.0	9.0
2. Discontinuance of the acreage reserve program in the Soil Bank?	54.0	30.0	16.0
3. Raising supports to 100 percent parity with tight production controls?	26.0	49.0	25.0
4. Continuing flexible supports?	33.0	44.0	23.0
5. Dropping all supports and controls and returning to free production in accord with supply and demand?	43.0	35.0	22.0
6. Enactment of domestic parity program for wheat with allotment based on bushel rather than acreage quotes?	52.0	29.0	19.0
7. A foot-stamp plan by which needy persons could obtain surplus foods through normal commercial channels?	68.0	24.0	8.0
8. Taxing co-ops on the same basis as other businesses?	63.0	21.0	16.0

FARMER-RANCHER ONLY

Do you favor—			
1. Soil Bank program as presently operated?	16.9	70.0	14.0
2. Discontinuance of the acreage reserve program in the Soil Bank?	51.0	31.0	18.0
3. Raising supports to 100 percent parity with tight production controls?	50.0	31.0	19.0
4. Continuing flexible supports?	18.0	55.0	27.0
5. Dropping all supports and controls and returning to free production in accord with supply and demand?	36.0	48.0	16.0
6. Enactment of domestic parity program for wheat with allotment based on bushel rather than acreage quotas?	57.0	21.0	22.0
7. A food-stamp plan by which needy persons could obtain surplus foods through normal commercial channels?	67.0	20.0	13.0
8. Taxing co-ops on the same basis as other businesses?	45.0	34.0	21.0

RANCHER ONLY

Do you favor—			
1. Soil Bank program as presently operated?	16.0	64.0	20.0
2. Discontinuance of the acreage reserve program in the Soil Bank?	54.0	26.0	20.0
3. Raising supports to 100 percent parity with tight production controls?	26.0	62.0	12.0
4. Continuing flexible supports?	26.0	31.0	43.0
5. Dropping all supports and controls and returning to free production in accord with supply and demand?	57.0	31.0	12.0
6. Enactment of domestic parity program for wheat with allotment based on bushel rather than acreage quotas?	48.0	23.0	29.0
7. A food-stamp plan by which needy persons could obtain surplus foods through normal commercial channels?	65.0	21.0	14.0
8. Taxing co-ops on the same basis as other businesses?	66.0	22.0	12.0

RESULTS OF ALL RETURNS

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Do you favor—			
1. Spending more money for defense?	41.0	41.0	18.0
2. Increased spending for missile program warning system, research, etc.?	44.0	18.8	37.2
3. A crash program on earth satellites?	13.4	51.1	35.5
4. A huge nationwide Federal bomb shelter program?	15.4	62.8	21.8
5. Maintaining conventional military forces as now? (If "no," smaller (1), larger (2), none (3).)	61.4	19.6	18.9

FOREIGN POLICY

Do you favor—			
1. Continuation of our present foreign policy?	34.8	29.4	35.8
2. Eisenhower Middle East Doctrine of military support against Communist aggression when requested by any nation in that area?	61.6	18.0	20.4
3. Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?	50.4	10.0	39.6
4. Furnishing atomic missile weapons to our NATO allies in Western Europe?	48.4	31.0	20.6
5. A summit conference between the President and Soviet leaders?	48.0	28.0	24.0
6. Inviting to this country heads of Communist nations for conferences?	40.6	27.6	32.8
7. Continuation of our mutual security foreign aid program? (If "yes," at present cost (2), at reduced cost (1), or increased cost (3).)	52.6	21.4	26.0
8. Aid to Communist satellite nations (Yugoslavia, Poland, etc.)?	14.8	58.2	27.0
9. Aid to "neutralist" nations (India, Indonesia, etc.)?	45.6	28.2	26.2

RESULTS OF ALL RETURNS—Continued

AGRICULTURE

	Percentage		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Soil Bank program as presently operated?	16.2	64.8	20.0
2. Discontinuance of the acreage reserve program in the Soil Bank?	50.0	24.8	25.2
3. Raising supports to 100 percent parity with tight production controls?	23.3	55.5	21.2
4. Continuing flexible supports?	27.5	39.0	33.5
5. Dropping all supports and controls and returning to free production in accord with supply and demand?	48.8	31.3	19.9
6. Enactment of domestic parity program for wheat allotment based on bushel rather than acreage quotas?	44.7	23.8	31.5
7. A food-stamp plan by which needy persons could obtain surplus foods through normal commercial channels?	53.3	18.2	28.5

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Do you favor—			
1. Public inspection of union pension and welfare funds?	90.4	1.6	8.0
2. Antimonopoly legislation for unions as for corporations?	79.2	5.2	15.6
3. Mandating secret ballots for strikes and for election of union officers?	67.6	10.0	22.4
4. National right-to-work law which bans the union shop?	74.6	10.0	15.4
5. No union dues being used for political purposes?	73.6	15.4	11.0
6. Extending Federal minimum wage laws to cover most retail and service businesses?	44.6	32.8	22.6

TAXES, BUDGET AND ECONOMIC POLICY

Do you favor—			
1. Balancing the budget at all costs?	28.2	44.2	27.6
2. Keeping taxes as is and raising the debt ceiling if necessary?	32.0	35.2	32.8
3. Increasing taxes to cover a possible deficit?	28.6	40.2	31.2
4. Giving professional men and other self-employed persons tax help in accumulating savings for retirement?	35.2	41.0	23.8
5. Taxing co-ops on the same basis as other businesses?	73.4	15.4	11.2
6. Use of the Federal Reserve rediscount rate as a means of curbing inflation or deflation?	51.6	10.2	38.2
7. The recent action of the Federal Reserve in loosening credit by reducing rediscount rates?	48.8	10.8	40.4
8. Wage and price controls to halt inflation?	48.4	29.6	22.0
9. Further relief now from "tight money"?	33.0	25.2	41.8
10. Reductions in nondefense Government spending even if existing functions are curtailed?	64.0	16.0	20.0
(If "yes," what programs would you suggest cutting: Foreign aid (1), farm subsidies (2), public works (5), veterans' aid (6), public housing (4), slum clearance (7), grants for local disposal plants (3), highways (8).)			

EDUCATION

Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid to education?	29.8	57.6	12.6
(NOTE.—49 percent of those voting favored assigning 1 percent of internal revenue collections from the State to the State treasurer, disbursing under the direction of the State legislature, as an alternative. The remainder opposed any type of Federal aid.)			

GENERAL

Do you favor—			
1. Developing new Federal public power and irrigation projects?	34.2	48.8	17.0
2. The present policy of allowing private companies to develop atomic power?	68.4	9.2	22.4
3. Reform of the presidential electoral system so that electors will be chosen in each State proportionately to the vote of each candidate instead of the winner take all as at present?	51.8	8.0	40.2
4. Or selection of electors by congressional district?	10.6	26.6	62.8
5. Enactment of presidential disability legislation?	67.2	5.8	27.0
(If "yes," do you feel the power to declare the President disabled should rest with the President himself (4), with the Vice President (5), Cabinet (1), Congress (2), Supreme Court (3).)			
6. Further action to get the Government out of competition with private business?	70.4	12.6	17.0
7. Returning to the States some Federal Government activities?	64.8	7.4	27.8
8. Having Government help railroads continue their passenger business by reducing their tax load or by subsidy?	31.0	42.6	26.4
9. Raising postal rates to cut huge postal deficit?	41.2	27.4	31.4
10. Increasing salaries of Federal employees and service personnel?	21.4	57.4	21.2
11. Allowing experimental pay TV?	20.8	49.0	30.2
12. The proposal to permit State, rather than Federal, control of natural gas at the wellhead?	35.4	36.8	27.8
13. Liberalizing the immigration laws?	12.8	67.0	20.2
14. Increasing social-security benefits with a corresponding increase in individual and employer contributions?	36.4	51.4	12.2
15. Increasing disability, hospital, and survivor's benefits for veterans?	34.2	46.0	19.8

Address by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, Chief of Research and Development, United States Army, Before the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Mass., is the oldest one in our country, dating back to the early 1730's. Throughout the years it has held its annual banquet on March 17, having always as its principal speaker an outstanding person.

On March 17 of this year, the society had as its principal speaker one of the outstanding Americans of this era and one of the country's greatest military leaders, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, who at that time was Chief of Research and Development of the United States Army.

It is a pleasure, officially and personally in my extension of remarks, to include the splendid and inspirational speech made on that occasion by General Gavin:

Members of the Charitable Irish Society and guests, it is a great pleasure and a great honor to be here with you this evening, on this St. Patrick's Day. This is more than just another city in which to make a St. Patrick's Day talk and, in fact, it is more than just another St. Patrick's Day. In the first place, Boston was and has been not only the cradle of American liberty, but the cradle of American Irish thinking. The first sizable Irish settlements were here and the names of Irishmen from Boston who have gone forth to serve this Nation unto the far corners of the earth are legion. And it is fitting and proper that we always associate Boston with not only the origin of our country but with the contributions Irishmen have made to the greatness of our country.

Next, I said that this to me is not just another St. Patrick's Day talk and it is not, for a very special reason. Exactly 10 years ago I spoke in Boston. It was not long after the war and it was my first talk in Boston. Much has happened in that time, both good and bad. To me it has been a decade of dilemma, a decade of constant searching for solutions to problems far too complex to lend themselves to any readily understandable so-

lutions. It has been a decade in which we have had to adjust our programs and policies from time to time to meet the opportunistic shifting policies of the Soviets and of those inspired by them.

Of those 10 years, I have spent almost 7 in Washington, in the Department of Defense and in the Army, and I have been engaged in work in which some understanding of these problems had to be found; otherwise, how could we have planned, in a military sense, for our survival? Out of all of this experience, to me at least, comes one overwhelming conclusion. The great goal which we seek in this battle in which we are now joined is the minds of men now uncommitted to either the East or the West, and the retention of those minds of the West, those now on our side. Despite our great preoccupation with satellites, missiles, and science in general, the most important things today are those of the mind, of the spirit, let us say, rather than of physical things.

This may sound strange, coming from a soldier, but for good reason, I believe it to be true. I have long analyzed and studied the things that we do in the Department of Defense and in doing so I have searched for the answer to the more fundamental question: Why do we do them? Since the beginning of history, the military man has asked science and industry what it could give him so that he might fabricate that given him into the weapons of war. How he can inflict catastrophic damage on a major portion of the human race with weapons that could be given to him, and thus serve no good, but in fact irremedial harm on humanity. The question, therefore, is no longer what, but why? And having obtained an answer to the question why, he merely must ask science and industry to produce weapons adequate to the expressed need, no more and no less.

This would appear to be a very simple and uncomplicated procedure—it does appear so but it is not. And in answering the question why, we touch upon the very heart and soul of our problem; our national attitude.

It is well that we ask ourselves from time to time, and if there ever was a time this is it, this year of 1958: "Where goeth the Republic"? What are our aspirations and our goals? Is it, as some would have us believe, that democracy has reached its greatest hour of fulfillment and that the abundance of physical comforts and the luxury that it brought to us are now ours to enjoy, and in order that we may enjoy them we are against any thing or any ism that would challenge that enjoyment? We are, as it were, for the status quo.

Max Lerner, in his excellent book, America as a Civilization, expresses it this way:

"The crucial question about America's destiny in the world frame brings us back to the tests of America's strength as a civilization. It is hard not to feel that while America is still on the rising arc of its world power it is on the descending arc of its inner social and moral vigor; that it has allowed itself to be switched off from the main path of its development into the futile dead ends of the fear of ideas and the tenacious cult of property."

I would point out that this is not Mr. Lerner's conclusion but it is a challenge that he poses.

It is important that we ask ourselves these questions and that we understand ourselves and our relations with other peoples and other nations who reflect our own aspirations. Once we decide what our relations with others will be this finds expression in national policy and then the military plan follows. Weapons systems are created to serve policy. So again, I say, it is important that we understand ourselves and know exactly where we stand and what we are for, we Americans.

If what I have said so far is a valid description of our national view then a policy of maintaining the status quo is adequate to the national need. And if one were to ask what we are for, the answer would most likely be, we are for "against communism." What a foreboding prospect this is, and how sterile, how lacking in creative hope, and how certain would be our end as a sociological and political entity.

I say these things because I believe that our democracy is a dynamic, living entity that can and does enflame the hearts and minds of men today wherever it touches them. I believe that the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson in describing the current state of our democracy are true, and I quote:

"Whe think our civilization is near its meridian, but we are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star."

Now, in saying this I should support it, I realize. And I will impose upon you for a few moments to do so. Volumes have been written on the subject of "What is America," and it would be difficult to capture in a few minutes the greatness of this Nation of ours, but of its uniqueness there is no doubt. There are those who would attribute its greatness to an abundance of natural resources, to our position of isolation on the earth, protected as we have been by two great oceans, or to a lack of war in our own land, but this cannot be true for we have had the bloodiest of all wars on this continent, or the fact that that our Nation from its inception was an expanding frontier and each generation had to meet the challenge of the unknown from its infancy and thus it developed men of great self-reliance, determination and courage as well as friendliness and mutual trust, among themselves. They had to develop these in order to survive.

I believe that America is all of these things, although I incline to the so-called frontier theory more than the others, although none of them is exclusively valid as the reason for the greatness of our people. But I would go back farther and point out that this country was established by men of exceptional courageous stature as we measure men today. They were the men determined, stout of heart, the rugged individuals who had the courage to turn their backs on all that Europe offered and to strike out and hew a new civilization from a wilderness. They, and those who came after them by the millions, and many of them are represented in this room here tonight, had the courage to say no to the castes, the cartels, the restrictions of societies somehow contriving an existence from the rubble of one decayed empire on top of another. They had the courage to turn to this land.

The original ones settled on the Atlantic seaboard, where they soon made articulate their loftiest of aspirations:

"To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

"To establish and preserve a system based on the concept of the dignity of the individual. * * *"

They were determined to promote and secure conditions under which this system could live and prosper. They were determined, to defend, with their lives this system for themselves and for posterity. The intensity of their purpose was well expressed in the Declaration of Independence:

"With a firm reliance on Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The Republic they created expanded across the Appalachians and the Allegheney, down the Ohio and across the Great Plains. Few Americans have captured the moving spirit of the time as well as Stephen Vincent Benet, particularly in Western Star, when he wrote:

"Oh, paint your wagons with 'Pike's Peak or Bust!'
Pack up the fiddle, rosin up the bow,
Vamoose, skedaddle, mosey, hit the grit!
(We pick our words, like nuggets, for the shine,
And, where they didn't fit, we make them fit,
Whittling a language out of birch and pine.)
We're off for Californ-lay,
We're off down the wild O-hi-o!
And every girl on Natchez Bluff
Will cry as we go by-o!
So, when the gospel train pulls out
And God calls 'All aboard!'
Will you be there with the Lord, brother,
Will you be there with the Lord?
Yes, I'll be there,
Oh, I'll be there,
I'll have crossed that rolling river in the morning."

They went on to California and history records that upon reaching the Pacific one said: "It's too bad; we wanted to go on." Well, they did go on, they and their sons after them, and they went on ultimately to the beaches at Okinawa and Iwo Jima, and the 38th parallel in Korea. They went on for reasons that to many people seemed to be hard to explain at the time, but they were not hard to explain to those who were touched with fire in an earlier war and saw totalitarianism at its full effectiveness in the concentration camps. We knew what we were fighting for although, at times, it may have for some lacked clear definition.

For devotion to country and for what it stands is more than an idea, and the conduct of battle at the hands of your sons is more than mere ruse of high explosive nuclear weapons, steel, petroleum, and the like. For the destined purpose of our people can only be realized when we hold clear convictions on the reasons why we conduct ourselves as we do, in peace and war. And we hold these convictions closely and fiercely. Among these, today, I would list such things as respect for the truth, belief in the dignity of the individual, belief in government by law, not by man, belief that responsibility matches privilege, belief in honesty and fair play among friends and strangers alike, belief in a good God, belief in man's rights to speak his mind freely, worship openly, and climb as high as his talents will lift him and his ambitions drive him, held within reasonable bounds only by his consideration for others and the desire that the common good be served, first of all.

These, gentlemen, are the imperishable, eternal truths, and as long as men live they will live in their hearts. And as long as good men serve their people they will be motivated by them. Today these ideals have permeated to the far corners of the Western World. The high tide of democracy surges and laps up against the 38th parallel in Korea, the 17th parallel in Vietnam, the East-West border in Europe, the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin. It is inconceivable to me to surmise, even for a moment, that the dynamism of democracy is waning even the slightest bit. For it represents the essential goodness in man and as long as freemen live it will live, and live with all the vitality and energy and dynamism of men themselves.

I have tried in a few minutes to tell you what our democracy means, as I have been able to understand it, and what the great promise of its future may hold. And this promise is for our children and our children after them, except for one thing: the well-publicized aspirations of the Communist Party, now controlling the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party is but 3 percent of the population of the Soviet Union but it exercises complete dictatorial control and so far with each passing year it has become more totalitarian in its methodolgy. All of the trappings of totalitarianism are present—the concentration camps, the control of in-

formation mediums, the system of election by appointment, and the ruthless destruction of any minority in disagreement, as was made so evident in Budapest.

But while these things are self-evident, the picture to the average individual must be thoroughly confusing. Mr. Churchill:

"Russia is a riddle, wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." It was a description that caught the public fancy, as it was intended to do, and it is perhaps for this reason that it is best remembered. Yet, it was quite descriptive of the phenomena with which we must deal. On one hand their leaders say, "We shall bury you," and on the other hand they say, "We shall continue this policy of peace in the future with all our might and with all our resources." Lenin, who, incidentally, has not been "Stalinized," said:

"The existence of a Soviet Republic next to a number of imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable," while latter-day disciples preach about a pattern of coexistence, living side by side in lasting peace. Perhaps this apparent conflict was clarified by Lenin's comment, made as a marginal note on a book by Von Clausewitz. Lenin wrote, "Ah, ah, witty," next to Clauswitz' statement:

"A conqueror is always a lover of peace. He would like to make his entry into our state unopposed."

In a modern version of this state of mind, we have had tons and tons of Soviet supplies pouring into the hands of the North Koreans while American and United Nations young men were dying by the thousands to deter that aggression, while at the same time the Soviet-inspired Stockholm peace petition was circulated and even Picasso's white dove was exploited. Is there an answer to this? There is, and it is very simple.

"War is peace," as George Orwell put it in 1984. As the Soviets would put it today, war and peace are inseparable and they are at war today and will continue at war as long as it serves their policy, which clearly seems to be our total destruction. In the end, as Mr. Khrushchev tersely put it, "We will bury you." War is a mere continuation of policy by other means and war should be continued in some form until their objectives are achieved. As far as the Soviet leaders are concerned they are at war now, and will be until we are utterly destroyed and they bury us, as they put it, or until they themselves are destroyed.

Now, I have carefully refrained from discussing specific military programs and problems, because I did not consider it appropriate for this occasion. Because of the technical background that I now have, however, I could not leave you this evening without urging more interest in and greater support for our space programs. I have been profoundly disturbed by the widespread lack of appreciation of the importance of space exploration. Far too many people consider it unreal, and perhaps feel that it is far and away and not in their time, and meaningless as far as they are concerned today. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We could have launched a satellite of good size long ago. We could have circumnavigated the moon by now, and we could have been much closer to manned orbital flight, if we had had the vision necessary to support such programs adequately several years ago. Perhaps our tardiness may spur us to a greater effort now that we are underway. I hope so. And I know of nothing of greater significance to us and to our security in the future than an adequate space program now. I agree entirely with Dr. Teller that:

"If they surpass us (referring to the U. S. S. R.) in technology in the year ahead, there is very little doubt who will determine the future of the world."

What good can come from space exploration? Well, first of all, we can understand the weather and weather patterns, and possibly ultimately to a significant degree, control weather.

We can establish worldwide communications nets via satellites.

We can, by launching satellites at sufficient velocity and distance, place satellites in what would be essentially stationery orbits; that is, stationery as far as their position opposite a point on earth is concerned. Such a family of satellites could be used to establish a worldwide television net and thus be an invaluable contribution to worldwide transmission of ideas, resolution of differences, and a clear contribution to the maintenance of peace. Likewise, reconnaissance satellites could be used under, for example, United Nations supervision, to keep under constant surveillance any portion of the planet.

Detailed photography can be accomplished and through this, major war preparations anticipated and thus, again through the United Nations, preventive measures taken. Thus, for the first time in man's history he has within his grasp the technical means of guaranteeing peace, if he will develop and use those means.

Returning to our relations with the U. S. S. R.: What is the answer to this dilemma? The answer is quite simple.

We must be honest with ourselves in recognizing the danger for what it is—our very lives and the life of our Nation are at stake. We must make sacrifices and prepare for the long pull. This begins with better preperation of our children for the challenges that lie ahead, and by this I mean a more thorough and better education.

We must have the wisdom to not seek an easy solution militarily, not rely on any one single weapons system, but recognize the need for a spectrum of capabilities as flexible and as responsive as the very concept of democracy itself. This will take sacrifice on our part and a larger investment of our national product in national defense.

We absolutely must have the moral courage to face up to these problems now, and not act as though we hope they may go away, as we continue to devote inadequate attention to them.

Our fundamental strategy must recognize that the battle, essentially, is for the minds of men, and this means that our strategic considerations must include many things besides military hardware.

And finally, our strategy will be most successful if never a hostile shot is fired, while at the same time the Western World gains in cohesion and in strength. This is entirely possible if we will devote ourselves to this goal and work hard toward it.

Lastly, we should urge and support the United Nations in a space program that can, if properly carried out, insure the world against ever again suffering from a major conflagration.

For a Sound Program in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Hon. Wiilliam Benton at a luncheon meeting of the American Committee for Israel's Tenth Anniversary Celebration, February 27, 1958, Hotel Pierre, New York City:

FOR A SOUND PROGRAM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By William Benton)

The celebration we are planning will have special meaning for Americans. The United States was the first government to recognize the infant republic of Israel. American citizens have contributed more than all others toward the maintenance and upbuilding of that courageous nation. And now recent events in the Middle East underscore that our role in that area is inevitably bound up with the destiny of Israel. The American people seem to understand this better than does the administration in Washington.

Since its inception, the State of Israel has demonstrated to the world what a dynamic democracy can achieve despite adversities that continuously threaten its very existence. Israel's great achievement has been its dedication to freedom, and its ability to provide a refuge—within that framework of freedom—to hundreds of thousands who have suffered indescribable persecution and oppression.

About one and a half million Jews have entered Israel in the past 10 years. They came in poverty; many lacked skills; most were without a knowledge of Hebrew. All needed shelter and medical care. Yet within this decade Israel has moulded its diverse population into a proud and homogeneous people capable of developing their homeland to high levels of productivity and of defending it against great odds. All the free Western world should take pride in Israel's triumphant achievements.

Mr. Chairman, you have stated that this anniversary is a time for turning the spotlight of public attention on the present perils in the Middle East—a time for mobilizing public opinion on behalf of those programs which will bring to that region peace and stability within the framework of freedom and justice. I applaud this goal. I congratulate you on the great leadership you are providing to help us toward it.

The free world now faces a critical challenge in the Middle East. Since 1947 the United States has been increasingly involved in this challenge. When Soviet power threatened the eastern Mediterranean in 1947, the Truman doctrine was proclaimed and Greece and Turkey were saved. In 1949, President Truman enunciated his great point 4 program which gave fresh hope to the depressed peoples of the Middle East. But in recent years as new responsibilities devolved upon us—as Great Britain and France continued their withdrawal from the Middle East—we have failed to meet them.

The Soviet Union has vaulted over the so-called northern tier and has penetrated the Middle East with its economic, ideological and political programs. The Soviets have exploited the disease, ignorance and poverty of 40 million Arabs while we have negotiated for oil, arms and military bases.

Despite the Eisenhower doctrine the Russians have succeeded in planting their feet firmly in the Middle East—one foot in Cairo, the other in Damascus. Though the U. S. S. R. has supplied arms to Egypt and Syria, its Middle East policy is based mainly on economic and technical assistance. While Khrushchev calls for summit conference to promote peace, he has publicly declared economic war. While we ponder strategy, he wins round afer round.

In the past 2 years, the Soviet bloc has given Egypt, Syria, and Yemen $770 million in military and economic aid. With the exception of $5 million—a gift to Egypt from Communist China—Soviet assistance is on a long-term, low interest basis. The United States—having promised Egypt $61,678,000 in economic and military aid in 1952—had as of last June 30 actually de-

livered only $39,200,000. Even if we include our aid to Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, United States assistance only totals about one-fifth that of the Soviet bloc. These figures help show why Secretary Dulles testified last Monday that the current Soviet aid—and—trade offensive is a greater danger to the United States than open armed attack.

The Communists' loans are at about 2.5 percent interest. We charge from 3.5 to 5 percent.

Soviet technicians stream into Egypt and Syria speaking Arabic. They make friends with the people and live and work with them. American technicians, relatively, keep aloof and stick to their English.

A Soviet delegate at the recent Cairo conference set forth the Kremlin's approach in these telling words:

"We do not ask you to participate in any blocs, reshuffle your governments or change your domestic or foreign policy. We are ready to help you as brother helps brother, without any interest whatever, for we know from our experience how difficult it is to get rid of need. Tell us what you need and we will help you and send, according to our economic capabilities, money needed in the form of loans or aid * * * to build for you institutions for industry, education and hospitals * * *. We do not ask you to join any blocs * * * our only condition is that there will be no strings attached."

Here in the mouth of a Kremlin spokesman are the words and the spirit which used to be our trademark. Are they the words of intended subversion? We think so, but many Arab leaders do not.

Clearly, we need a new policy in the Middle East. Perhaps I should merely say we need a policy. We need a policy which recognizes the fundamental unity of the Middle East and which is keyed to human and economic problems rather than to military strength. Military aid in itself will never enable the Middle East to become a bulwark of peace. In addition, there must be internal peace coupled with progress toward economic health and social well-being.

We must seek patiently and persistently to persuade the Arab world that the State of Israel is a great and irrevocable historic fact, and that the fortunes of the Jew and the Arab in the Middle East are inextricably intertwined. I believe the Arab world will come to accept Israel only in a climate of economic and social advance for the Arabs. Thus we must develop programs for economic betterment which will turn the interest and energies of the Arab leaders from fighting destructive wars and nursing self-destructive hatreds, to developing the economic potentialities of their countries. As a part of such programs, we must develop plans for economic improvement so advantageous to the Arab countries that they cannot reject them. We must seek plans which will encourage both Arabs and Jews to compete with one another not in arms but in the vigorous economic upbuilding of their countries. We must quietly and persistently encourage Arabs and Israeli to work together on projects like the Johnston-Jordan River Valley project where each obviously needs the cooperation of the other.

The new confederation of the Kingdoms of Iraq and Jordan now gives us a unique opportunity. This is the opportunity to promote and finance a great "TVA" of the Mesopotamian River Basin, involving flood control and irrigation from the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. Iraq has the undeveloped resources. Jordan has the needy people. We have a tremendous stake in the peaceful progress of these two friendly lands.

I like Senator HUMPHREY'S proposal for the creation of a Middle East Development Agency, organized under the United Nations. Governor Bowles has suggested a similar approach. We must remember that the impetus which gave NATO its successful start came from the fact that it was preceded and accompanied by the Marshall plan.

I should like to seize this auspicious occasion to suggest that—after proper preparations—the President of the United States join with the heads of the Western Powers in calling a conference of Middle East nations, including Israel, to chart a course that will speed economic development and strengthen the idea of freedom and democracy in that repion. Here indeed may be a chance for a summit conference that would be really productive.

The objective is a program that will attack disease, ignorance, and poverty, and promise an increasing measure of human dignity to the peoples of the area. Such a program would call for the development of natural resources and the reapportionment of farm lands, for industrialization and revision of obsolete taxation systems. It would guarantee liberal trade agreements. It would project long-range loans—from 25 to 50 years—at interest rates of less than 3 percent. It would promise trained Western technicians, teachers, and instructors for all Middle Eastern countries.

To implement such a program, we must inform the peoples of the Middle East. To offset the pro-Nasser and pro-Communist propaganda now being beamed to millions of Middle Eastern peoples by Radio Cairo, Radio Damascus, and Radio Tashkent, we must greatly strengthen and expand our Voice of America and other informational activities and facilities.

Even the Chinese are now beaming some 69 hours of Arabic broadcasts weekly.

A week ago Monday, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I identified the Iron Curtan as the gravest threat to peace. I outlined nine ways to pierce the Iron Curtain.

The same can be said of the Middle East. While the United States concentrates on negotiating with the rulers—some of them very shaky—the Communists go after the Arab people.

If we will, the United States can develop a sound and imaginative program of economic, social, and political action, and at the same time develop an information program designed to show the masses of the people of the Middle East that we recognize their legitimate aspirations, that we seek peace and cooperation, not exploitation; and that will give them the reasons why their best interests lie with the West.

We have a long way to go to regain our lost initiative in the Middle East. It is a long and difficult road. But we must take it. There is no time to lose. We must seek the road at once.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter of April 19, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas)

APRIL 19, 1958.

Cherry blossoms (3 weeks late), plus alternately balmy and brisk temperatures, have delighted throngs of Washington visitors. The pale pink blossoms are profuse, edging the Tidal Basin and Jefferson Memorial. Washington is lovely in the spring. The dockside *Mayflower II* is another visitors' attraction.

The freedom of information bill, H. R. 2767, occasioned an afternoon's lively debate. The bill amends an existing statute (sec. 161) which authorizes Government department heads to prescribe regulations for conduct and for custody, use, and preservation of records. The bill then adds this amendment: "This section does not authorize withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public." With the announced intention to prevent the needless withholding of information from the people, press, and Congress, no one disagreed. However, the possible misinterpretation of the specific langauge used (including by the court) occasioned a near rhubarb. Arguments for: (1) Only section 161 is hereby amended (not any of the other 78 laws concerning secrecy are affected, such as military information, FBI files, Internal Revenue Department files and many others); (2) section 161 has been abused as a convenient device: (a) For department heads to take the easy course (stamp a matter "Classified" rather than laboriously examine it); (b) For too many, who now have authority, to determine whether material is to be classified or not; (c) For the concealment of mistakes and wrong actions; (3) The intent of the original law of 1789 is thus restored, which intended section 161 only as a housekeeping authority, and not for the withholding of information, which should result only from further congressional legislative authority. Arguments against: (1) The wording becomes ambiguous by not being tied to section 161 closely enough, therefore the other 78 statutes are jeopardized, and necessary Government security is removed; (2) the press, including congressional staff men who are newspapermen, have lobbied this through under the catchy slogan, "The pople's right to know"; (3) the people have no absolute right to know having given up this right in the constitutional division of powers with accompanying discretionary authority.

The bill passed handily, after all amendments were defeated. Many misgivings remain. This bill is labeled "freedom of information", yet coincidentally several of us were cut off in asking questions in debate seeking information. Equally damaging is the fact that Congress isn't practicing what this bill preaches, since many of our committee hearings are secret (33 percent of them according to Congressional Quarterly survey).

The basic dilemma remains—no matter how sincere our intention in opening up Government files, the Court as ultimate arbiter of Congress' intent, can particularly if liberal, reinterpret the Constitution as it sees fit.

The rivers and harbors bill veto saves the taxpayers $349 million of unfounded boondoggle projects. The President should be commended for his courageous action on this and on his earlier veto of the farm price freeze bill. In my opinion, he should have vetoed the housing and highway bills, too, because of the haste-makes-waste treatment in the name of recession. Now the liberal Democrat-controlled Congress is pushing a new Community Facilities Act which would loan Federal money to local communities. Isn't this rich? The most heavily indebted Government entity in history is offering the loan of money to the people from whom the money is taken, for the reason that these people in the local communities haven't the money. And our Texas Senators are responsible for this gem.

The Dallas community refused the money, although only because the city could borrow the money elsewhere for less. What an opportunity existed there for telling the Federal men, the Senators, "We don't want the

money because it isn't the role of Federal Government to offer it; it's taxpayers' money; stop spending it and give it back to us in the form of a tax cut." What an opportunity still exists, too, to tell Uncle Sam the same thing in public housing, now that Dallas wants to get all it can, too, in the name of "urban renewal" under existing law. So it is, that a people lose their right to demand the return of tax moneys and the local and personal freedom that goes with it. Los Angeles people finally flatly refused Federal public housing. Will Dallas?

Briefs that deserve fuller treatment: (1) the public housing and race issue in northern cities is breeding crime and unhappiness; (2) congressional integrity is endangered by Members who change what they said on the House floor or add more (Curtis debate—April 16, 1958); (3) President Truman was caught in a lapse of memory or falsehood, denying the earlier Krock interview (recalls Cordell Hull's statement, "A lie can get halfway round the world while the truth is getting on its pants"); (4) Congressman POAGE's Dallas speech saying, "The administration is dedicated to kicking the farmer in the face" needs rebuttal; the farmers' hardships, whatever they are, are obviously the result of earlier Democrat programs and Democrat-controlled Congresses.

Archbishop Cicognani

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial Archbishop Cigognani, a deserving tribute appearing in the Pilot, of Boston, Mass.

As the editorial well said about His Excellency, the apostolic delegate:

From one end of America to the other, his friendly person is familiar to Americans.

The editorial follows:

ARCHBISHOP CICOGNANI

In the perspective of a human life 25 years is a sizable portion and it often provides an eminence from which it is possible to survey some measure of a man's accomplishment. A quarter of a century ago, in the colorful sanctuary of Santa Susanna in Rome, Amleto Giovanni Cicognani was consecrated titular Archbishop of Laodicea in Phrygia just before leaving to become apostolic delegate to the United States of America. Today, on his silver anniversary, 25 volumes could not contain the vast story of his labors and our progress in the time that has elapsed.

The contribution which Archbishop Cicognani has made to the church began long before his advent to America. His work with Cardinal Gasparri in laying the foundations for the codification of oriental law must be mentioned especially as a monumental labor of personal scholarship. His assignment to the United States was certainly one of special challenge, for the church in this land had problems and anxieties different from those anywhere else and they required the patient care of a representative of the Holy See who would understand at once the true depth of the faith here and its imperishable dedication to the successor of St. Peter. Archbishop Cicognani had brought a warm-hearted spirit of fatherly understanding which encouraged American initiative without permitting undue precipitation, and which gave its blessing to the active apostolate which the expansion of the church demanded of its people.

When the delegate came to us in 1933 there were in the United States only 20 million Catholics; the latest figures released this year by the Bureau of the Census indicate a national figure of just twice the earlier one, 40 million. But the church in America has not merely grown, it has grown wisely and well in the generous proliferation of dioceses and institutions to nourish and strengthen the faith of the faithful. A large measure of the present success and the high hopes for the years ahead must rest upon the shoulders of Archbishop Cicognani who, with the most admirable foresight and the most indefatigable industry, watched and worked over the speedy expansion of Catholic life and guided it in most productive directions.

To most of us Archbishop Cicognani is the delegate—we have never known any other. It is no disrespect to his illustrious predecessors in the office that we should think of him rather than of his office. From one end of America to the other, his friendly person is familiar to Americans. Not a single even of major significance in the life of the church during the last quarter century but his presence, and often his words, have graced the occasion. The Holy See has actually been present among us, moving in familiar circles, taking the measure of our necessities and blessing our endeavors. His name and his face are both happily familiar to all our people, even as to our clergy and hierarchy.

Here in Boston we have often had the honor of his visitation and the encouragement of his words. On this visit we are especially pleased to note that his personal anniversary of consecration coincided with the sesquicentennial observance of the See of Boston. This is a year when we look back over the 15 decades since the diocese was established and locally survey the progress made during this time. It is fitting that we should have with us during these celebrations that unique figure in our ecclesiastical history, Archbishop Cicognani, who in quiet wisdom and in his special manner, framed our present fortunes. God grant him length of days among us.

The Krol Family: Part of the American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lois Wille in the Friday, April 18, 1958, issue of the Chicago Daily News relating to the Krol family who were honored with achievement awards at the Immigrants Protective League's 50th anniversary dinner in the Gold Room of the Congress Hotel:

A BUSY LIFE'S REPORT CARD GIVES PAPA AND MAMA KROL NINE "A'S"—IMMIGRANT AWARD HONORS REARING OF OUTSTANDING FAMILY

(By Lois Wille)

A huge stack of report cards—all of them marked "good"—have been edged out of first place in the life of Alex and Mary Krol.

"For more than 40 years I save them," Mary said. "Always my bigggest thrill was when my children come home from school bringing their good grades.

"But now"

Mary slipped a hand through the arm of the man she married 50 years ago, and looked again at the impressive leather-bound citation he held.

"Now I think this is my biggest night, this paper here is my biggest thrill," she said.

"My report cards are second best now."

Thursday night Alex and Mary Krol, a Polish couple who reared nine outstanding children, were hailed as the best example of family life among Chicagoans of foreign birth.

The Krols, of 6059 S. Francisco, received one of 10 awards given to distinguished Chicago immigrants at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Immigrants' Protective League.

Alex and Mary sat quietly at the speaker's table in the lavish Gold Room of the Pick-Congress hotel and listened to such men as Adlai E. Stevenson and Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas heap praise on them.

"You are part of the American dream," Justice Douglas said.

"You have been as distinctly human as markedly individualistic in thought and achievement as Einstein, Fermi, Toscanini."

Stevenson read the nine Krol children's list of achievements, and announced:

"All I have to do is look at you and your family, and I am convinced that if the United States ever loses its vitality, history will fix the date of the decline as May 1921—the year Congress passed restrictive immigration quotas."

Alex and Mary listened to the other nine awardees give gracious little acceptance speeches.

But when their turn came, they said nothing.

"I was speechless," said Mary, plump, 70, and pinkcheeked as a teenager.

"Me, too," said Alex, 72, a beaming little man with a shock of thick, white hair.

But it didn't matter, because the standing ovation from the audience of 700 would have drowned out any thank-you's

The Krols emigrated to Chicago from Skulsk, Poland—Alex in 1903, Mary in 1906. They were married in 1908, and the happy results are these:

Dr. Edward J. Krol, president of the staff of Holy Cross hospital.

Dr. Zenon J. Krol, oral surgeon, Holy Cross hospital.

Dr. Arthur J. Krol, assistant professor of dentistry at Loyola University.

Dr. Henry J. Krol, optometrist.

Leonard W. Krol, professional engineer.

Adam T. Krol, fellow of the American Institute of Chemistry and head of Clearing Chemical Laboratory.

Walter J. Krol, professional engineer.

Alexander J. Krol, electrical contractor.

Henrietta J. Krol, dental nurse.

Sending nine children through college meant enormous sacrifices for Alex, a cabinetmaker, and Mary, a steamstress.

"We would put the children to bed, and then go back to work," Mary Krol recalled. "I would sit in the front room and sew. Alex would go back to his workshop. We didn't count our work by the hours."

The Krol system of rearing intelligent, prosperous citizens is threefold, Mary said:

"Take them all to church every Sunday, make sure they get good report cards—and don't let them get sassy."

How do you make sure those report cards are good?

"Every night we would sit them around the table and make them study," Mary said. "No fooling around—just study. It works."

And how do you prevent the back talk?

"Spank," Alex and Mary chorused.

Their children got jobs as grocery clerks, delivery boys, and newspaper copy boys to help put them through high school.

All worked in college, too.

Mary doesn't think much of today's youngsters.

"All too spoiled," she said. "Too much toys and too much television."

She added that this does not include her 19 grandchildren.

The Dismissal of Oppenheimer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

THE DISMISSAL OF OPPENHEIMER—REASON FOR REMOVAL OF SCIENTIST FROM UNITED STATES COUNCILS IS CLARIFIED

(By David Lawrence)

J. Robert Oppenheimer, who was ruled to be a security risk by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954, made a speech before the International Press Institute here Tuesday. Whatever mistakes he might have made in the past would not have come into public notice again, but the American chairman of the meeting, in introducing Dr. Oppenheimer, gave to the assembled journalists from all over the world an erroneous impression of why the scientist was denied access to security data. This needs to be clarified lest an important group of newsmen from foreign lands depart with a mistaken concept of what American policy was in this case. The chairman said:

"The charge, in brief, was excessive loyalty to one or two very old friends, and an occasional disdainful attitude toward the cops, and I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, those are two solid, sterling American traits. Unfortunately they were somewhat out of style during a few months in 1954."

The chairman added that there is "right now an evergrowing demand in these United States, and particularly in the scientific community, that Dr. Oppenheimer be returned to active work for his Government."

No doubt there are some Americans who feel that way and sincerely believe that what Dr. Oppenheimer did should not cause him to be removed from the Government councils on scientific matters. There are others who feel that, had Dr. Oppenheimer's advice against developing the H-bomb been followed, an important weapon would not perhaps have been available to the United States and that this country would subsequently have been at a serious disadvantage against Soviet Russia.

But the facts show the Atomic Energy Commission did not remove Dr. Oppenheimer from Government councils because of the advice he gave against making the H-bomb but solely because of his lack of cooperation in security matters.

Thus the decision of the Atomic Energy Commission in June, 1954, reads in part as follows:

"Dr. Oppenheimer has now admitted under oath that while in charge of the Los Alamos Laboratory and working on the most secret weapon development for the Government, he told Colonel Pash a fabrication of lies. Colonel Pash was an officer of military intelligence charged with the duty of protecting the atomic weapons project against spies. Dr. Oppenheimer told Colonel Pash in circumstantial detail of an attempt by a Soviet agent to obtain from him information about the work on the atom bomb. This was the Haakon Chevalier incident. In the hearings recently concluded, Dr. Oppenheimer under oath swears that the story he told Colonel Pash was a 'whole fabrication and tissue of lies.'

"It is not clear today whether the account Dr. Oppenheimer gave to Colonel Pash in 1943 concerning the Chevalier incident or the story he told the Gray board last month is the true version.

"If Dr. Oppenheimer lied in 1943, as he now says he did, he committed the crime of knowlingly making false and material statements to a Federal officer. If he lied to the board, he committed perjury in 1954. * * *

"Dr. Oppenheimer, under oath, admitted to the Gray board that from 1937 to at least 1942 he made regular and substantial contributions in cash to the Communist Party. He has admitted that he was a 'fellow traveler' at least until 1942. He admits that he attended small evening meetings at private homes at which most, if not all, of the others present were Communist Party members. He was in contact with officials of the Communist Party, some of whom had been engaged in espionage. * * *

"However, Dr. Oppenheimer's early Communist associations are not in themselves a controlling reason for our decision. They take on importance in the context of his persistent and continuing association with Communists, including his admitted meetings with Haakon Chevalier in Paris as recently as last December (1953)—the same individual who had been intermediary for the Soviet consulate in 1943. * * *

"It is clear that for one who has had access for so long to the most vital defense secrets of the Government and who would retain such access if his clearance were continued, Dr. Oppenheimer has defaulted not once but many times upon the obligations that should and must be willingly borne by citizens in the national service.

"Concern for the defense and security of the United States requires that Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance should not be reinstated."

If it was "excessive loyalty" to his friends by Dr. Oppenheimer and less concern for the maintenance of the security regulations of his own Government, can this be regarded in the circumstances as a "solid, sterling American trait"? Was it also just an "occasional disdainful attitude toward the cops"? Or was it, as the official record shows, a case of "deliberately misleading" the cops? Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, who was 1 of 4 members of the Atomic Energy Commission who voted to deny Dr. Oppenheimer security clearance, went further than all his colleagues. In a concurring opinion, after reviewing the evidence, he said flatly of the noted scientist: "He was disloyal."

The commission, itself, did not charge disloyalty but a "persistent and willful disregard for the obligations of security."

Cats That Walk on Snow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the high spots of my visit home during the Easter recess was a visit to the Tucker Sno-Cat plant in Medford, Oreg. This is where the famous sno-cats are made and is the home of their inventor, Emmitt Tucker and his three sons. I even had the pleasure of driving one of the big sno-cats, although not so big as the ones which recently took Dr. Vivian E. Fuchs and his party across 2,100 rugged ice-caked miles over the continent at the bottom of the world. I also drove a smaller model which is built for going through mud, at the same time trying, unsuccessfully, to get it stuck in a quagmire.

Under a previous consent I am including an article by Montgomery M. Atwater, Cats That Walk on Snow, which appeared in Mechanix Illustrated in January 1958. The article is as follows:

CATS THAT WALK ON SNOW—NO OTHER MACHINE CAN MATCH THESE CRAZY CATS TRAVELING OVER SNOW ON ANY TYPE OF TERRAIN

(By Montgomery M. Atwater)

It was January 13, 1952, the winter of the big snow. Donner Pass was cluttered with the roofs of abandoned cars. Pride of the Southern Pacific, the City of San Francisco's huge diesel thrust its plow into the clogging mass of an avalanche. Like some prehistoric monster caught in the quicksand, the luxury train struggled but could not move.

For a day Southern Pacific men and machines fought to rescue its train and passengers. In rapid succession the storm swallowed four huge rotary snowplows. One it smashed with an avalanche, killing the crew. The train's engine finally ran out of fuel. Cold, darkness, and fear seeped in through the metal walls of the Pullmans as the snow drifted higher around them.

On the second day the railroad called for help. The Army sent a fleet of Weasels, those rugged little snow buggies so well known to the mountain troops of World War II. They wallowed helplessly in the white quagmire. News accounts began referring to the passengers on the train as the second Donner party.

On the third day two Tucker Sno-Cats calmly floated across the sea of snow that had blocked every other effort.

Rescuing the streamliner is the most spectacular exploit of the incredible Sno-Cats. But professionals of over-snow travel can think of many that were actually more difficult. In 1950, for instance, the Bell Telephone Co. was trying to complete a new microwave station on Mt. Rose, not far from the Donner Pass, a year ahead of schedule. When avalanches obliterated the construction road a fleet of Sno-Cats took over. In 1955, the telephone company issued 5 of its coveted awards for heroism to the Sno-Cat jockeys who rescued 22 motorists stormbound in a Utah pass. Logically a sixth award might have gone to the inventor of the unique machine that did the job.

Emmitt Tucker can't explain what drove him to spend half a lifetime on this project. Part of it was a perfectly normal ambition to make some money. As far back as 1914 he realized that there was a market for a machine that would really travel on snow.

There's no great trick to designing a machine that will travel on well-packed snow and moderate grades, Tucker will tell you with a shrug. Dozens of inventors have gone that far with the problem. Because he insisted on a vehicle that would maneuver on every type of snow in rough country, Tucker at one point discarded a machine he had been working on for more than 20 years and began all over again.

This forerunner of the Sno-Cat on which Tucker labored from 1914 to 1938 is interesting in itself. For one thing it was a new and radical approach to the double-barreled problem of travel over snow: flotation and traction. Most designers have tried to solve it with a sled or a tractor in one form or another. Tucker's spiral-driven machine got its flotation from a cylinder or pontoon. For traction he welded a fin, corkscrew-fashion, to the cylinder. When the assembly was rotated, it floated and pulled itself forward like an auger.

In spite of its promising beginning, the spiral machine turned out to be an inventor's nightmare. Explaining why in simple terms is not easy. The first law of designing a snowbuggy is that its pounds per square inch must be approximately the same as a skier's. This is a simple rule but translating it into metal and horsepower leads the engineer into an impasse. He starts with a nice wide base—runner, track, pontoon, whatever he happens to fancy. He adds a body to carry passengers and cargo. He adds an engine, transmission gear and controls. Nervously he watches the table of weight which always goes up faster than he likes. Thus flotation and traction lead him around in a vicious and frustrating circle.

A skier's pound per square inch is about half a pound. Nothing that goes more than a few tenths above that figure can travel on soft snow. It doesn't give a designer much room to maneuver. Tucker spent years and built dozens of models of the spiral machine in the attempt to find a winning combination of flotation and traction.

No one, not even his own family, can predict how the brain of an inventor will react. After many failures with his corkscrew design, Emmitt Tucker went to bed one night in 1938 convinced that he was all done with snowbuggies and woke up next morning with an entirely new design blueprinted in his mind.

The test model that began to take shape in his garage was revolutionary. Yet it included one idea from the spiral—the pontoon method of flotation. This had always been the spiral machine's best feature. The worst was the amount of power it took to spin that bulky screw in the snow. What Tucker literally dreamed up was a new way of applying power. Instead of the spiral fins welded to a rotating pontoon, he saw the pontoon floating free with a track revolving around it.

This is the design, unlike anything that had been tried before, which at last made it possible for a machine to compete with a man on skis. Tucker was certain that it would work from the moment the picture was clear in his mind. He had to build it piece by piece, with hacksaw and file, or salvaged parts in his spare time. In the winter of 1941 he finally loaded the first Sno-Cat onto a trailer and started for the proving ground he knew so well, Crater Lake.

In a small town where Tucker stopped for lunch a stranger began to ask questions. Since the man seemed to be genuinely interested, Tucker invited him along to watch the tests. It turned out that the stranger was manager of a mine near Mount Shasta. He had a serious problem of hauling supplies in that big-snow country and was so impressed by the performance of the Sno-Cat that he bought the test model on the spot.

The Sno-Cat had to wait for its first real boost until after the war. At that time the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture was rapidly expanding its network of snow survey courses.

By one of those happy coincidences, R. A. Work, chief of the snow survey unit, was a personal friend of Tucker and knew all about the Sno-Cat. Between them they concocted an oversnow demonstration to end all demonstrations. It was a midwinter journey from the California border north to the Columbia River, along the crest of the Cascade Mountains. What it amounted to was 600 miles of the roughest, toughest, deepest snow country in any land.

It was an epic journey in March 1948, tougher than anything of the sort that had ever been attempted. Snowfall was heavier than usual that winter, so heavy that many of the trail markers had been buried. The network of trails and logging roads Work expected to follow through the dense coastal forest was choked with fallen timber. Soft snow or hard, wet snow or dry, across sidehills, up steep grades, over fallen logs, the Sno-Cat navigated the wilderness from Mount Shasta to Mount Hood.

The high point of the trip was a chance meeting with a party of engineers. This group had come directly up from the lowlands on a highway grade with a different type of snow machine.

Naturally the drivers got into an argument over the merits of their snowbuggies. And naturally the argument had to be settled by a tug-of-war. Thus on the summit of the Cascades in midwinter, two roaring snowbuggies fought it out before an audience of whiskery mountaineers, 50 miles from civilization. Both machines buried themselves. But the Sno-Cat got out of its hole under its own power and then rescued its adversary.

In 1950 the snow surveyors organized a come one, come all field trial for over-snow vehicles at Sun Valley, Idaho. By this time Tucker had made the final major improvement to the Sno-Cat design, the four-pontoon model. Fifteen different types of snowbuggies were entered in the tests which included obstacle courses, hill climbing, sidehilling in all types of snow. The Sno-Cat won. There wasn't any second.

The Sno-Cat is still the yardstick. It looks like something out of a bad dream. Although its top speed is about 15 miles per hour, it costs as much as a custom-built sports car. It is appallingly rough and noisy. But its pounds per square inch is 0.66 and its power factor compared to a skier is 1 to 500. Perhaps the greatest compliment ever paid to this machine and its inventor is that at his factory at Medford, Oreg., Tucker and his sons built eight huge snow cruisers for the Antarctic expedition. These machines are self-contained, mobile weather stations for use during the forthcoming International Geophysical Year. Though they weigh 8,000 pounds each, they will tread on the snow as lightly as a skier.

In addition to the Armed Forces, the Sno-Cat is used by utilities companies whose trouble shooters must maintain power, communications and fuel lines in mountainous country. Loggers, miners, ski area operators and game wardens also use the rugged Cats.

Emmitt Tucker is today a tall, slender, erect man of 64. With a sparkle in his eye he will tell you that he isn't much interested in over-snow transportation any more. It's a completed job. Then he'll get his hands on the wheel of a Sno-Cat and make it do tricks no one else dares to try. You remember those hands, the big, long-fingered, superbly dextrous hands that built the incredible Sno-Cat.

Address by Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, United States Department of State

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1958, in honor of Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, Department of State, Mayor John B. Hynes, gave an official luncheon on the occasion of her visit to Boston.

Many distinguished guests were present, including former Speaker MARTIN. I was also present.

On that occasion Director Knight made appropriate and informative remarks, which I am pleased to include in my extension of remarks.

The remarks of Director Frances G. Knight are as follows:

COMMENTS BY FRANCES G. KNIGHT, DIRECTOR, PASSPORT OFFICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE

This is indeed an honor, and on behalf of the entire staff of the Passport Office please accept sincere thanks and deep appreciation for your consideration and good will.

We are especially proud of the Boston Passport Agency, which was first opened in July 1925. The agency was closed in July of 1942 because due to the war the granting of passport facilities was centralized in Washington.

But on November 28, 1949, the Boston Passport Agency was reopened, and its growth and importance have been synonymous with the growth and importance of this part of our country.

In 1940 less than 2,500 applications for passports were received in the Boston agency. In 1951 approximately 10,000 applications were received; in 1954, 15,000 applications; and last year 18,500 passport applications were handled by the Boston agency. This, of course, is not the complete picture of overseas travel emanating from this area, because while the Boston agency is prepared to service the applications received by clerks of court throughout New England many applications are sent directly to Washington.

In order to better service Greater Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, we have enlarged our quarters in the Federal building and, with the cooperation of the regional office of the General Services Administration, had the offices redecorated and refurbished. We had installed modern equipment and initiated up-to-date business methods for handling volume. The result is that today the Boston Passport Agency is accepting applications and issuing passports on these applications within an average of 3 days.

Nationally, the length of time for issuing a passport has been reduced from an average of 6 weeks in 1955 and 3 weeks in 1956 to a standard of 4½ days since January of 1957. We are proud of the fact that 80 percent of our passports are mailed out 4½ days after the receipt of the application, providing, of course, that the application is correct, properly executed, and the fee and documents accompanying it are in good order. We are maintaining this speed despite the fact that we are issuing at an alltime high rate for this time of year. We are currently processing 4,000 passports a day.

On a day-to-day basis, our present workload is running approximately 18 percent over last year. The direct results of this speedup are a 50-percent decrease in followup correspondence, with a comparable decrease in telephone traffic in 1957 over 1956.

Your recognition of our improved public service is a very heartwarming tribute to the industry and initiative of our Passport Office employees. Under the leadership of Mr. John J. Flynn, passport agent-in-charge, every member of the Boston agency staff has cooperated in our modernization program and accepted with alacrity and enthusiasm our new procedures and streamlined organization. I emphasize this point because you must know how very difficult it is to make any kind of a change in Government procedures. There is a normal human resistance to change, but here in Boston, the installation of our new methods of operation was a happy and exciting experience.

For example, we have adopted modern filing procedures in the Passport Office. They are faster, more accurate, and make our files more accessible. Considering the fact that our master index file consists of 22 million cards, and our current application files con-

tain 40 million documents, anything we do to facilitate their use is bound to save time and money. We have streamlined the handling of close to a million pieces of correspondence a year; we have organized our carding, searching, and recording operation on a mass-production basis. We have revised the passport application form, and the format of the passport itself has been radically changed. Information in it has been rearranged to save time and space. We have provided the transportation and travel industry, as well as ourselves, with current passport statistics. We are now operating with the guidance of charts and graphs, facts and figures instead of hearsay. We have adopted a modern accounting system and have installed cash registers, numbering machines, stamping machines, electric staplers, flexiwriters, and a score of other new equipment which has resulted in an amazing increase in worker productivity. The General Services Administration has cooperated wholeheartedly in this rejuvenation, and in its report to Congress last year, estimated that the Passport Office effected a net saving of $386,000 a year over the cost of operating with antiquated procedures and obsolete equipment. In addition, the Passport Office averaged an increase of 5.5 percent in work productivity per employee in 1957, resulting in additional dollar savings. We expect to continue to absorb a 5-percent increase in our workload through increased worker productivity in the next 2 years.

But there are still many improvements that can and will be made. I am happy to announce that, as of today, the Passport Office is relaxing its requirements for a witness to the passport application. This is a very important step in cutting redtape and delay in passport issuance.

Consider the local situation. Over 30,000 persons visited the Boston Passport Agency in 1957. Of this number, approximately 14,000 were identifying witnesses accompanying applicants who, according to passport regulations, had to provide a witness willing to testify to the identity of the applicant. In April and May our workload is at its peak. During April of 1957, 5,000 persons milled around the Boston Passport Agency, of which over 2,000 were witnesses.

In our continuing studies to improve our services to the public, the question arose as to why couldn't the Passport Office accept the same identification used by banks, or the post office, or the Veterans' Administartion when cashing or accepting checks.

In my opinion, an applicant who would file a fraudulent application for a passport will not hesitate to produce a phony witness. It seems to me that the Government has adequate means of dealing with such situations. On the other hand, if an applicant can produce a former United States passport, or naturalization certificate, a driver's license, or a Federal, State, industrial, or commercial security pass or identification card which carries his picture or physical description and his signature, we should be able to accept such identification.

Starting today, April 7, the Passport Office has advised all its agencies, as well as the 3,800 clerks of court throughout the country authorized to execute passport applications, to accept such bona fide identification in lieu of a witness. If the applicant cannot provide any acceptable identification, then he must bring a witness. We estimate that this new procedure, if effective in only 50 percent of the applications we expect to receive this year, will relieve congestion in passport agencies and offices of the clerks of court by over 250,000 persons. In the Boston agency, we estimate that it will reduce traffic by close to 100 persons per day. I need not give you a blueprint of what this will mean to the more orderly operation of our business.

Recently we have been accepting personal checks in payment of the passport fee. This, too, is a great convenience to the applicant. It has been hard for me to understand why a citizen could pay his income tax with a personal check and not his passport fee. I am not greatly concerned about checks bouncing back at us. The passing of a bad check is a criminal offense, and it seems to me that this is another matter which the Government can handle effectively by means other than inflicting a bothersome restriction in the field of passport issuance.

Now, may I say one word about passport pictures. I've been asked how my campaign is coming along on promoting happy, relaxed and smiling passport photographs. The answer is, "Fine." We are getting an encouraging number of color photographs. A couple of months ago we announced the acceptance of color passport pictures, as well as those in black and white. They have been trickling in, and may I say that the ladies are charming and attractive, and the men are handsome and dashing.

Before I close, I want to say a very special thank you for the outstanding Members of Congress from this area. They have given the Passport Office consistent support and encouragement in its modernization program. They have been our stanch friends, and for that we will be forever grateful. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with the Federal and local government representatives in this city.

Once again, please accept the deep appreciation and thanks of the entire Passport Office staff for this honor and for your gracious hospitality.

Sputniks Fright Good for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Herald:

SPUTNIKS FRIGHT GOOD FOR SCHOOLS
(By Bill Cunningham)

In all the recorded annals of man, nothing that didn't actually spill blood in great quantities ever brought such instantaneous fear and confusion over so much of the earth as the launching of the two Russian sputniks. That was true in our great and all-powerful United States. In fact, we seemed to come closest to national nervous prostration.

The fact that the Russians had beaten us to outer space was a matter of grave concern to a great many sincere people, some of whom may possibly have a vague idea of what outer space is, and a vague idea seems to be about all even the experts can boast to the moment. But it was also seized by various causists, theorists, lobbyists, and plain nuts as a great and God-given chance to prey on the public fear and promote their pet causes.

Politically, for example, the Democratic campaign strategists began to belabor the administration and cry down Eisenhower for having cut back the rocket program and let the Russians soar ahead. Militarily, the various arms with their varying forms of the same missile, began to clamor that they could have beaten the Russians by months if they could have been freed from interference and parsimony.

Ideologically, those whose idea of forward is a tack to port, began to ululate anew over the uncoupling of Oppenheimer from any nuclear connections where the national security is involved. They included all others who were dropped for cause, or who backed out of the tent using the fifth as a curtain.

M'CARTHY BLAMED

The persecution and hounding of these noble savants, resulting in their leaving Government work, was what actually threw the initiative to Russia, so quacked this claque, and it was all the fault of such witch burners as the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and so on all the way back to that black-hearted Beelzebub, the late, but still never-to-be-spat-enough-upon Senator Joe McCarthy.

Just where in all this the professional education phalanx rightly belongs, it's hard to say. It, however, was one of the first to charge, with ram's horns braying and bloody shirts on its pikestaffs. To be fair, much of it had already been at work in the field, and much of it is sincere.

Not all of it, however, is unsuspect. The field of pedagogy is organized in great part into what amounts to a powerful union, and maintains what amounts to a powerful lobby in Washington. There also are potent campaigners who have been pushing Federal aid to education so long, and so hard, that it has become a perennial big issue in the successive seatings of the Congress.

There is now a Federal Department of Health and Education, which means a bureau, with a bureaucrat at the head of it and which like all such, wants more funds, more scope, more employees, more authority so the top job will be bigger, the Department's standing higher, its perpetuity assured.

So education, pointing a quivering finger at the topless vault and screaming sputnik, lathered its charges in an assault on the front pages. From the sidelines it was hard to tell whether their model was Poul Revere, with his warning, or some hairy Biblical prophet crying "Repent, repent." The net of their message, however, was that Russia has now far surpassed us in the field of general education, and specifically has passed us so far in the fields of science and engineering that we have but the comparative standing of Igorottes.

UNITED STATES FRIGHTENED

For a nervous while, there's no question about the fact that the people of this Nation were both frightened and concerned. The papers were full of the subject of education. Almost any qualified spokesman was certain of an anxious hearing. Sermons were preached. Editorials were written. School board and PTA's were meeting almost prayerfully.

The Government proposed putting a billion dollars into college scholarships forthwith. Various governors—our own for one—outlined ambitious State plans. Practically every endowed—which means private—college in the Nation rushed forth with a new, a huge, and a highly organized campaign for funds. Harvard's 82-odd million was the master call of all.

Then, in view of the significance, a sad, and actually a silly, thing happened. By what was obviously a crash program, and after 2 or 3 spectacular fizzles, we managed to pump a couple of miniature moons of our own up into that outer envelope.

They're only bird-shot compared to the marble the Russians stuck up there, but at least we equaled the Muscovites in orbits, and we may even have surpassed them. For we also upped a third, but can't call it official because it failed to beep, and hasn't since been seen. The best we can claim is that it looked all right going up and, so far as anybody knows, it has never come down, but what really happened with it nobody knows.

That, however, leaves us a certified two now up there alone since the Russian pair has burned out. It also brought proud statements to the effect that we could have done it long before the Russians, if we'd considered it sufficiently important. We'd suspended space probing to concentrate on what seemed more important—atomic submarines, to name but one item.

Our authorities—Mr. Dulles speaking—confessed that we completely underestimated the psychological and propaganda value of such a spectular scientific achievement and, to that extent, the Russians had taken us, but that was all, and so what?

The net result was that fear seemed to vanish.

CRIES CEASED

So did public concern with the issues the fear had raised, including the fears largely manufactured by the various causists. The cries have ceased, the campaigns stopped, the public interest changed to other things—the recession, for instance.

This also applies to the subject of education, which was smoking hot, not over 3 months ago. The bill for Federal aid is right back where it was and while that billion for scholarships may yet be voted there seems more than an equal chance it will never even make the floor.

Personally, my vote would be cast against Federal aid, and I doubt that the billion is necessary or, if voted and used, would produce anything more than the thinly lacquered type of "college man" and woman we're accustomed to settling for.

It will be a shameful loss, however, if further general interest in this vital subject dies just because we're not scared to death any more. Here is a great opportunity for some valuable soul searching. Charges have been made, and the charges still stand.

Furthermore, some very great authorities in the field were already concerned with the American educational problem, and had made surveys and recommendations long before that floating doghouse of the Russians ever went up amongst the stars. One of these is Harvard's former president, Dr. James B. Conant. For some years, he's been surveying and pondering our high-school structure, and he was already on record before the world ever heard the word "sputnik."

There were others, and what the sputnik hysteria did was to bring many of these studies, surveys, and blueprints forward with more speed and urgency than might otherwise have prevailed. Several excellent studies, and covering all levels, are newly released, and they deserve careful and conscientious attention.

On the college level, for example, there's a special report on American higher education, 1958. This is an unique cooperative effort by college alumni magazine editors all over the country, and it's appearing at the moment in some 153 magazines in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. It tells the college story.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDY

On the high-school level, there's the Conant plan. Sponsored by the Carnegie Corp., the former head of Harvard made a first-hand survey of 50 high schools in 16 States, and has now drawn his blueprint for a better type of high-school curriculum.

Covering the grade-school level, a new book called "Schools Without Scholars" by one John Keats, who writes as a parent, has kindled considerable controversy and is attracting wide attention. There are other brochures, addresses, and an interesting number of magazine articles.

These latter are mostly byproducts of the sputnik confusion just now seeing light because it takes that long for, especially, a monthly magazine to be made up. As already explained the sputnik jitters have passed, but these studies shouldnt be junked as a consequence. They still deserve to be read, and pondered.

Basically, the charge is that the Russian educational system is far superior to ours because the Russian pupil, from his earliest years, takes harder courses, more of them, and pust pass them, or else—the "else" being dropped as a scholar and consigned to peonage on a farm or in a factory. Furthermore, they not only make allowance for the brainy student; they screen for him.

The Russian system is summed up succinctly in John Gunther's new "Inside Russia," just off the presses, in the following words:

"The average Russian boy or girl gets more than five times the amount of science and mathematics than is stipulated for entrance even into such a specialized American institution as MIT.

"Every Russian student is paid to go to college. The Russians have the most formidable educational machine in the world, but they are also the most ignorant people in the world about affairs outside their own country."

SCORES SCHOOLS

Against this is the following commentary on the American system from that "Schools Without Scholars," by John Keats.

"The brave new philosophy of preparing the child for his place in society, rather than filling his mind with dates, rules, and formulas, has resulted in a curriculum dominated by courses in domestic sciences, industrial arts, and social adjustment.

"In attempting to do everything for the child, schoolmen are turning out high-school graduates who have been taught how to dress for a date, play football, make copper ash trays, and very little else. Fancy equipment for unnecessary courses inflates construction costs and bemuses students with gleaming gadgets."

Both the Conant plan for high schools and some of the newer college studies have the superior student especially in mind. Some few colleges have been trying to unfetter him from the classroom drag of his "average" colleagues, for a number of years now, but with differing grades of success.

In the Conant concept high schools would have three general levels of courses. For the top 20 percent of the class, presumably college bound, there would be a stiff academic curriculum. The bottom 20 percent would be expected to operate on an elementary level. There would be a diversified vocational program for the rest.

The whole would be flexible to the extent that students could move from one level up to the other to take some special course provided they could keep up in it. Every student would have to take 4 years of English, 4 of social studies, 2 of math and 2 of science. The wind, however, would be tempered to the shorn lamb. These courses would be taught at levels he could handle. If exceptionally bright, he'd also take 3 years of a foreign language.

The problem, as stated by the plan's author, and recently published in Life magazine, is: "How to raise (United States education's) intellectual quality—giving its best minds a chance for unhampered intellectual growth—and yet, still preserve its traditional democratic ideals."

TIME FOR DREAMS

It all, of course, starts with the children, which means the parents of the children, and some of the students of the matter are caustic on that point. Last month, in Sarasota, Fla., I heard Philip H. Hiss, chairman of the Board of Public Instruction of Sarasota County, speak along these lines. He said there is too much watching of television and listening to radio, without children contributing anything of their own.

We should really be grateful for the scare given us in this particular category and proceed with a complete and constructive survey. Never mind what the Russians do, or what the Russians are. Our yardstick should be only our own potential, and our concern how far below it we've been content to coast.

Social Science—The Unused Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a classmate of mine at college, Joseph Clawson, now an author and an economist of prominence wrote an article in 1947 which I believe to have considerable pertinence to the situation facing us today. He tells us not to laugh at the economist, the psychologist, the sociologist, and other behavioral scientists, for your life may depend on him.

Under a previous consent I include my friend's analysis of how our salvation may lie in the behaviorial scientist and his recommendation that our emphasis had better be in this direction if we wish to survive.

Did you know that mankind's mighty mouse, the social scientist, faces a strange crisis this year—a dilemma which concerns you and your family more vitally than your job, your life insurance, your friends, or the cost of living? He faces this crisis partly because he is more misunderstood, more underrated, more bitterly opposed than the chemist or the nuclear physicist were before the war.

Who is this unusual person? And why mankind's mighty mouse?

This new friend of yours may be a psychologist, an economist, a sociologist, or perhaps an anthropologist. He might be an historian, a political scientist, a statistician, or an education research worker. Like the movie hero, Mighty Mouse, his job is to get civilization out of jams. Like the movie hero, he is usually thought of as a sort of comical cartoon character. In fact, the public smiles upon him as an absent-minded daydreamer puttering around like a happy child, with his white mice, dirty old clay pots, many-colored price charts, his straight-faced studies of nightclub panics and race riots.

In accomplishments, he is mighty. In comparison with the superhuman task ahead of him, he is a mouse. Yet on this same quiet, unassuming person may depend your greatest chances of physical survival. Why is this?

With scarcely an exception, every one of our great national problems today is a problem of human relations. War is exhibit A. There is already blood upon the neutron, and there may be more before we're through. The experts agree there is no military or technical defense against an atom bomb attack. They also agree that 40 to 100 million Americans would be blasted into radioactive dust during the first hour of war. The remainder would die soon after from food and air poisoning, strange new germs, and V–2 rockets.

Next, read the headlines of your newspaper. They shout about strikes, race riots, and divorces, or inflation, housing shortages, poverty, and sex butcheries, or robberies, juvenile delinquency, panics, approaching depression, and unemployment.

What do you make of them? Is it the Frankenstein menace of machinery that

makes these headlines? No, it is the failure in human relations. Dr. Raymond B. Fosdick, farseeing president of the Rockefeller Foundation, puts it this way: "We've been learning how to control physical nature, but we haven't learned how to control ourselves."

After all, the atom bomb is not dangerous. The deadly explosive is man. We are apemen in rocket planes, Alley Oops disguised as Flash Gordons.

But where does the social scientist come into this unpretty picture?

With new tools and rules this specialist is fighting every moment of the day for your life and happiness. If the story of his great social inventions and discoveries is ever told, it will be one of the most fascinating tales of human struggle, of truth against witchcraft, ever related. Heroism and drama underlie every advance of the social scientist. Galileo, Pasteur, Eve Curie, and Einstein had no monopoly on adventure or success. Yet we have been calling the new pioneers "impractical daydreamers" and "crackpots."

Consider their achievements.

The door opens and a gray-haired cripple swings up to you on crutches. "Look at me, mister," he says. "A disabled veteran. Not from this war, or the last war, but the one before that, the Spanish-American War." He smiles ruefully. "I'm living proof, don't you think, that war is an inborn trait of human nature? Like cutthroat competition and selfishness, they're inborn, all of them."

He has reason to be bitter. But for a scientific answer, let's turn to the cultural anthropologists. Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead have shown in their investigations that the answer is a resounding "No." All three of these traits are learned, like your 1-2-3's and the English language.

Powerful social weapons against war are on the production line right now. But we need to play for time until they are ready. Meanwhile, the handiest tools are the U. N., the UNRRA, the reciprocal trade agreements, the International Trade Organization, the World Bank, the world fund. For personal understanding, there's Donald Watt's delightful Experiment in International Living.[1]

"But," you ask, "are we actually getting down to the fundamentals, the causes of war?"

At this, a tall, energetic young professor of psychology speaks. You take an immediate liking to him. "For one thing," he asserts, "depressions frequently cause wars. Let's put it this way: frustration causes aggression. Over in Germany in the early 1930's, for example, thousands of young Germans, jobless, hungry, defeated, heard a spellbinder blaming all their troubles on the scheming Jews, as he called them. Or on the lack of living room. So, a heartless persecution began, and a merciless army swung into step to conquer the world."

That's Hadley Cantril from Princeton speaking. His discoveries regarding mobs, panics, and social movements have been revelations. A few years ago, his study of the panic that followed Orson Welles' broadcast of an invasion from Mars was a scientific gem.

As a psychologist, he was speaking of depressions causing wars. So we turn to the economists and ask, "What causes depressions, then?"

Among other things, they say, a depression follows from inflation. Maybe we haven't cured any depressions yet, but we have harnessed one inflation. In the United States, Canada, and England the prevention of a big wartime price boom between 1942 and 1945 was a remarkable achievement. It had never happened before. Every major conflict before World War II had ushered in a great price upheaval, and few in 1940 believed it could be controlled this time. But these countries did it with tools supplied by economists like John Maynard Keynes of England and Alvin Hansen of Harvard.

Mary, the neighbor girl, and Bill, her fiance, come forward with a more personal question. "We're engaged and—terribly in love," says Mary, hesitantly. "But with so many marriages breaking up, we'd like to know if there isn't some way of finding out ahead of time whether—well, whether we have any chance of happy marriage."

Yes, Mary, there is a way. Burgess and Cottrell at Chicago and Terman at Stanford have developed tests which will help you. If your joint score—yours and Bill's together—is definitely high or definitely low, these tests can predict with remarkable accuracy whether your marriage will succeed or fail.

"That's wonderful," says Bill. Then he stops and frowns. "But can't we affect the outcome, or are we just stuck with things as they are?"

Yes, Bill, you can, thanks to the pioneering efforts of sociologists like Ernest Groves and Paul Popenoe. They recognized a vital human need and decided to fill it. In 1925, Dr. Groves established at Boston University one of the earliest college courses in marriage problems, a forerunner of hundreds of such courses now being offered in colleges and night schools all over United States. Dr. Popence heads the 17-year-old American Institute of Family Relations in Los Angeles, which has helped build hundreds of successful marriages at a time when hit-or-miss marriages are failing in every direction.

Amazing? These are only appetizers—only a couple fields of practical social science research. Yet each of these victories in human relations is significant, each as sensational as a commando raid on Dieppe. Some of the inventions and discoveries of human science are as familiar as the census, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Reserve System, the ballot, the Constitution, the public opinion poll. Some have caused worldwide sensations, like Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis, which is still in use though the emphasis has shifted. Others are almost unknown, but they deserve monuments and medals for their aid to civilization.

Crime is being revealed by the lie detector, diagnosed by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck of Harvard, and treated by Chicago's "back-of-the-yards project." Racial troubles hold fewer secrets because of Donald Young's and Gunnar Myrdal's work. Tolerance is being spread through mixed communities by Jahn Granrud's Springfield plan.

A business executive clears his throat. "Wait a moment," he interrupts. "Don't forget those investigations made by Roethlisberger and—let's see—Dickson on labor-management techniques. They've been a gold mine for me."

Yes, and businessmen are also keeping out of the red with tested advertising, market analysis, pretested movie plots.

Along with radar, jet propulsion, and relativity, the record of great Twentieth Century inventions must also include intelligence tests, vocational aptitude tests, the wartime rumor clinic of Gordon Allport, and Simon Kuznets' pioneering studies of national income.

These highlights of just a few outstanding social inventions show that the social scientist is truly mighty. Though the human sciences may lag far behind the natural sciences; they can be useful from the very start.

Does this mean that the social scientist is any more intelligent or honest or sincere than our political leaders, our clergymen, generals, authors, teachers? Certainly not. Their success has been due exactly to the measure in which they have applied the methods of science to the problems of modern society. Science has gotten us into this mess, and science must get u out. For nature—human and otherwise—gives true answers to all who ask sensible questions according to scientific method.

You object: "Hold everything. If the social sciences are so terrific, why didn't they solve all our problems long ago?"

That's a good question—and a basic one. The specialist in human relations today is mighty, for his size. But he is Mighty Mouse against Frankenstein. The truth is, the social scientist isn't strong enough yet to save us. But there is worse to be told. Our political leaders are using barely a fraction of what is already known about human science. Like witchdoctors refusing to administer modern penicillin to a dying patient, they have repeatedly refused to employ the medicines and instruments of social science. Indeed, three times since the first atom bomb was dropped on Japan, Congress has refused to include the social sciences in any plan for a Government-aided National Science Foundation. One Senator contemptuously referred to them as "various kinds of ideology."

So the social scientists are fighting lonely, isolated skirmishes in the dark against powerful foes—fighting them almost with bare hands. They are the peacetime commandos against the atom. The number of these doctors of civilization has never exceeded 18,000 in the United States, plus a few thousand abroad.

The most conservative estimates indicate that at least $350 million a year is spent on natural science research. During the war we spent over $2 billion altogether, or say half a billion dollars a year on the Manhattan atom-bomb project. Nearly $175 million a year was spent on other military programs of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. In contrast, it appears that less than $100 million a year is spent on social-science research, even when the professors' regular teaching salaries are included.

The pitifully small funds, the overworked personnel of the social sciences are concentrated in university social-science departments, in the social-science research council, in the Rockefeller, Sage, Milbank, and Sloan Foundations, and timidly in a few obscure Government bureaus. They are doing all they can, but it isn't enough.

The publicity and action organizations which conscientiously use scientific findings in their programs are also amazingly few in number. Among them are the Public Affairs Committee, the National Planning Association, the American Institute of Family Relations, Johnson O'Connor Human Engineering Laboratory, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, and to some extent the older organizations—Boy Scouts, YMCA, Red Cross, and Community Chest. There's the picture.

Without the full ounce of prevention, society takes many tons of cure. Strikes cost the workers over $200 million in 1945. Federal, State, and city governments regularly spend $3 billion a year for public welfare and relief, $250 million for police protection and penitentiaries, and, worst of all, spent $69 billion a year for World War II.

But it wasn't the dollars that suffered. At least 36 million people, armed and unarmed, all over the world were imprisoned, wounded, lost, or killed during World War II. and 37 million went through the same wringer during World War I. In December 1932, at the bottom of the great depression, 13,600,000 workers were unemployed in America, with additional millions walking the streets in England, France, Germany, and elsewhere.

These weren't statistics. These were people. The money and lives and human costs we waste once these social plagues get started are like water poured down a

[1] Youth Experiments in Latin-American Living, Reader's Digest, January 1942.

rathole. Only scientific methods, applied in advance, can prevent them.

What do the social scientists need to equip them for the superhuman task ahead?

They need four things. First of all, they need funds. A half billion dollars a year would be a cheap investment in peace and prosperity. Second, personnel. America needs a standing army of 50,000 social scientists. Third, organization. A superabundance of these three things—money, men, and organization—were poured into the Manhattan project. And in an incredibly short time, the project produced the atom bomb. But a fourth ingredient is required by social science. It needs active partners in every community. In traditional American fashion, they must advertise these new inventions and put them into use.

Yes, we can have any kind of a world we want, say the social scientists. We can even have a political and social defense against the A-bomb. "That is," says Sylvanus Duvall, "we can if we quit spending billions for bombs and pennies for people."

Comments on the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Mill Times, of April 17, 1958:

Sometimes it is a bit difficult to determine in which direction the Eisenhower administration is heading. Only a few months ago the President called for a tight-money policy to curb spending and retard inflation. Interest rates on loans shot skyward; down-payments on Government-financed homes rocketed; efforts were made to sharply curtail all installment buying.

Last week President Eisenhower told reporters at his news conference that the way to lick the recession was for everybody to buy. "Buy what?" a reporter asked.

"Buy anything," the President replied.

So I suppose the only way we can lick this thing is for everybody to go out and start buying stuff, regardless of whether they need it or not, and even if they don't have money to pay for it.

But the only catch is—right in the middle of your spending spree the Ike administration may invoke the tight-money policy again.

Frankly this is the first recession (depression) I have experienced that was accompanied by inflationary prices. Customarily a business recession is accompanied by sharply declining prices. But this time the recession hit with prices at an all-time high, and the longer the recession lasts, the higher the prices go.

It poses quite a problem: Is it more important to lick recession or inflation? It seems that trying to whip them both at once is similar to traveling in opposite directions at the same time.

Oh, well, we'll let the eggheads figure that one out.

While on the subject of the inconsistencies of the administration, one of the worst phases is the doublecross of the American textile industry. The administration has arranged it so foreign countries (largely Japan) can purchase United States cotton 26 percent under the price paid by American textile mills. The Japs manufacture the cotton into cloth with labor that is paid only one-tenth of what American textile laborers receive. The administration then lets the bars down so that American markets are overrun with this cheap, imported cloth which is priced far below the manufacturers' cost of United States made textiles.

If this policy is continued over the years it could well destroy the American textile industry. Already it has caused numerous mills to cease operations, and daily is jeopardizing the livelihood of more and more textile workers.

The administration has repeatedly made it clear that to them the friendship and well-being of the Japs matters more than the economy of the Southland and of New England, and the employment and welfare of our citizens.

How Hiring the Handicapped Helps You and Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a very fine essay written by Miss Floy Jean Scribner of Fillmore, Okla., in my congressional district.

This splendid essay was one of the national winners in the 1958 National Essay Contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. The expenses of this contest were born by the Disabled American Veterans. Miss Scribner is a student at Milburn High School, Milburn, Okla. Along with other national winners, Miss Scribner will receive her award at the opening session of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped on May 8. The award will be given to her directly by President Eisenhower.

Miss Scribner's essay reads as follows:

HOW HIRING THE HANDICAPPED HELPS YOU AND ME

As the strength of a chain is measured by its weakest link, so a nation's well-being is measured by its nonproductive citizens. It is a basic American belief that every man should have a chance to develop all that is best within him and achieve his fullest measure of perfection.

Oklahoma, alone, has 40,000 so-called handicapped adults. Multiply this by 48 and we have a fair estimate of the potential drag on our economy if these citizens are not given the opportunity to become producers. They are all consumers. They require food, clothing, shelter, and all other needed services to live. If they are compelled to remain in a state of dependency, others must work to support them, thereby lowering the standard of living of both the impaired and the worker. This need not be. Countless examples could be given to show that impaired workers can become efficient, self-supporting, contributing members to a nation's economy.

We have in times past failed to see that the so-called handicapped have many latent abilities that could be trained and put to work. All of us are in some way handicapped. Most of us would be handicapped if called upon to play football, or solve scientific or mathematical problems, but is that any reason for ignoring and failing to train the capabilities that we do have?

If we could leave out all humanitarian and charitable obligations to hire the handicapped, which we cannot, it would still be profitable for our well-being and our Nation's economy to train and hire them. They would pay back in Federal income and State sales taxes many times the cost of their training. Hiring the handicapped would reduce our welfare rolls. Hiring them would lighten the physical and mental burden of the ones who must now work to support them; and it would broaden the horizons of the unhappy, dependent handicapped persons.

It is no longer a question of debate as to the competency of handicapped workers. They have proved that when placed in jobs for which they are trained they become valuable employees. They work hard and conscientiously; they are rarely absent from their jobs or late to work; they ask no special favors. All this inspires the physically fit worker to do his best and makes the employer who hires the handicapped feel that he is lucky to have them on his pay roll.

Placing the handicapped in productive employment helps you and me. Placing them in productive employment is a gain for everyone. The hiring of all available manpower and working skill is vital to our national strength and wealth and to our national standard of living. It is the working people who support their community and their nation, not the people who are living on welfare funds and compensation pensions.

The economic progress and superior standards of living depend on good labor relations. American labor with its system of private enterprise stands to profit by providing every available opportunity for handicapped persons who are qualified to take their places in productive jobs. American labor and industry have proved that thousands of persons who we once thought were handicapped have done their jobs well in war time and peace time. When the handicapped person is trained to meet the requirements of the job, he is no longer handicapped. Human needs of all of us as well as the handicapped are best served when the handicapped are helped to become self-supporting and are made capable and given their chance to make their contribution as self-reliant members of society. Nothing is truer than what the vocational rehabilitation people say: "It is not what a man has lost but what he has left that is important." [1]

Thousands of formerly handicapped workers, but now no longer handicapped because of training, are doing you and me a favor by taking their wheel chairs, leaving the four walls of their homes, even the confines of the home community to join the army of independent producers who pay with their own efforts for what they consume, who become property owners, and who pay taxes to make our country a better place in which to live. No, we are not doing for them any more of a favor than they are doing for us. They have earned their places among our most valued employees.

From a business standpoint, we are fortunate in having them. From a humanitarian standpoint, it is good for our souls. We cannot reduce life to pure materialism, to an attitude of letting the fittest survive. Hiring the handicapped helps you and me combat attitudes of prejudice and intolerance. Only weak, selfish men must be surrounded by absolute perfection, so working side by side with the physically handicapped makes us strong.

If America is to be kept strong, you and I must help all men who will work, to find work, not only the physically sound but also the men whose bodies are impaired but who have talents and skills that can be used to

[1] United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, from pamphlet, Help the Disabled, revised April 1953, p. 8.

strengthen a country that holds its high place because of a free economy. Any attitude that black lists any employable worker is lowering the national standard.

Organized labor is neither wholly selfish nor entirely humanitarian in pledging their organizations to see that the handicapped are hired. They are both. They know that State and national economy, to be what it should be, must hire any worker whose talents can be used to make him productive and self-supporting.

Hiring the handicapped helps you and me, not only economically but also morally. We know that no single job requires all faculties of a normal person. We know that the handicapped can do just as many skills—perhaps not all the same—as the nonhandicapped. We know they ask no favors. They meet the same production and safety standards as other workers. They ask for only their just rights, the opportunity to be self-respecting and self-sustaining. Unless they are given gainful employment in keeping with their abilities and interests, they are denied their just rights.

We cannot promote the strength of the whole free world as we contend that we want to do unless we are willing to work shoulder to shoulder with the handicapped. They can add spirit and power to American industry and remove any stigma or accusation that we still practice the tactics of the Dark Ages when the physically or mentally unfit were hidden from the public eye or allowed to starve or freeze in dungeons.

The handicapped do not want our sympathy. They do not need it. They will help you and me when we see that they are trained and hired to work at jobs that will give them human dignity that is their inalienable right.

The Objective Is Fine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald of April 17, 1958:

THE OBJECTIVE IS FINE

President Eisenhower is having a rough go with Congress over his plan to reorganize the Defense Department.

Part of the President's trouble is his own fault. He has not made himself clear. His 7,000-word proposal for streamlining the department left many points in doubt. Vagueness has been one of the President's weak points on more than one occasion.

The overall objective that the President has in mind, however, is certainly worthwhile. He wants greater efficiency in our Defense Department setup.

Ike wants to give the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff more authority. Each separate defense branch—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—would lose some authority.

The result might be less interservice squabbling, for one thing. The Joint Chiefs might be more inclined to look at the overall defense picture—and spend the available money more efficiently. The tendency of each individual branch to try to get more than the next might decline.

Maybe Congressmen don't agree with the President on the details. But we'll go along with Ike on the main idea. The Defense Department can stand a whole lot of reorganizing.

Upturn Is On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News has a spirited and colorful writer, Jack Mabley. I follow his columns religiously and wish to have consent to insert one of his stories appearing on April 15. I wish to commend Jack Mabley for his accurate and timely article on the current economic condition.

UPTURN IS ON
(By Jack Mabley)

The recession is V shaped, it's U shaped, it's saucershaped, it's tapering off, it's getting worse, it'll end in the fall, it will continue through the year, it's a readjustment, it's a depression, it's good for us, it's calamitous.

One thing we know for sure. If the economists in Washington knew what they were talking about they would have foreseen this recession and moved to avoid it.

Most of the predictions of when the recession will end are just so much hot air. Nobody knows when it will end. When the public starts buying instead of saving, business will get better.

Recession is caused by a state of mind. Newspapers are criticized for printing bad news about business. This makes the public cautious and gloomy and worsens the recession.

The critics overlook the fact that if we didn't print bad news along with the good, word of mouth would take over, facts would become monstrously distorted, and a real panic would take place.

Our Democratic Senator came back from Washington last week. He's a humanitarian and anxious to get information to guide him in the Senate.

SHOULD HAVE TALKED TO SAVERS

So to get near the people he hiked out to the State unemployment offices and talked to the unemployed. He got a pretty miserable picture. He is alarmed. We reported his alarm.

I wish the Senator had ogne out to a savings institution on a Saturday morning and talked to people putting their money away. They're employed and well off. They are the ones who could have told the Senator when and why they might start spending.

At any rate, he's gone back to Washington with a frightening picture, based on talking with the 8 percent who are unemployed. The 92 percent who are employed hold the answers.

When the 92 percent start spending, they'll stimulate jobs for the 8 percent not working. Then we'll be out of trouble.

When? Here's a guess. There has been a pitiful absence of direction or leadership from Washington. The panic merchants there are doing more to undermine confidence than any group in the Nation.

So the citizens are taking matters into their own hands. Private business is providing leadership.

SALES DRIVES MAY MARK THE UPTURN

Business is providing salesmanship and good buys. Chicago is in the middle of a huge auto sales campaign. Almost every city in the Nation has done or will do the same.

This may mark the turn upward. This would mean that people smart enough to buy during this sales drive would get the best price of the year or maybe of several years.

Retailers in every field who are giving good buys find the money and the willingness to buy are there.

Over the weekend I shopped in a department store, hardware and garden store, and a drugstore. There were sales going on, and it certainly didn't look like hard times in these places.

Strictly on the basis of trying to figure people, I offer the curbstone opinion that we've hit botton and are on our way up. The initiative and drive of the auto dealers deserves a major share of the credit.

Our People's Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, last fall, the Air Force, in a so-called economy move, arbitrarily took practically all of the maintenance overhaul and alteration business of our fighting aircraft away from the private companies who had developed an efficient and economical defense industry, and transferred it to our Government-owned depots, many of which, conceivably, could have been used in the B–52 dispersal plan.

One of the best editorials I have seen on the subject of getting our Government out of competition with its taxpaying citizens is that of Wayne W. Parrish, in the April 7 issue of American Aviation magazine.

The editorial follows:

OUR PEOPLE'S FACTORIES
(By Wayne W. Parrish)

It is quite apparent that the United States Military Establishment feels that the Soviet Union has evolved a way of life worth emulating. The Air Force and the Navy, especially, have moved rapidly into the Soviet pattern of state socialism with a network of people's factories and a people's airline (called MATS) and almost any day we expect the Order of the Red Star to be given to some stanchly patriotic United States general or admiral for having out-performed Rumania or Czechoslovakia in following the Moscow formula for success.

All this must be so, because the facts are there to prove the belief of United States military in the Soviet way of doing things. It used to be in presocialist days that USAF and Navy let our maintenance and overhaul work to the privately owned aircraft maintenance industry. But today only 3 percent of the $1.5 billion which Congress allocates for maintenance is offered out competitively to private industry.

When Congress ordered a 7 percent cut in the fiscal 1958 budget for aircraft maintenance, the military did just fine. It cut its own people's factories 1 percent and cut private industry 56 percent. And whether or not the military services realize what they are doing, the end result is one big boost to the cause of state socialism as pioneered by the Soviet Union.

Today over 140,000 civilian skilled personnel are employed in 20 people's factories, known as overhaul and repair depots. Not bad empire-building. After all, out of the $40 billion defense appropriation a whopping $7 billion goes for maintaining our weapons once they come into inventory. A commissar's paradise. A carnival for state socialism. Bureaucracy in its finest flowering. And all

done for the glory of the people's democracy, United States branch.

Well, as we often say, the United States of America can take care of its enemies in due style, but Lord save us from those carrying our flag at home but who undermine the very system which made this country great. The military who have pushed their people's factories into big socialistic business following the lines of Lenin and Stalin had better do some soul-searching before it's too late.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am placing in the RECORD the prize essay of Ellen Gira Zisking, 50 South Ardmore Road, Columbus, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, entitled "What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?"

Each year the American Legion of Ohio conducts an essay contest based on a patriotic subject. The study and effort devoted to this contest by thousands of high-school students is a great stimulus to understanding of the duties of citizenship. The subject this year is especially challenging. This winning essay contains thoughts that could well be weighed and taken to heart by every good citizen.

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

What part will I play as a citizen? In order to come to terms intelligently with this question, it becomes necessary to define the word "citizen." Webster defines citizen as follows: a member of a State; a person, native or naturalized, who owes allegiance to a government. It is clear that the significant word in this definition is "allegiance." Allegiance is a matter which may vary with the individual. For myself, however, allegiance to my country implies a recognition that the privilege of living in a democracy where an individual is guaranteed certain basic liberties, carries with it definite duties and responsibilities. The manner in which I accept and discharge these responsibilities, will determine the kind of citizen I shall be.

What do I consider the responsibilities and duties of citizenship? First, it is important that I stand ever ready to defend my country against its enemies. A country is only able to survive if its citizens stand committed to fight for it. Thus, as a citizen, I am prepared to do so.

Second, it is my duty to obey the laws of my country, State, and city. Only through obedience to law is it possible to live in harmony with others. Failure to obey laws brings chaos and disorder.

For the good of my country, and because this makes it a better and more decent place in which to live, I propose to heed legal authority.

Third, it is my responsibility to participate in the educational, cultural, and religious goals which will insure my country's growth, progress, and development. Excellent schools, opportunity to express ourselves creatively, and strong moral teaching make for a better government. Thus, I resolve to lend my efforts diligently to these causes, because both my country and I will benefit immeasurably through such labors.

Fourth, I know that living in my country involves living with others. There will be people who are less fortunate than myself, who, through sickness and disease or other circumstances, will need help. Since it is my understanding that my country is only as strong as its willingness to lend aid to its unfortunate, my citizenship will direct me to make myself a part of a program on behalf of the disabled and underprivileged, wherever such conditions exist. Moreover, as a citizen, I shall never consider this work completed until the causes for these conditions are eliminated.

In conclusion, I consider it a part of my citizenship to work for the achievement of peace. I am mindful that my country offers me many opportunities and stands ready to protect me always. This, my country, can only continue to do, if I, as an individual, through my Government, strive for a world in which all men are brothers under the kingship of God. Thus, my citizenship shall be a challenged, wherever possible, to pursue the cause of peace between nations, and all men, always.

How Hiring the Handicapped Helps You and Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the waste of manpower which has resulted from not fully making use of the talents and ability of persons who are physically handicapped.

I think this has been very ably summarized in an essay by Miss Sally Ann Walter of Mandan, N. Dak. Her essay is so good, in fact, it has been adjudged one of the prize winners in this year's essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and the Disabled American Veterans.

Because of her fresh and vigorous approach to this problem, I believe every Member will be interested in what she says:

HOW HIRING THE HANDICAPPED HELPS YOU AND ME

(By Sally Ann Walter, Mandan Senior High School, 1100 Sixth Avenue NW., Mandan, N. Dak.)

You and I, collectively and individually, constitute the American public. We share in the government, the freedom, the luxury of a great Nation, but we also have a part in its problems and indebtedness.

If the magical genie of Aladdin's lamp would appear suddenly to us, the American public, and show us a sure-fire way to cut down on taxes, increase the number of producing citizens, boost the integrity of the United States abroad, and gain a great deal more blessings both materially and spiritually for this country, wouldn't we weigh Mr. Genie's plan carefully? In fact, wouldn't we jump at the chance to gain just those blessings for ourselves and our country?

Yes, I think so. For you see, Mr. Citizen, we are the pioneers and people of the greatest democratic nation on the face of this earth today. Americans have always faced up to their national problems, accepted criticism, and looked for ways to bettering their Nation and people. The genie of Aladdin's lamp has an answer and a plan for solving many of the troubles of today. It is to hire the handicapped.

At first thought this may seem strange to you. You may even argue that such a plan has nothing whatever to do with the great, pressing needs and problems our country is facing today; that it would profit you nothing to hire a handicapped individual. But take a second look; consider the proposition a little longer.

Today we are engaged in a cold war with Russia, and other communistic countries, that is basically a contest between two ways of life. Hiring the handicapped is a vote for democracy and an answer to communism's challenge because democracy is based on the policy that all men are created equal. This does not mean that a person without a leg, arm, or eye can physically equal a totally well and whole person. But he can equal and even surpass a normal person in a specific vocation.

A man who possesses a pair of skillful, sensitive hands can repair precision watches even if he has no legs; a deaf man could do better work in a noisy factory than his normal fellow workers who would be distracted by the din.

All facts considered and weighed, you still have the truth that all men are equal. Take the handicapped person, look beyond his physical defect, and you will find another American citizen. Look at what the person has left, not what he has lost, and you will see him as your fellow human being, your equal. Going one step further and treating the handicapped as your equal, Mr. Citizen, is a direct hit at the terror of communism, for you are expressly demonstrating that all men are basically the same, equal. You are upholding democracy and safeguarding your way of life.

What has democracy provided for these people? What have you as a citizen contributed to their welfare? Your Federal Government operates and finances the vast vocational rehabilitation program which stretches into 48 of the 48 States. You have passed the Federal Rehabilitation Act, which provided financing and expert medical and guiding help for those people with physical defects, to help them become more useful citizens. In 1943 you amended this law, widened it to include those with emotional or mental handicaps. Your President has organized a President's Committee, and your Congress has voted financial aid for these programs. Your country has been an example to foreign nations and to the ever-threatening danger of communism in this very significant way.

But the strange and wonderful fact about the whole matter is that we not only gain integrity and esteem of other countries, we not only prove that democracy is best, but materially we benefit by hiring the handicapped.

Over $400 million are consumed by these handicapped persons through governmental assistance payments in 1 year alone. This money goes to 260,000 blind persons; 2 million with diabetes; 200,000 amputees; 750,000 epileptics; 500,000 with tuberculosis; 10,500 cases of cerebral palsy a year. There are over a million other people with minor difficulties.

This means that our institutions and hospitals are filled with persons who rely on Government aid through tax-supported institutions. Rehabilitating these people would free the Government plus you and me, the citizens, from higher taxes.

But let's get down to cases. A few years ago a cross section of 8,000 handicapped individuals were receiving between them $5 million of assistance payments, your tax money. They were rehabilitated, put back in the active stream of life. In the first year alone after their return to activity, they earned $14 million. They no longer relied

on your tax money; instead they paid $1 million in income taxes. The tax consumer can become a taxpayer, no longer a burden on your pocketbook but an asset to the Nation and the Nation's business.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in cooperation with the National Association of Manufacturers, has made a spot survey of 800 member companies to determine the comparative performance of the handicapped and nonhandicapped workers. Their findings show that the handicapped are adaptable, that they adjust quickly and satisfactorily to the conditions of the job.

Handicapped people are equal and sometimes superior to nonhandicapped persons in their job performance. They make safety records equal or superior to other workers. They tend to have job attendance records as good as fellow workers on the same job. They are not job hoppers but reliable, trustworthy employees. They have proved to be assets to their communities, families, and employers.

Webster defines "handicap" as: "any disadvantage which makes progress or success more than ordinarily difficult." Note that he doesn't say impossible, just difficult.

In other words, this handicap is a challenge to the individual. He must work many times harder than a normal person to be a success. He must overcome the pain of his defect, must crush out his shame and embarassment, develop patience and courage. This, then, is no person to be ignored. He has struggled and fought through a great war with himself. He has died a thousand deaths.

Abe Lincoln said of the dead at Gettysburg: "They shall not have died in vain," and I say of our handicapped people: "They shall not have fought in vain." Just as our soldiers fought on the battlefields of the world for democracy, so also does the handicapped person fight for democracy. He, as an individual, is a unit of democracy and we as individuals profit from his fight because we, too, are a part of this democracy. This is exactly how hiring the handicapped helps you and me.

Is Work Going Out of Style?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, of April 16, 1958:

IS WORK GOING OUT OF STYLE?

If you're like the rest of us there have been times when you have sat back and dreamed about how nice it would be to have plenty of money and to loaf the rest of your life.

The dream is perfectly normal, but it reminds us of a growing attitude in America that work is distasteful.

Dr. William Kvaraceus, of Boston University, said the other day that this country is developing a culture that is seeking to get rid of work. The magic words today, he says, are labor-saving device.

The Boston educator says work is discipline. He says the attitude that work is something to be avoided will cause juvenile delinquency to rise.

Another man, Dr. D. Ewen Cameron, says we have an "asinine belief that not to work is to enter into bliss."

The point is that doing nothing can get mighty dull and uninteresting. Soft living develops weak humans.

Work gives you a chance to show what you can do. It gives dignity to your life. It offers you a chance to express yourself and to make some contribution to the world in which you live.

If you become a parasite, taking and never giving, you'll lose your zest for living. And doing nothing won't be any fun. Work is what makes you able to appreciate rest.

It doesn't matter what kind of work you do. The important thing is to have pride in doing the job well. The satisfaction you'll get will give meaning to your life.

Stop Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial appearing in a newspaper of wide publication. I am doing this because I, too, am worried because the legislation referred to is seemingly another step of federalization of our entire Government procedure. If we do not call a halt to Government controls in my opinion it will be but a short time before many other businesses will come under Federal jurisdiction.

BILLBOARDS AND HIGHWAYS

By the close vote of 47 to 41, the United States Senate last week approved a bill going all around the proverbial Robin Hood's barn to effect a partial Federal control of billboard advertising on the Nation's highways. The measure now goes to the House for consideration.

The bill originally provided that States which conform to Federal regulation of size and placement of billboards—in practical terms, their virtual elimination—on their segments of the 41,000-mile National Highway System will receive a bonus in the form of a larger allotment of Federal money.

An amendment to the bill exempted some 10,000 miles of federalized highways by stipulating that the law would not apply to any roads being built over the routes of already existing highways. So the law, if enacted, will affect only the remaining 31,000 miles.

We do not object to the motive behind the legislation. We prefer highways which are not defaced with unsightly advertising signs, along which motorists may enjoy the unspoiled natural beauty of the countryside without incongruous distractions.

We do see several dangers, however, in the equivocal manner in which Congress has approached the problem.

For one thing, it represents one more instance of indirect Federal dictation to the States. Of course, the proposed law is not compulsory. Any State which does not wish to ban billboards on national highways is free to refrain—but how many States will refuse what amounts to a polite bribe to bow to the Federal Government's will, when it means more money from Washington?

Another thing is that it would provide reason for those who would like to establish the principle of some degree of government control over advertising to point to a precedent favoring their objective.

For once the premise that the Federal Government may properly control advertising is established, what is there to prevent its application to other mediums?

Finally, the move looks very much like another subtle invasion of States rights.

The problem of whether or not to permit billboards on principal highways varies greatly in different localities and is affected by many factors.

If individual States wish to ban, or not to ban, depending on how their citizens feel about it—and do it frankly, without resort to a devious system of rewards or penalties, as embodied in the Federal bill—it seems to us less chance exists of setting a dangerous precedent.

Sales in You-Auto-Buy Drive Roll in High Gear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to insert a story about Chicago's you auto buy which went into gear April 16. This campaign is to last for 9 days and, according to the Chicago Daily Tribune story of April 17, the results are making the dealers sing.

For some time I have been saying that American private enterprise will take steps to give our economy a boost. The automobile dealers over the entire country have embarked on a drive which merits praise. They are not going to succumb to the onerous lamentations from some quarters that America is in a situation from which we cannot emerge. I commend Raymond Ellis of the Chicago Tribune for his fine account of Chicagoland's participation in this program.

SALES IN YOU-AUTO-BUY DRIVE ROLL IN HIGH GEAR

(By Raymond Ellis)

Chicago's you auto buy now campaign was locked into high gear yesterday as sales continued at about the same high rate established in the first 3 days of the 9-day drive which opened Saturday.

Tuesday's sales of new cars were estimated at 925 units, raising the 4-day total to more than 2,600 units from 1,303 in the corresponding period a week earlier.

SALES WILL TOP 4,711

If this rate continues, sales during the campaign will run well over the 4,711 new cars sold in the 12 days preceding the opening of the campaign.

The you auto buy now campaign in Chicago is sponsored by the Automobile Trade Association, composed of new car and truck dealers, and the Greater Chicago Used Car Dealers Association.

In the first 3 days, used car sales were estimated at 3,300 units, with a total value of $3,300,000. Total value of new cars sold was placed at between $8 million and $9 million.

COUNTRYWIDE SALES EFFORT

The you auto buy now drive is part of a countrywide campaign promoted in cooperation with the automobile industry to give a boost to the economy.

One out of seven workers owes his livelihood to the automobile industry.

On an individual basis, it was reported yesterday that dealers were profiting in proportion to the amount of effort each put into the campaign. One dealer reported a fivefold sales increase in the first 4 days—an average of 10 cars a day compared with a yearly average of 2 cars a day.

Resolutions of Breeders Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a series of five resolutions, pointing the way to a stronger agriculture, which were adopted on March 29 by the Minnesota Holstein-Friesian Breeders Association.

The association, a great farm organization in Minnesota, is composed of about 975 members who are all prominent dairy farmers of the State. In a meeting at Northfield, Minn., the group passed the following resolutions which I believe should be studied and thoughtfully considered by all members of Congress as we are confronted with legislation for the benefit of our farm people:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE MINNESOTA HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN BREEDERS ASSOCIATION, IN MEETING AT NORTHFIELD, MINN., MARCH 29, 1958

TAXATION OF FARMERS COOPERATIVES AND THEIR PATRONS

Under the law, farmer cooperatives are taxed in the same manner as business enterprises conducted by individuals or partnerships. The savings made by farmers in marketing their products through their cooperatives, belong to the farmers.

Patronage refunds are income to farmers and are therefore taxable to the cooperative patron. The extension of withholding taxes to such allocations of income before distribution to farmers would discriminate unfairly. We oppose any legislation whereby farmers' earnings allocated directly to individual farmers by their cooperatives would be subject to withholding taxes.

MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

We recommend review of the regulation imposed under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to the end that exclusions from the market are no longer necessary or in the best interests of farmers and consumers, shall be removed.

Improvement in transportation equipment and the possibilities of reducing transportation costs by use of new developments in the science of manufacturing may make it unreasonable to exclude from these markets, producers living at considerable distance, but now because of advancement in the techniques of manufacturing and transportation should and can now supply milk and products of milk to the advancement of both producers and consumers.

NATIONAL UNIFORM SANITARY STANDARDS FOR MILK

The development and administration of standards for use in the marketing of perishable commodities interstate is a well-defined function of Government.

Such standards have been developed but never made mandatory with reference to fluid milk. The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has prepared a milk ordinance and code as a service to local communities. This ordinance and code is widely used for administering the public function related to the local milk supply. If health officers fail to apply the standards uniformly, the shipment of milk interstate for use in the various markets becomes uncertain and confused.

We recommend to the Congress of the United States that:

(a) The provisions of the United States milk ordinance and code should be made mandatory with reference to all milk moving in interstate commerce in all markets of the United States, and that (b) to prevent build-up of duplicating and conflicting agencies, the personnel of local public health offices be qualified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, insofar as feasible, to administer the inspection and certification divisions of the code.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Labor, costs, or wages cannot be advanced more rapidly than the productivity of labor if our present disastrous inflationary trend is to be curbed and a stabilized dollar realized. We appeal to the leaders of the labor movement to use discretion and sound business judgment in making demands for wage increases, and do so only when increased productivity would justify such increases.

We also appeal to the management of industry to refrain from price increases that extend beyond the cost of production plus a reasonable return or profits on investment. The vicious wage-price spiral of today constitutes one of the great dangers jeopardizing the future welfare of our free American economy, and constitutes the principal cause of the present price-cost squeeze on agriculture.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Minnesota Holstein-Friesian Breeders Association in convention assembled joins with other interested livestock organizations in recommending and strongly urging that the joint commission for the prevention of foot-and-mouth disease, now located in Mexico, be continued. In addition, we wish to commend both the Governments of Mexico and the United States in maintaining a nucleus of personnel and equipment under the joint commission for the protection of both countries against the reoccurrence of the dreaded foot-and-mouth disease on our continent.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, with the air filled with an ever-increasing number of socialistic schemes under the guise of antirecession legislation, it is especially gratifying to be reassured that the youth of our country realize that through the free enterprise system, this Nation became great, and only by perpetuating it, can we continue to prosper.

It is with genuine pleasure that I direct the attention of my colleagues to the following essay written by Miss Nancy Nickerson, of Rapid City, S. Dak. Miss Nickerson is a high school senior, and her essay was awarded first place in the South Dakota State Medical Association's annual contest.

The United States of America is the richest Nation in the world, for here we enjoy a higher living standard than any people in any other land. No other nation has achieved the progress and success that America has achieved.

Throughout the world people look to America for assistance in the bare necessities of life. These people need the food produced on America's Midwestern farms, the cotton produced in the South, and the machinery built from steel in American factories. The people of the world look to America as an example: an example of freedom and prosperity.

Yes, truly America has the highest living standard in the world. But, you ask, why is this so? Why do we have more than others? There are many reasons why we are so fortunate. But the American free enterprise system has been the greatest force in raising our standard of living. The American ecenomic system grew out of a longing for personal freedom and has always emphasized the idea on individualism. Our American free enterprise system is based on the belief that individuals should rely on their own efforts for most of the things they want. This economic system is characterized by the institutions of private property, freedom of enterprise, and freedom of contract.

Freedom to own property gives one the exclusive right to own something of value. Private ownership of wealth is one advantage of our economics system. The hope of increasing earnings stimulates initiative and causes man to work harder. The accumulation of wealth gives an incentive to save. The result is an increase in capital for both the individual and the Nation. If more people have more money with which to buy goods, more goods will be produced and production costs will decrease. Thus, the American standard of living will rise.

The second institution of our economic system is freedom of enterprise. Freedom of enterprise gives on the right to go into business for oneself. Freedom of enterprise leads to competition. It has been said that competition is the life of trade. Competition causes producers to maintain and to strive to improve the quality of their merchandise. New methods must continually be discovered if one competitor is to remain on an equal basis with another. The producer must produce the goods needed and wanted by the majority of the consumers. The producer and the merchant must be alert in order to keep up with his competitor. Competition causes the sale of more goods; therefore competition results in lower cost. In American's free competitive market, business is operated for the purpose of making a profit. The hope of making a profit stimulates initiative to work. Clifford F. Hood, president of the United States Steel Corp., believes that the desire to make a profit is the spark plug in our industrial mechanism. Because Americans are allowed to go into business for themselves the American standard of living rises.

The third institution in our free enterprise system is freedom of contract, which gives an American the right to make an agreement which can be enforced in a court. This institution is a protection of an individual's freedom.

Yes, Americans are very fortunate. The American free enterprise system gives one the right to succeed or to fail. It gives one

the right to work as hard as he wishes. It gives one the right to have a little or to accumulate a lot. As long as Americans continue to possess this freedom, our standard of living will continue to be the highest in the world. Mr. Hood said about our economic system, "I strongly believe that the American enterprise system is making its contribution to more than just material welfare of the American people, and of other peoples whose lives it touches. I feel too, that along with religion, the industrial enterprise system stands in apposition to godless, grossly materialistic Russian communism."

Years ago Karl Marx wrote that by adopting his form of communism, a country's living standards would rise to great heights. He also believed that communism would eventually become the form of government for the entire world. How surprised Marx would be if he knew that the free-enterprise system of the United States had accomplished all that he thought his communism would accomplish. What would he think if he could now compare the living standards of the United States with that of the people of Russia?

The Communists often say that "while socialism might not work in the United States where the people are for the most part well off to begin with, it was a good thing for China and other less advanced nations." It must not have occurred to them that this country was not pretty well off to begin with, but got that way precisely because it followed the principles of free enterprise.

The leaders of the communistic and some socialistic countries take from each of their people according to their ability, and give to each according to their need or their work. In America we are free to work and to earn more or less than our fellow worker. We often fail to understand that democracy with individual freedom is impossible except on the basis of the free-enterprise system. We must preserve our economic system, for as long as we practice the American free-enterprise system, we will continue to have the best housed, most healthfully fed, most soundly educated nation in the world.

Daniel E. Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the giving of oneself in the service and interests of others is the principal characteristic of a first-class citizen.

I submit this release from the fifth Legion district news service to substantiate that Mr. Daniel E. Lambert is eminently qualified to assume this title:

It was announced today that Daniel E. Lambert, South Brewer, Maine, Penobscot County commander, Department of Maine, the American Legion, has set a new record by presenting over 100 talks to non-Legion groups on the programs of the American Legion and Auxiliary since his election last June.

Commander Lambert, a four-time wounded member of the famed Darby's Rangers of World War II, has covered all phases of the Legion activity in a move to acquaint non-Legionnaires with the outstanding features of the organization. As a result from these active and informative sessions, many groups are desirous of obtaining his services, presentations of his subjects are booked ahead for 1 year by PTA, civic, church, and fraternal groups, as well as TV appearances, to further the Legion's program. This public-relations program has the full support of the fifth Maine Legion district.

The record number of addresses by this disabled Ranger shows that he has not lost his fighting spirit. Considered one of the best speakers in the Pine Tree State, Lambert's presentations are now crossing State lines in New England area. His most recent invitation will be in Canada this coming June.

Lambert has devoted much time to the VA program of community acceptance of disabled veterans and has called for the need of every citizen to be interested in the Veterans' Administration. It was also announced that Commander Lambert will undertake a special series of talks on rehabilitation, child welfare, and service work during the next 2 months.

Off the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chester Reporter of April 9, 1958:

OFF THE RECORD

People as individuals rarely learn from the experience of others. In the case of nations, history recalls only a few instances when one nation has profited from the experience of another. Here in the United States we are playing footsy with the idea of the welfare state while ignoring evidences of its failure in other lands. We dislike the Communist system, of course, because it depends on a police state for its survival.

But what of the welfare state in a free country? According to a recent Gallup poll, 56 percent of Great Britain's young people between 21 and 34 years of age would like to leave their native islands and settle somewhere else. The elsewhere includes Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States in that order of preference.

Other surveys in recent years have shown similar desires. Student organizations have probed deeply into why so many of England's young people should wish to leave their homeland forever. Reasons are many and varied. But one of the principal ones is found in the restrictions of the British welfare program.

Government controls are rigorous and carry with them a crushing burden of taxation. Opportunity for most young people is limited in the extreme. The heavy hand of an intrenched, rule-bound bureaucracy is felt everywhere. Main basic industries are nationalized and most large privately owned enterprises are circumscribed and dominated by Government.

Security without opportunity can be as oppressive as a police state. That is why England's people want to get away to a land of more freedom, more chance to make the most of their energies and abilities in an atmosphere that encourages private enterprise.

There are lessons to be learned from England's experiments with the welfare state but the trend in the United States has been more to duplicate the mistakes than to learn from them.

We have become too sophisticated, too wrapped up in new ideologies, to interpret correctly the significance of the simple success story. The State told recently of the career of one of its former newsboys. He is John E. Swearingen, native Columbian, who is now, at the age of 39 years, president of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana.

This was no poor boy, rags-to-riches story, but the account of a hard-working youngster who took advantage of the ordinary opportunities to be found on every hand in the United States.

England gave us the story of Dick Whittington but we doubt that he could become Lord Mayor of London in the welfare state. Our present danger in the United States is not a depression but the loss of a fraction more of freedom and independence as the Government moves in with more controls and guaranties of security.

It used to be that when we wanted to cite something as completely ridiculous we would compare it with a man attempting to lift himself by his own bootstraps. We no longer have boots as everyday wear and few people know the purpose of a bootstrap. A man trying to lift himself by his shoestrings would be more apt if Secretary Dulles had not recently supplied a better illustration.

In his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Dulles argued that the $3.9 billion foreign-aid program was needed down to its last dollar to cut unemployment in the United States. It was his contention that three-fourths of what we give away to foreign countries was spent in the United States and that the remainder—after aiding the economy of our allies—eventually comes back to the United States to buy additional products.

In other words, the more we give away, the better off we become economically. This is the giveaway philosophy that has affected the State Department for a number of years. It defies all known economic law and would have already bankrupted this country except for the tremendous resources of our economic system. But the day of reckoning is approaching.

Report on Hill-Burton Funds in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since it has been my pleasure to be a Member of Congress, I have had an opportunity on several occasions to help a number of hospitals qualify for and receive Hill-Burton funds to build and improve hospitals in the various parts of my district. This experience suggested that it might be of interest to do a study of this program as it relates to the State of Iowa. I am happy to take this opportunity to report to the Members of this body the results of my study of 10 years of grants-in-aid or better known as Hill-Burton program for hospital construction in Iowa. First, it may be well to recall the apparent intent of the Congress in the passage of Public Law 725 and its subsequent amendments.

First. To study the comparative need of all communities for hospital facilities in terms of national standards consistent with the best thinking available.

Second. To provide funds to assist communities with greatest unmet need for hospital facilities who demonstrated sufficient incentive by providing two-thirds of the funds required for the subject.

Third. To utilize commercial practices of design and construction which would result in the maximum hospital facilties for the fewest Federal dollars with the shortest period of time.

Fourth. Administration of the program would be by State agencies with only technical assistance from the Federal agency.

Fifth. Planning.

When the program was inaugurated in Iowa, the public reacted rather skeptically. Most sponsoring groups inquired with reservations because of their experiences with previous Federal WPA and other public works programs where control and regulations were entirely in Federal hands and where excessive regulation and control had been continuously demonstrated. The architectural profession of this State was equally reluctant to participate in the program because of these same unreasonable regulations and control.

During the first 5 years, most of the public reluctance was overcome. The Federal agency offered assistance in expediting projects to completion with a minimum interference through regulations. Their interpretations of the intent of Congress seemed acceptable. While Public Law 725 authorized an annual appropriation of $150 million, it should be pointed out that in all but 1 year the appropriation was below the authorization and ranged down to as low as $60 million.

Accordingly, the Iowa agency has never been able to assign Federal funds to every eligible applicant responding to the annual invitation in spite of the dire need of many communities. As a result, many communities whose needs could not be denied utilized their maximum local resources, reduced the scope of their planning, and proceeded without Federal assistance.

During the past few years, certain groups within the State have expressed themselves in regard to the effect of the program. A criticism occasionally heard is that the program is stimulating construction beyond the needs of communities. This seems to be an inaccurate statement and not based on facts. The basic program permits participation only in areas with existing unmet need for hospital beds, needs based on accepted national standards. Demand for participation has always been beyond the funds available to the State, thereby precluding allotment of moneys to the projects with least unmet need. Such comment seems to stem from the larger hospitals that are apparently jealous of the service rendered the smaller communities by the smaller hospitals built with help of the program. There is no question that the program has benefited, either directly or indirectly, the citizens of every community in Iowa. Thousands of people now have access to adequate hospital facilities and treatment who would otherwise be denied this opportunity.

INDIRECT RESULTS

Mr. Speaker, it is also very gratifying to note the indirect results of this construction program. It was stated earlier that many hospitals could not participate in the grants program and proceeded to build a smaller facility than was needed but without grants-in-aid. It is conservatively estimated that during the past 10 years, there has been $120 million worth of needed hospital construction in the State, exclusive of construction in State owned hospitals. Of this total, approximately $64 million worth of hospital construction was with grants-in-aid which totaled less than $19 million. Directly or indirectly, 1 Federal dollar stimulated $6.32 worth of hospital construction.

At this point, it might be well to pursue further the possibility of overbuilding. The hospital experience of the past 10 years in Iowa has been reviewed from several angles by highly qualified people. None give indication of excessive building. All facilities are being used to the maximum. It is safe to say that the rate of construction in the past has done little more than eliminate some of the obsolete facilities which existed at the beginning of the program.

The initial study criteria for hospital beds classed them as acceptable and nonacceptable. No initial provision was made for determining the degree of obsolescence or the future life expectancy for the acceptable beds. On the basis of this simple criteria, it was determined that in 1948, 35.56 percent of the total statewide bed need was met. After constructing $120 million worth of hospitals, with $19 million aid, Iowa can provide only 51.98 percent of the total bed need. If the acceptable beds were studied further, however, we would find that a portion of these have only limited future expectancy in terms of obsolescence based upon present day standards.

FUTURE NEEDS

The Iowa State Department of Health has made preliminary studies toward projecting a 20-year program designed to fulfill all unmet needs, replace obsolete hospital structures which cannot reasonably be licensed, and meet needs for population increase. Several basic assumptions were necessary, such as—

First. That population trends would be reasonably constant.

Second. That the average life expectancy of buildings is 50 years from the date of construction.

Third. That bed need per unit of population is not inconsistent from the conservative criteria utilized in the current grants program.

Projecting the above assumptions and correlating the past construction of beds to fulfill unmet need, a conservative estimate indicates that a construction rate of at least 1,236 new beds per year is necessary until 1978. During the past 10 years when hospital construction has been most active, we have built at an average rate of 582 new beds per year. In other words, Iowa would have to triple its present rate of construction to approach fulfillment of such a goal. Interpolated to dollars, and assuming that construction costs were comparable with the past 10-year average, Iowa needs to construct hospitals at a rate of from $35 million to $40 million per year until 1978.

OTHER NEEDS

The earlier comments were in terms of hospitals as defined in Public Law 725. The amending Public Law 482 which incorporated related health facilities into the program introduces an additional need for nursing-home bed. In this category Iowa, as many other States, presently finds itself in a deplorable condition. The problem of adequate and pleasant homes for our fathers, mothers, and other people in their age group is becoming more acute every year. This may be the next great social problem that we will have to face as a Nation. Many communities and States have already recognized this problem and have pointed the way toward meeting the challenge with and without Government encouragement and help.

Examples of the fine contributions that have already been made are found in Friendship Haven, Inc., a home for the retired people of Ft. Dodge, Iowa, sponsored by the North Iowa Conference of the Methodist Church. And another community that has seen fit to meet the challenge is Washington, Iowa, where the Presbyterian Church has maintained a home and where now other citizens of the city see the need for meeting the challenge and have already improved and bettered the facilities for more people in their community. Robert Blue, former Governor of Iowa and now a member of the governing board of Friendship Haven and who through the years has given much thought and study and furnished fine leadership in this whole area of the problem of retired people, has this to say in reference to the problem in Iowa. "There is a very large need for modern nursing homes. There are practically as many people in nursing homes in the State of Iowa as there are in all of the board of control institutions, which include the penitentiary, reformatory, boys and girls reformatories, mental hospitals, and hospitals for the feebleminded and epileptic."

He further observes, "most of the present nursing homes in this State are secondhand buildings that were originally constructed for a home, a hotel, a hospital, or a factory."

In the discussion of this subject, he points out further that "one of the facts that is too little understood is that an aged person or a chronically ill person can be adequately cared for in a modern nursing home at approximately half the cost of care in an ordinary hospital."

Here, then, is testimony of dire need by a competent and able public official who has dedicated his life to a study and consideration of this problem and then set about trying to do something about it.

He further states that it is his considered opinion that "a substantial amount of the overcrowding at State

mental institutions and in the ordinary hospitals could be relieved if we had a nationwide program for building modern nursing homes. This care, whether it be for the chronically ill, the senile, or the person with ordinary medical ailments, can be furnished in modern nursing homes at a saving of approximately 50 percent, either to the individual who pays his own way or to the public body that must care for such a case."

Finally he makes a statement saying that Congress should recognize the situation that has been created and seek to rectify it and endorse a nationwide program for building modern nursing homes with the Federal Government furnishing part of the money and the balance furnished by State, county, or the municipality, and says that if Congress wants a building program of real worth, constructive in its nature, and looking toward the future to help ease the present unemployment situation, a nationwide program for nursing homes would be one of the most commendable programs that it could adopt.

Organizations that were most prominent in the success of this program in Iowa are the Iowa Hospital Association, State Medical Society, Iowa Osteopathic Physician and Surgeons Society, and the Iowa Nursing Home Association.

There are many people who have been very helpful in many ways and they include Harold K. Wright, Sioux City; Sister Mary Edmunda, R. N., Fort Dodge; Miss Esther Squire, R. N., Washington; David H. Grau, D. O., Muscatine; Con R. Harken, M. D., Osceola; E. E. Munger, Jr., M. D. Spencer; Miss Anna A. Carlson, R. N., Ida Grove; Mrs. A. D. Wiese, Manning; Mrs. Ralph D. Jacobson, Boone; Thomas W. Purcell, Hampton; and Roy Hawkins, Leon.

The people who have been appointed by the governor and given the responsibility for the administration of this program in the State of Iowa are: Dr. Edmund G. Zimmerer, Polk County, commissioner of public health for the State of Iowa; Mr. James Anderson, Fort Dodge, member of State Hospital Licensing Board; Dr. G. H. Ashline, medical doctor, Keokuk; Mr. Louis B. Blair, Cedar Rapids; B. D. Fickness, registered nurse, Nevada; Dr. Charles H. Flynn, medical doctor, Clarinda; Dr. Gerhard Hartman, doctor of philosophy, Iowa City; Mr. G. Edward Harvey, Missouri Valley; Mrs. James Henderson, Waterloo; Merrill E. Hunt, Des Moines, Iowa; Dr. C. N. Hyatt, medical doctor, Corydon; Mrs. Phyllis Kocur, Des Moines; Dr. R. N. Larimer, medical doctor, Sioux City; Mrs. Alice Nuzum, Des Moines; Marjorie Perrine, registered nurse, Council Bluffs; Dr. Floyd Pillars, dental surgeon, Des Moines; Mrs. Jay S. Tone, Jr., Des Moines; and Dr. H. B. Willard, D. O., Manchester.

The people hired by this council and who are eminently qualified and have had the responsibility for successfully carrying out the policies outlined by the council are: Felix W. Pickorth, Des Moines, director of Division of Hospital Services for the State of Iowa; and H. W. Stricker, Des Moines, Chief Engineer of Division of Hospital Services for the State of Iowa.

Maine Potato Industry Plans Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, marketing plans, more and more, are coming to the fore as excellent vehicles for successfully disseminating agricultural commodities through commercial channels, particularly those of a perishable nature.

Such programs—through quality control and wise marketing practices—serve to help not only the particular area where they are instituted, but all other producing areas as well.

The potato industry in Maine has been recognized as a leader in this field of planned marketing, and as it has done in the recent past, so is it planning to do in the immediate future. The following article from the editorial page of the April 19 issue of the Packer, a vegetable trade paper, graphically portrays the Maine potato industry's forward look:

MAINE POTATO INDUSTRY PLANS AHEAD

For the 1956 and 1957 crop years the Maine Potato Council prepared and executed a marketing plan, and subsequent actions of growers and shippers in carrying out the objectives of these plans undoubtedly contributed to a considerable degree to the success with which the crops were marketed, particularly the 1957–58 crop.

While the marketing plans have been of inestimable help in marketing the crops, the programs did have one shortcoming, the council points out; namely, they were adopted and executed after the crops had been produced. To remedy this situation, a move has been made in Maine to tailor the crop to be produced to fit the pattern of what it is believed can be marketed profitably. To this end, the productive practices committee of the Maine Potato Council has drawn up a marketing plan for the 1958 Maine potato crop before the prospective crop has been planted.

The packer gave wide publicity to the Maine marketing plan which was set up last year before the crop started to market. It is our belief that the planning which spelled out Maine's program for marketing the 1957–58 crop aided other late producing States greatly in making their own marketing plans, and because we believe a program which spells out a marketing plan, which includes plantings, will help other producing areas even more, we are pleased to present below the highlights of Maine's plan for 1958 at this time. Objectives: Accent on quality, and tailoring the crop to fit its probable market. Here are the plan's highlights:

1. The plan was developed through the Maine Potato Council, the potato growers' own organization.

2. Its objective is to tailor supplies available for market from the 1958 crop to what can be sold. The goal for a successful marketing season is 52,000 cars.

3. Based on the acreage that growers now intend to plant, the 1958 crop can easily total 400 million bushels.

4. In the past 6 years potato growers have planted more potatoes than their March 1 intentions in every year except 1957. Potato plantings usually increase following years of good prices and decline following years of low prices.

5. Potato growers have a greater opportunity to adjust production to meet market needs before the crop is planted than after it is harvested.

6. In making the decision, the individual grower needs to evaluate the overall supply and demand situation and what he logically can produce and sell from his farm.

7. Maine can successfully sell more potatoes from the 1958 crop than they did in any year except 1957 and possibly 1929.

8. Maine growers have reported intentions to produce more potatoes in 1958 than in 1957.

9. Quality is a must if markets are to be maintained and expanded. Following recommended production practices will assist in giving desirable quality.

10. The crop should be tailored to meet specific market needs and prospects. Caution needs to be expressed in increasing production of Russet Burbanks and potatoes for chips. In some varieties, seed production can be increased. There will be an expanded outlet for potatoes for food processing in Maine from the 1958 crop.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am placing in the RECORD the prize essay of Timothy J. Ucker, 100 East North Broadway, Columbus, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, entitled "What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?"

Each year the American Legion of Ohio conducts an essay contest based on a patriotic subject. The study and effort devoted to this contest by thousands of high-school students is a great stimulus to understanding of the duties of citizenship. The subject this year is especially challenging. This winning essay contains thoughts that could well be weighed and taken to heart by every good citizen.

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

Many times I have been asked the question, What do you intend to be when you grow up? I always answered it by telling of my intention of someday becoming an engineer. I never considered what part I would take in the affairs of my country. Now that I think of it, I can see that I shall have certain obligations toward my fatherland and shall receive certain privileges from it.

In the future I will become an active participant in a great organization, the Government of this, the United States of America. I shall be, as every member of this organization is, entitled to all of its rights and freedoms. I shall be free to worship, to speak, and to write as I please. I shall be free to vote as I choose for the people that I wish to head this organization. All of these liberties are enumerated in the Constitution. All will be mine as a citizen.

As a citizen of the future it will be my duty to defend and protect my country, if called upon to do so, to respect its laws and civil authority, and to serve it in whatever other ways are presented to me. As a citizen of the future I hope to assist my Nation politically, economically, and socially in all ways possible for me. And I shall be willing to lend a hand and assistance to it for all

it has given and shall continue to give to its inhabitants. That is, in general, the right to live as free men, under God, and to enjoy security, sociability, and peace of mind.

As a citizen-parent of the future I shall have the obligation to rear my sons and daughters as law-abiding and civic-minded patriots. I intend to encourage the growth of the spirit of national loyalty in their hearts, and to impress upon them the importance of a practical knowledge of the workings and policies of the Government under whose dominion they shall live; so that they may, in their era, willingly share their burdens of the Government and be aware of the freedoms and liberties duly granted to them.

My part in my country's operations and affairs will probably be a minor one in comparison with others who may be called upon to lead and guide it through stress and trouble, but by contributing what I am able, I can help to keep the unity of my homeland intact and maintain the stability of the Nation.

Remember Dr. Cook?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following editorial from the Orchard Park Press of April 17, 1958, entitled "Remember Dr. Cook?"

Dr. Frederick A. Cook devoted many years of his life to the exploration of the Arctic and Antarctic regions.

Today, April 21, marks the 50th anniversary of the discovery of the North Pole by Dr. Cook.

The Grosvenor Reference Library of Buffalo, N. Y., has an exhibit this month which shows some of the original effects from Dr. Cook's polar expedition as well as documents by leading explorers and geographers who have supported Dr. Cook's claim.

The editorial follows:

REMEMBER DR. COOK?

In a nuclear age when most of the earth's population are concerned primarily with survival of their planet, few care to pause and reflect upon a question so academic as to who was the first human to stand on the top of the world. Yet, when it is a case of injustice, and the righting of a great wrong, there will always be those ready to champion a cause, no matter how small a niche of history it may be.

Such is the case of Dr. Frederick A. Cook. Our grandfathers will remember him as an unassuming and little-known American polar explorer, who overnight rose to the honor and fame of a modern Columbus. For 50 years ago this Monday, on April 21, 1908, Dr. Cook became the first man to reach the North Pole, culminating over three centuries of vain attempts by the world's leading explorers.

Yet just as quickly he was swept into the confusion of bitter controversy, distrust, and ultimate condemnation. Denounced as a fraud, he sadly departed from the mainstream of American history and was scorned and neglected. He died with the world disbelieving his feat.

The paradox in the tragedy of Frederick A. Cook was that his attainment was supported and recognized by most of his contemporary explorers, and European geographers and mapmakers acknowledged him as the discoverer of the pole years after his countrymen closed the doors of their scientific societies to an impartial study of his claims. The giants of polar exploration, like Amundson, always stood with him against his bitter detractors.

Dr. Cook died in 1940, and is buried in Buffalo, where he lived out the remaining years of his life, poor in health and funds, but rich in friends all over the world who kept faith in him. Now, half a century since his great feat, recognition is coming.

Early this year the Italian Polan Institute acknowledged him as the discoverer of the North Pole, and urged other scientific bodies to grant similar just, if belated, recognition. The Buffalo explorer's pioneer accounts of the vast polar basin in the Arctic Ocean are now being recalled by the scientific teams at work in the International Geophysical Year.

One of the most wronged men of all time, these moves come too late for Dr. Cook, who in his lifetime received only defamement. Like Columbus, he was rejected, stripped of his honors and neglected, and died not to know the vindication that would one day come.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there has been such outspoken opposition to the principle of Federal aid to education, judging from the letters I have received, that it seems important to present some of these expressions of opposition to the full House.

For this reason, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter received from the vice president of the Valparaiso Technical Institute of Valparaiso, Ind.:

APRIL 14, 1958.

Representative JOHN V. BEAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BEAMER: This is to inform you of my views on Federal participation in education, or control of education. I definitely want none of either.

Any direct Federal grants, Federal schools or even scholarships would be the first step toward complete Federal control of schools. This would be a tremendous step toward socialism, which I do not want. It is a matter of record that the Federal Government each year increases its participation and spending and then control in all areas in which it is active, with almost no exception. Federal control of education would also be a step toward a police state and a step away from freedom of thought and speech.

Education is a grassroots problem and its various phases must be worked out between the educators and parents, with a keen eye toward how the graduates of our schools fit into the community in which they live and how their can contribute through their jobs and other activities, to the well-being of the community and the benefit of the Nation. I firmly believe that a group of bureaucrats in Washington, surrounded with redtape and politics, could do nothing constructive to the education system as a whole. They could only slow down any progress and restrict the initiative of the individual teacher and schools.

My belief, that the largest problem in our schools today is the attitudes of the parents, of the students and of the teachers, has been strengthened by many recent magazine reports and television programs. In recent decades there has been a gradual change of what we might call the early American idea of devotion to duty. This change in attitude is finally being felt in our educational system, and Federal control would not tend to stop it. Federal control would only increase this change of attitude by stereotyping our schools and decreasing the amount of competition toward a scholastic excellence that exists in some measure today.

Sincerely,

EUGENE E. BULLIS,
Vice President.

Truman and His Memory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson, entitled "Truman and His Memory," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 19.

As I publicly stated at the time the House Banking and Currency Committee initiated hearings on the recession, their real purpose is political dramatics. They are designed to try to make the American people believe that the administration has taken no action to stimulate our economy, while the contrary is true.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 19, 1958]

TRUMAN AND HIS MEMORY—EX-PRESIDENT HELD MISTAKEN IN DENIAL OF STATEMENTS ON 1950 JOBLESSNESS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The pronoun "I" has always occupied a disproportionate place in Harry S. Truman's vocabulary, and as he has grown older his egotism has grown embarrassingly.

It was painfully noticeable in his appearance at the last Democratic National Convention when he played upon his former position as President to bully the delegates, jabbing a finger at them as he talked, assuming the stance of a strut even while standing still, and leading the laughter at his own lame wisecracks.

He cannot resist the limelight and when performing in it ad libs to grab popular headlines.

He claims a profound knowledge of history, but it is childishly superficial. He draws preposterous analogies and on one occasion (a speech on the theme that dictators are all alike) introduced a purely legendary figure among historic personalities.

He continually accused the Russians of the big lie, representing America (identified with himself) as the white knight of purest truth. But as Prospero said of his brother Antonio in the Tempest, he has often "by telling of it, made such a sinner of his memory, to credit his own life."

In some folios, if I recall correctly, sinner is written traitor, and at any rate, Mr. Truman, who is highly sensitive to the word, has been a traitor to his memory. Government and especially Foreign Service officials have

pointed out several instances in his memoirs where he recalls incidents or statements that appear in no contemporary records. Although anyone quoting Mr. Truman to his discomfiture is accused of garbling, he is, himself, a garbler.

He rarely gets caught up in a real whopper, provable by unquestionable documentary evidence, available to everybody. But he was on Monday, in testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee on how to end the recession. He remarked that "I" would not "sit in * * * a pool of economic stagnation * * * because of some fear, whether * * * real or fanciful, of inflation somewhere down the road in the future." (Bess must do the family shopping, or he'd know the future is here.)

Republican committee members reminded him that he did in 1950, sit in such a stagnation; that unemployment at that time was 8.1 percent of the labor force as compared with 7.7 percent of a much larger labor force today; and that he had then told Arthur Krock in an exclusive interview to the New York Times, "A certain amount of unemployment, say from 3 to 5 millions, is supportable. It's a good thing that job seeking should go on all the time." To which the ex-President replied, "That exclusive interview did not happen. It came out of the air."

That was the whopper. Every editor in the United States knows it happened. Washington correspondents, jealous of a scoop, breaking the tradition of no exclusives by Presidents, challenged him at his next press conference, where he defended his right to see and talk with anyone he chose. Had there been anything phony about the interview rival newsmen would have pounced upon it. If it or any part of it had been denied, Mr. Krock, a most careful and conscientious reporter, as well as the august New York Times, would have been in a caldron of boiling water. Of course, Mr. Krock submitted his article to the President before releasing it. Even were this not protocol, he and the Times would have done so for self-protection.

Mr. Krock needs no defense. Although it is infuriating to be called a liar, Mr. Krock could and did receive the allegation with equanimity, putting upon it the generous interpretation of a slip in memory.

This is not this columnist's interpretation. Mr. Truman, caught up in his egotistic loquacity, was nettled, annoyed, and blurted off the cuff. He refused to be reminded.

After such an example of sinning memory, it will be hard to believe anything he says.

Such is the result of self-inflation.

Postal Service—Past, Present, and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my distinguished colleague from Utah, Representative HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, at the dedication of the Smithfield, Utah, Post Office on April 11, 1958. It is an interesting and concise history of postal service and the size to which our present postal system has grown.

The address follows:

It is a genuine pleasure to be here in Smithfield today and take part in the dedication of your new post office. It is always stimulating to have the opportunity of being present when any significant development takes place in any one of our Utah communities. It is a source of double satisfaction to be here in Cache County and address you fine people on this particular occasion.

I am sure that you will agree that today your Post Office Department serves more of our people more intimately and more frequently than does any other branch of our Federal Government. Scarcely a working day goes by but what each and every citizen receives some service from it. The Post Office Department is indeed a sound servant and a fundamental part of our living democracy. Democracy and a free and uncensored postal service have grown and developed together—each dependent upon the other.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A postal system such as we know and take so much for granted is a relatively recent development in the history of man. It is true that the roots of such a service go back into antiquity, but until modern times effective postal services were only for the nobility or the very wealthy.

However, men have communicated over distances with each other for thousands of years. Signals or symbolic objects were used in the distant past to convey certain thoughts. A quiver of arrows as a declaration of war, a pipe as an offer of peace, a pillar of smoke to announce the appearance of a stranger are good examples of that type of communication.

Our modern Post Office Department is simply an organized distillation of men's need to communicate.

You may be surprised to know, however, that the famous lines of tribute to our postmen—"Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds"—was first written by the great Greek historian, Herodotus, in the 5th century before Christ.

There are biblical references to a postal system in the book of Esther, and in Job there is a passage which states, "My days are swifter than post; they flee away."

The Romans built post roads so that the carriers could ride over a hundred miles daily, and the Aztec Indians of ancient Peru had a parcel-post system to distribute fresh fish among the villages. But these early beginnings were for the purpose of serving the state, and the heads of the state, and only through them serving the people.

THE PUBLIC SYSTEM

The first public postal system was established in 1516 and operated between Vienna and Berlin. A broader and more general public system, one that was really the beginning of our type of postal service, was created by Charles II of England when he commanded the establishment of the famous London Penny Post, in the later part of the 17th century.

Here in America in 1672 New York's Governor Lovelace created mail service between New York and Boston over the route known today as the Boston Post Route No. 1; and in 1683 William Penn established the Philadelphia post office. Shortly before the French and Indian wars Benjamin Franklin became postmaster general for the North British Colonies in America. He later became the Postmaster General for all the colonies under the direction of the Continental Congress.

From those small but significant beginnings has developed the massive and efficient postal service we know today.

SIZE OF THE AMERICAN POSTAL SERVICE

It is difficult to conceive of the size of the American postal system of our time. It is just as difficult to fathom its value to our social and economic life. Let me quote some figures for you to help you visualize the postal service in America in 1958.

1. There are over 37,000 post offices throughout the country.

2. The postal service sells more than 34 billion stamps per year in spite of the fact that more than half of that mail is handled under permit by use of printed indicia.

3. There are more than 32,000 rural carriers traveling more than 1½ million miles each working day—a distance equal to approximately 4 round trips from the earth to the moon.

4. Over 400,000 money orders are issued each day, and if they were piled one on top of the other (flat side to flat side) they would make a stack 1½ times as high as the Washington Monument.

5. The Post Office Department employs more than one-half million people—more than any other Government agency except the Department of Defense.

6. It operates more than 85,000 vehicles—the largest motor-vehicle fleet in the world.

7. This year it will handle approximately 61 billion pieces of mail. A volume equal to roughly one piece for every man, woman, and child in the United States every single day. Incidentally, that is nearly two-thirds of all the mail that will be handled this year in the entire world. The Chicago Post Office alone handles more mail than the entire nation of Canada.

I am sure that you will agree that our postal service is a big business—and it is a growing business. I am told by postal officials that the volume of mail has been increasing at about twice the rate of population growth. That means that by 1965 the postal service will probably be serving 200 million Americans and handling more than 100 billion pieces of mail annually.

THE NEW PROGRAM

President Eisenhower and Postmaster General Summerfield have embarked on a far-reaching program to modernize the postal service—an essential step because of the tremendous volume of mail and its astounding rate of growth. Because of World War II, the scarcity of building materials immediately thereafter, and because of the heavy drain on the Treasury of the United States in meeting the postwar defense needs of our Nation, the Congress has not appropriated any monies for the building of new post offices since 1938. Since then the mail volume has more than doubled. It is little wonder then that many of our post offices are literally bursting at the seams.

Under the President's and Postmaster General's program, the building of new post offices (like this one) built by private capital and leased to the Post Office Department on a monthly rental or a 10- or 15-year basis has been increasing rapidly. Postal officials inform me that now, nation-wide, contracts are being let at a rate of two each day. I understand that this is the ninth new postal facility formally dedicated in Utah in the past thirteen months.

Under a program recently suggested by the President (if adopted) 12,000 new postal facilities will be built in this country during the next three years. Private capital is scheduled to supply more than 1½ billion dollars to construct them, and they will in turn be leased to the Post Office Department. Under the plan, increased postal rates should supply another ½ billion dollars to modernize and mechanize existing post office buildings throughout the country. The plan (if adopted) will, in my opinion, bolster the economy of the country and at the same time provide the kind of postal quarters our dedicated postal employees need to render our people the kind of service to which they are entitled.

POSTAGE RATES

As most of you know, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have each passed a bill to provide for an increase in postal rates. Increased postal rates are badly needed to make the post office Department somewhere near self-sup-

porting. The legislation to provide this needed increase is now in conference between representatives of the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees. The main difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is that the Senate measure calls for a 5 cent first-class letter rate on nonlocal mail and a 4 cent rate on local letters. The House bill calls for a 4 cent rate on all first-class mail. If the Senate version of the 5 cent nonlocal letter rate prevails, the extra cent is earmarked for the next three years to modernize our postal plants. The extra cent on out-of-town mail will provide about $175 million each year. At the end of that time the 5 cent rate is to revert to 4 cents.

While I am sure that no one wants to pay more for anything than is necessary, it is, I think, amazing that postal rates on first-class mail—the 3-cent rate—is the same as it was in 1932. Like most everything else, the cost of handling the mail has more than doubled since 1932. It seems only reasonable that rate increases for postage be enacted into law.

Both the House and Senate versions of the postal rate increase bill call for reasonable advances in the cost of mailing second- and third-class matter as well as the letter rate increases.

I think that we as American citizens need to face the unequivocal fact that the cost of handling the mail must be paid in one way or another. There are apparently three alternatives: (1) increase the rates; (2) charge the deficit to the taxpayer; or (3) borrow the money from future generations.

According to figures supplied to me by the Post Office Department, the 5- and 4-cents letter rate would cost the average American family about 20 cents per month or $2.40 a year additional for postage expense. At the same time it costs that family about $7 per year to pay its share of the postal deficit through taxation. This is because most of the mail is business mail. I do not see why the average family should subsidize big business through the maintenance of unreasonably low postage rates. You might be interested to know that in Western Europe the average letter postage rate is about 50 percent higher than ours, and their postal employees are paid only about one-third as much as we pay ours.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I want to congratulate Postmaster Hillyard and the people here in Smithfield on their new post office. I think that it is a genuine asset to your community. I only wish that more of our cities and towns had facilities as nice and as adequate.

I believe that the American people want good postal service. I believe it is essential to the welfare of our people and our Nation that they have it, and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall endeavor to see that they get it.

Again my congratulations to you on this splendid occasion—the dedication of the new Smithfield Post Office.

An Intimate Report on the U. S. S. R. as Told by Two World Travelers to Emilie Keyes, Feature Editor of the Palm Beach Daily News

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. James Hollingsworth, of Palm Beach, Fla., having some weeks ago returned from a trip through the U. S. S. R., gave an exclusive interview to Emilie Keyes. I quote one paragraph from her interesting article, which appeared in the February 2, 1958, issue of All Florida magazine:

The Hollingsworths base their conclusions on firsthand acquaintance with Russian factories where tractors roll off the assembly line at the rate of 1 every 9 minutes, and of the Russian educational system that is turning out 3 engineers to this country's 1.

Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest this article has created and in order that my colleagues may have the benefit of the keen observations of Mr. and Mrs. Hollingsworth, under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks.

The article follows:

EDUCATION: THE SOVIET'S STRONGEST WEAPON

(By Emilie Keyes)

Sputniks I and II, positive proof of the Soviet Union's great strides in scientific research and productive ingenuity, literally have shaken the confidence of Americans and other peoples of the free world.

Formerly prone to consider his counterpart—the average Russian citizen—as a push-over opponent in a contest of any kind, mental or physical, the average American is now beginning to look askance at this new and formidable Communist. Instead of being treated lightly, as a breather game on some sports schedule, the U. S. S. R. has become a dangerous dark horse threatening the very existence of the free way of life.

With sputniks circling over our land and missile-laden submarines lying offshore in surrounding waters, a timely warning of another Soviet weapon—education—comes from a Florida couple:

Mr. and Mrs. James Hollingsworth of Palm Beach, who spent a month behind the Iron Curtain, told this writer that Russia is rearing a youth that poses that country's most vital threat to the free world. The Hollingsworths were interviewed at their home on Via Palma.

"This is a youth thoroughly indoctrinated in communistic principles and regimented into government jobs where they can contribute most toward world conquest," the couple reported. "Americans needn't delude themselves—communism and atheism are in the Soviet Union to stay."

The Hollingsworths returned to Florida convinced that the Russians worship Lenin and education. They emphasized the fact that while under the rule of the czars less than 10 percent had an education, now there are 5 million Russian youngsters in secondary schools. (The United States has approximately seven million pupils in this age group.)

"The Kremlin wants citizens it can control from cradle to grave," they stated. "When a baby is 2 months old, the mother returns to her job (everyone works) and leaves the baby in a government nursery, later in a kindergarten.

"A famous Russian scientist believed that through conditioned reflexes a child can be molded into any pattern desired, so at the age of 2 months these babies are given exercises; at 18 months they can go through them alone. Many times we saw 2-year-old robots marching in orderly lines to the park. They behave like robots until old enough to think for themselves."

To those of us who are used to parental love, pampering and much slower development of our offspring, this seems to be a needlessly cruel way to introduce a baby to its place in the world. However, it is the communistic way of preparing for mass education of its youth, without consideration of parental heritage of social or monetary position.

Whereas an American tot is given a mechanical toy to play with for amusement only, the Russian child is taught to totally dismantle and reassemble the toy as part of his education. The treatment given a frog might be another example of the difference in the development pace of the two countries' youth. The American boy's frog is a secret, real live plaything that produces some educational interest, but primarily is a source of merriment through pranks of teasing little girls. However, the Russian boy is introduced to the frog through a biology vivisection lesson, and the frog is not considered as a good subject for classroom pranks.

EMPHASIS ON SCIENCE

The great emphasis in Soviet education is in the fields of science and engineering. They have excellent vocational schools, and in 1953 graduated 50,000 technicians. There are 33 universities besides 800 specialized schools.

"Students don't have to be urged to study," the Hollingsworths reported, "for if they don't pass the exams, they get hard labor jobs and, once typed find it virtually impossible to better themselves." They also pointed out that the importance of education in Soviet planning is indicated by the fact that the professor is the best paid worker in the country. In contrast, teachers in the United States receive comparably law wages.

When the Palm Beach couple decided to add the Soviet Union to the list of their interesting global travels, they did not want to become puppets in the hands of Intourist, that government's travel agency. They wanted to see the things that corresponded with their varied interests in this country, so they prepared a list of these interests, such as nursery schools, kindergartens, boys' and girls' clubs, colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, opera, ballet, municipal government, etc.

Backed by letters from heads of organizations with which they have worked, they submitted their preferences to Intourist.

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

"It worked," remarked Mrs. Hollingsworth. "We saw everything on our list and on Intourist's, too. We listed the towns we wished to visit, and when we reached Moscow, Intourist had permission for us to visit them all. We had complete freedom of movement within all these towns.

"We were told at the American Embassy in Moscow not to take pictures of military installations, bridges, harbors or airfields. Jim took 32 rolls of color movies without any molestation. At no time were we ever aware of being followed."

They traveled by train, plane, car, subway, and boat, at all times with guide, interpreter and car with chauffeur. Only once, on the train headed toward Leningrad from Helsinki, Finland, did a customs man open one of their bags. Their itinerary included visits at Leningrad, Moscow, Stalingrad, Rostov, Tbilisi, Sochi, Yalta on the Black Sea, and Kharkov in the Ukraine wheat country.

In relating their impressions of the Russian people and the Communistic way of life the Hollingsworths covered both the ominous advances in military and scientific strength and the pathetic retreats socially and morally.

"After three generations of propaganda, fear, regimentation, indoctrination, and education crowned by success in the fields of industry, science, education, agriculture, and health, communism is their god and their religion. The campaign against religion is incessant, starting with the cradle.

"Moreover, our opponents are on a wartime basis; it's as though they were all in the army. Americans have been lulled into

false security. We have been led to believe the Russian worker is clumsy with his hands, doesn't understand machinery and is mentally inferior to us.

"It has taken Russia only 15 years to become industrial geniuses because they have had the benefit of German scientific brains as well as factories and workers from East Germany and Czechoslovakia. Our trip dispelled any doubts and questions we had of Russian mechanical ability."

The Hollingsworths base their conclusions on first-hand acquaintance with Russian factories where tractors roll off the assembly line at the rate of 1 every 9 minutes, and of the Russian educational system that is turning out 3 engineers to this country's 1.

SATELLITE COUNTRY

On their way back they saw in Czechoslovakia what it means to be a satellite country with no ray of hope that communism won't take over industry and agriculture as completely as it has the government.

Like all of the rest of the people in the U. S. S. R., the American travelers were completely cut off from news and information of the outside world for the months of their stay. The people hear and read only what the controlled press and radio elect to make known.

"When you consider," the Hollingsworths added, "that 200,200,000 citizens have lived under circumstances like these for 40 years it's easy to see why communism is here to stay. For they have read nothing but horrible propaganda against the United States and other democracies. Those who can't read are shown horrid cartoons against us.

"They simply don't believe you when you talk about the things we take for granted, such as automobiles and electric refrigerators for every family.

OTHER IMPRESSIONS

On the other side of the picture, the couple was impressed by the general good health of the people—virtually no polio and reportedly no venereal disease—the constant stream of delegations from nations far and near, the be-kind-to-foreigners atmosphere and lack of resentment against visitors who got preferred treatment.

Also among their memories are: the lack of traffic problems (there was virtually no traffic in the enormous public squares), the crowds at the superb ballet, the opera, the theater, the circus—and the poorly dressed audiences.

"There are no smart, chic women in Russia," Mrs. Hollingsworth observed. The sagging, baggy cotton and rayon print dress is the uniform of all Soviet women. Jim called them sad sacks."

The Floridians found it almost impossible to adjust to the idea that no one owns anything personally. Mr. Hollingsworth was unable to buy a painting of any kind in the Soviet Union. Artists paint only for the state. There is no stock exchange for no one owns a share in anything, no private enterprise, no golf courses, and supposedly no tips—unless no one else chances to be looking on at the time.

Foreign travelers can have all the caviar they want at any meal, without extra cost. They get $5 a day spending money from the Government itself, but there is almost nothing that tourists care to buy as souvenirs. A cotton, hand-embroidered blouse costs $45; a Cossack cap, $200.

In summing up their impressions of the Russians' attitude toward the communistic way of life, Mrs. Hollingsworth said, "It was hard for us to keep in mind that you do not miss things you never had nor read about nor saw in the movies. Russia has had three generations who have never had freedom of travel from one town to another, to select their own jobs or change from one job to another.

"We became convinced that the vast majority of the Soviet people are satisfied with the Communist form of government—but with more comforts and a higher standard of living. Formerly they worked for glory and the honor of the U. S. S. R., but now they like money and by working harder and faster they can earn more. Also, for special meritorious work they may get that piece de resistance—a 4-week vacation, with all expenses paid, at one of the seaside rest homes, such as we saw at Yalta.

WORKERS ARE SATISFIED

"We have a feeling most of the workers are pleased as Punch with communism and feel sorry for the poor, browbeaten American laborer. It is no use to try and tell them different, they don't believe you.

"Their housing is shocking, but I never saw so many apartment buildings under construction. Even the highest paid workers are lucky to have a four-room apartment, and all have other people living with them. It's estimated that an average of 4 people live in a 9- by 12-foot room."

Not alarmists by nature, Mr. and Mrs. Hollingsworth returned from Russia more frightened by what that country is accomplishing than before they went.

"Every American should know," they warn, "that Russian leaders have written books on the conquest of the world. They have mapped out their plans step by step and they have not changed their plans except to accelerate them. The new look that we saw everywhere means nothing."

The Propaganda Struggle Between East and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on Saturday evening, April 19, 1958, before the Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity of St. John's University School of Law at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. The address was as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO BEFORE THE DELTA THETA PHI LAW FRATERNITY, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, APRIL 19, 1958

Mr. Chairman, distinguished clergy, friends, this is the second time that I have had the distinct pleasure to address the members of this honored fraternity. I am indeed very happy to be here with you once again.

I had been told by a mutual friend that a few remarks on brotherhood and fraternity would be most appropriate on this occasion. Frankly, that would have pleased me too. But then it occurred to me that you did not simply invite me to come up here from Washington to speak to you on a subject which can be handled more capably by anyone in this room. With your kind permission, therefore, I have decided on a compromise subject which I consider to be both timely and appropriate.

Not so very long ago, during the course of an address in Congress, I had called to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting and significant fact, and it is this:

Since 1939 approximately 5½ million square miles of territory and about 732 million people in Europe and Asia have been brought under direct domination or control of the Soviet Union and its partner Communist China. Of this total, no less than 700 million people came under Communist control since the end of World War II, only about 12 to 13 years ago. The strange fact about it all is that in many instances this was achieved by the Communists without firing a single shot; it was done not through war, but by means of propaganda, subversion, and chicanery.

This has made all thinking men's hair turn gray, and me to lose mine altogether, trying to figure out why. At this rate, I am afraid there will be no United States of America, as we know it, within the lifetime of most of the people here tonight—unless we are able to beat the Russians at their own game.

What is this game which is being played for the highest stakes of all time? For us, if we win it spells, freedom, independence, economic prosperity, morality, and human dignity. If we lose the game as played by the other side, it means enslavement, poverty, human degradation, godlessness, and brainwashing.

This game which we have been forced to play is called propaganda, where words lose all meaning, where lies are shamefacedly described as the truth, where day is night and black is white, and where deception is used far more effectively than atomic weapons or missiles. The Russians apply their ingenuity in the field of propaganda merely as a subterfuge to deplete our resources and to bankrupt us financially. They do not expect to engage us in a battle with weapons of total destruction, because they are well aware that it would mean suicide for them too.

No, my friends, it is with a constant barrage of words that they hope to take over control of the free world and bring us down to our knees. In this respect they feel safe because they know we will never start a new war and new bloodshed.

The situation is such that, whether we like it or not, we must match them in the field of propaganda. Unfortunately, however, we are very weak in this field. In promoting a product for sale to the public, Americans are capable of the most imaginative advertising gimmicks; yet at heart they are basically modest, shy, and reserved individuals. When it comes to extending aid to the needy abroad or even to bolster the economics or defenses of whole nations, we don't ask too many questions once the need is established—we just act. We send our aid to the far corners of the earth, wherever it is needed. Yet often these humanitarian and charitable deeds are overlooked by the very nations we strive to aid, while they listen to the glib tongues of Khrushchev and his ilk who shout from the rooftops about the piddling aid given by Russia.

A recent Senate report shows that in the 11-year period 1945 to 1956 the United States assistance programs to foreign countries, including military, economic, and technical aid, amounted to $57 billion. Of this, $47.5 billion was in the form of grants and $9.5 billions in loans. During the same period, Russia has extended only $1.5 billion in assistance to countries outside the iron curtain, and it was almost all in the form of loans (only $125 million in grants out of $1.5 billion). Much of what is termed "Communist economic assistance" is actually paid back by the recipient countries in exports to Russia or its satellites.

Let us look at it from another angle. India and Yugoslavia are reputed to be the two most important neutralist countries. Frankly, they are playing both sides of the street. What are the figures on aid to these two countries, as given them by the United States and by Russia? Here they are:

During the years 1945–57, we have given India in grants, $273 million; in loans, $227 million; total, $500 million.

During the same period 1945–57, we have given Yugoslavia in grants, $780 million; in loans, $56 million; total, $836 million.

Now, let us see what Russia has done for these two countries. The Russian foreign-aid program first began about 2 or 3 years ago. Before 1956, Russia had given no aid to India or Yugoslavia. Since 1956 it has granted to India loans amounting to $270 million, primarily for the construction of a steel mill. The steel mill is still not in operation, while India will have to repay the loan. Meanwhile, Russian propaganda is capitalizing on the construction of a mill for India.

To Yugoslavia, Russia has extended loans in recent years for $465 million for the construction of a fertilizer plant and an aluminum plant, neither of which is in full production.

Thus we have given to these two countries twice as much aid as Russia, and the bulk of our aid (three-fourths of it) has been in outright grants, while Russia has given them only loans.

In extending this aid, whether to India, Yugoslavia, or other countries, we have never given ourselves a pat on the back, nor did we convey to them that Americans were paying for this aid through the nose in back-breaking taxes and assessments, nor that we were indeed sacrificing ourselves for their welfare. Thus, in the greatest public-relations test in the world, the test which will ultimately determine our security and the survival of the free world, we act like amateurs.

Notwithstanding the aid we have given and continue to give to the neutral countries, they lean toward Russia and not toward the United States. Invariably, they support Russia in the United Nations. They are quick to take up every Russian propaganda trick against the West; for example, the current Kremlin campaign for a summit conference and Moscow's unilateral ban on nuclear testing after Russia had completed the dirtiest atomic tests in history. Our emissaries are scorned at, while the Russians are greeted with brass bands, confetti, and searchlight parades. Compare, for example, the reception given to Khrushchev and Bulganin in India a year or two ago, with that given to Secretary of State Dulles.

When we ask: Why? these neutralist or undecided peoples say that we deal with them as superiors, we give them a handout from our tremendous resources, while the Russians, who are much poorer than we are, treat them as equals, as brothers in distress, in a fraternal spirit, without any strings attached to their help. Communist propaganda stresses that Russia's only concern is the welfare of all humanity.

These are nothing more than words, words, and more words. We know that after having gained a foothold in these countries, the Russians will swallow them as they have swallowed all those other countries which I have enumerated a few moments ago. But the millions of people in these backward and underdeveloped countries, who are illiterate and unfamiliar with Communist tactics, are exploited through all kinds of gimmicks by this phoney Soviet propaganda. They are not aware that they are the intended victims, while their extreme poverty makes them fall for it.

What are we doing about it? How are we counteracting this flow of words and lies?

In their vicious propaganda of spreading lies about us and placing halos on themselves the Russians last year spent close to a billion dollars, compared to $95 million on the part of the United States. I do not want this fact to be misinterpreted that we should blindly spend as much or more than the Russians for propaganda. We must be more imaginative. We must have ideas. Our expenditures must be directed into more fruitful channels.

Today we do have two imaginative and dedicated experts in the fields of propaganda and intelligence. I refer to Allen Dulles of the Central Intelligence Agency and George Allen of the United States Information Agency. The Congress will be glad to back these men to the limit if they come up with an effective program to outsmart and outtalk the Russians in retaining the friends we now have and in gaining new ones.

Take the case of the Russian sputniks. We now know that Russian periodicals, in our possession for months before their launching, spoke about them and even described them. Yet we failed to translate these articles—presumably because of lack of funds—and in this way we failed to inform the American people of the threatened danger.

The success achieved by the Communists in this adventure made the undecided and fence-sitting peoples of the world forget all about Soviet brutality and its suppression of liberty in Hungary. It again placed Russia far ahead of the United States in the cold war struggle for men's minds.

Now comes their latest propaganda gimmick—the Kremlin's new peace offensive to terminate all nuclear tests for the safety of mankind. The vast majority of the peoples whom we are trying to reach seem to have overlooked the fact that there is a catch in the Russian pronouncement. We have not yet been able to get across to the neutral and uncommitted nations that this was just another phony type of propaganda; that having concluded a series of elaborate tests herself—in which she released the dirtiest fallout destined to shorten human lives—Russia is anxious to call a halt now before the United States has had a chance to perfect its nuclear research and weapons. Nor did these neutral peoples attach any significance to Moscow's qualification of its pronouncement, namely, that if we went through with our already announced Pacific tests, Soviet Russia would resume further testing.

If we and our allies are to combat successfully the effects of Soviet propaganda, we must develop a new program and new initiative—and we must do it quickly. If we fail to do so, millions of people all over the world will believe Moscow's propaganda about stopping nuclear bomb testing and banning nuclear weapons, while branding us as those desiring to destroy humanity. I, therefore, propose the following bold program:

The United States should issue an official declaration to the nations of the world (with the necessary steps being taken that the message reaches in particular the neutral and uncommitted peoples, as well as those behind the Iron Curtain who are opposed to us) to the effect that the United States desires and will do everything within its power to abolish war and bloodshed as a means of settling international disputes; that it is willing to destroy or discard all of its nuclear weapons and missiles; that it will never again undertake further nuclear tests designed for war purposes; and that it is ready to go so far in the interests of world peace and the security of all mankind as to withdraw all its troops from foreign soil and to liquidate its military bases abroad.

At the same time the United States insists that Russia take similar steps, as follows:

1. Russia must destroy its nuclear weapons and missiles, and abandon all future nuclear tests designed for war purposes.

2. Russia is to remove her troops from foreign soil under Communist domination, including East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries in Europe and Asia.

3. Russia is to agree to genuine disarmament, or if this is not feasible at least to an effective arms-control system.

4. Russia is to agree to the esablishment of an international police force, attached to the United Nations, whose purpose it shall be to help maintain the peace of the world.

5. The Soviet Union is to join with the United States in raising the standard of living of all undernourished and underprivileged peoples of the world.

6. The Soviet Union is to join with the United States and other member nations of the U. N. to promote free elections in all countries and to guarantee the sovereignty of all duly constituted governments.

To attain these objectives, I feel certain the President of the United States would be ready at all times to sit down at a summit conference with other heads of governments and to keep on talking with them until the light of peace shall shine on all.

This, my friends, is the kind of language peoples all over the world, including the Russian people, understand and want to believe.

Add to this propaganda the fact that the nations of the world are today spending more than $100 billion annually on armaments, which could be used to combat poverty and disease and to help raise the living standards of all nations—and you have made a most convincing argument which can be readily understood by all peoples.

We must get this argument across to them, if we are to save ourselves and all of mankind from total destruction.

A Fair Deal for the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia is an American. He places the welfare of our country ahead of any personal or political consideration. I commend to the Congress and to the country his eloquent and timely address before the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute:

A FAIR DEAL FOR THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(Address of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL at the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, April 12, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, and fellow guests, it is a happy privilege indeed to be with you this morning. In other years, you have done me the honor to invite me to meet with you. I rarely ever leave Washington when the Congress is in session. This has denied me the pleasure of foregathering with this distinguished group, among whose members are many whose friendship I have enjoyed over many years.

I must confess that I might have visited with you during times when economic and international conditions created a much happier climate. We could all view prospects with much more confidence before the advent of Sputnik and the current decline in our own economy.

This is overbalanced by the fact that I am with you during the presidency of my good friend, Lamartine Hardman. Our fathers were friends before us, and I have enjoyed the most cordial relationship with him and his family for all of my adult life. I am sure that all of you who know him share my high regard for his character, business ability, and warm personal characteristics. He will serve you well as your president during these trying days.

Beyond the personal pleasures involved, it is gratifying to be with this group. A large part of your activities have to do with the processing and merchandising of cotton. In a large sense, this is a commodity in which we have a common interest. The economy of the State that I have sought to serve depends to a great degree on the welfare of producers, processors, and manufacturers of cotton. We also have substantial interests in other textiles. It is by all odds our largest industry, for the value of Georgia's annual textile output is more than a billion dollars.

The cotton business in all of its aspects is one of the oldest in our Nation. It is safe to say that no other single business has contributed more to the building of the American way of life and the great and prosperous civilization of which we are so proud. Time will not permit a discussion of the details of cotton's contributions to American world leadership.

And yet, cotton today is a sick business. A careful study might indicate that many elements of the present recession are attributable to the distress of the cotton industry. It is little wonder that those of us most vitally concerned in cotton and textiles should be disturbed over the precarious condition in which this great industry finds itself. We have not been able to accomplish a great deal, but we have certainly talked about it and tried.

We have agitated to such an extent that one Government official observed in the recent past that before coming to Washington he had thought that cotton was a commodity, but since being there he had come to know it as a religion.

No other industry has been beset with so many difficulties. No other industry knows a higher degree of domestic competition. When one considers the buffets you have endured from national policy, the competition to which you have been subjected, the squeeze of rising costs and declining prices, the fact that you have been able to survive and maintain your enthusiasm is eloquent evidence of your stamina and business acumen.

The great development of all of America's industry and business was brought about by competition. Initiative, self-reliance and ingenuity have been necessary to survive and go forward. Our great textile industry is a product of competition. It expects to meet and solve the normal problems of technical demands, capital investment, new techniques, more modern products that come from research and technological progress. It knows that the best managed plant will get the most business. It expects this type of competition. Where elements and individuals fall by the wayside in this kind of a contest, they are accepted as casualties of our competitive system.

These are the ordinary hazards of business life.

But the textile industry, more than any other major industry in the Nation, has been beset by problems that had their origin in Government and national policy. The industry has not only been called upon to bear its fair share of the taxes to pay for foreign aid, but it has been peculiarly victimized by foreign competition generated by this aid. Unless the present policies are changed or the Congress can be persuaded to take the steps necessary to prevent it, this great industry is threatened with liquidation. It will become the No. 1 casualty of a foreign policy which in some cases seems to be dedicated to the building of unfair competition for American business to develop the economy of foreign nations.

We are now in the midst of a great drive to extend the reciprocal trade program for a period of 5 years. The proposed legislation would give to the executive branch of the Government the power of life and death over American business and industry.

I was a member of the Congress of the United States when the reciprocal trade concept was first enacted into law. I supported that bill. It was originally contemplated that the United States would export to other nations goods that we produced or could produce in surplus quantities. It contemplated that the United States would import from other countries goods or raw products which we either did not produce or which we produced only in negligible quantities. The whole idea was built about the word "reciprocal" and, as originally conceived and planned it was a great piece of legislation.

The act and its several extensions delegated to the President the power to regulate our foreign trade program. The President, of course, could not handle the matter personally and he, in turn, delegated the power to the State Department. For many years, this legislation served a useful purpose. There were few complaints of abuses and it did stimulate world trade on a reciprocal basis.

With the end of World War II, we have seen a change in the purpose of the reciprocal trade program. Instead of being used purely to stimulate trade, the State Department has now seized upon it as a method of extending additional foreign aid.

Since World War II, we have expended directly more than $60 billion in foreign lands for almost every conceivable purpose. We have restored the devastation of war. We have revived sagging economies. We have enabled some nations to reduce their taxes and their public indebtedness at the expense of the American taxpayer. More than that, we have built many industries throughout the world with dollars in part paid as taxes by similar industries in the United States. We have built these industries in low-wage areas and have brought them in direct competition with American industries that are saddled with costs of production in the form of wages and raw materials much higher than those borne by their foreign competitors.

I supported both the original reciprocal trade and the original Marshall plan, to restore the ravages of war and get Europe back on its economic feet.

Several years ago, I concluded that our State Department did not have any foreign policy other than that built on the expenditure of American tax dollars as foreign aid. I was unwilling to continue economic aid after the original objectives of the Marshall plan had been reached. Since that time, I have vigorously opposed the various economic-aid programs.

There has been an increasing resistance in Congress to continue to increase the appropriations of American tax dollars for economic foreign aid. When the State Department became unable to get the appropriations of dollars that they desired, they continued to expand economic aid by administering what should be a reciprocal trade program in such a way as to provide economic aid, not from appropriated funds—but at the expense of certain segments of American business.

I still believe in the original concept of reciprocal trade, but I shall not support a program to liquidate vital American industries, to throw thousands of American citizens out of work in order to create an economy in some foreign land suitable to some dreamer in the Department of State merely because the bill bears the title of "Reciprocal Trade Program."

In the last analysis, the free world is dependent upon the armed strength and the powerful industrial complex of the United States to prevent war and to confine Communist aggression. We cannot maintain the necessary military strength nor the industrial plant essential to its support if we kill the industrial goose which lays the golden egg of taxes by pursuing unrealistic and unnecessarily expensive policies and programs.

I am aware of the importance of a strong Japan to the free world. However, the American textile industry is essential to the maintenance of a strong America. Our friends throughout the world know in their hearts that the free world cannot of itself contain communism any longer than America is able to maintain the military force which deters aggression.

The Congress has the power to save the textile industry and the jobs of all of those who derive their livelihood from it. It can do it by a policy of true reciprocal trade instead of distorting it into a means of extending aid. It can do it by directing that American industries that are in distress shall have priority over offshore procurement, at least in foreign lands that today do not have as high unemployment percentagewise as we do.

We are making the fight. I was one of the sponsors of an amendment to the Mutual Security Act for 1957 which sought to prevent the swamping of certain segments of American business by foreign importation. That amendment lost by a margin of two votes in the Senate.

I propose to continue the fight to try to compel the Government of the United States to deal fairly with its own people in order to protect our own economy as the only means to assure our survival.

Figures are often given as to the number of people whose jobs are claimed to be dependent upon the foreign aid and reciprocal trade programs. It would be interesting to know just how many of the 5½ million Americans who are now unemployed have lost their jobs due to the policies and programs of the Department of State.

If means are not found to change the present operations of the State Department that will sacrifice any and all things at the demands of foreign countries, we can produce an unemployment situation in this country that will pull down the whole structure of our Government.

The Congress has been hastily improvising an extensive program of public works as a means of stemming the rising tide of unemployment. Extreme situations may justify a public works program, but in our economy, tax-supported public works can never be an acceptable substitute for steady employment by private enterprise in a free competitive system.

THE THREAT THAT THE SOVIETS WILL PREEMPT FIELD OF FOREIGN AID

In the attempt to persuade the Congress and the American people to increase our own foreign aid program 13 years after the conclusion of World War II, the proponents of the increases press upon us the threat that unless the United States increases its economic assistance, the Soviets will move in with their own aid program and eventually take over the recipient countries. To me, the least persuasive of all of the arguments for foreign aid is the threat that the Russians will take it over on a worldwide basis. Up until now, outright grants by the Soviets have been insignificant. Their dealings in this field have been in the form of loans, usually well-secured, as in the case of the Egyptian cotton crop—or sales that are made on a cash-on-the-barrel-head basis. It does not speak well for the efficiency of our program to have those who administer it contend that Russia gets more credit for transactions based on sales and loans than the United States can get for outright gifts. If this contention be true, the only thing it proves to me is that the United States needs a new set of diplomats to administer the program.

The fundamental weakness of the whole business is the lack of a clearly defined and easily understood national objective. The American people would feel better about the program if there were a target date for termination or reduction. Instead, they are

only presented each year with arguments in favor of increases in foreign spending.

ADEQUATE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT MUST BE MAINTAINED

In this presence, it is stating a commonplace to say that the cost of national defense is the most formidable part of our fiscal problem. In the light of world conditions, no sensible person would advocate wholesale reductions in the strength of our Armed Forces. It has been said that it profits one little to be the richest man in the graveyard. An epitaph as the wealthiest and most powerful Nation in oblivion is not an attractive prospect for the United States.

The success of the Soviet in launching satellites and their stride forward in the field of missiles has intensified criticism of the organization of our Defense Department. I would be the last to contend that great improvements cannot be made, but we must resist the ranger of oversimplification.

Whether we have three military departments or a single Department of Defense, whether there are four members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or a single Chief of Staff, the responsibility for initiating and implementing defense decisions is with the President and the Secretary of Defense. In the final analysis, many of the reorganization proposals will only determine the sources from which the President and the Secretary of Defense will secure advice. In my opinion, a determined exercise of authority that the Secretary of Defense already posesses could go a long way toward eliminating many of the unnecessary committees and complicated procedures and produce faster decisions.

It could be fatal to place all of our faith in some procedural gimmick as a substitute for vision and willingness to make decisions. There is much room for improvement in the efficiency of administration, but reorganization cannot produce a formula to provide defense with magic instead of money.

Even if we achieve the maximum of efficiency, the costs of adequate defense will remain high. The technological revolution constantly introduces new weapons systems and causes the abandonment of old ones that were of themselves costly. This does not mean that the investment in the old system was unwise. The cost of the B-36 program, for instance, was great. But it was in the nature of peace insurance, and good insurance it proved to be. Let us hope that the new bombers and our ballistic missiles will serve as well.

The cost of the new missiles is exceeded only by their intricacy and complexity. Many obstacles must be overcome to perfect ballistic missiles of intercontinental range.

For example, 1 of these missiles has more than 36,000 components. If each of these components has such a reliability that its rate of failure is only 1 in 100,000, simple mathematical computation shows that only 2 out of 3 firings could be successful.

Another arresting illustration of our difficulties occurs as we work to achieve accuracy in pinpointing targets. What is known as the cutoff velocity of a missile vitally affects its accuracy. This cutoff velocity, which means the speed at which the missile is moving when its power source is cut off, is 23,000 feet—more than 4 miles—per second. This velocity of 23,000 feet per second must be very precise. Every deviation of only 1 foot per second will cause a difference of 1 miles in where the missile will hit after traveling 6,000 miles.

Whatever it may cost, we must maintain adequate military strength and the most modern and powerful weapons. We are confronted by a ruthless and unconscionable enemy that neither heeds nor understands any language other than might.

We have become committed to a series of agreements and treaties that obligate us to respond to an attack on any 1 of 42 countries as an attack on these United States. Most of these nations, and many others who are not party to these treaties and agreements, are, of course, interested in securing financial aid from us, whether it be in the form of dollar aid or preferred American trade. But, in the final analysis, the one outstanding amalgam that holds the free world together is the belief in the chancelleries of all of the nations associated with us that American military might and potential is greater than that available to the Soviet Union. If that faith be shaken, the combinations that we have made at such great effort and expense will fall to pieces overnight.

So firm is my conviction on this score, that I have strongly urged that the increased cost of our missile program should be taken from the military assistance being extended largely in conventional weapons rather than by weakening our country by increasing either taxes or the debt limit.

The fact that the Soviet beat us into space with a sputnik did more to shake the faith of those associated with us and to weaken free-world unity than would be caused by a drastic reduction in the military assistance program.

My faith in the capacity of the American people and our great industrial plant is unshakable. There is no objective attainable by human beings that we cannot accomplish if the American system is properly utilized. We have a long tradition of success and we would be unworthy to strive for less, whatever the odds, but our resources are not unlimited, and it is essential that we confine our efforts to those problems that are really important to our national security and survival. That great aim can be achieved within the framework of our system without frittering away our resources or our heritage.

Too Much Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Eisenhower upon his veto of the $1,700,000,000 omnibus river and harbor-flood control bill. The bill contained too much pork. By the phrase too much pork I mean it contained too many projects that had not been adequately surveyed by the United States Army engineers, too many projects that were opposed by the Army engineers, opposed by the Budget Bureau, and opposed by the Secretary of the Army. The vetoed bill contained too many projects on which local cost sharing, as figured by the Army enginers, was entirely disregarded.

During House debate, I, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, tried by amendment to strike 18 of the most objectionable projects from the bill.

Had these 18 projects been eliminated I feel certain the President would have signed the bill. With these objectionable projects in the bill I felt it was a certainty the President would veto the bill. My proposal to strike these 18 projects from the bill was defeated 234 to 167.

That the President's action has met widespread approval is indicated by many editorials that have appeared in newspapers since the veto.

Connecticut had a number of projects in the bill; yet, despite the fact that Connecticut stood to obtain many projects had the bill been signed, the Hartford Courant, a leading newspaper of Hartford, Conn., lauded the President's courage in vetoing this bill. Said the Hartford Courant editorially:

THE PRESIDENT BLOCKS WASTE IN RIVERS, HARBORS

Connecticut has lost another few years in the fight against floods and erosion. The rivers and harbors measure that the President vetoed on Tuesday was the authorization bill that would have needed a followup with money. But it would have meant setting in motion, at any rate, action on the Mad River, Hall Meadow Brook, East Branch Dam, and erosion-control projects in Long Island Sound.

Who's at fault in this delay? The obvious target for criticism would be President Eisenhower for having had the courage to veto the bill. Yet a sound and thorough examination proves otherwise. It was, instead, the politicians who loaded the measure with unacceptable projects, unapproved projects, what used to be called more frequently, pork-barrel projects. They built a measure that contained worthwhile projects into one that would have cost the taxpayer a pretty penny without a proper measure of return.

There are about 150 projects covered in the bill. The orderly way to have these projects come before the Congress is for proposals to be reviewed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Budget Bureau. Then, if approved, they could be studied by the Congress. Instead, individual Congressmen make deals to have pet projects slipped into the bill anyway. Sometimes this makes sense; the urgency of the flood problem in Connecticut led legislators a year ago to push for action on Winsted, Torrington, and Litchfield projects without waiting for a report by the Army, which has since approved them. But from the taxpayer's point of view, it can be a sorry mess.

This year, the bill authorized 28 new projects costing $350 million under terms unacceptable to the President. Some, for instance, would have made the Federal-tax payer pay more than his share, giving local areas an easier ride than usual. Four projects costing $27 million had not yet been evaluated for the Congress, although they were willing to spend the money. Three projects, costing $115 million, are not economically justified according to the engineers. Other provisions of the bill represented efforts to sidestep executive decisions unfavorable to specific projects.

The President is given the power of veto against just such congressional waywardness. It is easy for a local Congressman to work hard for his district without bothering about the overall effect. Senator NORRIS COTTON of New Hampshire, who opposed the bill originally, remarked: "Perhaps if there were any real big projects in my State, I would not be so fearless and so statesmanlike" in opposing it. The people of Connecticut can regret that action is again delayed on necessary projects here. It will endure the President's urging that Congress take a new and more sensible look at what it is doing. But it will also resent the way Congress refused to be concerned about waste as it voted the public's funds.

The Washington Star, of Washington, D. C., took much the same attitude as did the Connecticut paper. The Washington Star commending the President for his veto of the bill said:

TOO MUCH PORK

President Eisenhower's veto of the $1.7 billion rivers and harbors bill could hardly have come as a surprise to Congress. The reasons he cited for returning the legislation without his approval were largely the same as those he gave for vetoing a similar authorization nearly 2 years ago. They may be summed up this way: Too much pork.

The measure had some good provisions in it, of course. The President cited favorably $800 million worth of projects previously authorized in connection with river-basin development. But Congress, as it has been accustomed to do in the past, loaded the bill with pet projects desired by special interests back home but not recommended by the Army engineers for various reasons. Mr. Eisenhower indicated that he might have accepted some of these projects if their sponsors had provided for the assumption by local government of its proper share of the cost. As the President pointed out in this message and in his veto message of 1956, "The best test yet devised for insuring that a project is sound" is the "willingness of local people to invest their own money in a joint enterprise with the Federal Government." Indeed, several of the items thrown into the omnibus bill have been denounced by the Corps of Engineers as having no economic justification.

Promoters of the pork-barrel projects had attempted to justify them as antirecession measures. But the President pointed out that, with a few exceptions, many months or even several years might be required to reach the construction stage on them. Meanwhile, there are plenty of other Federal public works of importance that could be started now to stimulate the economy. Many of these already are being rescheduled for immediate construction.

The President made a sensible suggestion as to how Congress can avoid the prospect of a presidential veto on rivers and harbors legislation in the future. He proposed that projects approved by the Corps of Engineers be included in one bill and all the other projects be the subject of separate measures. In that way desirable legislation would not be imperiled by pork-barrel proposals. Any project sound enough to stand on its own feet would be assured of special attention in this way. And a veto of any or all of the additional projects would not affect those which are really essential to the public welfare.

The Evening Sun of Baltimore likewise praised the President's veto of the omnibus bill. It urged that a clean bill without the projects objectionable to the President be developed and enacted by Congress. Here is the Baltimore Sun editorial:

TOO MUCH PORK

President Eisenhower was justified in vetoing the mish-mash of sound and unsound projects contained in the $1,700,000,000 rivers and harbors bill. As he pointed out, the bill authorized some $115 million worth of projects for which there is no economic justification, $168 million worth of public works for which local financial participation has not been worked out properly and $27 million for projects for which there has been no adequate justification. Unfortunately, as the President also recognized, the bill contained such sound projects as the one to spend $28 million in the desperately needed deepening of ship channels into the port of Baltimore. Congressmen logrolled themselves right into this veto, just as they did with a similar bill 2 years ago. The ancient device of voting for another's man's pet local improvement in return for his support for one's own simply doesn't work when the man in the White House stands on principle and pens a reluctant veto rather than give a reluctant approval. Lacking the power to veto separate items in order to forestall the worst dipping into the pork barrel, the President must veto the whole thing, the sound projects along with the unsound ones. And Congress cannot even claim validly that the bill as a whole deserved approval as an antirecession measure. Most spending would have come much too late for that.

What now? President Eisenhower has pointed out a perfectly practical way to separate the good from the bad. Put all the projects favorably reported on by the Army engineers (our port project has such approval) into one bill. Put the more questionable ones into separate bills, so each could be considered by Congress and the President on its merits. Any such sensible course is bound to run into opposition in Congress; dubious proposals would face almost certain death. Nevertheless, something on these lines is going to have to be accepted. The President has twice vetoed pork-barrel bills of this sort. How about Senators and Representatives whose home States do have approved projects doing a little logrolling of their own to see that their much-needed improvements get into a bill which is at least preponderantly sound?

This is a sensible suggestion and one that should be accepted by the Congress. Good projects which have been fully studied and meet all requirements should not be imperiled by including in a bill projects not adequately surveyed or concerning which there is great controversy.

Congress will fail to fulfill its responsibility if it continues to insist on including many questionable projects in the bill and thereby in effect saying, "Take the bad projects along with the good or no bill at all will be passed."

Commemorating Israel's 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I request permission to insert in the RECORD, the following fine article from yesterday's New York Times, entitled "Israel's First Decade—And the Future," by David Ben-Gurion:

ISRAEL'S FIRST DECADE—AND THE FUTURE—ITS PREMIER REVIEWS 10 YEARS OF HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT, INCLUDING THE RECEPTION OF A MILLION IMMIGRANTS, AND LOOKS AHEAD TO FURTHER BUILDING OF A SECURE AND STABLE STATE

(By David Ben-Gurion)

JERUSALEM.—No small number of new countries have arisen in Asia and Africa during the past decade, but Israel differs from them all, both in the origins of her rise to independence and in her history during the first decade of her existence.

In the case of all the other countries concerned, their peoples were never expelled from their own soil but were conquered by foreigners and emerged into self-governments either with the agreement of their masters or as the result of a revolt against them. The Jewish people, on the other hand, had been uprooted from the soil for nearly 2,000 years and scattered throughout the world, and the source of the renewal of their state was the messianic version that lived in their hearts during their dispersion.

At the beginning of the 20th century every sober and practical person regarded the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine as an absurd and impossible dream. Even at the end of the First World War there were fewer than 60,000 Jews in the country. But it was not only the immigration of a few hundred thousand Jews between then and 1948 that gave birth to the State of Israel. The extent of Jewish immigration into Palestine during the 70 years that preceded the establishment of the state was much smaller than that of Jewish immigration into the United States of America and other countries, but the aims of those who came to Palestine were different from those of the Jews who migrated to any other country.

Beginning in 1878 the Jewish settlers in the land of Israel set about building an independent economy, creating a revived Jewish culture and establishing a defensive force of their own. The aim that guided them was the building of a Jewish state. Only a hundred years ago there was not a single Jew in the world whose mother tongue was Hebrew; today it is the spoken language of hundreds of thousands. Even before the rise of the state, Jews in Palestine tilled the soil, made roads, built houses, hewed stone and manned ships to a greater extent than any Jewish community in any other part of the world.

The circumstances in which Israel's independence was proclaimed were also different from those which applied to the other young states. All the other new countries were established with the agreement—willing or enforced—of their foreign rulers. The midwife of Israel, however, was the U. N. General Assembly. Over two-thirds of the members of the U. N., headed by the United States and the Soviet Union, decided on November 29, 1947, on the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state in one part of the country and an Arab state in the other. Then, in defiance of this U. N. decision, Israel had war declared on her even before she was established.

On November 30, 1947, Arab gangs opened the attack on the Jewish community in Palestine, while the mandatory government at times stood by, at times helped the Arabs and occasionally assisted the Jews. In most of these attacks the Jewish Haganah (the underground defense organization of the Jews in Palestine which had existed in various forms ever since the period of Ottoman rule) had the upper hand.

On May 14, 1948, I announced Israel's independence in Tel Aviv. (According to the Hebrew calendar, the 10th anniversary of that date is April 25; since that is a Sabbath, the anniversary will be observed on April 24.) Eight hours later, at midnight, the British authorities left the country and the armies of five Arab states—Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq—invaded Israel with the aim of wiping the revived Jewish state off the face of the earth.

At that time the state had 650,000 Jewish inhabitants, while the invading countries had a combined population of over 30 million. The Arab armies were equipped with every type of modern land, sea, and air armament, while Israel had no army, only an underground defense organization equipped with light arms: rifles, machineguns, and a few hundred mortars.

The U. N., which was to some extent responsible for the rise of Israel, did not lift a finger in defense of the young state. This invasion by the Arab armies, however, nullified the decisions of the U. N. Assembly—not in the manner that the Arab rulers would have liked to see, but in the opposite sense. The Arab armies were defeated and expelled, the area of Israel was increased, and the new

Jerusalem again became the capital of Israel, as in the days of King David.

But Israel's most distinctive feature is the fact that during the first decade it has trebled its population. At the end of 1957 Israel had a population of 1,976,471, including 1,762,471 Jews and 214,000 Arabs. (If I am not mistaken the United States did not treble its population until 35 years had passed since its war of independence.)

As soon as it came into being, the new State of Israel opened its gates wide to any Jew wishing to make his home in it. The proclamation of independence declared that "The State of Israel will be open to the immigration of Jews from all countries of their dispersion." On the basis of this declaration, about a million immigrants from 79 different countries came to Israel during its first decade.

Of the 3 great achievements of these 10 years—the renewal of the Jewish state after more than 1,800 years of exile and wandering, the amazing victory of the Israel defense forces over the Arab armies in the war of independence and the immigration of a million Jews in the course of the decade—there is no doubt that the last was the most important and difficult. For its sake the state was founded; it was the vision that fired hearts of the fighters for freedom, and it was the goal toward which the efforts of the state and the assistance of the Jews of the world were directed during the first 10 years.

The immigrants who reached this country before the Second World War came mainly from Europe, endowed with capital, education and vocational skills. The great majority of immigrants who have arrived since the establishment of the state, however, came from impoverished and backward countries, without capital, vocational training or education.

The young state, subjected to military siege and economic boycott by its Arab neighbors, was compelled to find housing for the immigrants, to teach them trades, to give them work, to settle them on the soil, to help them to acquire a new language and to educate them to a live as free and equal citizens of a democratic and freedom-loving state. It is doubtful whether this could have been achieved without the devoted assistance of the Jews of the world and especially of American Jewry. Valuable aid was also received from the Government of the United States.

More than a half million rooms have been built in the course of the last 9 years; the state invested over $721,500,000 in building alone during the period. About a quarter of a million immigrants settled on the soil and became diligent farmers, although only a few among them had tilled the land before their arrival in Israel. About 500 new agricultural settlements were established, and the cultivated area was increased from 195,000 acres to 950,000 acres, while the irrigated area rose from 63,000 acres to 275,000 acres.

The greater part of these villages were established by immigrants from Asia and Africa who had had no agricultural training of any kind before their arrival, and yet within a few years they became transformed in Israel into a constructive and creative force, providing the town population with most of its food and, together with the Israel defense forces, maintaining the security of the country's borders. Most of the immigrants were absorbed in industry, communications, and shipping, mainly in vocations in which they had never engaged before settling in Israel.

And just as there was a far-reaching transformation among the million immigrants in the cultural, economic, and social spheres, so there was also a profound change in the appearance of the country.

Agricultural and mining settlements sprang up in wastes that had been desolate and uninhabited for centuries; bare and lonely mountains and hills were covered with forests and orchards. Millions of trees were planted on the sand dunes on the hills and by the roadsides up and down the country. The extensive and pestilential Hula swamps in the north were drained, and thousands of acres of good and fertile land were reclaimed for new settlement.

There have also been cultural achievements on a large scale in the course of this decade. In September 1949 a law was enacted providing for compulsory and free education between the ages of 6 and 14. In 1949 there were 180,844 pupils (including 6,780 Arabs) in the elementary schools; in 1958 the number had risen to 404,900 (including 27,500 Arabs). There was a considerable expansion in secondary, vocational, and agricultural education.

The Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the Technion (Israel Institute of Technology) in Haifa became fertile sources of scientists and technologists of a high standard; the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot has become one of the finest scientific institutions in the world. About 1,200 new Hebrew books are published in Israel every year, which is no small number in proportion to the size of the population and bears witness to the spiritual energies of the young state of Israel.

There has also been important progress in the field of health during the first decade. The infant death rate, which was 52 per 1,000 in 1949, had fallen to 36 per 1,000 by 1957. In 1949 the average expectation of life was 65 for males and 68 for females; in 1957 it had risen to 68 and 72, respectively.

The main feature of the last 3 years of the decade was the more intensive development of the South and the Negev. A railway was built to Beersheba, and a road was laid from Beersheba to Elath, thus joining our country's two seas—the Red Sea and the Mediterranean—by a network of roads. After the Sinai campaign an oil pipeline was laid from Elath to Ashdad on the Mediterranean coast. These three undertakings opened up the Negev for settlement and development, which will be one of our central tasks in the second decade.

During the first 10 years there has been a considerable improvement in the lives of Israel's Arabs—in the economic, social, educational, and health spheres. In all these respects their position is better than that of the Arabs in the Arab countries of the Middle East.

At the end of 1948 the non-Jewish population of Israel was about 120,000. Since then about 30,000 Arabs who were living in the neighboring countries on the day the state was established have been permitted to settle in Israel with a view to the reunion of families. At the end of 1957 the number of non-Jews in the country was 214,000. Modern water installations for irrigation and drinking have been set up in the Arab villages. The improved methods in use in the Jewish villages are spreading among the Arab farmers.

There has been a great change in the education of Arab youth. Every Arab child, like every Jewish child, receives elementary education at the expense of the state. There are Arab students in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the Technion in Haifa. The general incidence of disease and the infant death rate among the Israel Arabs is smaller than that in any of the Arab countries.

The Arab farmer is not in bondage to large landholders as in the neighboring lands. A network of cooperatives is spreading in the Arab villages, in growing contact with the Jewish cooperative movement. The Arabs are represented in the Knesset, Israel's Parliament, both as members of Jewish parties and as the representatives of Arab parties. They are entitled to speak Arabic in the Knesset, though some of them prefer to speak Hebrew. In our second decade we must complete a number of tasks which we began in the first decade ,and carry out several tasks which have yet to be begun.

The main goal of our settlement work in the next 10 years is to populate the South and Negev and establish agricultural and industrial settlements in Central and Upper Galilee. The first thing that is required for this purpose is the completion of the Jordan project, so that the waters of the River Jordan may flow to the South and Negev and enable us to double the number of our agricultural settlements in those areas.

From now onward, however, the concept of settlement must not be limited to agriculture. Israel's shipping, to the expansion of which there is hardly any limit, must occupy an important place in our constructive work, and the same applies to the development of mining and industry. During the next decade we shall develop and exploit solar and atomic energy and we may succeed in desalting sea water by a cheap and economic process.

The population of the Negev will be based on pasture, plantations, field crops, mining, industry and crafts, transportation, tourism, and shipping in the Red Sea. I can foresee three great and growing population centers in the Negev during the next decade, Elath, Mitspeh Ramon, and Beersheba: Elath as an international port town, Mitspeh Ramon as a great center of mining and associated industries, and Beersheba as the gateway to the Negev.

The center of the state will continues to be Jerusalem, but there will be an important shift of population southward. During this decade we may expect to see a firm link between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. The Beersheba railway will be continued as far as Elath; the oil pipeline will be enlarged; the Dead Sea works will achieve their maximum output, and scores of industrial towns will be built in the area stretching from Elath to the Lachish region and the settlements on the Gaza Strip border.

During the next 10 years we shall raise the standards of elementary, secondary, and higher education, foster scientific research, and do all we can to attract men of intellect and science from all countries to Israel and to establish Jerusalem as a world center of science and culture.

In the second decade we must complete the absorption and integration of all the immigrants who arrived during the first decade, as well as taking in and absorbing several hundred thousand additional immigrants from the centers of distress in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and tens of thousands of pioneering youth from the prosperous countries of Europe, America, and South Africa. From the Western countries we shall receive, in the main, a select and pioneering immigration. The driving force behind this latter immigration will not be distress—for it is to be hoped that the Jews of the Western countries will not suffer from economic or political disabilities—but Israel's power of attraction.

During the next 10 years we must enhance our scientific and technical skills, and our capacity and efficiency in work. Increased stability, strength, security and survival itself are possible only if we raise our high standards of quality in all spheres: the quality of our work in field and factory; the quality of our military service; the quality of our science and technology; the quality of the internal social relations among our people. Without constantly growing participation by the best of the younger generation in the Western countries—in Europe and America—we shall find these things very difficult to carry out. On the other hand, the more our pioneering undertakings in the conquest of the desert and the raising of our cultural standards grow, the greater will be the attractive force of Israel; young Jewish intellectuals and scientists from the free and highly de-

veloped countries will find in Israel a broad field of action for their creative initiative. For I have no doubt whatsoever that among the Jewish youth in these countries there is also a latent desire for creative and pioneering work.

There will also be immigrants of a different type from these countries, and from the point of view of quantity they may be in the majority—immigrants whose energy and talents will be expressed mainly in the economic field; in agriculture, industry, shipping, and transportation. There is an excellent example of an undertaking of tremendous economic and defense value which has been set up by a small number of young experts from America in the last few years: the Bedek repair and maintenance workshops for planes at Lydda. In a country whose construction is only beginning there is room for much creative and useful enterprise of this type.

To our regret there has been no interruption in the threats of the neighboring Arab rulers to destroy Israel—but we look forward to the second decade confident in our strength, our creative capacity, and our goodwill; our hands are held out in peace to all people, near and far.

If the Arab States understood the benefits to be obtained from peace and cooperation between neighbors, Israel would be ready to cooperate with them in the political, economic, and cultural fields on a basis of equality and mutual assistance. I am convinced that not only would this be an important contribution to world peace, but it would be of advantage to the Arab peoples.

What these peoples need above all is development, education, health, and the enhancement of the dignity and value of man. In these fields Israel has shown her capacity during the past 10 years, and she would gladly give her neighbors the benefit of her experience. Nor would she limit cooperation only to the economic and cultural sphere. She would also be ready for political cooperation on the condition that it should be aimed at fostering peace in the Middle East and in the world.

In the meantime, Israel is determined to strengthen her military preparedness and to persevere in her work of rebuilding and redemption; to bring in Jews from the lands of oppression and misery; to conquer the desert and make it flourish by the power of science and the pioneering spirit; and to transform the country into a bastion of democracy, liberty, and universal cultural values based on the teaching of Israel's prophets and the achievements of modern science.

Radio Activity Is Boon to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an event of considerable importance has been scheduled for the month of May and that is, National Radio Month.

From the day when the first faint reception was received until today when the "beep, beep" signals are heard around the world from orbiting satellites, radio has become an important, necessary part of our lives.

Radio's role in our daily lives becomes increasingly important because it is through this medium that we track our ventures and adventures in outer space.

The National Association of Broadcasters has advised me that Americans own 150 million radio sets—ample testimony to this medium's value to the continued progress of our Nation.

Moreover, statistics show that 66 million Americans listen to radio daily and the dramatic growth of this industry in our vast communications network is exemplified by the 3,600 AM and FM stations now broadcasting in the United States compared with 600 stations just 10 years ago.

Our reliance on radio is demonstrated by the fact that the stations throughout the country are geared to broadcast on a second's notice any threat to our national security, while giving us timely information on disasters and other emergency situations from day to day.

I, for one, salute radio—for while orbiting in space, it has kept its feet on the ground to provide Americans with maximum performance.

Congress Should Act Promptly To Correct Supreme Court Mistake in Mallory Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary is to be commended for reporting H. R. 11477, of which our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is author. Action on this bill is urgent, and it is hoped the Rules Committee will promptly grant a rule and clear the measure for House debate.

This bill undertakes to correct what appears to be an obvious mistake made by the Supreme Court in the Mallory case. The error, which seems self-evident even to the layman, was in a misinterpretation placed by the Court on Rule 5 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

That rule requires the arraignment of defendants "without unnecessary delay" after being arrested. It provides that an officer making an arrest shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. The rule does not state that the prisoner must be taken before a committing magistrate forthwith or immediately. It simply provides that it shall be done "without unnecessary delay." The Supreme Court rules that "without unnecessary delay" means, in effect, forthwith or immediately.

With that background, let us examine the Mallory decision and other developments which I think will demonstrate the imperative necessity of prompt corrective action by the Congress.

In the Mallory case, the defendant, a Negro, was charged with raping a white woman in the basement of her apartment house here in the District of Columbia. That occurred on April 7, 1954. With his identity concealed by a handkerchief over his face, the defendant committed the offense in the basement of the victim's apartment project where she went to do some family washing. There was no witness. The following afternoon at 2:30 the defendant was arrested. His brother was the janitor in the apartment where the crime took place. He denied the offense and, along with others, was questioned at some length. In his case he was questioned for 7½ hours, and confessed.

Mallory was detained that night, his confession coming after closing hours for magistrates. He had been questioned for 2 hours, and the 7½ hours elapsed between his arrest and his confession. The following morning he was arraigned. During the time he was held he was given food and water. He confessed freely and voluntarily. His confession was corroborated by supporting evidence. There was no claim that he was mistreated in any manner.

But the Supreme Court reversed the jury's conviction, holding that the 7½ hours during which he was detained before he confessed made his confession inadmissible. So by action of the Supreme Court Mallory was turned loose upon society. Since then he has committed another crime of a serious nature.

COURT DECISION UNSOUND

It is significant that Federal Judge Alexander Holtzoff, who presided over the trial of Mallory and sentenced him, has been very critical of the Supreme Court's decision. Here is his statement, in part:

> It so happens that I was a member and secretary of the Advisory Committee appointed by the Supreme Court to prepare a draft of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The record of the Committee will show that the words "without unnecessary delay", were deliberately chosen and were not to be taken as synonymous with "immediately" or "forthwith." The notes of the Advisory Committee appended to the Rules discloses the intent of the Committee. To be sure, they are not binding on the Supreme Court, but they fulfill the same analogous role as that played by a congressional committee report in determining what the congressional intent was in framing a statute. The notes of the Advisory Committee indicate that the words "without unnecessary delay" were used as equivalent to "reasonable time."

And some of the authorities referred to in the notes, cited to indicate the intention of the committee, sanctioned a much longer interval of time than is involved in the Mallory case.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that even an average layman can see the utter unsoundness of the Supreme Court's interpretation of rule 5 (a)?

SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT HAS TURNED OTHER CRIMINALS LOOSE

This drastic decision, which has shocked not only members of the legal profession and law enforcement officers but also the general public, was cited by the Court of Appeals here last fall in reversing three murder cases. Many can recall the words of the late Mr. Jus-

tice Cordoza when he said: "Justice, though due the accused, is due the accuser as well."

In one of the cases, against Clarence Watson, a Negro, the accused was twice convicted for the brutal murder of Alyce O. Taggart at Scott's Hotel in the District of Columbia. Even though his confession was free and voluntary and well corroborated by other evidence, because of the Supreme Court's ruling in the Mallory case he was turned loose, and he walks the streets today.

In another case, one Russell Carter was duly convicted for murdering 15-year-old Caroline Nelson, whom he had never seen before. He was convicted by a jury, confessed voluntarily, and was protected by all constitutional rights. Yet, by order of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case Carter was turned loose upon society, unpunished.

In a third case one Robert Starr killed his wife on June 11, 1956, in the presence of witnesses. He plead insanity and was duly convicted for the crime. He had confessed, and his written confession was admitted because of its bearing on the issue of sanity. But under the Supreme Court's decision in the Mallory case, the conviction was reversed.

The net effect of the Supreme Court ruling has been to protect criminals and obstruct police officers in their investigation of crime. It means that when a crime is committed and the police pick up a suspect, and it is finally decided in the course of the investigation that the evidence justifies charging him, if during that investigation he has voluntarily confessed, and is arraigned following that determination, the arraignment is too late and the confession is null and void.

JUSTICE BEING OBSTRUCTED BY MALLORY DECISION

In order to comply with the Supreme Court's new doctrine, police will in some instances be constrained to arraign innocent persons and thereby place the stigma of a police record upon them, because there would be no time to clear them by interrogation and investigation before arraignment. Indeed police would hardly dare question a suspect before arraignment because in that event if the questioning led to a confession it would, under the Mallory decision, be null and void.

Moreover, multiple defendants in many cases could not be prosecuted, as has been pointed out by Mr. Dwight S. Strong, president of the National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions. When the first defendant is arrested, if, as required by the Mallory case, he is immediately arraigned that fact would be publicized. It would then be difficult to obtain further evidence implicating codefendants. They would scatter and conceal themselves. The Mallory decision is a built-in shield for clever criminals.

Police Chief Stanley R. Schrotel of the Cincinnati Police Department is quoted as saying:

I can't tell you how to live with the Mallory decision. We haven't had to learn how. I don't know how we could. Unless you have an army of policemen to search for evidence, I don't see any alternative to questioning. It is an injustice to the innocent not to question.

PENDING BILL IS BOTH FAIR AND NECESSARY

The pending bill to correct the grave error committed by the Supreme Court is fair and it is reasonable. It does not sanction the use of confessions obtained by force, coercion, threats or improper promises. It simply provides that mere delay in arraignment, standing alone, is not enough to outlaw an otherwise voluntary confession. And that is the way it should be in order to protect society against criminals. After all, it is our duty not only to provide safeguards to protect the rights of those accused of crime; it is also our duty to provide some protection for people who have not been murdered, robbed, or raped. This measure simply gives the police a reasonable opportunity to question a person suspected of a crime.

VOLUNTARINESS IS THE PROPER TEST

Mr. Speaker, voluntariness has always been the test for admission or rejection of confessions in most if not all of the States. Under that rule confessions that are voluntary are admissible, regardless of the delay in arraignment. If, of course, the delay is unreasonable, it might raise a presumption against the voluntary character of the confession. But that would be a question of fact for the presiding judge or the jury to determine.

The point is that a reasonable delay after a suspect has been arrested before he is formally arraigned should not be the test of whether a confession given during an investigation should be admitted in evidence. Such a rule is dangerous and it is manifestly unsound.

Before I conclude I should like to congratulate the Washington Evening Star for the valuable service it has rendered to the public in publicizing the Mallory decision, with all its implications. That service has helped educate the public and arouse the people to the seriousness of the effect of the Supreme Court's action. It is imperative that the Congress act promptly and effectively to correct the unfortunate blunder made by the Supreme Court.

Long Trains Block Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the unreasonable length of freight trains in the Chicago land area has brought about traffic congestions at crossings that are inexcusable. In many cases switching trains have as high as 175 to 200 cars and occasionally remain stalled blocking 8 or 10 street crossings for as long as 15 to 20 minutes.

Thousands of man-hours of labor are lost annually by reason of workers of this great industrial area being delayed waiting for freight trains to open the crossings for passage.

The following editorial from the Hammond, Ind., Times reflects the thoughts on the minds of most of the citizens of the Calumet region of Indiana:

LIMIT ON LENGTH OF TRAINS

From Washington, D. C., comes the news that Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, of Lake County, has suggested it may be necessary for Congress to limit the length of trains in congested areas.

This is of particular interest to Calumet region residents, automobile drivers and truckers, in particular, because of the trains blocking crossings for long periods of time.

The Hammond Times over the years has criticized this practice and secured relief from the railroads from time to time, but after a while those who make up the freight trains slipped back into their old practice and added as high as 150 cars and more to trains "snailing" their way through the region.

All who work or live in the Calumet region are aware—or should be—that the railroads are, of course, one of our valuable assets. They account for many industries locating in this area and thus help to provide many jobs. But that fact is sometimes forgotten when those mile-long freight trains tie up a crossing for an exasperatingly long time.

It would seem that the problem could be handled by the railroads themselves without the necessity of passing a law on the subject. For nobody likes to be hamstrung by any more laws than are absolutely necessary.

Congressman MADDEN no doubt had this in mind when he discussed the subject on the floor of the House without actually throwing a bill into the hopper. His warning is more a reminder to the railroads than anything else.

David Reynard, of Cleveland Heights, 1 of 12 Winners of American Legion Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the events which we Ohio Members anticipate every spring is the trip to Washington of the winners of the year's American Legion essay contest. It is always heartening to see the intense interest of these young people for what is usually their first vist to our Nation's Capital.

I am extremely proud of the fact that this year one of my constituents, David Reynard, 1041 Nelaview Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, a senior at Shaw High School, is among the winners. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his winning essay herewith:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

(By David Reynard)

My promise to America:

I will vote wisely on all issues that come before me for my approval.

I will vote for a candidate on his merits, and will not follow the bandwagon.

I will take an active part in all public affairs and will encourage others to do likewise. I will express my opinion on all mat-

ters which concern me or the society I live in honestly and sincerely, never resorting to bandwagon techniques.

I will give my full, wholehearted support to the winner of any election whether I voted for him or not, because I realize that he is the people's choice.

In short, I will do my best to help build and maintain good government for myself, my fellow citizens, and for citizens of the future to pattern their governments after.

I will support the schools and colleges in my area, so that my neighbors' children, as well as my own, can attend good schools, and gain the finest possible education.

I will do my best to instill good moral values in my children, not forcing any beliefs upon them, but leading them in the right direction, giving light, so that they may see their own way.

I will attend church regularly so as to fulfill my moral and spiritual needs in myself and my family. I will make use of every opportunity to worship God in my own way.

I will join civic organizations and will take an active part in them, so that everybody living in my society will have equal opportunities and freedom, and so that my children will grow up in a world where freedom and equality prevails.

I will teach my children to respect and obey the law to be tolerant toward people who differ slightly from themselves, to respect others' rights and their property, and to practice fairness and honesty at all times in their dealings with others.

In short, I will raise my children in the best way I know how, giving them all the opportunities I have enjoyed and some that I did not.

I will obey the laws set down for me by the legislators I elect. I will aid the law-enforcement agencies whenever possible, will serve on jury duty when my name comes up, and will encourage others to do the same.

I will contribute liberally to charities to help those less fortunate than myself to lead a normal, healthy life.

I will cooperate with all public officials in the performance of their duties, and will aid the police, fire, and city maintenance departments by doing my part to maintain order, preserve public and private property, and preserve sanitary conditions.

I will utilize, but not abuse my rights and privileges as an American citizens, and will defend to the death the right of my decendants to enjoy them also.

I will serve America in the Armed Forces if she decides that I am needed there.

I will keep my Government on its toes and will examine all issues of public interest seriously, doing my best to retain good government.

In short, I will be the best citizen I know how to be.

This, America, is my promise as a citizen to you. I will do my best to make your dreams of a free, happy world come true. Your future is bright. You will become greater and more powerful. You will do great things, and I will help.

Out of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been focused on labor unions in recent months and the need for legislation is quite apparent. An editorial appeared in the New York Daily Mirror which covers some very interesting points with regard to prospective legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial to which I refer and commend it to my colleagues for careful consideration:

OUT OF CONTROL

A convincing argument for legislation to end monopolistic control over much of American industry by labor unions is made in a little volume masquerading under the doleful title "The Economic Analysis of Labor Union Power."

Lest we be charged with antilabor, anti-union bias, we hasten to add that the author, Edward H. Chamberlin, an honored and esteemed scholar, is professor of political economy at Harvard and editor of the Quarterly Journal of Economics. He long has been friendly to trade unionism.

Professor Chamberlin's point is that trade unionism today is big business, and that its true position in our economic and national life is still largely unrecognized, despite all the revelations before congressional investigating committees.

"The plain facts," says Professor Chamberlin, "are that for anyone concerned with the preservation of free institutions the power position of labor has become truly ominous * * * and that it cries out for analysis from a truly public, as distinct from a labor, point of view."

In the past 25 years, he points out, organized labor has grown from around 3 million members to well over 17 million or, roughly, a third of the nonagricultural working force, and unquestionably dominates the vital mass production industries, mining, construction, public utilities, communications, rail and truck transportation in the United States.

LABOR IS BIG BUSINESS

Working capital, in the form of dues, pours into union coffers at the rate of at least $600 million a year.

Union resources, mainly in the form of accumulated pension funds, run into the billions.

Still, in the thinking of the man in the street as well as the professional economist, industry and business remain the villains in our society while labor, organized and united, is the "underprivileged" have-not.

Since labor has become big business, with labor leaders seeking to extend their power and control through agreements with other unions, Professor Chamberlin feels the time has arrived to enact appropriate legislation to control organized labor just as the anti-trust laws prevent monopolistic practices by big business.

To cite the powers enjoyed by labor unions in the United States today, and their freedom from control or supervision, Professor Chamberlin offers this example:

"If A is bargaining with B over the sale of his house, and if A were given the privileges of a modern labor union, he would be able:

"1. To conspire with all other owners of houses not to make any alternative offer to B, using violence or the threat of violence to prevent them; 2, to deprive B himself of access to any alternative offers; 3, to surround the house of B and cut off all deliveries, including food; 4, to stop all movement from B's house, so that if he were, for instance, a doctor, he could not sell his services and make a living; and 5, to institute a boycott of B's business."

LABOR AND COMPANY POLICY

Professor Chamberlin also sees great danger in recently announced demands by organized labor for a voice in determining company policy on profit distribution, such as that presented the auto industry by Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers.

Unless proper legislation is speedily enacted to resist such trends and relegate organized labor to its proper and merited position in society, Professor Chamberlin warns:

"It is more than a possibility that much that is vital to the competitive character of our economy, and which is responsible for its efficiency, will be lost through a substantial invasion of the management area by labor, and that the public will awake one day to find that a degree of economic control, which it would never have tolerated in the hands of businessmen, has already passed into the hands of someone else."

Still, high and respected labor leaders resist all control—even measures designed solely to protect the funds of the dues payers.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following prize-winning essay entitled "What Part Will I Play As a Citizen?" written by William J. Clemens, of Toledo, Ohio. This essay was chosen as 1 of 12 in a statewide high-school competition sponsored by the department of Ohio, American Legion, with a view to promoting interest among our high-school youth—the citizens of tomorrow—in the responsibilities of their future role as citizens. William Clemens envisions his future responsibilities with remarkable clarity and I have every confidence that he will meet his responsibilities as a citizen with the same measure of sincerity, zeal, and competence as he has demonstrated in defining them. It is with pride that I commend the following essay to your attention:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

(By William J. Clemens)

Contrary to popular belief, citizens are made and not born. We may be born in this democratic country of ours with the right to take advantage of all the privileges of a citizen, but we cannot be citizens in the true sense of the word until we have availed ourselves of these privileges, fulfilled our obligations, and gone beyond the call of duty to add something of ourselves to our community. Acceptance of responsibility, cooperation with others, and contributions of time and money for public welfare are all important.

With this definition in mind, I foresee my role, as follows:

I must provide for myself and my family so that my particular family unit does not become a burden to society. This is very important, because if each of us can take care of himself, then the Nation can progress. It is our duty to take advantage of every educational opportunity and every vocational experience so that we may be qualified to earn and maintain a high standard of living.

I must make myself well informed on all issues concerning my Government, and when I have done this to the best of my ability, I must never fail to vote in all elections. Ignorance on vital issues has been responsible for a great many people misusing the vote. This could be even worse than

not voting at all. A beneficial issue may fail or a good man may not make the grade, because the public is either uninformed or misinformed. In the same way, unqualified persons can be put into office and undesirable issues passed. We must go to the polls knowing the facts.

I must never lose sight of the fact that the security of my own family is directly dependent upon the state of the Nation. I must be as alert to the Nation's problems as to those of my own family.

I must be aware of every situation where I can help my community. This is not necessarily of a political nature, but involves working with youth, church groups, or similar neighborhood activities.

Military service is definitely in the picture for every male citizen, and I will do my best to serve my country in any way that I can. However, I feel this has now taken on a new meaning to each one of us. No longer is it merely a matter of being drafted or enlisting, serving a term, and then forgetting about the whole thing when civilian life is resumed. Now each one of us has a new responsibility to himself and to his country. Each of us must strive to learn everything he possibly can about this strange new era we have been plunged into so suddenly. We must pursue learning not only in the fields of science and mathematics, but also in political science and foreign language to the limit of our abilities whatever they may be. Our survival depends upon each of us using his capabilities to the utmost.

Perhaps my greatest contribution will be to lead my life according to the highest standards I can muster and to endeavor to teach my children to do the same. No matter how the world seems to shake around me, I will try to keep my head and not panic. I will do my own thinking and not be swayed by demagogues. I know that everything I do, everything I learn, everything I am or hope to be, affects my role as a citizen.

This is what I believe—this is the part I will play as a citizen.

School Administrators: Scapegoats of Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the American people are now engaged in a salutary reappraisal of their educational system. As part of this process, from time to time the charge has been made that those who administer our schools are largely to blame for the weaknesses in our schools.

Unquestionably some of our educators have been both uninspired and shortsighted, but one wonders if this indictment has not been badly overdrawn.

A few days ago a perceptive young editor in my congressional district, Jones Osborn, the editor of the Yuma, Ariz., Daily Sun, had some trenchant comments on this question in his Editor's Notebook column. His observations follow:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK
(By Jones Osborn)

Ever since October (birth of Sputnik I) we've heard much about our schools.

Would this be a fair summary of those comments:

1. United States schools teach too much frills, not enough basic courses, and standards are too low.

2. Most American parents are unhappy about this and would like it changed, but—

3. Most professional educators are resisting such changes.

Perhaps that isn't a fair summary.

But the Gallup poll tackled the question.

Three thousands parents and one thousand one hundred high-school principals were asked:

"Do you think our public schools today demand too much work or too little work from the students?"

Ninety percent of the principals said "Too little."

But only 51 percent of the parents.

Another question:

"Some people say that colleges should raise their entrance requirements, making it harder for high-school graduates to enter. Do you think colleges should do this?"

Forty-nine percent of principals said "Yes."

But only 27 percent of parents agreed.

In fact, most parents (62 percent) thought standards should not be raised.

I think we might keep this in mind. For in the final analysis, the public schools are just about what the public is prepared to support, no better, no worse.

Shall We Halt H-Bomb Tests Without Russian Inspection Guaranties?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the prizewinning essay by Katharin Knippenberg of Hartville, Ohio, entitled "Shall We Halt H-Bomb Tests Without Russian Inspection Guaranties?"

Katharin, an 11th grade student at Lake High School in Hartville, submitted this essary to the Our Times scholarship program sponsored by Wesleyan University. Her achievement has been a source of great satisfaction to her school, her parents, the community, and myself.

SHALL WE HALT H-BOMB TESTS WITHOUT RUSSIAN INSPECTION GUARANTIES?
(By Katharin Knippenberg)

If the United States of America is looking for a sure way to commit political suicide, here it is: Call an immediate halt of our H-bomb tests without Russian inspection guaranties.

Americans are horrified at their own progress in producing a weapon that could destroy so many lives, but what we consider wrong in our country may be entirely correct in another. Halting our H-bomb tests would give the Russians, who lack our moral qualms, the opportunity to build up tremendous stores of hydrogen weapons of their own. With this advantage, Russia could quickly out-distance the United States and our position of world supremacy would be lost.

Certainly, we do not want to live in a world where the constant threat of annihilation hangs over our heads. We want to be able to trust other nations. But when moral standards are so unlike, how far can we go in blind faith?

When the Russians sign an agreement it is usually part of a plan for furthering their cause, although there may be no outward sign of this. When the agreement has served its purpose, it is disregarded and the Russians revert to their original plan. If agreements are made only to be broken, what will happen if there is no ironclad assurance of enforcement of inspection rules?

By reviewing past disarmament conferences, we can see the attitude of the Russians more clearly:

In 1946, Bernard Baruch developed a plan which he submitted to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. The Baruch Plan proposed the formation of a world monopoly of fissionable material and production of nuclear weapons. Inspection would be part of this plan and a police force would be set up to punish violators of the agreement.

While parts of this plan were practical, other parts were not. Small amounts of fissionable material could be stolen by a rebel country and could be converted into bombs. Existing stockpiles could be hidden easily. Rockets and launchers could escape detection by being placed underground. In general, a thorough inspection was not possible and nations were not willing to accept the plan on faith alone.

The Russians retaliated with a plan of their own. Roughly, it said, "Ban bombs and trust the Russians." This plan called for halting production of weapons and then starting an inspection system. The difficulty in this plan was, "Would all countries stop bomb production?" If the United States ceased making bombs, and the Russians continued, we would be in a bad position. For this reason, the plan was highly impractical—from any but the Russian standpoint—and was never accepted by the United States.

In 1955, President Eisenhower proposed his open sky plan at the Geneva Conference. This plan was in three parts: Exchange of plans between countries; observers at key points and by aerial photography; evaluation of data received in the first two points. Actually, the open sky plan was more a warning system than a strict disarmament plan.

The Russians seemed willing to accept this plan but always found some technicality which was not to their liking. This situation continued for quite a while, with the final result that the open sky plan never went into effect.

This has been the Russian attitude in the past. Since the launching of the sputniks, their attitude has been more imperious and arrogant than ever. The Russians demanded an East-West conference that would exclude our allies. President Eisenhower refused this request.

Until we understand the culture and the standards of Russia, the United States should not risk her security through bans on H-bomb tests without Russian inspection guaranties.

A Letter From Joey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I spoke to the House about cystic fibrosis—that grim disease. Among the letters I have gotten recently on the subject was one from a 17-year-old victim of cystic fibrosis from my State.

Joey Patton says more in the following three paragraphs than I could possibly say in several thousand words:

SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 5, 1958.*
Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KNUTSON: I am 1 of the "about 7,000" babies who was born with cystic fibrosis in 1941, but I am one of the more fortunate ones, being old enough now to be able to write a letter to you, a lady who, through the kindness of her heart, has taken up the cause of thousands of children who are strangers to her.

Someday I hope to be able to earn a living for myself, and perhaps marry and have a family, but I would want my children not to go through what I have the past 17 years. It's been a hard life, but I'm still here—my brother and sister (both cystic fibrosis victims) are not.

I have read the speech you gave on CF on March 20, and I think it was wonderful. And, I'd like to say—from the bottom of my heart—thank you, Mrs. KNUTSON.

Yours truly,

JOEY PATTON.

A Test of American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech delivered by Rear Adm. W. G. Schindler, United States Navy, before the Rotary Club, in Shreveport, La., on April 11, 1958. This speech is entitled "A Test of American Character" and it is the type of speech that will provoke real thought and perhaps will provoke some controversy. Nonetheless, the speech is a most forceful one and is the type seldom heard in modern times. It is as follows:

A TEST OF AMERICAN CHARACTER

(Remarks before the Rotary Club, Shreveport, La., by Rear Adm. W. G. Schindler, U. S. Navy, April 11, 1958)

Since the Soviets launched their first sputnik in the United States, and people in the countries of the free world as well, have been greatly concerned over the progress and status of our scientific development. As a nation, we became frantic because of a supposed inferiority in our ability to maintain our established lead in equipment and armament supplied to our Armed Forces. The Congress has appropriated billions in an endeavor to bolster what is considered our lagging efforts to produce war material. Our Department of Defense is being investigated with a view to improvement so that we may not again be beaten by the Soviets in firsts in science and in instruments of war and destruction. The whole Nation has been virtually up in arms in demands for greater efforts and better hardware.

Certainly, we need better guided and ballistic missiles, better performance in our aircraft and warships and better scientific developments—and we need them now. These are grave matters and grave times. But to my way of thinking, even more than these material things in a hurry, we need better manpower, better citizens—and we need them now.

We in this country lack an appreciation of the shortcomings of our own people. We sort of take our superiority for granted. But I'm sure, if you stop to think about it, you'll agree that we don't have the stamina, the faith, the doggedness and, yes, the integrity of our forefathers who founded and developed this great Nation. Now there is evidence on every hand of softness and irresponsibility; a lack of respect for authority, an attitude of "what's in it for me," a desire for undeserved luxury, no appreciation of citizen responsibility—all are becoming commonplace in our national character. These qualities are manifestations of a deterioration of our social systems—of our personnel. They present a problem which must be the concern of everyone with the fate of his country at heart.

I'm going to wade into this problem by giving you a harsh and cruel indictment of our fellow citizens.

In July 1951, at a place called Prisoner-of-war Camp No. 5, Chautong in the People's Republic of North Korea, the chief of intelligence of the Chinese People's Volunteer Army in North Korea wrote a report to his chief in Peiping. The report was entitled "An Estimate of American Military Personnel." This is what it said:

"Based upon our observations of American soldiers and their officers captured in this war for the liberation of Korea from capitalistic and imperialistic aggression, the following facts are evidenced. The American soldier has weak loyalties to his family, his community, his country, his religion, and to his fellow soldiers. His concepts of right and wrong are hazy; opportunism is easy. By himself he feels frightened and insecure. He underestimates his own work, his own strength, and his ability to survive. He is largely ignorant of social values, social tensions and conflicts. There is little knowledge or understanding, even among United States university graduates, of American political history and philosophy; the Federal, State, and community organizations; States rights and civil rights; freedom safeguards, and how these things supposedly operate within his own system. He is exceedingly insular and provincial, with little or no idea of the problems and the aims of what he contemptuously describes as foreigners and their countries. He has an unrealistic concept of America's inherent, rather than earned or proven, superiority and of its absolute military invincibility. This is his greatest weakness. He fails to appreciate the meaning of and the necessity for military organization or any form of discipline. Most often he feels that his military service is a kind of hateful and unavoidable servitude to be tolerated as briefly as possible; then escaped from as rapidly as possible. He is what he himself calls a peacetime soldier. He looks on military service only as a soft and safe job. He resents hardship and sacrifice of any description, as if these things were unfair and unreasonable to him personally. Based upon these facts about the imperialistic United States aggressors, the reeducation and indoctrination program for American prisoners proceeds as planned."

This report I have just read is the estimate of the Chinese after nearly a year of interrogation and observation of American prisoners of war. The report was from a Chinese intelligence officer to his superiors in Peiping. It certainly was not propaganda but, in their eyes, a factual report and estimate on American conduct and reactions under the peculiar conditions of a prison camp.

Now I don't for a minute pretend that this was an entirely accurate estimate. But, on the other hand, we can't be realistic about it and at the same time dismiss it as being a figment of Chinese Communist imagination.

Whether we like it or not, this appraisal of your American youth (for most of these prisoners were young men) points out specific weaknesses and shortcomings manifested by our military personnel in Korea. Furthermore, it reflects certain weaknesses and shortcomings in this generation of Americans and in our parents, teachers, and leaders.

There is a severe criticism of our way of life; of our social system. It is a commentary on manners and morals; on national character and the lack of it. In fact, to use appropriately strong language, it is a disease that might well be considered the number one social disease of America.

Now I want to make another strong statement: The prevention and successful treatment of this disease are essential to the continuing survival of our system. I ask you to think about that: "the continuing survival of our system." For if our system—the American way of life—goes under we can expect a far worse fate than that being meted out to peoples of Soviet satellites—Hungary, as an example.

But before we accept the Chinese appraisal of our manhood let's examine the evidence.

Four days after our ground forces engaged the enemy in Korea—July 9, 1950, to be exact—an American Army officer, taken prisoner 48 hours before, made a 900-word broadcast in the enemy's behalf over the Seoul radio. This man said, among other things, "We did not know at all the cause of the war and the real state of affairs, and were compelled to fight against the people of Korea. It was really most generous of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to forgive us and give kind consideration for our health, for food, clothing and habitation."

What must we American citizens think of something like that? Here was an American, an officer in the Army, within 2 days after capture, practically committing treason—certainly abetting the enemy. How had such a behavior been possible? Service authorities were dumfounded. Within a few weeks many statements of this sort were picked up at radio listening posts.

The Army began at once the collection of data for a formal study of the behavior of our Korean prisoners of war in all its aspects—medical, psychological, propagandistic, and legal. The study was one of the most searching and exhaustive analysis of human conduct ever made. Nothing was left to chance, opinion or conjecture. Beginning with the first returned prisoners in February 1951, every American prisoner of war was interviewed and interrogated by specialists: counter-intelligence officers, doctors, psychiatrists, lawyers, and administrative workers. These men were drawn from all the services, the Army predominating. No limit was set on the length of the men's answers to questions which ultimately covered several million pages of interviews.

The Communists had warned our men that when they returned to their country they would be subjected to intensive and, it was implied, to brutal questioning by the American authorities. Because of this, the interrogators and specialists were extremely understanding and sympathetic in their tactful handling of the men. Everything possible was done to restore their peace of mind and assist them in a gradual and undisturbed recovery from their ordeal as prisoners of war. Answers to questions were not forced or influenced in any way. What was wanted was facts—facts arrived at naturally and truthfully.

This they succeeded in doing after more than 2 years of careful and exhaustive work. Time does not permit even outlining the many hours spent in obtaining every possible bit of evidence from each man and then checking and doublechecking each fact. The indisputable facts were then pieced together to form the whole story of the American prisoners of war in Korea.

Now I want to give you some of the facts and findings that I have taken from various reports and studies. Much of the material on prisoners of war in Korea was obtained from an article by Mr. Eugene Kinkead and

a paper by Maj. William E. Mayer (Medical Corps), United States Army.

At the beginning various members of the study groups had preconceived ideas about Communist treatment of their prisoners. It was commonly believed that any American falling into Communist hands would be subjected to such brutal, inhuman treatment that he would become insane, or die trying to resist or suffer a moral collapse and become a Communist. Statistics show, however, that of the whole group of prisoners less than 5 percent were mistreated—and most of these cases occurred early in the war when the North Koreans were still in evidence. The incidence of mental disease among prisoners of war in Korea, while there and after their return, was not as high as in the general population in the United States. Thus, the procedure that the Communists imposed upon their American guests did not produce insanity.

The death of the prisoners was appalling; 62 percent survived and came home; 38 percent did not. This was the lowest survival rate, the highest death rate, among American prisoners of war since the American Revolution. It was at first assumed that the 38 percent who died, died at Communist hands. But a searching and intensive investigation disclosed that there was not a single documented case of any American who was ever tortured to death, beaten to death, starved to death, or executed for resisting the Communist brainwashing or indoctrination treatment.

What, then, caused this high death rate? The plain, unvarnished truth is that the men couldn't take it. And they couldn't take it because of many contributing factors. The first one, of course, is that we in America today do not live a hard life. Few of us are very hungry, few of us have to fight for survival. As a Nation, we are drifting away from a code of discipline—a code largely responsible for the establishment and early growth of our country. Our idea of life is generally one of less work, more pay, and more play. We shy from the harsh realities of life and are drawn toward the luxurious. None of this provides us with the fortitude to face up to something unforeseen—like a prisoner-of-war camp.

In Korea it became clear that so-called liberalized, but actually undisciplined, military organization, designed to please mama's boy and boys' mamas, cannot survive when the going got tough on the battlefield or in prisoner-of-war camps. It was the mama's boys who died first. It can be demonstrated that survival in battle depends almost entirely upon organization and discipline and the same applies to survival in case of capture—or, for that matter, in case of any civilian emergency or natural disaster. But I want to make this point clear. It does not mean something arbitrarily forced on a helpless drafter by a tough old sergeant or heartless chief petty officer. It does not mean something forced on young lieutenants by unreasonable colonels. Far from it, discipline is a system of values that requires constant attention and constant building. It is a set of beliefs and convictions which are meaningful to the individual and which actually guide his behavior.

A person who has been taught, and has acquired, good discipline knows right from wrong, knows the reasons for and the worth of obedience to proper authority, knows the value of integrity in himself and others; he does things that need to be done even though he doesn't like doing them; he appreciates and respects the rights and sensibilities of others even though he does not always agree with them in principle. In short he has a guide for his own behavior and this guide has been obtained mainly through the teachings and examples of others.

It was that kind of discipline that made the difference between those who lived and those who died; that often was the difference between those who resisted and those who gave up.

Many prisoners died because of an illness known as "giveupitis." An Army doctor, who as a prisoner himself, reported, "First, the sufferer became despondent; then he lay down and covered his head with a blanket; then he wanted ice water to drink with his food; next, no food, only water; and eventually, if he was not got to and helped, he would die. You could actually predict how long it would take. If you didn't get to him within 3 weeks, he was a goner; if you got to him sooner, he could usually be saved. But in a camp of 3,000 men, which was what we had at the start, and with only a few doctors, it was hard to locate all of these cases."

Why, you ask, even with a shortage of doctors among the prisoners, didn't the prisoners themselves help the sick and despondent? Now here is a $64,000 question. The sad and simple fact of the matter is that the prisoners lacked discipline—both military and personal discipline. The men who were captured in large groups early in the war (incidentally, most prisoners who died, died in the early stages of the war) became unmanageable. Even in prison camps our military regulations require maintenance of organization and rank structure. But in Korea the men refused to obey orders and they cursed, and sometimes struck officers who tried to enforce orders. This sort of thing was, of course, encouraged by the Communists. They informed all newly captured prisoners that command organization no longer existed among them and that they were all of equal rank as simple prisoners of war.

At first, the badly wounded suffered most. Then dysentery took its toll and gradually the inability of the men to take care of themselves in the primitive conditions of the camps further weakened their physical and mental resistance to those things which required personal discipline and good old Yankee resourcefulness to overcome. I do not have the time now to relate incidents of cruel and almost savage treatment of men by their fellow prisoners. Some of these stories are almost unbelievable, but they have been confirmed by evidence and thorough investigation.

Now I would like to consider the other most appalling thing of the prisoners' conduct: Collaboration with the enemy. By collaboration I mean acts of cooperation by prisoners with and for their captors. These acts ranged all the way from thoughtlessly snitching on their fellow prisoners to supplying information of military value to the enemy. One man, by his own admission, related how he gave information to the Communists after 35 minutes of not very intensive questioning. As he explained it, "They said they had ways of making me talk, so I talked." In contrast to this kind of behavior, another man, who had said nothing in the almost 3 years of his captivity explained that he had been taught not to communicate with the enemy, so he didn't.

An Army medical officer, who interrogated many returned prisoners and studied hundreds of cases and thousands of pages of documented testimony, placed the prisoners in 4 categories.

The first of these, or about 13 percent of the total number of collaborators, he placed under the general heading of "hard core." This group consisted of men with little capacity for enduring stress, who capitulated early in the game.

In the second category he placed the opportunists. They would give information, sign petitions, and make broadcasts for the sake of tangible benefits they were told they would receive, such as additional food, cigarettes, or soap or freedom to walk outside the camp. Despite their acts of collaboration, these men appeared no deep-seated convictions about communism and no real understanding about its techniques.

The third, and smallest, group of collaborators consisted of those who actually accepted communism. In general, they seemed to be men who had never formed any strong attachments of loyalties in their past lives. They had no confidence in themselves or were dissatisfied with what they had been up to that time. Thus, they were willing to accept a system as different as possible from the one they believed had done nothing for them.

In the fourth category were placed the great majority—3 out of 4 to be exact. Here were the men who chose what seemed to them to be the line of least resistance. In the absence of group discipline, they tried to substitute a form of conduct or protection of their own. Lacking personal discipline this procedure was doomed to failure. They complied outwardly with less extreme demands and some signed petitions and made broadcasts, but these were relatively harmless. On the whole, this group refused to do anything obviously traitorous.

They believed that the Communists would be more lenient if they acquiesced to demands and that if they didn't they would be punished and even tortured. These beliefs were of their own making largely because of the inadequate quality of their personal character and fortitude. Unfortunately, there was no one around to point out to this group that their atitude was unrealistic and that if their behavior had been based on reality, rather than on fantasy, the entire camp experience would have been easier for all of them. This conduct of outward compliance and lack of personal discipline made the Communist's system operate. Without it, the Communists would have been powerless.

I have pointed out a few factual results of American behavior under presssure. Such behavior, in such proportions, is not good for our country. In fact, unless and until we establish and maintain the integrity, fortitude, hardihood, and faith of our country's forefathers, our very survival is at stake. That statement is made in all seriousness and conviction. Reiterating what I said at the beginning of this talk, we are producing sufficient material requirements of life and for our national defense. What we need is a national and individual effort to improve the quality and character of our personnel.

What the Communists were able to do with our young men in the prison camps of North Korea, they are trying to do with our entire country. They have been working at this for some time. They are hard at work now and they will continue into the future until we or they go under. It is as clear cut as that. Our very survival is at stake.

In an analysis of our people we can examine the problem from two aspects: What the Communists are doing to deteriorate or influence our collective character and what we are doing or need to do to build it up.

At the present time the Communist is operating what amounts to a kind of evangelical warfare. For his evangelist he is obtaining the services of people who initially believe at least a part of the Communist doctrine.

This method of indoctrination and education of masses of people is a very effective one. It is a weapon in a very real war and one which is going on right now all over the world. And it is being used most intensively in the United States—in classrooms, homes, news media, organizations—everywhere around us. This is a war which we are not winning at this time. In this war we can't rely on retaliatory bombing squadrons, radar warning systems, intercontinental missiles, nuclear powered submarines or upon any material fortifications. The fortifications of this battlefield must be moral, spiritual and psychological.

This is a war of ideals and in this war we do have a better weapon. But it's a weapon which, like any other, is worthless unless it is used with understanding and effect.

Our weapon is our ideological principles as compared to those of the Communist. It is the strength of our men and women and teenagers; of our bill of rights; of our freedom of thought and speech; of our individual and collective intergrity, faith, honor and justice. But what we must face up to today is that these strengths are being misused or, what is even worse, unused by us.

We can learn a lesson from the prisoners who returned from Korea. These men were normal American citizens, such as you and I. What was done to them can and will be done with equal success to others. It is in process now and will succeed unless we set up fortification to combat it and defeat it.

The study of American prisoner behavior in Korea forcefully disclosed a deficiency in character and morals as well as physical stamina. It indicated a decided lack of old-fashioned ideas about personal honesty, loyalty, dependability and responsibility. To rectify these shortcomings requires a system of personal and character development and an awareness and determination by everyone that such a system must have universal support.

This kind of character development begins in the home—the military does a very credible job with its young men; but it must have something sound to work on. The character buildup must begin in the cradle and at the parent's knee (and let's hope the day will soon return when some of this development is accomplished across the parent's knee). From the home, the development must be continued and broadened in schools, churches, playing fields, work shops, and offices. As personnel managers and leaders you are in a position to make better citizens of our young American workers. Instill in them the pride of accomplishment of a good job, well done. Make them proud of their earning power—make them see how important it is do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

A vital part of the answer lies in an understanding by all Americans of our noble heritage, of our system of ideals and values which underlies our country's greatness. Specifically, it lies in a realization of the fact that we have available to us a power greater than that of ourselves alone. The Communist is an atheist and boasts of it. This is one of communism's great weaknesses. We are a Christian Nation. We should boast of it. It can be our greatest strength.

New Ruling Is Blow to Little Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the San Angelo, Tex., Standard Times, April 16, 1958, which I think is both sound and timely. I commend this particularly to the Committee on Education and Labor, which has jurisdiction over the subject matter. Corrective legislation should be enacted at once.

The editorial follows:

NEW RULING IS BLOW TO LITTLE BUSINESS

Government bureaucracy appears to be moving in on small business again while Congress and the do-gooders beat their breast over little business.

The Department of Labor, through Clarence T. Lundquist, Administrator of the Department's Wage and Hour Division, has announced he will put into effect a ruling on May 5 which will deprive those employees classified as executives from holding this title unless they receive $125 a week. Under the present procedure this title can be held by all those who receive $100 a week and above.

There are not many executives getting less than $125 a week. The only ones we know anything about are those who work for small-business concerns in the smaller cities of the Nation.

Mr. Lundquist's ruling will make eligible for overtime payment all so-called executives receiving less than $125 a week. While Mr. Eisenhower admonishes Mr. Reuther to be reasonable, the President's employee, Lundquist, moves in on the little fellows.

There is no need for Congress to profess interest in little business if this ruling goes into effect. If Congressmen want to help little business, here is their chance. They can talk Mr. Lundquist out of this ruling. The cumulative effect of the ruling will be the penalizing of those little concerns, which are already having a hard time competing with their large competitors.

We doubt if any executive in any business of any size will be affected. But the little-business people, who get such consistent solicitude from every liberal organization and politician, have no means of reaching Mr. Lundquist and his helpers and might just as well await his ax. Little business gets it again on May 5, 1958, unless alert Congressmen act quickly.

Doesn't Help REA Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a note of commonsense is welcome in the current discussion of interest rates for REA loans, and such a note is supplied by an editorial in the Ohio Farmer magazine for April 5. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

DOESN'T HELP REA CAUSE

For many years we've lent our full editorial support to rural electric cooperatives. During the years of their organization, the Ohio Farmer carried many articles about them. In more recent years, we've continued to tell of the valuable services they perform for Ohio members.

A rural electric cooperative provided the first power service to our home farm in Guernsey County. We number many REA directors and members as friends. Even so, we can't accept some statements of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Ellis is against the proposal to increase the interest rate the Government charges when lending money to rural electric cooperatives. Naturally, everyone likes to borrow money as cheaply as possible. And Ellis has every right to express his opposition to the move. But, there's little excuse for building a case upon emotion and sly innuendo.

For instance, Ellis charged recently that the bill to raise the interest rate was designed to kill rural electrification. In a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson he declared: "Your decision to give Wall Street the REA loan business obviously is not a fiscal decision. It's a decision to sacrifice rural America upon the golden altar of Wall Street money changers."

The plain fact is that money is a commodity, like anything else. Interest is the rent you pay for the use of money. The Government gets the money it loans to REA cooperatives and many other groups by selling bonds on the open market. During recent months the Government has been paying more to get the money than the 2 percent interest it charges the REA cooperatives. It has been picking up the check for the loss, and to that extent subsidizing REA loans.

Whether that subsidy should continue is the question. If so, the facts justifying the subsidy should be stated clearly and honestly. It's hard to believe that the future of REA will be decided by the fine point of whether the interest rate is raised.

If you're a member of a rural electric cooperative you have every reason to be proud of your organization. You'd like to see interest rates low—as who wouldn't? But, that doesn't mean you expect all the people in the country to help you pay part of the cost in the form of an interest subsidy, does it?

Certainly, when you have right and reason on your side, you don't need to engage in emotional ranting. An emotional approach often implies a weakness of facts. Don't you agree that the interest question can be considered squarely upon facts?

We have not seen a scrap of evidence to prove that the proposal in question would sacrifice rural America upon the golden altar of Wall Street money changers. These emotional charges do not reflect the calm, careful thinking we've always associated with our friends in the Ohio rural electric cooperatives.

San Jose News Takes on Another Federal Power Claim at Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in its editorial of March 11 entitled "Trinity Project and the P. G. & E.," the San Jose News helps explode another myth used by the Federal power supporters in their attacks against the Trinity partnership legislation.

In claiming that the P. G. & E. is out to take advantage of the consumer, the all-Federal power advocates ignore one point: that the company is one of the most widely owned gas and electric companies in the Nation—and that this constitutes real public ownership in the highest sense.

As the News notes:

The number of (P. G. & E.) shareholders stands at 225,487 with 143,528 Californians, or 66 percent, owning 46 percent of the outstanding shares.

It would seem that Californians having stock in this company reflect an investors confidence in the future of their State and the future of P. G. & E. Such widespread ownership of P. G. & E. stock certainly does not indicate a soaking of the taxpayer and consumer of gas and electricity.

At Trinity, it is the all-Federal power plan that would soak the taxpayer and consumer. For its advocates are asking the majority to pay the power bills of a few minority preference customers. These bills represent the difference between a production cost of 7.3 mills and a selling price of 4.6 mills per kilowatt hour. This would mean a loss of more than $120 million to the Federal Government during the 50-year repayment period—a loss borne by water users and taxpayers. In contrast with the heavy tax load carried by investor-owned utilities, Government power installations escape taxes almost completely. It is little wonder that the Government can often undercut its own citizens in the marketing of power, at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers?

I have requested that the San Jose News editorial referred to above be included in the RECORD for the information of those who are hearing the current myths of all-Federal power:

TRINITY PROJECT AND THE P. G. & E.

A great gust is whipping up over the issue of whether to grant the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. a partnership in the $262 million Trinity River diversion complex now being constructed as part of the vast Central Valley project. According to the New York Times, it is expected that the issue will play a major dramatic role in the 1958 election campaigns.

One of the charges leveled against the utility company by opponents of the plan is that it is a private operation that will be enriched at the expense of the taxpayer and the consumer. Without at this time going into the financial involvements (we shall touch upon this at a later date when the issue really gets hot), we should like to scrutinize closely what is mean by the word "private."

How privately owned is P. G. & E.? For many years, it has been the most widely owned gas and electric company in the Nation. Only six other firms have more stockholders. The number of shareholders stands at 225,487 with 148,528 Californians, or 66 percent, owning 46 percent of the outstanding shares.

Some 656 insurance companies own stock and 497 religious institutions have holdings thus spreading the earned income among millions. In addition, 433 educational institutions, investment trusts, private and public pension funds also are owner-shareholders. A total of 87,697 women, as opposed to 51,510 men, derive income from their holdings.

Thus the myth of the "private" company is exploded since the average holdings are spread horizontally across the land and affects multiple millions of people.

Item Veto Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, twice in the past 2 years the President has vetoed river and harbor-flood-control bills that had been passed by Congress. Both bills were a hodgepodge of good projects and bad. He vetoed the bills for that reason.

Some of the projects in both bills had been inserted against the advice and recommendations of the agencies—United States Army Engineers, Budget Bureau, and Secretary of the Army—which are especially charged with the responsibilities of studying such projects and reporting their findings to Congress. In many cases the recommendations of these agencies were ignored. Some projects had not gone through the customary procedure of reporting on them.

When the river and harbor-flood-control bill came before the House there were 132 projects in it which almost everyone agreed were economically sound and desirable. There were 18 projects that were objectionable to many for various reasons. Almost everyone wanted the good projects approved. To obtain authorization of the good projects, however, would have involved approving 18 projects, total cost of which exceeded $300 million, which were not acceptable. Accepting $300 million of objectionable projects in order to obtain the good projects many felt was too big and wasteful a price to pay.

Dispute over issues of this kind could be eliminated if the President were granted the item veto, which he does not now have. Under Federal law the President must accept every project or item in a bill or veto the entire bill. In many States governors have the right of item veto; the President does not.

The item veto would deprive the Congress of no rights it now enjoys. If the President were to veto several items in a bill the Congress, if it had the votes could override his veto of any one or of all the vetoed items.

Had the President possessed the power of item veto, he could have vetoed in the river and harbor-flood-control bill those projects he considered objectionable. Such action would have authorized the good projects in the bill and left to Congress the power to authorize over the President's veto any of the projects in the bill he had vetoed.

The item veto is in keeping with the salutary provision of checks and balances provided by the Constitution. This often would work for less waste and for more efficiency in Government.

The Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., one of the most outstanding daily newspapers in the Pacific Northwest, in an editorial in commenting on the recent veto by the President of the river and harbor bill recommended the item veto for river and harbor-flood-control bills. On this subject the Oregonian editorial said:

ITEM VETO NEEDED

Impasses such as that developing between Congress and President Eisenhower over important bills, including the vetoed rivers and harbors bill, could be prevented by the grant of an additional legislative power to the Executive: The item veto.

Every United States President of modern times has sought authority to accept or reject separate items in appropriation bills rather than deal with an omnibus bill as a unit. Some have taken the view that a constitutional amendment is necessary. President Eisenhower has held, however, to the opinion that congressional legislation is all that is necessary. In May 1957, he publicly asked Congress to pass such legislation.

Congress has much to gain by following the recommendation. The President surely would never veto in its entirety a measure like the rivers and harbors bill if he were authorized to reject items selectively. Such procedure would give greater assurance that worthy projects would pass into law unincumbered by the products of logrolling and the pork barrel. In fact, pork could be expected to be at a minimum in a bill subject to the President's selective veto. Congress would still have the power to pass vetoed items over the Presidential objection; but patently unworthy projects, such as now ride in, would seldom survive.

Foreign Aid Duel With Reds Calls for Caution by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach consideration of the foreign aid program for the fiscal year 1959, we should give careful consideration to our aims and whether or not these aims are being met under the program as carried out today.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen entitled "Foreign Aid Duel With Reds Calls for Caution by United States," which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

FOREIGN AID DUEL WITH REDS CALLS FOR CAUTION BY UNITED STATES

(By Bishop Fulton J. Sheen)

The United States, under Providence, is to play an important role in the preservation of the liberties of the world.

But governments are not completely inspired by an amor benevolentiae or the love of others for their own sakes. Foreign aid has many aspects; military, political, economic and social. One of these aspects which is worth examining is the giving of aid in order to combat communism by keeping the underprivileged nations within the orbit of the free world.

In relation to the assumption that foreign aid combats communism, we would point out 3 cautions and 3 recommendations.

Caution 1: There is nothing in foreign aid of and by itself which makes it an effective weapon against communism. Aid can be given by the United States to combat communism; but aid can be given and is given by the Soviets to further communism.

It is conceivable that the Soviets could give more than the United States, because they give greater primacy to creating new slaves through world imperialism, than to adequate production for those presently enslaved.

Caution 2: It is a fallacy to believe that he who gives the most, is assured of winning the underprivileged. Foreign aid, from this point of view is like courtship, and it is well to remember that a maid does not always marry the one who gives her the biggest wingswept fenders.

The underprivileged nations, to continue the analogy, need not marry at all; they can become old maids, or politically become narrowly nationalistic; or they could be won by a third power, which would be neither the United States nor the Soviets, and of which we speak in a moment.

Caution 3: Avoid seeking to win other peoples into our orbit by economic means alone. To do this would be to put ourselves

on exactly the same basis as the Soviets, namely, materialism.

Denying it in theory, but affirming it in practice, we would thereby assume the basic Marxian principle of the economic determination of history.

And what would be tragic is that we would be doing it to peoples who themselves refuse to accept the primacy of the economic.

Recommendations are as follows:

1. The foreign aid of the United States must introduce some factor besides the economic, political, and military; one which is the strongest in our national traditions and one which the Soviets not only lack, but repudiate.

They have one fear in our dealing with the rest of the world, that we will take cognizance of that defect which makes them suspect by all the peoples of Asia and Africa and that is our belief in God, the dignity of the human person, the freedom of conscience, and the principle that the state exists for man not man for the state.

When we go along with the Communist line that matter alone matters, we are weak and they are strong; when we give economic aid on the basis that matter alone does not matter, they are powerless and we are strong.

2. Along these lines, recognize that there exists what might be called a third world power, which despite many fundamental differences with Christianity and Judaism, nevertheless does believe in God and prayer.

One out of every 7 persons in the world is a Moslem; 375 million of them in the world constitute a great supranational force.

Already the anti-God forces of the Soviets have won over some of their governments and largely because we have been silent on the fundamental differences between them and the Soviets.

Islam can be made sympathetic to the free world more by recognizing its belief in God than by mere economic aid which ignores that belief.

One of the strongest anti-Communist blocs in the world is ignored because in our insistence on the economic, we have placed ourselves on the same level as the anti-God forces.

Food for Thought as We Ponder the Problems of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly respected journalists I know is Frank Tripp, chairman of the board of the Gannett Co. He is a long-time leader in the Gannett group of newspapers and radio stations, founded by the late great American, Frank E. Gannett. Mr. Tripp is a veteran writer and editor who speaks with authority and perspicacity on a wide range of subjects. Often, his calm, incisive comments cut away the fat around an issue with clean strokes and bare the marrow for the readers' eyes.

On a number of occasions Mr. Tripp has written about various problems in our educational system. In a recent column in the Gannett papers, he makes some points worth remembering. Although I am firmly convinced of the need for strengthening our reservoir of educated people, and for establishing a Federal loan program for needy college students, I do feel Mr. Tripp's words deserve wide attention. Therefore, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD his column entitled, "A Plea for the Trades":

A PLEA FOR THE TRADES
(By Frank Tripp)

Nobody is paying much attention to the basic education that will man the trades in that effortless tomorrow. Who will build when all of our kids become mental wizards?

While dreamers of a collegiate utopia unfold their plans, nature is creating its eternal majority of commonplace children—new lives that can be frustrated and their usefulness impaired by misplaced higher education, urged upon them by theorists and parents who gamble that any kid may be tutored into an Einstein.

This is to be a visit with some of their dads—that unsung army of craftsmen who have let themselves become important only on election day—and have come to look down upon their own worthy vocations.

Their forebears, and mine, proudly proclaimed that to build is as dignified and important as to create. They held that man's prime obligation to society was to live by his own hands, for all had hands and only the few had genius. Their lives were backlogged by work and practical experience.

The trades and the newspapers were pop's university. He would rather rear a journeyman tinker than what he called an "educated fool," a nonproductive misfit of a codfish aristocracy.

Excepting only the major professions, that was pop's rude estimate of higher education. It was his deliberate slur of the arts—the same arts and sciences that his sons today crave for their children—which brings us down to now.

Out of pop's philosophy survives one inescapable truth—that "all have hands, only the few have genius." The flaw in today's reversal of pop's thinking is that almost every craftsman's third grader has become a potential Steinmetz, who "must never work for a living as his father did"; though crippled Steinmetz slaved as few men have.

The fallacy of it all is that the greater the success the tougher the job. Craftsmen themselves are discrediting the dignity of their trades, degrading the builders of tomorrow.

Preparation for youth's effortless career ignores that work and practical experience will reveal true genius where it exists. Yet diversion, leisure, glamour, and fame, above achievement, have become too much a part of parents' aspirations for their children.

We may build palatial schools and universities, Pentagon in size, reeking in theory; build great industries with automatic machinery that does more thinking than its operatives; raise wages, shorten hours, bestow benefits that drive costs higher than income; leave posterity with hopeless debt, dependent upon Government, craving the moon:

But we never can cram or legislate capacity to learn, or guts to win, into kids who lack such innate ambition and ability.

Westerns never can take the place of reading, or TV dinners the place of corned beef and cabbage. Theory never will displace experience. Automatics and Univacs won't develop minds incapable to produce without them.

Are we breeding today such millions of phenomenons that the three R's are nonessentials to education; college aspirants who can barely spell, write legibly, multiply by 9, learning the alphabet from a telephone directory?

Don't believe it? They come for jobs, and out of high schools. How about some of pop's good old-fashioned "lower education"? He wasn't wrong about that.

We have got to better educate future artisans who will not go to college, and not make millions produce a diploma to get a job, or feel important.

We lavish too much adoration upon geniuses, personages, "honorables" and "stars"; too little appreciation of those who build. We have gone celebrity-cockeyed.

Who else is getting fed up on the applesauce that in America's tomorrow there will ouly be places for wizards, sheepskins, scientists, and stars?

Who else believes that we are overemphasizing higher education, with too little fundamental basis to accept it? Even worse, shaming the common-school millions who must house, clothe, and feed us.

Are we nurturing a Nation of pop's "educated fools" as a means to discover the genius among them?

If you think all this is crazy, just try to fill the apprentice ranks in a good half of the essential trades. They all want to start as vice presidents—their misguided parents expect it.

Some of the Causes for Our Present Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. E. A. Jackson, which makes a fine point regarding some of the causes for our present recession.

I commend this letter to my colleagues:

JACKSON BROS.,
Saratoga, Calif., April 5, 1958.

Congressman CHARLES GUBSER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: I have been wanting to write you for a long time how the tax situation affects us in our business but have hesitated as I feel you must already knw the things I am going to tell you.

I am interested in and am president of the Santa Clara Cold Storage & Freezer Co. in Santa Clara, Calif., which about 40 of us farmers built about 5 years ago due to shortage of storage space for our pears. It is about 1 million cubic feet and cost about $1 million. We borrowed about 50 percent and have over half of our loan paid off.

There is again a real shortage of cold storage space in the summer time and we have been studying the problem of adding some new rooms to accommodate 125,000 boxes of pears at one filling and the estimated cost would be around $150,000.

We can raise the money but it is just not practical to go into the venture if we have to pay 52 percent of our profits in taxes and then again pay 35 to 50 percent of what we get in personal tax.

I wish to point out that if we could be assured that the corporation tax would not be over 25 percent in the future, we would go ahead with our expansion program without hesitation.

It would mean that our company would spend this difference or 27 percent for expansion and a new sound business instead of the Government spending it.

Another important factor against this high 52 percent tax is that the Government is paying 52 percent of the labor bill and other expenses also. This is a very important reason why most companies raise wages so easily.

Our wages and salaries have raised about 50 percent in the last 5 years and under these conditions and with 52 percent tax we just can't see our way clear to expand as we naturally should.

I am thoroughly convinced that the high tax rates both corporation and personal is what is bringing on the recession and will continue in the same direction until real tax relief is given.

If all companies were allowed to keep and use that 27 percent it would be used for employment and expansion which would make a healthy economy instead of the Government getting it to pass out to people for doing nothing.

Taking tax money at the 52-percent rate to give away certainly is not a solution to our problem.

It has been quite a few years now that this plan has been going on and I am sure many of us knew that it would ruin our industries if it continued.

I hope I have made it clear how the high tax rates are affecting our company and assume it does likewise to millions of others.

If you believe in what I have told you do you think it would help to write to others about it? And who would that be?

We farmers who market through Mr. Irving Woodies, of the CES of Sacramento, thoroughly agree with the administration's farm policy and know it will work out right in the end.

Very sincerely yours,

EDGAR JACKSON.

Democrats, Politics, and Panic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the current business slump seems to have alerted the Democrat Party to the necessity for stressing to all of our citizens the great dangers we are facing. In a similar situation in 1949 and 1950, they were very quiet and had little to say.

The Chicago Tribune, in their editorial of April 5 entitled "Politics and Panic," points out the difference in Democrat attitudes in these two periods. The editorial is as follows:

POLITICS AND PANIC

A good many influential Democrats are lamenting the current business slump with an enthusiasm that suggests something more than concern for the Nation's economy. It would be naive, in fact, not to associate their cries of panic and their prolific emergency spending programs with the approaching November elections. The more they can plant the idea of a Republican recession in people's minds—whether their programs are adopted or not—the better it will be for them in November.

The administration, on the other hand, has backed away from its earlier touch of panic and from time to time adopts a stoic wait-and-see attitude, tinged with hope.

This attitude has led Speaker RAYBURN to comment somewhat sarcastically: "I see [from the President's remarks] that everything is going to be all right. We heard a lot of that kind of talk in 1928, 1929, and 1930. But I never heard of wishing making it so."

It was no accident that Mr. RAYBURN failed to mention 1948–49. Statistically, that recession was a good deal like the present one. The percentage of unemployment was about the same; production went down slightly less, but income went down a good deal more. Then it was the Democrats who were in office, and it was they who did the minimizing and the hoping.

Speaking of deflation in his economic report in January 1949, 2 months after the recession began and 6 months before business turned up, Mr. Truman said, "We need to have available a range of governmental measures which can be applied as brake or as accelerator, according to the need." Here, clearly, was the Democratic chance to use some of the measures which they advocate today.

Yet in the same report Mr. Truman spoke reassuringly of "our escape from the danger of a general recession," and warned against continuing inflation. In his state of the Union message the same month, he said that the protection of our economy "cannot be attained by Government alone. Indeed, the greater part of the task must be performed by individual efforts under our system of free enterprise."

A few weeks later one of Mr. Truman's leading economic advisers, Leon Keyserling, had this to say: "I am not one of those who believe that compensatory Government spending is a sure or efficient solution for a recession or a depression. We learned from the last depression (in the 1930's) how hard it is to bring about a complete and effective revival in that way."

For a man so closely associated with the great Government-can-do-it notions of the New Deal, this was indeed an example of calmness.

As business grew worse, various remedies were suggested, but Mr. Truman lay low. He let it be known that he was ready to act if necessary, but Government spending did not go significantly higher than it already was; Federal unemployment compensation was discussed, but not pressed, and price supports were not increased.

Business recovered in the fall of 1949. The recovery probably was hastened by the decision of the Democratic administration to take no action. The present excitement of the Democrats is wholly different from their calm view of the problem when their man was in the White House.

Harry, the Medicine Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of former President Truman's visit to Washington last week, several excellent editorials appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which I thought should be called to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorials follow:

DR. TRUMAN PRESCRIBES

Our adding machine blew out a gasket yesterday as we were trying to compute the total amount of spending and tax reduction recommended by former President Truman as an antidote to the recession.

The tax reduction was easy—a cool $5 billion, but of course only for middle and low-income groups. When the New Dealers raise taxes it is always the higher incomes that get soaked, but when they reduce taxes (when did they ever reduce taxes?) only the middle and low-income groups are to get the benefit. A couple of bucks to the voter are always worth more than the $16,000 average investment that is required to create a job in industry.

It was when we got into the spending part that our adding machine went haywire. Mr. Truman said that we ought to spend $3 billion more in the next fiscal year for defense outlays than the administration planned, and that we ought to be spending $5 billion more a year by 1964, that we should spend $1,700,000,000 more for education, public health, and public assistance next year, and that by 1964 we ought to be spending $12 billion for these purposes, $2½ billion for the development of natural resources and $2,200,000,000 for housing. And that isn't all. Dr. Truman also prescribed expansion of the unemployment compensation system, increased social security benefits and equity capital for small business. Was anybody left out?

Just the taxpayers from whom all this money is to come, on top of the $72 billion they're already paying. And on top of that, the former President would have the Government lower the interest rate on the public debt. How do you go about that, we wondered, by lowering the redemption price on a $100 savings bond to $90?

In a crack at the Eisenhower administration Mr. Truman said we should not "try to brush recessions aside by pretending that they are a good thing." And of course he glossed over the effect his spending and tax reduction remedies would have on inflation and further reductions in the purchasing power of the dollar.

We would have more confidence in Dr. Truman's nostrums if he had tried them out on the patient in 1950, when the jobless percentage was higher than it is now, and if the results had been successful.

But at that time Mr. Truman didn't call for more Government spending and lower taxes. On the contrary, he was quoted in an exclusive interview with Arthur Krock, then chief of the New York Times' Washington bureau, as saying that a certain amount of unemployment, say from 3 to 5 million, was healthy for the economy and that it was a good thing for job-seeking to go on at all times.

Reminded of this interview yesterday, Mr. Truman described it as having "come out of the air." But Krock said the interview was proposed by Truman, that it was submitted to him before publication, that it was returned approved with a few changes but none in the passage about unemployment.

We will take Krock's word as opposed to Truman's faulty memory.

TRUMAN IN WASHINGTON

Former President Truman was in Washington Monday primarily to tell a congressional committee what he thought should be done to end the recession. His prescription was quite amazing, as we noted yesterday, amounting as it did to another massive dose of inflation. But before the day ended, his economic views were virtually submerged by a question of veracity between himself and Arthur Krock, New York Times' columnist and former chief of its Washington bureau.

This came about when Truman said an exclusive interview he granted to Krock, which was published February 15, 1950, "did not happen, it came out of the air." In his column in yesterday's Times, Krock described how the interview originated and repeated his assertion that it was submitted to the White House for approval before publication. If any substantiation is needed, it is to be found in the record of a press conference the next day at which Truman told other reporters that the interview was authorized and defended his prerogative of giving exclusive interviews to whom and whenever he desired.

With what can only be described as extreme charity, Krock commented that Truman "has played a minor and unfortunate role as an active repudiator of established facts concerning him, even when this reflects without justification on the personal integrity of others. Perhaps a bad memory explains some repudiations. If so, this memory is remarkably bad."

We remember very well the interview in question. At that time the hottest issue in Washington was the Communist infiltration of the Government and the efforts of congressional committees to expose it. And, what seemed at the time to be the hottest subject in the interview was Truman's statement that he still believed the Alger Hiss case, even after Hiss had been convicted of perjury, was a "red herring" designed to distract public attention from the alleged misdeeds of the "do-nothing Republican 80th Congress."

Less attention was given to another statement in the interview that "it is a good thing that job-seeking should go on at all times. It is a healthy thing to have some unemployment * * * from 3 to 5 millions is supportable."

It was when this statement was brought to Truman's attention Monday that he said the interview "didn't happen, it came out of the air." Even the most ardent admirers of the former President among the Washington newspaper corps—and he has some—must have been shocked by Truman's brazen accusation that a newspaperman of Krock's standing would write, and a newspaper of the Times' stature would publish, a fake interview.

Truman's place in presidential history is still to be established. He will be noted for making bold and momentous decisions, but not for adherence to the truth.

Taxpayers' Tenants: Public Housing—the Chicago Scandals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, since the time that public housing deviated from the purpose for which the program was originally justified—that of taking care of needy people who are displaced as a result of slum clearance—there have been recurring reports of corruption, mismanagement, waste, and other excesses in connection with the operation of the various projects over the country.

A good example of this is contained in an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 10, 1958, written by Mr. Ray Vicker. It goes without saying that many public housing projects are operated as fairly and properly as they can be, but it begins to look more and more like that practice is the exception rather than the rule. Let us hope the situation will improve.

Mr. Vicker appears to have done an excellent job of exposing the manner in which many of these projects are being operated. He deals with the excessive cost of upkeep, the threat of new slums in such housing projects, rent delinquencies, union rules, vandalism, and also with alcoholics and unwed mothers. Since American taxpayers are underwriting this program, every one should read Mr. Vicker's report, which follows:

CHICAGO.—At the 15-story Gov. Henry Horner tax-supported public-housing project here, the windows open outward and upward like awnings. A favorite competitive sport of high-spirited lads on warm days is atom bombing. You drop a pop bottle from the top floor, then count the number of windows it goes through on the way down.

In Toledo, Ohio, soaring maintenance costs threaten the solvency of public housing. High rental delinquencies form the central theme of one critical report on the program in Hamtramck, Mich. In Cincinnati public-housing folk are seeking to discourage baby production by unmarried females living in tax-supported apartments and collecting bigger welfare benefit checks for each new child.

Public housing's difficulties with problem families—welfare and police cases, alcoholics, the chronically unemployed, and such—are widespread. These troubles boost maintenance costs, threaten to make slums of new projects, and are hiking the project managers' load in a job which may not be easy under the best of circumstances.

CLOSER CHECKS

The Public Housing Administration, the Federal agency which funnels public-housing subsidies through about 900 local housing authorities scattered around the Nation, now is making closer checks of management practices of these local authorities. PHA wants to be sure taxpayers get their money's worth for the $473 million the Federal Government already has invested in public housing through the subsidy payments.

Chicago, Toledo, Hamtramck, Rockford, Ill., and Zanesville, Ohio, are only a few of the communities where such studies have been made. Currently, other management reviews are underway at Minneapolis, St. Paul, Cincinnati, and various other places.

In Chicago 22 public housing projects are Federally supported to the tune of $3.9 million annually. At least $1 million a year is spent to cover waste, union featherbedding, mismanagement and tenant vandalism, says PHA's Chicago regional office in one such review.

In Washington, Abner D. Silverman, Assistant PHA Commissioner for Management, says nearly 200 management reviews have been made during fiscal 1958. He explains that in 1957, PHA launched a comprehensive audit and analysis program, with every local housing authority due to get such a review once every 3 years. He adds: "The recent study of the Chicago Housing Authority is an example of this new type of review and analysis. It is not an investigation but an overall administrative management analysis and study designed to permit PHA to discharge its responsibilities under the law in a fashion that will prove most helpful to the local housing authority."

DEPRESSION MEASURE

Public housing was first spawned in 1937 as a depression make-work measure. A subsidiary aim was to provide rental assistance to families in the lowest income group. City planners subsequently saw it as a slum clearance weapon.

Social planners saw it as a sociological conveyor belt. Low income, poorly educated tenants—usually former slum dwellers—would come into a project paying minimum rentals. They would have roomier, lighter, cleaner, better ventilated apartments and would raise their own moral and cleanliness standards to match—the theory went. Incomes would rise until families exceeded the maximum allowed in a project. Rehabilitated families would move to new homes of their own. This would permit more low income families to be attracted at the base to start the process over again. Good housing was supposed to reduce juvenile delinquency and crime, promote stable family life and encourage an overall higher standard of living.

The social planners who subscribed to these theories went awry in figuring that good housing automatically stimulates problem families into rising above their previous environment, public housing officials now admit.

"Problem families merely recreate their old environment at the new site," says one midwestern housing man. Growing cynical, he adds: "It isn't buildings that make slums. It's people. Move those people from a slum to a new housing project and they'll create a new slum."

MUSTERING EVIDENCE

Considerable evidence can be mustered to show that, far from stimulating people to rise above sordid environments, public housing may discourage many from trying to better themselves incomewise. They prefer subsidized housing to being forced to move elsewhere if their income rises.

Under the Federal program, PHA, underwrites loans of local authorities which build and operate projects. PHA then assists communities in paying off the debt through annual subsidies. Communities handle maintenance and operating costs from the rents they collect.

Today this depression baby has grown into a sprawling giant. Over 1.7 million people now live in more than 425,000 federally aided low-rental units operated by various localities. Some localities add units of their own with State and city money exclusively, raising the total number of people now living in public housing to around 2.4 million.

This year 35,000 more federally aided units are planned. And once again a recession is being cited as a reason for building public housing on a broad scale.

"There is every justification for low-rent public housing to represent 10 percent of annual housing unit production on a continuing program basis," says the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials; an organization of State and local officials headquartered in Chicago. Such a figure would mean construction of 90,000 to 100,000 units annually.

FLURRY OF INTEREST

There are now over 900 public housing authorities serving 1,225 communities, up from only 265 communities served in 1949.

Recently there has been a further flurry of interest in public housing on the part of communities, say housing officials.

"There are five localities in the Chicago region for which applications for new housing have been made since September 30, 1957," says Brice Martin, assistant to the regional director for the Chicago region of P. H. A. "In addition, there are 27 localities that have evinced an interest in getting housing."

The 10-State Chicago region now has 96 authorities engaged in public housing.

There is no doubt, though, that many a city is having trouble managing the public housing it already has.

Authorities blame a lot of their troubles on the fact that public housing attracts a high percentage of broken families, families with big broods of children by nameless fathers, other welfare cases and shiftless characters who prefer unemployment to work as long as Government agencies provide handouts.

"We are becoming caretakers for problem families," moans one public housing official in Chicago. "Changes must be made in the setup of public housing if it is to survive."

There are, of course, many hard-working, earnest low-income families in public housing projects besides the problem cases. But housing authorities note many of the former sour on their less respectable neighbors and move elsewhere. The problem families then tend to take over, threatening to make slums of the housing developments.

MALADJUSTED FAMILIES

Visit some of Chicago's housing projects and you see what a problem these maladjusted families can be.

At Grace Abbott Homes, southwest of Chicago's Loop, rags are stuffed into 1 broken window of a 15-story building. Steel doors bar some entrances, for anything less strong might be kicked in by rambunctious tenants. Children are playing with automatic elevators, so you walk up several flights of stairs noting how some hall windows are sealed up to prevent glass breakage. Light bulbs are frequently missing, while the jagged pieces of 1 broken bulb still remains in 1 hall socket.

Cockroaches scurry along the floor. On upper floors there is an odor of urine. One tenant complains bitterly that her children can't reach bathrooms in time when playing downstairs because elevators usually are undergoing repairs or occupied.

Fire hydrant caps and hydrant control caps frequently are missing. Brass caps, worth $8 each, are stolen for sale to junkmen as scrap, explains one Public Housing Authority official later.

Such conditions are underscored in a 6-volume report of Chicago Housing Authority operations released recently by Public Housing Authority.

"Vermin infestation is practically universal," says the report. "With some notable exceptions, tenant cooperation in maintenance is most lacking."

In one apartment building of recent vintage, cockroaches are so thick that they are clogging motors of tenant refrigerators, says the Public Housing Authority report. One investigator tells of seeing bed bugs crawling on walls of the model apartment used as a demonstrator at Stateway Gardens development.

CONTROL BUTTONS

Consideration is being given to bolting steel plates over the button controls of automatic elevators. Holes would be drilled so that "each control button can be pushed with a finger through a hole, but the buttons cannot be damaged, since they will be protected by the steel plates," says a PHA recommendation. Rowdy tenants now use hammers to knock off the buttons. Vandalism and tenant damages are costing CHA at least $150,000 a year, says PHA.

Release of the report is resulting in a rash of activity in public housing projects in Chicago. "Many of the suggested improvements already have been made," says Alvin E. Rose, executive director of the CHA.

Sheer size of some of the public housing authorities in large cities poses a management problem. The New York City Housing Authority, swelled by city and State, as well as Federal, projects, now is a $1.1-billion empire consisting of 82 public housing developments. Many of them are cities in themselves. Chicago values the land, plant, and equipment of its public housing at $190 million.

In projects of such size, management's right arm may not know what the left arm is doing. This situation is ideal for strong labor unions to run up operating and maintenance costs through featherbedding and restrictive practices.

LABOR PRACTICES

When PHA dug into this situation at Chicago, it uncovered a long list of practices, including:

Painters wash all painted wall surfaces while janitors wash only the tile, even though both surfaces are side by side.

A carpenter must be used to replace a screw in a bracket.

An electrician must be called to plug in a new refrigerator in an apartment.

Removal of a hot-water heater requires a plumber to disconnect the cold-water pipe and a pipefitter to disconnect the hot-water pipe.

Glaziers install 6.5 window panes per day, though in Detroit glaziers handle 18 panes per day.

Thirteen janitors are employed 8 hours a day each in one project though time studies show 5 janitors could handle all the work on a four-hour day.

In some instances, electricians are used to replace light bulbs.

A MINOR REPAIR

The sequence of operations in making minor plaster repairs to a wall behind the kitchen range is this:

Inspection by the head janitor and preparation of work orders.

The janitor sweeps out and removes debris.

Inspection by plasterer to determine plastering work.

Inspection by painter foreman to determine extent of painting.

A visit by a pipefitter to disconnect the range.

The janitor moves the range out of the way.

The plasterer and a helper repair the wall.

A painter washes and paints the wall.

The janitor moves the range into place.

The pipefitter reconnects the range.

Janitor cleans up.

Chicago's public-housing problems may be worse than average. Yet the city's difficulties illustrate the situations now facing many authorities in other cities.

Pointing in the direction of the LeClaire Courts housing project which ironically is almost in the back yard of his real-estate agency, Ralph Finitzo, bespectacled and graying Chicago home builder, says: "That's the biggest slum in this whole area and it is only a few years old."

NEWSPAPERS AND TIN CANS

Slipping behind the wheel of his 1957 Buick sedan, he drives through the project. Newspapers blow across a lawn. Rusty tin cans lay beside one front door. But a new coat of paint lends a bright touch to the two-story apartments built with monotonous regularity on the site.

"We took so many photographs of this place to show people how a new slum was created that the Chicago Housing Authority got tired of it," says Mr. Finitzo, past chairman of the National Association of Home Builders' public housing committee. Recently CHA sent a crew of painters down here and slapped fresh paint on the buildings."

In another Chicago public-housing project, an unmarried woman with 4 children by 4 different men lives in a tax-supported apartment while drawing aid-to-dependent-children checks from the welfare department.

A Chicago social worker expresses surprise when queried about that case: "Such cases are so common I don't know why you are asking about this one," she said. Then she tells of another woman with an even larger family of children by different fathers.

"There are 6 or 7 children, I'm not sure which without checking records," says this social worker. "Now the eldest girl in the family is pregnant, too, father unknown."

The CHA claims it seeks to discourage illegitimacy in public-housing projects. Says a spokesman: "When a woman with children applies for housing she is given a form to fill out. On this she must list her children and their fathers. If there is more than one father she may not be admitted. However, if it appears that the pattern has been stopped, she may be admitted. She will be evicted automatically should that pattern be resumed again."

In Cincinnati the Metropolitan Housing Authority allows a mother with illegitimate children to enter housing. But it takes a count of the children and has mothers sign a statement that if another child pops up without a marriage license the family will be subject to eviction.

INTERFERING WITH THEIR RIGHTS

"When we first launched this program there were some complaints from women that we were interfering with their rights," says Harry L. Reece, executive director of the CHA.

Problem families not only hike maintenance costs, they may cut revenue. The theory of public housing is predicated on having a spread of tenants in various income brackets, with those in the higher brackets carrying more of a load than those in lower brackets. If you earn more, you pay more. If you earn more than the top limit, you move.

Thus, in Chicago, the minimum rent is $31 a month for the family with an income of $1,705 a year or less while the maximum rent is $96 a month for the 7-person family earning $5,750 a year. To enter a project, the 1- or 2-person family must earn no more than $3,600 while larger families must earn no more than $3,800.

But the housing authority finds that problem families are more heavily concentrated at the low end of the income scale. Once in a project they may not try to increase incomes, yet they cling to subsidized apartments harder than the diligent families.

UPSETTING THE THEORY

Today, 50 percent of tenants in Chicago's projects are paying minimum rents. This upsets the cross sectional rent paying theory. There aren't enough renters at the upper end of the scale for total rents to carry the operations load.

"The current financial picture of the CHA operations holds in the threat of insolvency," warns PHA in its management review of Chicago projects. It urges that "selection of tenants be made from an income grade which will provide tenant families of such incomes which will help to achieve and maintain a representative cross section of low income families and produce more revenue."

A deficit of nearly $500,000 is estimated for CHA in the current fiscal year, a figure which will rise to $1.2 million in fiscal 1960 if steps are not taken to correct difficulties, says PHA.

Increased Federal Forest Timber Sales Will Increase Employment in Many Western Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there are only two departments of the Federal Government that make a profit. These are the Internal Revenue Service, which collects the taxes, and the Federal Forest Service, which manages and sells federally owned forest timber.

The Federal Forest Service last year sold 7 billion feet of Federal timber and for that timber received $111 million. This $111 million from the sale of Federal timber after paying for all operating costs of the Department left a $32 million surplus which business would call a profit.

Desirable and helpful as that $32 million profit from timber sales was to the Federal Treasury, it could have been

better. It could have been bigger and better because, while the Federal Forest Service sold 7 billion feet of timber it, according to statements of its chief foresters, could have sold 11 billion feet of Federal forest timber and still have grown timber on the federally owned forest lands as fast as the timber was cut.

The Federal Government by selling 11 billion feet of timber from its Federal lands annually, instead of the present 7 billion feet, can increase the Federal Government's revenue from timber sales by more than $60 million a year. This will be far above all costs involved for the sale of extra timber and will leave the Government an additional profit of many millions of dollars a year to help finance the cost of Government.

Also the making of more Federal timber available will improve the economy of communities in the federally forested areas by assuring these communities an uninterrupted increased supply of logs which their woodworking industries require to assure full employment.

An artificial shortage of timber available for cutting has existed in the Pacific Northwest for several years due to undercutting on Government sustained yield forest lands. This certified shortage has resulted in many communities in curtailed employment.

By selling more Federal timber the Federal Government still, according to its own experts, can grow young trees to replace the old as fast as the old trees are cut. By doing so it can make money for the Federal Treasury and at the same time increase employment and prosperity in the timbered areas.

I am in full agreement with the text of a letter sent to President Eisenhower, under date of April 17, 1958, urging increased timber cutting on Federal forest lands by the Industrial Forestry Association, of Portland, Oreg. The text of the association's letter follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

At the annual meeting of the Industrial Forestry Association, whose members employ more than 63,000 people in western Oregon and Washington today, our subscribers unanimously directed that we send you the following telegram:

"With the United States Government owning every other tree in Oregon and Washington which provide the American people with one-quarter of their forest products, it is imperative that a realistic allowable cut of Federal timber be sold each year. In the last 10 years, through failure of the United States to sell more than 7 billion feet of ripe timber which should have been harvested, the economy of Oregon and Washington has lost three-quarters of a billion dollars. Government's failure to sell the full allowable cut has created artificial timber shortages, contributed to inflation of timber prices, and resulted in fewer job opportunities in our States. We respectfully request that you direct the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to sell each year the full allowable cut under sustained yield forest management. Harvest of the full allowable cut of Federal timber is essential to the new housing program, will increase employment, stabilize communities, speed attainment of long-range Federal forestry objectives, and return increased revenue to the Treasury and local governments."

NILS B. HULT,
President, Industrial Forestry Association, Portland, Oreg.

Time for Congress To Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the Trilling case last week underscores the widespread confusion surrounding the application of the Mallory decision. The five separate and often conflicting opinions reflect the uncertainty on the bench about what the Mallory rule means. If our judges are so hopelessly divided, how can the police or the public know what they can and cannot do for the security of the community?

It is time Congress acted to put an end to the perils inherent in such varying and clashing viewpoints on a vital matter of criminal justice. We should get right to work and pass the legislation approved by the House Judiciary Committee. It should put an end to the present chaos, provide ample protection for the rights of individual defendants, and allow the continuance of reasonable police methods.

The Washington Star has been in the forefront of the battle to enact Mallory legislation. Their editorial of April 20, 1958, typifies the paper's hard-hitting and logical approach to this urgent problem. Also, in their publication of April 18, the Star outlined the high points of the lengthy and complex Trilling decision. I commend both these pieces to the consideration of every Member, because I am hopeful the legislation needed to cover this crisis will be before us on the floor soon. I also want to commend the Star for continuing to wield its editorial cudgels with such vigor in defense of this community and all communities where the Mallory ruling may come into play.

Under leave previously granted, I insert the article on the Trilling case and the editorial from the Washington Star in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Washington Star of April 18, 1958]

THREE-WAY SPLIT IN APPEALS COURT WIDENS MALLORY RULE DISPUTE

The United States attorney's office and the police department today were trying to unravel a 71-page opinion of the United States court of appeals here featuring 3 different interpretations of what the Supreme Court's Mallory decision means.

The opinion, handed down late yesterday also was highlighted by a recommendation from 1 of the 9 judges that the Federal rule behind the Mallory decision should be reexamined by the rulemaking process or by Congress.

A bill to remedy the effects of the Mallory decision through legislation has been reported out of the House Judiciary Committee and is now awaiting House action.

The decision yesterday involved the 3 housebreaking and larceny convictions of John E. Trilling by 3 different juries before 3 different judges. Confessions figure in all the convictions.

INTERPRETATIONS DIFFER

In the controversial Mallory decision, a confession was barred because of a 7½-hour delay between an arrest and an attempt to bring the prisoner before a committing magistrate. The Mallory decision has been interpreted by several district court judges here as barring all questioning of suspects. Others have called this too narrow an interpretation.

Yesterday's 3 opinions by the 9 judges ranged all the way from asserting that no confessions should be admitted at trials to insisting that police can question suspects.

The differences of opinion were so marked that what became the majority opinion was actually agreed upon by only 2 of the 9 judges—and 1 of the 2 said he agreed reluctantly, believing that 1 of the minority opinions makes sense and ought to be the law.

When all the opinions were sorted out, it developed that by a 5-to-4 vote, conviction on 1 of the 6 counts against Trilling in the 3 cases was affirmed by a 6-to-3 vote convictions on the other 5 counts was reversed.

HOW JUDGES WERE DIVIDED

This was the box score:

Judges John A. Danaher and Warren Burger voted to affirm the one count and reverse the others. Judge Burger said he did so reluctantly and only because he though he was compelled to do so by the Mallory case.

Chief Judge Henry W. Edgerton and Judges David L. Bazelon, Charles Fahy, and George T. Washington ruled that all the counts should be reversed. That gives Judge Danaher a majority on the cases he thought should be reversed.

Judges E. Barrett Prettyman, Wilbert K. Miller, and Walter M. Bastian voted to affirm all the convictions. In doing that they concurred with the part of Judge Danaher's opinion affirming 1 count of 1 case and thus made that part of Judge Danaher's opinion the majority opinion.

There was one other split within the split. Judge Edgerton concurred with the opinion written by Judge Bazelon. Judges Fahy and Washington simply announced that they would reverse the convictions on all counts and remand the cases for new trials on the basis of three Supreme Court decisions—McNabb, Upshaw, and Mallory.

QUICK CONFESSION

Trilling, according to the various reviews of the evidence by the different judges, was arrested at 5:30 a. m., denied his guilt under questioning and was transferred to the headquarters cell block. At 8:15 a. m., a policeman who knew his family confronted Trilling with the evidence police had gathered and he quickly confessed the housebreakings for which he had been arrested.

Subsequently, Trilling was questioned in a murder case and passed a lie-detector test. During an intermission in the murder interrogation, a safe-squad detective went down the list of 15 unsolved safecrackings between January and September 1955. According to the testimony, Trilling denied 7 and admitted 8 at about 10 a. m. He dictated a statement in 1 of the cases at 2:35 p. m.

Between 2:45 and 3 p. m. he was taken to municipal court for arraignment. After arraignment, now in the custody of two deputy marshals, he returned to headquarters where he made another written confession, went to Rock Creek Park to recover tools used in the safe jobs and on his return to headquarters made still another written statement. He was taken to jail at 10 p. m.

Judge Danaher ruled that the first confession—that made to a police friend of the family—was admissible at his trial because it was voluntarily given within minutes after Trilling's being confronted by the policeman with the evidence already amassed against him.

DANAHER'S INTERPRETATION

He said the later confessions had to be ruled out because police failed to get Trilling arraigned without delay and detained him for the purpose of eliciting damaging state-

ments which ultimately established guilt. This, he said, is forbidden by the Mallory decision.

Judge Danaher interpreted the decision this way:

Questions are not forbidden but an arrest and conviction are not to depend on the answers during a period of what may become illegal detention.

He emphasized that he wanted to dissociate himself from Judge Bazelon's opinion and "particularly do I dissent from his conclusion that confessions obtained by questioning an accused before arraignment are not admissible in evidence." He said if the Supreme Court had intended to bar confessions it would have said so.

Judge Bazelon wrote that arrest was not for the purpose of providing an opportunity to question a defendant and that the Mallory decision means confessions obtained before arraignment are not admissible in court.

"The utility for police purposes of questioning an arrested person before arraigning him," wrote Judge Bazelon, "lies in the element of compulsion which results from his fear, in combination with his ignorance, even when no violence is used and no threats are either expressed or purposely implied."

In a footnote, he attacked part of the pending legislation which provides that police must advise prisoners of their rights before the questioning. Even a timely advisory statement by police, he said, would not excuse failure to bring the prisoner before a committing magistrate.

LATER ADMISSIONS

Turning to the confessions made by Trilling after arraignment, he said they were inadmissible because they simply reduced to writing the earlier inadmissible confession, because they came through illegal detention and because the record does not show that the magistrate informed Trilling of his right to be silent. He said the marshal violated the judge's order by taking Trilling back to headquarters instead of taking him to jail.

Judge Prettyman, with Judges Miller and Bastian concurring, said he disagreed with his colleagues, both vigorously and thoroughly. He said he refused to agree that the Supreme Court in the Mallory case established a bare time rule to govern the admission of confessions or that the Supreme Court has forbidden the police to investigate crime.

"The usual, most useful, most efficient and most effective method of investigation is by questioning people," Judge Prettyman wrote. "It is all very well to say that police should investigate by microscopic examination of stains and dust. Sometimes they can. But of all human facilities for ascertaining fact, asking questions is the usual one and always has been. The courts use that method."

The police, he said, cannot question in the mode or for a period which has the effect of extracting confessions not otherwise forthcoming, but he emphasized: "It takes no astute student of police procedure to recognize whether the police are trying to extract a reluctant confession, whether they are reasonably seeking the solution of a crime."

On the score of the confessions made after arraignment, Judge Prettyman said the Mallory rule did not apply there. He said the colleagues who considered those confessions inadmissible must either be holding the confessions involuntary in the constitutional sense or writing a new rule. But, he added, his colleagues did not make clear the basis for their action.

POINTS OUT MISTAKE

He said his fellow judges who wanted to throw out the Trilling confessions "make the mistake of viewing the facts in one telescoped, condensed frame—like looking back at telephone poles on a railroad track."

He said he did not believe there was unnecessary delay between arrest and arraignment of Trilling.

"To my mind," he wrote, "it is simply unrealistic and unsupportable to say that during this day and intense activity, involving many different matters, the police delayed unnecessarily at any point. To generalize, as I think my brethern do, putting a decision upon a single telescopic statement that Trilling was questioned off and on all day from 5:30 a. m. to 10 p. m. is, to my mind, to ignore what actually took place, ignore the speed with which the police went about their work, ignore the complex of offenses involved and lay an erroneous premise for an erroneous conclusion.

He warned that the outlawing of the conduct of the police and processes followed by them in this case will unjustifiably and materially impede the enforcement of the criminal law in this jurisdiction.

Judge Burger, in concurring with Judge Danaher, said he did so reductantly because what Judge Prettyman has said makes sense and ought to be the law. Judge Burger was the one who thought the rule on which the Mallory case was based should be reexamined.

BAZELON CRITICIZED

Judge Prettyman wound up his opinion with some sharp criticism of Judge Bazelon's opinion. He objected that Judge Bazelon in crucial phases of the Trilling story adopted the version giving by Trilling.

"I see no justification for us, who neither saw nor heard the witnesses," he said, "to reject the view unanimously held by so large a number of hearer-viewers."

Judge Prettyman also objected that without any evidence but Trilling's. Judge Bazelon denounced a proceeding in municipal court.

"He (Judge Bazelon) says Trilling's account is uncontradicted by evidence," wrote Judge Prettyman. "So it was; but it was wholly uncorroborated, and it absolutely impeached the validity of a judicial proceeding in open court and the conduct of the presiding judge. With all deference I think the acceptance of Trilling's sweeping denials of all process, without one other particle of proof, is untenable."

He also criticized Judge Bazelon's passing reference to a district bar association committee report which had criticized municipal court proceedings. He said that the report has no standing.

"We ought not," he said, "impugn the integrity and capacity of 12 judges on so slim a showing."

[From the Washington Star of April 20, 1958]

HELP, HELP

A Solomon would stagger away, talking to himself and shaking his head, if called upon to explain what the Mallory rule means in the Nation's Capital today.

It has been almost a year since the Supreme Court handed down its unanimous decision in the Mallory case—a ruling which threw out the confession of a convicted rapist and resulted in his release. Mallory had been held by the police for 7½ hours. The reason for the reversal was that he had not been arraigned without unnecessary delay as required by Federal rule 5 (a).

We thought from the beginning that the Supreme Court's decision was unreasonable in the circumstances of the Mallory case and that its meaning was unclear. Others disagreed, contending that the opinion was both proper and its meaning clear.

Now, almost a year later, comes the opinion of the United States Court of Appeals in the case of John Trilling, an eager-beaver safecracker. This appellate court is composed of nine able and conscientious judges. Yet they are in hopeless disagreement with respect to the meaning of the Mallory rule as applied to the Trilling case.

The division among the judges is cited here, not in any needling spirit, but to illustrate the massive confusion which prevails. Judge Danaher wrote what becomes the opinion of the court, affirming Trilling's conviction on 1 count in 3 indictments. Trilling, in three trials, had been found guilty under all of the indictments. Judge Danaher was joined in full only by Judge Burger, and we will return to Judge Burger later. Judge Bazelon, joined by Chief Judge Edgerton, would have thrown out all confessions and reversed the one conviction. Judges Washington and Fahy came to this same conclusion, but, perhaps significantly, they did not join in Judge Bazelon's free-wheeling opinion. Judge Prettyman was joined by Judges Miller and Bastian. He agreed with Judge Danaher as to the correctness of the one conviction, thus supplying a majority of the court on this point. But Judges Prettyman, Miller, and Bastian thought that all of the confessions were valid and that all of the convictions should have been affirmed.

This, then, is the prevailing state of the law in the District with respect to the Mallory ruling. How can any policeman, prosecutor, or trial judge be expected to know which end is up?

Let's get back to Judge Burger. In a brief statement he said he agreed reluctantly with Judge Danaher because he thought he was compelled to do so by the Mallory ruling. He would have preferred to join Judge Prettyman because what he said "makes sense and ought to be the law." Then Judge Burger said this: "Rule 5 (a) should be reexamined by the rule-making process or by Congress."

To this we say "Amen," although we believe action by Congress is preferable. This community, in which the Mallory rule hits with full and crippling impact, is in desperate need of help. That help can best come through enactment of pending legislation which provides that mere delay in arraignment shall not serve to invalidate voluntary confessions. We earnestly hope the decision in the Trilling case will furnish the extra push needed to get the bill through Congress.

Cystic Fibrosis, Children, and a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if it had been a cattle disease, a constituent of mine recently wrote me, something might well have been done long ago to conquer it. This constituent's letter was 1 of over 900 thoughtful letters, telegrams, postcards and telephone calls I received within 3 weeks after I gave the March 20 address to you on the subject of CF.

In our lifetimes many new words, phrases and abbreviations have found their way into our household vocabulary. Some of these expressions have come and gone; others have stayed with us and have become permanent fixtures of our language. CF is an ugly word. In time, we must rid the language of this word as well as the ugly disease for which it stands. But first, CF must become a rallying word. CF must become a slogan, to gather within us all the cre-

ative energies we can muster, through research, necessary to discover a cure for this disease.

If we hope to eliminate CF from our language, we must first made it an important part in our calendar for action. As I said to you on March 20, we must declare war on CF.

CF is cystic fibrosis. As Sam Dann has so aptly put it, "a physician can define it in 13 words." And if you believe that the number 13 is an unlucky number, let me read you one of the most unfortunate 13-word sentences in the English language:

Cystic fibrosis is a generalized disorder of unknown etiology affecting the exocrine glands.

Now I would not be here talking to you today if I did not think that cystic fibrosis was important enough for current congressional consideration in these complex times so pregnant with problems.

One out of twenty of us in America, it has been estimated, carry the recessive genes which cause this hereditary congenital child-withering disease. One out of six hundred children are born with cystic fibrosis—about seven thousand flesh and blood boys and girls each year. About half of these CF-stricken children die before they reach the tender age of 5; not many of these children survive their teens. Unless we find a cure or new treatment in the meantime, almost 100 percent of CF victims will die of CF before they are old enough to die of something else.

President Eisenhower's heart condition and ileitis did much to trigger medical research in these fields. President Roosevelt's handicap drew attention to polio—and dimes marched against this dread disease. But cystic fibrosis with its thousands of victims, born to die before reaching adulthood, might very well never have a President to carry the banner against it.

The complexion of all I am saying here today would be different if it were impossible to cure this disease, if there were no hope. But as so many parents have written me, from all parts of the country, during the past few weeks, "where there's help, there's hope." Today, we know that there is very little than man cannot do if he puts his mind to it—if he put his God-given mind to it.

Dr. Sheldon C. Reed, director of the Dight Institute for Human Genetics, in Minnesota, has written me:

The prospects for survival of the affected child are improving with medical research.

Last week, I asked the National Institutes of Health and the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation to meet with representatives of my office to discuss the matter of CF research.

I have learned that CF research appears to be getting somewhat shortchanged because NIH has to compete for the congressional dollar, other diseases have been more widely publicized, competent research physicians and clinicians interested in CF are scarce, bedspace at the Institute is hard to come by. Little is known about CF—and little is known about the little which is known.

The House, when it passed on the appropriation which covers NIH, gave NIH the mandate to accelerate its research. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, chairman of the subcommittee which handles this appropriation, asked the head of one of the Institutes:

What are we doing in this field [cystic fibrosis] now? What are you doing about it? * * * How much are you spending in that area?

The answer was: "Not very much."

I realize, of course, the great progress which has been made since the disease was first identified by Dr. Dorothy Andersen only 20 years ago. But I am impatient because it would almost appear that only those persons affected personally by the disease are concerned with it. There are, of course, some dedicated researchers in this country and abroad who are investigating CF. I named a few of them the other day when I talked with you. We all are grateful to them.

I plan to insert in the Appendix to this RECORD a few of the nine hundred or so touching letters I have received urging additional research in CF. I cannot answer each one of these letters personally but I want to say that I hope and trust that an all-out war against CF will be forthcoming in the months to come.

I hope that the Senate will endorse the House's mandate to NIH to get substantial CF research underway, and that NIH will get whatever appropriations such stepped-up medical research demands.

Meanwhile I have written the following letter to the Surgeon General of the United States, urging that a conference of CF researchers be called to find out where we are and where we need to go. I have also asked for certain data relating to present NIH research efforts:

APRIL 14, 1958.

DR. LEROY E. BURNEY,
Surgeon General, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. BURNEY: On March 10, 1958, I asked the Congress to declare war on cystic fibrosis. You are undoubtedly aware that this disease strikes about 1 out of 600 children born each year in the United States and that during the past 20 years since the disease was first identified, it has been almost 100 percent fatal. I understand that cystic fibrosis has a lower incidence rate than polio or cerebral palsy but, even so, apparently has one of the highest mortality rates among children's diseases.

Research, of course, is the answer.

On April 9, 1958, representatives of my office met with Drs. Justin Andrews, Donald Whedon, and Norman B. McCullough of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Robert H. Parrott of the Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia, and officials of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation. I should like to thank the representatives of the Institutes for their constructive suggestions regarding the following through on our declaration of war against CF. I was assured by them that the Institutes will do everything within their power to bring CF research into proper perspective.

In order that I may properly bring the progress of your CF research at the Institutes to the attention of the Congress, I respectfully request that you furnish the following data on your NIH programs:

1. How many professional persons are now engaged in research on cystic fibrosis of the pancreas: (a) Intramurally? (b) Extramurally?

2. What was NIH expenditure on cystic fibrosis research in 1955, 1956, 1957, and estimated 1958: (a) Intramural? (b) Extramural?

3. How many applications for extramural CF research projects have you considered during the past 3 years?

Of those applications received and considered, how many CF grants were approved?

What percentage of total applications for extramural research grants do those in the field of CF represent?

4. Please list the six children's diseases with highest mortality rates, in rank order of mortality rate, and provide data as to (a) number of professional persons now engaged in research intramurally and extramurally, (b) cost of each of these research programs for 1955, 1956, 1957, and estimated 1958.

5. Are the persons who consider applications for grants (extramural) fully aware of the high incidence and mortality rate of cystic fibrosis?

6. Because the nature of cystic fibrosis research must be carried on at the several Institutes, would it be feasible to get up a research center at the Institutes to coordinate such research? Give reason.

At the meeting of April 9, Drs. Whedon, McCullough, and Andrews all agreed that much of the difficulty in substantially expanding present research activities in cystic fibrosis is the shortage of researchers interested in this area of research. Little is known about the disease.

I therefore respectfully urge that a conference be called by the appropriate Institute at NIH, as an intramural project, a conference of the Nation's leading "cystic fibrologists," as Dr. Andrews called them, to find out what research has been and is being carried on in CF in the United States. Such a conference should let us know where we are and, if a conference report might be published, might stimulate medical professional interest.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON.

Mr. Speaker, in a few days I shall introduce a bill to promote additional research. This bill, discussed last week with representatives of NIH, is presently being drafted for me by legislative counsel.

Let us make "beat CF" your slogan, now.

As Minnesota's Victor Cohn, in his fascinating book entitled "1999," said:

Defeat of most diseases will never be total. One person out of one must always die of something. But we may expect wonderful progress. * * * Medical progress, like all other kinds, fathers problems. Linus Pauling is even worried about the consequences of perfect drugs. What will people die of? But the progress must come. * * * The possible bad comes along with the good, but the good, if past medical history is prediction, should overwhelm us.

One person out of one must always die of something. But, with the necessary research, perhaps we can prevent the spectacle of children dying before they have even a chance to live.

The love of life is a built-in feature of life itself. Today's and tomorrow's CF victims also love life. They are counting on us to do something about CF.

Cystic fibrosis is children's foe. It is a word and a disease and a challenge.

Appendix

Importance of Work of National Health Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Veterans' Administrator Sumner G. Whittier at the kickoff rally of the Federal service health campaign, made here in Washington on March 13, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Whittier has dramatically and effectively brought into focus the importance of the work that a number of our national health agencies are doing to combat the dread diseases that plague mankind.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE SUMNER G. WHITTIER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, IN A KEYNOTE ADDRESS FOR THE NATIONAL HEALTH AGENCIES AT THE KICKOFF RALLY OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE HEALTH CAMPAIGN, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 13, 1958

We, in this country, have made a solemn promise. When our patriotic and bewigged forefathers gathered in Philadelphia we said, in effect, with them: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Whenever men have been put in chains or held in slavery, we Americans, on the basis of that early declaration, have gathered, have armed, have put on uniforms, have fought and often died that men might be free.

If thousands of Americans were suddenly captured, held prisoner and enslaved today we would be angered. We would demand their immediate freedom. We would at once pledge our fortunes and our sacred honor to free them. We would hold rallies, enlist volunteers. We would become an arsenal for democracy.

We have made the promise of freedom, but we have not totally fulfilled it, for there are Americans in bondage. Not in far Communist China, no, not in wastes of barren Siberia, nor the hills of Astrakan—but here in the capital of our free world. There are prisoners held by a tyrant so demanding that these Americans, born of free parents beneath a free-flying flag, have known life, but never liberty, and little of the pursuit of happiness.

For how can you pursue happiness if you are chained by a dread disease, if you are held bedridden? These folks are countless in their numbers. They are a legion who are held in varying states of bondage. And as our fathers pledged that all men might be free upon this continent, let us here rededicate ourselves to the proposition they so nobly advanced.

Doctors and scientists and research men have fought with a sense of dedication, with love and generosity and devotion to drive back the dark frontiers of disease and illness and pestilence, but the malady lingers on. Too many Americans are yet chained.

And though the doctors still wage their relentless siege against the bastions of bacteria and virus, against microbes, against the dread enemies of cancer, heart attack and muscular dystrophy with all their wondrous weapons of streptomycin and inoculation and vaccines and an endless list of unpronounceable drugs—the war is just begun. But we are moving fast. Heavy as our attack is, we need more troops, more support.

The arsenal in this democratic crusade is the arsenal of your generosity. Only giving can drive back the darkness. How dread that darkness can be.

Where do we stand in medicine today? What still needs to be done to fulfill our dream of better health and longer life? Just how will your dollars help?

Let us consider, 1 by 1, the 8 areas you are asked to support through the Federal service health campaign.

The human heart pounds away day after day. Yesterday I had lunch with a man who had held a live human heart in his hand. He said that as he looked at that fragile instrument, he wondered how it could stand up to the incessant beating, beating—minute after minute, year after year. One moment the heart is pumping normally and routinely. Then a stabbing pain. Just catalog in your own minds those you have known struck down by this killer that stalks the poor and the wealthy, the famous and the infamous.

Today, 10 million Americans suffer from some form of heart or circulatory disease. Each year a quarter of a million people under 65 die of heart ailments, in addition to a half million older men and women.

How do you keep hearts beating? By opening your own heart to the American Heart Association. By supporting new and daring research into the cause and control of ailments of this fabulous human pump.

How miraculous an instrument is the human body? Consider what an efficient tool the human hand is. Consider how beautiful the human body can be when Elizabeth Taylor moves gracefully across the screen. Then dwell for a moment on the twisting, crippling effect of rheumatism and arthritis. Consider how they can turn a lovely hand into a gnarled and useless thing. Consider how they can wrench a woman, however young and attractive, into painful distortion.

The Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation is doing all it can to straighten tortured limbs. Do you realize that more than 1 million are so badly crippled they barely can move about? Are you aware that these diseases strike 1 family out of every 5?

The Muscular Dystrophy Association does all it can—within the limits of your giving—for the youngsters who rarely live to maturity because of this evil malady. Death is always sad and tragic; no matter what age an individual may be we feel a sense of loss; yet somehow the tragedy of death is especially poignant when little children are cut off—their lives unlived—the wonderful things that might have been, wiped cruelly away.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society does detective work on the mysterious crippler which strikes at nearly half a million Americans, usually in the prime of life. Its cause—unknown. Effective treatment—unknown. All we do know is that once it develops, there is only one course for it to take: slow, relentless, progressive paralysis.

But so long as research can go on, there is hope. If not for today, hope in some tomorrow.

One time I visited a home for crippled children in the city of Boston. The Sister, who was my guide, took me into a ward filled with empty beds, save one. There a little girl was sleeping, her blond head upon the white pillow. Her legs, the nun said, were held in a Bradford splint in an effort to straighten them. As we looked down, the little girl wakened. Fretfully, she called for the Sister who was her particular nurse. When that nurse came the little girl seemed to calm down at the first touch of the loving womanly hand upon her forehead. And as I saw the little girl look up at the Sister, and the Sister look down at the little girl with loving kindness, I saw the power of a weapon greater even than drugs and medicine, the power of love and of compassion.

The head nurse and I walked into another ward. A little girl was in bed there, and hanging on the foot of her bed was a great brace. It was large and black; there seemed to be more brace than little girl. I winced as I looked at it and mentioned its size to the Sister. She said, "It may look ugly to you, but she loves it. With it she can stand with a sense of independence, of self-support." Then she told me of the little girl's father. He had come there to visit his daughter. He had made the brace for her. He had stayed to make braces for other children.

The National Society for Crippled Children and Adults converts your money into hope for the handicapped, into rehabilitation services for disabled men and women, for boys and girls, to help them achieve their God-given independence of body as well as of spirit.

There are so many ailments that assault this castle of flesh and bone in which we live. For many of them there is a group, an organization, such as the United Cerebral Palsy Association—searching, ever searching for answers, and able to continue that search because of your concern and your assistance. One day we shall lick and destroy cerebral palsy.

We have made telling attacks on other diseases, such as the great white plague. Tuberculosis has been dramatically reduced during the past 3 years. There has been a 16-percent decrease in the average daily number of patients undergoing treatment for TB, due largely to the new wonder drugs.

During the last 50 years the death rate from TB has dropped more than 90 percent. But there are still a million Americans who need medical attention for active or inactive TB. And there are 10 percent who have active TB and don't even know it. They are the dangerous ones, who can spread the disease to their families and friends. Thus we must support the National Tuberculosis Association.

And what about cancer?

More than 150,000 men and women are alive today because they heeded the advice of the American Cancer Society for frequent medical checkups. They were able to start cancer treatment in time. Yet 1 out of every 4, who did die of cancer last year,

might have been saved had they, too, listened. Your money goes to help the society spread the word to every city and town in America—a lifesaving word.

Your money also goes for research. The society now sponsors the work of 1,000 scientists in 152 leading medical laboratories in their never-ending war on cancer.

Well, I have run through a catalog of the diseases at which we are aiming our fire in this campaign.

We live in an exciting and adventurous age. When at night we look at the tremendous range of stars, stars in endless spatial sprawl, we know that before long human beings will be abroad in some kind of interplanetary vehicle making milk runs from star to star.

What races of creatures will we find? What distances are there beyond the farthest star? What wonders shall we discover? But if we are looking outward, so too are we looking inward at ourselves to find miracles equally spectacular.

What is it that makes one human mind turn its possessor into a murderer, to be placed behind bars in a prison cell for long years? What makes the owner of one mind an Adolph Hitler, to plunge the world into a bath of blood? What makes another man an Albert Einstein?

What are the answers in this great detective story of medicine to the ills that strike down men? Where do we find the solutions to stay the devastation caused by a strange, weird little virus, too small to be seen by man or miscroscope; the bizarre illness that strikes down a Lou Gehrig; that destroys suddenly and quickly, apparently healthly people? A microbe and an instant of time—then a warm rich live human being has become matter, memory, nothing.

We do not know the answers. But in this age of swiftly moving progress we know that we shall find them. We shall create those answers as surely out of your dollars and your giving, as though you worked in the laboratory, or at the operating table.

A man and woman had wanted for a long time to have a child. At long last, after 13 years of marriage, the miracle happened. She was to become a mother.

They planned long and lovingly for the child to come. At long last—it seemed like years—the day arrived. He took her to the hospital and, like all expectant fathers he paced the floor while she was taken into the delivery room.

After he had smoked a long chain of cigarettes, the doctor appeared. "Mr. Jones," he said. "Congratulation. You are the father of a little boy."

The man beamed. He went almost limp with relief. Then the doctor added: "But Mr. Jones, he was born with a withered arm."

"Have—have you told my wife?" he asked.

"Not yet," the doctor replied. "But I will."

"Let me do it," the man pleaded.

The doctor agreed, and the two of them went into the wife's room. Meantime, the nurses had brought the infant to its mother. It was swathed in blankets so that she couldn't see its little arms. As any new mother would do, she was fondling the infant when her husband and the doctor entered.

Her husband tried to tell her, but the words wouldn't come. The doctor stood by, watching. Then as though fate had directed her hands, she removed the blankets to rearrange them. She saw the withered arm.

There was a long silence. Then she said, "God knew how much we needed him. God must have known how much this little boy needed us."

You and I and your families need our doctors and our hospitals. We need our drugs and our cures. Just think, in this room—1 out of 5. Arthritis, cancer, heart attack—which person will they strike? Count the statistic you may become. Remember the life you save, with your giving, may be your own.

You need the research and the healing. But the doctors need you. They need your support, your dedication, your giving. They need the determined devotion, the unending energy of the key men and the key women who so truly are missionaries in the sacred ministry of healing. I am sure they will not be disappointed.

President Chiang Kai-shek's Testimony on the Importance of Good Friday and Easter

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most remarkable addresses I have had the privilege of reading was sent to me by my sister, who is in Formosa. It is one which President Chiang Kai-shek delivered on Good Friday.

When the leader of a nation speaks as President Chiang Kai-shek did on that occasion, it seems to me we can be heartened, because out of the East have come the great religions; and here is a leader, indeed, who was speaking to his people in relation to their vital, spiritual needs.

Among other things, he said that several young Chinese scientists who are doing research work in the United States have distinguished themselves by making valuable contributions to the field of science, but in letters written to their parents and friends they confess that they feel a spiritual void in their hearts. President Chiang Kai-shek's address points up the fact that the more advanced materially civilization becomes, the poorer, to some, at least, is man's spiritual life.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed, following my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S TESTIMONY ON GOOD FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1958

Today is Good Friday, and Easter is only 2 days hence. I am here to give you, my fellow Christians and my fellow countrymen, my understanding of the significance of these two holy days.

I feel that in recent years, there has been a decline of moral standards and a degeneration in spiritual life. This is in reverse proportion to the advance that has been made in scientific knowledge and material civilization. Consequently, many people are experiencing an emptiness in their hearts. They are lost because of the uncertainties of life. They are afraid, not knowing where to turn next. They fail to see any meaning in life, nor can they find any purpose in living.

What good, then, can such people do for their nation, and for mankind as a whole, since they are wasting their life in ignorance? In the eyes of those concerned with the spiritual welfare of mankind, this is one of the most pressing problems which calls for solution.

Why should people more and more feel so lost and afraid as time goes on? The only answer is that people cannot find a way to fill the spiritual emptiness in their hearts.

Recently several young Chinese scientists doing research work in the United States distinguished themselves by making valuable contributions in the field of sciences. But in letters to their parents and friends, they confess that they feel a spiritual void in their hearts. This points up the fact that the more advanced material civilization is, the poorer man's spiritual life may become.

KEY TO LIFE AND DEATH

Through his crucifixion and resurrection, Jesus Christ sought to make everybody understand the key to life and death as well as to comprehend the real answer to the question of life and death. By dying for us that we may live, Jesus Christ was crucified and nailed on the cross. This was his way of redeeming us sinners. And this is exactly what Caiaphas the high priest meant when he told the priests and Pharisees at the council: "Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not."

This was to testify that their countrymen received new life through their Savior Jesus. This was also to testify that they acquired spiritual substance in their hearts; that they were no longer slaves to evil and death, or threatened by uncertainty and fear. Jesus said: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Again He said: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

Through these two passages, we can have a general idea of Christian views on life and death, and also understand how important is the meaning of the crucifixion and resurrection for life as Jesus has revealed it to us. Therefore, in commemorating the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, we are not merely to recall what happened 1,925 years ago, but to grasp the meaning of life and the purpose of living.

SOUL-SEARCHING AGAINST EVILS

The evil of communism has divided our world, created a dark age unprecedented in history. Some countries are completely shut behind the Iron Curtain, while others are half free and half enslaved. Today people behind the Iron Curtain have lost the freedom of religion, of thought and many other freedoms. In free societies the poor people are victims of fear and anxiety because of hardships of life and dimness of the future, while the rich people feel a spiritual void and the uncertainty of life. They both are prone to fall prey to the temptation of communism. Consequently, I think the turning point of, and the basic solution for the peace of the world, the happiness of the human being, and the success of our anti-Communist revolution, must start from a new self-examination and a new determination to search for the denouement of life.

Jesus warned the world by saying: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." Nowadays, communism, which aims at conquering the world through hatred and force is trying to deceive the people by false smiles.

If anyone feels that he is inwardly empty, thus yielding to the temptation of communism, it not only means the loss of individual life and the destruction of the soul of the Nation; it will also bring on an unprecedented calamity to the whole mankind.

CHRIST VIS-A-VIS CONFUCIUS

We derive our nature from the spirit of God. This spirit is the spirit of love. In this love lies the truth of the universe and the meaning of life. This spirit of God is, according to the Chinese, similar to divine

nature as propounded by Confucius in his saying: "Heaven's will is divine nature." This divine nature comes with our life, and has been there all the time. We need now only to seek it within ourselves, to rediscover it and to make it meaningful. If every one of us can recover this divine nature of our own, it will certainly fill our inward emptiness. We can thus regain our lives and our lives will be full and meaningful.

As Christians, we are baptized in order to gain rebirth—resurrection—of our lives. We embrace the faith of Jesus Christ. But if we do not have this spirit of love in our hearts, we still shall fail to gain life and resurrection. Thus, although we may profess to be Christians we are only false ones. But if we accept this spirit recover our inborn nature, we shall not only gain resurrection, but also immortality.

It is stated in the First Epistle General of Peter: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." This explains that those resurrected are living the word of God, or in God's spirit, not in their inevitably corruptible bodies which are destined to die. That is to say, should a life be born again, it is to change a destined corruptible body into an incorruptible one, or to change a mortal body into an immortal being. Thus, no authority of death will ever dominate us, and no clutches of death will ever menace us. Then, in our hearts, there will be no more fear or anxiety, and our life will be reinforced and can be completely free. Such a life is indicated by Jesus when he said: "We are more than conquerors."

IMMORTALITY OVER DEATH

Many people think that one cannot have eternal life without first abnegating death. Christianity recognizes death as a fact but overcomes that, thereby attaining immortality. St. Paul has told us: "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness." Behind the Iron Curtain today, any hardship, suppression, hunger, danger, and the threat of bayonet and bullets can only hurt a sincere Christian's mortal body, but can never harm his immortal spirit, nor can it separate him from God's kindness and love.

On the contrary, God's kindness and love stand out all the more because of all this hardship, suppression, hunger, danger, and the threat of bayonet and bullets to which the masses are being subjected. People in free societies, by virtue of their love for their nation and for mankind, are withstanding all forms of coercion and temptation. They are enduring sufferings and making sacrifices.

True Christians, however, are never pessimistic and never feel depressed. In Godhead and God's eternal power, they can find hope in the midst of despair, see light in the midst of darkness, and remain as pillars of strength in the midst of moral deterioration by making their life triumph over death in this evil world.

CHRIST AN EXAMPLE FOR US

Through crucifixion and resurrection Christ has set for us an example, for He showed kindness and love in spite of the hatred of men; He sacrificed himself in spite of the selfishness of men; He made eternal life possible for all mankind in spite of the death that men had inflicted on Him. At the very moment when He was completely overpowered on the cross and could not help Himself, He triumphed over darkness, over the world, to save mankind.

From His crucifixion and resurrection we have come to understand more than ever before that love means infinite patience and that life is a finite growth. As long as we have a strong faith, and our hearts are full of love, we shall be able to stand all insults and coercions, to resist all temptations and to ward off all evil approaches.

CHRISTIAN SPIRIT TO PREVAIL OVER COMMUNISM

As Christians, we can bear what others could not, and act when others would not, to defend truth and uphold justice, resist evil enemies and overcome unprecedented calamities. In sacrificing ourselves so that our country can remain free and our Nation can survive, in fighting for the world security and human welfare, and in devoting ourselves to the task of resisting communism and Soviet aggression in the course of our national revolution, we shall become truly more than conquerors.

States Rights—The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Charles J. Bloch, of the Georgia bar, has written a timely, significant, and moving book entitled "States Rights—The Law of the Land," which is worthy of notice by every student of constitutional history and law. A review of this book, written by me, appeared in the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal and Sentinel on April 20, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the review be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF STATES RIGHTS

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR., United States Senator)

Charles J. Bloch, of the Georgia bar, is deeply versed in history and law. He loves and understands the Constitution of the United States. He knows it was designed to establish an indissoluble union composed of indestructive States.

While attending a congressional committee hearing a year ago, Mr. Bloch was amazed to hear a Congressman voice the astounding statement that the doctrine of States rights "Is the very warp and woof of the philosophy underlying the Communist system." He concluded on the spot that it was high time * * * someone tried to tell the American people the facts of history upon which the doctrine of States rights is based.

The American people are, indeed, fortunate that Mr. Bloch did not leave this task to others. He devoted to its performance his enlightened mind, his understanding heart, his vast learning, and a tremendous research in historical and legal fields.

The result is the recently published States Rights—The Law of the Land, a compact volume of 381 pages. (The Harrison Co., $10) whose lucid and luminous language is readily understandable to lawyers and laymen alike.

SIGNIFICANT VOLUME

The book is timely, significant, and moving. It merits a place in the library of every American who believes that the destiny of this Nation ought not to be dictated by nonelected Supreme Court judges who forsake their proper sphere of action to usurp and exercise constitutional powers belonging to other departments of the Federal Government and the States.

The able and eloquent author analyzes with commendable clarity and conciseness historical facts, the Constitution of the United States, and relevant decisions of the Supreme Court to document and establish these fundamental propositions:

1. The States do not look to the Federal Government as the source of their powers. The reverse is true. The Thirteen Original States became self-governing Commonwealths 13 years before George Washington's first inauguration as President. These sovereign States created the Federal Government. They did this by a Constitution, which delegated to the Federal Government the specific powers necessary to enable it to discharge its limited functions as a central government, and reserved to the States the general powers necessary to enable them to regulate their internal affairs. To make the retention by the States of their reserved powers doubly sure, the first Congress and the States inserted in the Constitution the 10th amendment, which declares in words of utmost simplicity that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

SOVEREIGNTY ESSENTIAL

The preservation of the sovereignty of the States, within the limits of their constitutional powers, is essential to the preservation of our system of Government. To preserve the sovereignty of the States, the Constitution and the great decisions of the Supreme Court of former days established three cardinal rules to govern the judges of the Supreme Court in judging State action or State legislation. The first rule is that the Supreme Court is not concerned with the desirability or wisdom of State action or State legislation. These are matters exclusively for State determination. The second rule is that in passing on the constitutionality of State action or State legislation, the only question for the Supreme Court to decide is whether such action or legislation is within the scope of the reserved powers of the State. The third rule is that the Supreme Court is not to hold State action or State legislation unconstitutional unless the conclusion to that effect is unavoidable.

3. During the past 20 years a majority of the judges of the Supreme Court have been men who had no judicial experience whatever and little actual experience as general practitioners of law before their respective appointments to the Supreme Court. Instead of adhering to the sound rules designed to preserve the sovereignty of the States, these judges have been instrumental in handing down decision after decision invalidating as unconstitutional State action and State legislation simply because they deemed such action and legislation undesirable or unwise.

GROWING THREAT SEEN

4. Our system of Government will survive only if affirmative action is taken to prevent further inroads by the majority of the Supreme Court on the constitutional powers of the States. This action ought to be twofold in nature. The Senate should reject all future appointees to the Supreme Court save those whose past judicial or legal experiences makes it certain that they will carry with them to that high bench the qualifications and temperaments indispensable to the proper discharge of judicial duties; and the Congress should enact legislation restricting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and inferior Federal courts and revitalizing the 10th amendment.

When the reader lays down this book, he instinctively joins in the prayer implicit in the author's dedication: "To my grandsons, for them and those of their age, my hope is that constitutional government may survive."

William F. Knowland, Senator From California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD William S. White's article about Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1958.

Senator KNOWLAND is the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, and all of his colleagues, whether they be of his own political party or the opposition, have great affection and respect for him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1958]

THE STRANGE ESTEEM FOR KNOWLAND—REPORTS THAT CAMPAIGNING IS LANGUISHING BRING NO DELIGHT, EVEN TO SENATE FOES

(By William S. White)

The United States Senate is peering anxiously at a single political race much in the attitude of a man tiptoeing through the sickroom of an exasperating friend.

The patient in this little figure of speech is WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND. KNOWLAND is throwing over a secure Senate seat, not to mention the Senate Republican leader's post, to try for the governorship of California.

The weight of the informal bulletins coming in from the coast suggests that he is languishing. The outlook for his recovery before November is regarded as poor.

Certainly more than half of the Senate officially and on the record wants KNOWLAND to lose. For more than half of it is Democratic, along with his rugged and popular opponent, Pat Brown.

It is probable, moreover, that upon purely impersonal standards—on KNOWLAND's positions on various major issues—at least two-thirds of the Senate would view an absolute end to his public career as far short of a public catastrophe.

All the same, certainly three-fourths of the Senate—and probable four-fifths of it, quite regardless of party or faction within party—irrationally and determinedly wishes him well.

Not everything is impersonal, even in politics. Its practitioners are human—all too human, perhaps, sometimes. And KNOWLAND, stolid, inflexible and nearly humorless though he is, has unconsciously accomplished a strange feat of institutional public relations.

The very chamber that probably would reject him for most any high office on a strictly objective basis undoubtedly will be generally unhappy if he is rejected on any basis in California.

Certain famous liberals will be, too, in spite of the fact that KNOWLAND is the arch-symbol of conservatism and even though their weakness toward him distresses them even as they wryly acknowledge it.

The inherent seeming improbability of this estimate of the situation is quickly conceded. It is an entirely true estimate, nevertheless.

The explanation does not lie wholly or even mainly in the well-known fact that the Senate in many ways is like a club and that W. F. KNOWLAND is a Member of same. It lies more importantly in his private character, which to the Senate tends to overcome various public liabilities.

KNOWLAND's speeches are much more earnest than brilliant. His work most of the time is more devoted than outstanding. His personal manner makes him a living refutation of the usual rules on how to win friends and influence people.

He is unconquerably tactless, with a sort of genius for saying the wrong thing to the right people at the worst possible time. Far from kissing the baby, he is more likely stonily to ignore it—or to mistake its parents for quite another couple.

Already, though the campaign in California is not far advanced, stories are reaching here of instances of his sure instinct for excessive candor—like impatiently brushing off certain burning local issues with the air of a man with more important things on his mind.

And when the Senate hears these accounts it does not recoil in horror from such professional ineptitude, as with another man it surely would do. It only chuckles and says: "That's old BILL for you."

The phrase "Old BILL" is an accolade. It means that KNOWLAND is a man of utter responsibility, in intention if not always in fact. It means that he is a politician of rare, if not always perceptive, courage. It means that when he has given his word he goes on to the end with it.

KNOWLAND, like nearly all the other orthodox Republicans, gave much sober attention some years ago to trying to beat out the brains—politically—of a man named Dean Acheson, Mr. Truman's Secretary of State.

But KNOWLAND never meanly fought this or any other action. A pretty good authority for this is Dean Acheson, who in public and in private uses the words "honorable opponent" to describe his erstwhile antagonist.

There is not much in common between the elegant, sensitive and witty Acheson and the plodding, heavy man of honest cliches, KNOWLAND. But there is, after all, this one point: They both stand on the upside of that line which, as the saying goes, divides the men from the boys.

Resolution of Jackson Electric Cooperative, Inc., Edna, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution calling attention to the adverse effects of excessive oil imports, passed by the Jackson Electric Cooperative, Edna, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This electric cooperative serves consumers in Jackson, Matagorda, Calhoun, Brazoria, and Lavaca Counties, Tex.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY JACKSON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING, APRIL 15, 1958

Whereas the excessive importation of foreign crude petroleum and petroleum products into the United States is drastically affecting our Nation and endangering our national security; and

Whereas the economy of Texas is being depressed by these imports to the extent that due to the loss of tax revenue from State-produced oil, it will soon be necessary that Texas impose either a sales tax or a State income tax on its citizens, to compensate for the loss of tax revenue through curtailed oil production brought on by excessive imports; and

Whereas the royalty owners of Texas are losing many thousands of dollars each day because of these imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors, representing more than 5,000 members of the Jackson Electric Cooperative, Inc., respectfully request that you give your support and vote for H. R. 11781 by Congressman IKARD, which, in our opinion, will tend to remedy the foreign oil-import problem.

Respectfully submitted.

JACKSON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
E. S. YOAS, *President*.

Attest:

W. M. SELLS, *Secretary*.

Community School Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since our entry into the space age there has been much discussion about the faults of American education, many proposals for changing and reforming various features of our educational system, and a great deal of very critical remarks aimed directly at our public schools and public school teachers.

While there are many improvements that could be made in our educational system, especially in the area of providing more scholarships for worthy students, I think we must never lose sight of the enormous contribution to education and enlightenment that has been made by the community school teachers. In many small rural communities, the community school teacher gave instruction in all subjects to all school age children in the area. It was from the community school teacher that many Americans learned the three R's and got their first knowledge of history, science, music, and culture generally.

One such community school teacher was Mrs. Lena Antrobus of Clarendon, Tex. Mrs. Antrobus, 71 years ago, in July of 1887, first came to Clarendon, where she was to become the first school teacher in the community.

The Amarillo Daily News, one of the most influential daily newspapers in the Texas Panhandle tristate area, carried an article by Tommie Saye in its issue of Friday, April 18, 1958, which vividly describes the life of Mrs. Antrobus, who celebrated her 91st birthday Sunday, April 20.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled, "Clarendon's First Teacher Celebrates 91st

Birthday," by Tommie Saye, from the Amarillo Daily News of Friday, April 18, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Amarillo Daily News of April 18, 1958]

CLARENDON'S FIRST TEACHER CELEBRATES 91ST BIRTHDAY

(By Tommie Saye)

CLARENDON, April 17.—It was in July 1887—71 years ago—that Mrs. Lena Antrobus got her first look at old Clarendon. Her first view was from a perch atop the seat of the covered wagon that brought her and her husband, George, from Owensboro, Ky., to their new home in the Texas Panhandle.

Sunday Mrs. Antrobus celebrated her 91st birthday in her home here.

When the couple arrived in Clarendon, plans had begun for relocation of the town on the railroad line. The young couple staked their tent at the railroaders' camp, northeast of the depot, where the railroad was drilling a water well preparatory to establishing a division and terminal and shops.

They lived in the tent while their one-room house was being built, and the young bridegroom worked for the Mayfair Lumber Co., which did a booming business during the formative years of the town. Mrs. Antrobus witnessed construction of the city of Clarendon.

She became the community schoolteacher because she was interested enough in the children to spend long afternoons reading to them. The Clarendon parents reasoned that if she were going to read fairy tales to the youngsters she might just as well add some basic instruction in the three R's. She was qualified to do so, since she held a teacher's certificate. Fees were set at a dollar a month, but practically no one paid.

The whole community turned out to see the first train puff into the depot of Clarendon. As Mrs. Antrobus remembers it, the train consisted of an engine and caboose, carrying railroad officials on an inspection trip. It was an important day in the beginning of a thriving community.

In 1888 Mr. Antrobus bought a section of land a mile east and 2 miles south of town. The family moved to the farm in the summer of 1890 and continued to live there about 20 years, though Mr. Antrobus continued to work in town. Little of the land was ever put under cultivation.

The couple built their home on a rise near the center of the section, with good view of the surrounding country. The Antrobus house on the hill did signal service during the Indian scare in 1891. The telegraph operator at Clarendon had received a message from the operator at Salisbury that Indians from the reservation were raiding the country.

Several Clarendon families sought refuge at the Antrobus home. In Clarendon, some of the men decided to take the battle to the Indians. They broke into the Henry Taylor hardware store and took 11 guns and ammunition. They then boarded a locomotive and headed for Salisbury—where they found no telegraph operator and no Indians. The only casualty of the scare was the hardware stock.

After the first building boom, Antrobus went into the coal business. Then, as farming become more important to the area economy, he sold farm implements.

This was the beginning of the Antrobus Hardware & Implement Co. He opened a coal and transfer business in 1892; in 1898 added general hardware and leather goods, and by 1911 his stock also included furniture and rugs.

Almost every pioneer merchant sold on time. Bills were paid in the fall when crops were gathered or cattle sold. Some bill were carried over, automatically placing the merchant in the loan business.

By 1916 Antrobus was devoting most of his time to the loan business and he eventually sold his hardware business to his son, Barcus, and son-in-law, O. C. Watson.

Their present store building and hotel was constructed in 1926. Col. Ernest O. Thompson of Amarillo, who operated the hotel for about 5 years, named it the Antro. It was sold in 1946, and the name changed to the Donley Hotel.

Antrobus continued to operate his business until his death in 1938.

Prior to the husband's death the couple had done extensive traveling. Their trips took them to the east and west coasts and to Mexico City. They took a voyage from New York, through the Strait of Gibraltar to the Isle of Malta and later cruised from Florida to Cuba.

Through the years, Mrs. Antrobus has lost none of her zest for going places and doing things. When she decides to go visiting, she purchases a ticket, calls her son Barcus and her daughter, Mrs. Watson, says goodby—and goes.

She travels to see her son, Ed, in Tucumcari, N. Mex., to visit 1 of her 3 daughters, Mrs. Florence Magden of Lubbock, Mrs. Edith Mercer of Fort Worth and Mrs. Lucy Stargel of Oklahoma City.

She took her first plane ride at age 80, flying from Fort Worth to San Antonio to visit with a granddaughter. "I enjoyed every minute of the trip," she says.

She has been a member of the First Methodist Church of Clarendon since a few months after its organization in September of 1888. Through the years she has held offices in the Women's Missionary Society.

She is a meticulous housekeeper and a good cook. These skills shine when her 6 children, 13 grandchildren, and 26 great-grandchildren gather at her home during the Christmas holidays.

Mike Mansfield, Senator from Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, we Montanans are proud of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, and the great record of service to his State and the Nation which he has built during his tenure in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Senator MANSFIELD's decision to stand for reelection is warmly approved by the vast majority of the people in our State of Montana. Recently the Daily News, published in Lewistown, Mont., summed up very well some of the reasons why Senator MANSFIELD deserves and receives the support of the people of Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the Daily News editorial, entitled "Senator MIKE MANSFIELD Gets Our Vote," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD GETS OUR VOTE

We expected and hoped that Senator MIKE MANSFIELD would seek reelection. So, while his announcement of this intention comes as no great surprise, it is nevertheless most welcomed news.

The Daily News heartily endorses Senator MANSFIELD's candidacy not because he is a Democrat but because of his magnificent record—because America and the free world need the tremendous contributions which he has shown himself capable of making.

As majority whip in the Senate and as ranking member of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, Senator MANSFIELD has been in recent years one of the leading architects of American domestic and foreign policy. And, in many cases wherein our national policy has faltered or failed it was precisely on those points wherein the administration or the Senate failed to follow Senator MANSFIELD'S advice.

Because of his leadership, his ability, his character and his dedication to public service, Senator MANSFIELD has become a new national figure, known and respected from Maine to Florida, and from New York to California. He has given new luster and stature to Montana's name over the Nation and the world.

All this, of course, is known and appreciated by Montanans in all walks of life and among all shades of political faith. Therefore, the matter of Senator MANSFIELD'S candidacy is not a question of whether he will be returned to the Senate or not. It is inconceivable that anyone could defeat him, although stranger things have happened. Montanans can show their appreciation for his selfless service by giving him an overwhelming vote of confidence.

Veto of River-Harbor-Flood-Control Bill Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the river and harbor flood-control bill vetoed by the President contained an item of $44 million of authorization for the Los Angeles flood-control area. This was one of the large items in the bill.

Despite the fact that Los Angeles stood to gain much from the bill becoming law, the Los Angeles Times approved the President's veto of the bill. The Times believes the President on sound ground, as also do I, in vetoing a bill that contained too many objectionable projects as the price to be paid for obtaining projects including the Los Angeles one which everyone admits has merit and to which no one objected.

The Los Angeles Times approving the veto of the bill editorially said:

DEATH, WE HOPE, OF THE WATER BILL

The President's veto of the $1,500,000,000 water projects authorization bill was not unexpected; he had vetoed a similar bill 2 years ago and for practically the same reasons. What he objected to was that the bill was a hodge-podge of good projects and bad; some have been described as a waste of money. Under the bill provisions were made for the construction of 150 navigation, beach erosion, flood-control and power projects scattered across the country.

Some of the projects in the bill had been inserted against advice based on careful

study and considered judgment of the professional services and other executive agencies concerned, according to the President.

That didn't stop Democratic legislators—as well as some Republicans—from pushing for it, however. The Democrats particularly have been demanding its passage as a weapon to fight the recession even though it was obvious that it would take time, perhaps years, to get the spending started.

But the President's veto doesn't mean the end of the story. The Senate early this month voted 52 to 11 to accept a compromise version of the bill as drafted by a House-Senate committee. That majority, if it held, could easily override the veto.

Anyway the President has shown that he is not going to be stampeded into signing any and all measures sent to him with the representation that they will help end the recession. We hope Senator KNOWLAND can pull enough of his fuzzy-minded colleagues into line to sustain the veto.

Early Release of United States Citizens Held Prisoners in Communist China Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce urging that the Federal Government take action to accomplish the early release of United States citizens unlawfully held as prisoners in China by the Communist government of that country:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce, in the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has been informed that there are citizens of the United States unlawfully held as prisoners in China by the Communist government of China; and

Whereas the members of said organization strongly believe and urge that it is the responsibility of the United States Government to continually use all proper means to secure the immediate release of such citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That the members of the aforesaid Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce hereby urge that the proper officials of the United States Government take immediate and continued action to accomplish the early release of the citizens of the United States unlawfully held as prisoners by the Communist government of China, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and the Member of the House of Representatives from Luzerne County.

I hereby certify that the aforesaid resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce, on Tuesday, March 18, 1958, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

WILLIAM A. STREY, JR.,
President, Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce.
STANLEY NOVINSKY,
Executive Secretary, Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Reciprocal Trade and Plywood Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently a discussion occurred in the other body, involving plywood imports, between Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of my State of Oregon, and Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, of the State of Washington.

Congressman PORTER opposed legislative quotas on plywood imports, while Congressman MACK advocated them.

It is significant that a leading daily newspaper, the Portland Oregonian, of April 5, 1958, published a documented editorial which declared that Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER "takes the broader view in this instance." I ask unanimous consent that this effective editorial from the Oregonian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLYWOOD IMPORT QUOTAS

Involved in the proposed imposition by Congress of import quotas on plywood is more than protection of the domestic plywood industry. It touches directly the problem of world trade and commercial and political relations between the United States and Japan, which is the source of most of this country's plywood imports. Representative CHARLES O. PORTER (Democrat, of Oregon) who opposes the quota bill introduced by Representative RUSSELL V. MACK (Republican, of Washington) takes the broader view in this instance.

Recently W. G. Hellar, vice president of Heidner & Co., Tacoma importers and exporters of plywood and other products, circularized the Douglas-fir plywood industry with a statement which appears to make a good deal of sense.

His figures indicate that imports have not had an adverse effect on domestic production since 1951, the period in which Representative MACK says imports of Japanese plywood increased from 13 million square feet to 686 million. In that period, Douglas-fir and other western softwood plywood production rose from 2,866 million square feet to 5,750 million, Mr. Hellar said. And the production of hardwood plywood in the Western States, a product with which the imports compete, rose from 75 million square feet to 288 million.

Figured on a three-eighths-inch rough basis, the usual method for computing Douglas fir plywood production, imports from Japan last year amounted to less than 5 percent of plywood production in the Douglas-fir area. They did not compete with Douglas-fir plywood either in price or in use, since the bulk of the Japanese plywood imported to this country is in the form of doorskins for flush doors, which domestic producers did not produce in the sizes, thicknesses, and appearance grades required, according to Mr. Hellar.

In a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee, Jack Davidson, president of the Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, admitted that the hardwood plywood imported from Japan is to some degree competitive with domestic hardwood plywood, but the bulk of the United States plywood industry produces softwood plywood, with which the imported hardwood ply is not competitive.

The Japanese doorskins have made possible the great growth of the flushdoor manufacture in the United States in recent years, and imported plywood has been a factor in the increased use of wall paneling in low-cost homes and in the trend away from painted wood and steel kitchen cabinets, he told the committee. Serious curtailment of hardwood plywood imports would not result in much greater use of more expensive domestic hardwood plywood, he said, but would, rather, cause a greater use of hardboard or other substitutes or abandonment of decorative wood paneling in low-cost housing.

There is danger in Congress' imposing quotas on any item. Plywood quotas might be followed by similar restrictions on any number of products which could result in retaliation against American exports and the loss of jobs dependent on exports. Trade not aid is not a one-way proposition.

Mr. Hellar has suggested that, if the Douglas-fir or domestic hardwood plywood industries feel they are being hurt by foreign competition, they should bring escape-clause action under present tariff laws. If injury is proved, the Tariff Commission and the President can provide a remedy through higher duties and quota restrictions. This seems a better approach than through congressional action.

Courage With Blindness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the front-page editorial entitled "Very Special Courage," which was published in one of New Hampshire's leading daily newspapers, the Manchester Union Leader, on Saturday, April 19, 1958.

The editorial refers to the magnificent adjustment made by Forrest A. Garland, of Sanbornville, N. H., whose service to his country in time of war resulted in total blindness. Mr. Garland's courage, in overcoming his handicap and achieving success as an active and useful member of his community, represents the finest kind of example for all those similarly afflicted.

The editorial provides a heartwarming comment on the personal philosophy of this heroic veteran. I believe it merits the attention of every Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERY SPECIAL COURAGE

"And courage never to submit or yield."

Very special significance marks the line just above; a very special significance because it was written by John Milton, blind poet who could not see the visible world but who did see its beauties and its mysteries.

"And courage never to submit or yield" most certainly also applies to Sanbornville's Forrest A. Garland, whose war service resulted in blindness, but who does not consider himself handicapped. No, indeed. Think of the fact, as only one example of his valor, that the autobiography he is writing is entitled Blindness Has No Part in My Life.

That is no empty phrase. Forrest Garland lives the title. He works; he plays; he is very much a part of the community. He enjoys companionship and is himself a good companion. "Anyone who is blind or has physical disability should never doubt being able to live a normal life," he declares, and adds, "I go on doing just like everybody else."

While Forrest does not consider himself extraordinary, the truth is that he is most certainly of heroic mold. He might have become embittered. He might have made himself totally dependent upon the ministrations of others. But Forrest Garland is made of sterner stuff. He is independent; he leads a useful life; and he is happy in his normal life.

He does not want and he does not need pity. He glories that he is respected, much-liked and accepted as a part of the community. He does for himself, and it is our opinion that he does much for others. Discernment other than Milton's has described the Forrest Garland type of valor. Shakespeare said:

"For courage mounteth with occasion."

Forrest Garland was born with strength of character, from which courage stems. And when the need came, that courage mounteth, and grew strong and lasting. Recall his philosophy:

"Anyone who is blind or has physical disability should never doubt being able to live a normal life."

The Old Quest for Peace in the New Age of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Old Quest for Peace in the New Age of Science," which I delivered before the 11th annual Borah Foundation Conference, at the University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, on March 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD QUEST FOR PEACE IN THE NEW AGE OF SCIENCE

(Address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

I deeply appreciate the invitation to come to the University of Idaho and to participate in your annual Borah Conference.

I do not know of a more appropriate group before which to discuss the quest for peace in this perilous age.

For 11 years now this forum has given its participants new insights into foreign policy and the problems of peace. Indeed, this conference has achieved a well-earned national reputation.

As we meet, satellites are flying through the air above us. Newspapers are filled with H-bombs, outer space, intercontinental missiles, antimissile missiles, and anti-anti-missile missiles.

In truth, everywhere we turn in the question of war and peace, we see the influence of science. There is no doubt that science has greatly complicated the problem of keeping the peace.

As one commentator put it: "The road to hell is paved with good inventions."

Gone are our two precious allies of the past, time in which to mobilize, and distance to protect our homeland. Today whatever force is required, either to deter war or to win it if deterrence fails, must be on hand, ready at all times.

On the other side of the world, we face an adversary who is deliberately determined to use science and technology as the handmaiden of ultimate world conquest.

As a result of Soviet advance in science and technology, they now challenge us across the board, in military prowess, in science, in economic and political affairs, in education, in person-to-person relations, indeed in about every area of activity.

It almost goes without saying that we must meet the material challenge by producing enough weapons, launching satellites, overcoming recessions, and increasing the rate of our industrial growth and development.

These are the dramatic things which we must do.

But there is real danger that we will think of this contest as only one of: number of planes against number of planes, range of missile against range of missile, size of satellite against size of satellite.

I'd like to talk with you now about a very undramatic, very commonplace, very obvious thing—and yet the most important thing of all—people.

The history of international politics, when you come down to the essence of it, is the history of individual human beings.

What are their loyalties? How hard will they work? What ultimately matters is what human beings believe in and how well they labor for it.

What counts is what a farmer in some remote Indian village, some university student in troubled Indonesia, or some civil servant in the new state of Ghana, believes and does.

There are over 2 billion people in the world. Roughly one-third follow Moscow. Another one-third follow the free way of life, the traditional centers of which are North America and free Europe. The final one-third are the uncommitted peoples across the broad sweep of the Afro-Asian area.

What matters is this: Will Moscow be able to hold the people behind the Iron Curtain and keep them working effectively and productively?

Will the free world be able to hold itself together, with its people working effectively and productively?

And what will happen to the uncommitted peoples?

At this point we face a great paradox. On the one hand, we have our free tradition saying that the individual is everything, the individual person is what counts. On the other hand, we have Marxism saying that individual people are nothing and that all that matters are the laws of history. Yet despite this, it is the Soviets, more than we, that in practice seem to realize what really matters—people.

Look how they appeal to the ordinary person's hunger for peace. By a remarkable public relations job Khrushchev persuades many people that the Soviet system has really changed since Stalin's day, into something less dangerous.

Take the recent example of Hungary—turning loose brutal murderers one day, turning loose the dove of peace the next. Within weeks after the enormous bloodletting in Hungary, the Kremlin was back in business cooing peace, and getting people to believe it.

Khrushchev's refrain seldom varies: "We want peace and the other side wants war," a heady tune for peoples who yearn for a future of peace and progress.

Not so long ago, the Kremlin showed no concern for other peoples—except to support Communist factions abroad. Today, however, Moscow gives the impression of being concerned with everyone. Anyone who is not aggressively against them is called friend. Khrushchev courts non-Communists, like Sukarno and Nehru, every bit as diligently as Stalin once courted his Communist agents.

Last January, a Gallup poll in New Delhi, India, asked this question: "Which is doing more to help peace in the world, Russia or the West?" The answers came out this way: Russia 54 percent; West 18 percent; don't know 28 percent. Note the ratio: 3 to 1 for Russia.

Another recent Gallup poll asked citizens of 12 world capitals: "Who is ahead in the cold war, Russia or the West?" The answers came out this way: Russia was rated ahead in 10 capitals, in some cases by 4 or 5 to 1, among those who gave definite answers. The West was rated ahead in only two capitals.

Around the whole globe today we are clearly on the defensive.

How has this happened?

One reason is that Moscow uses deliberate lies as a matter of policy and manages to fool many people a lot of the time.

A second reason is that we are an open society—we live in a goldfish bowl. People can see not only what is right with us, but everything that is wrong with us. People cannot easily see what is wrong with Moscow. Moscow lets the rest of the world see only what she wants them to see. No reports of the ruthless purges are issued by the Kremlin press. No accounts of the Siberian prison camps ever get through Kremlin censorship.

A third reason for our difficulty is that Moscow is consciously and deliberately going about being nice to people—ready to snap the trap shut when the time comes. The voice of Moscow is perhaps the least important weapon in the Soviet arsenal.

Rising Soviet industrial strength gives Moscow goods and brains for export, and Soviet leaders now exploit economic aid as an instrument of political warfare. More than 2,000 Soviet technicians are at work among the uncommitted peoples. Moscow has welcomed a steady stream of visitors from Asia and Africa for training programs behind the Iron Curtain.

A fourth reason for our defensive position is that Russian experience is just a generation away from that of the uncommitted peoples. Only recently the Soviet Union was a backward, feudal, and underdeveloped country, too. Persons in less well-developed countries are encouraged by Soviet experience, partly because it is closer to their own.

By contrast our experience as an old industrial nation seems very far ahead of theirs. The American standard of living is roughly 3 times as high as the Englishman's, 6 times as high as the Italian's, 11 times as high as the Turk's, 18 times as high as the Peruvian's; but it is 40 times as high as the Indonesian's.

When President Sukarno went to Moscow he reportedly told Khrushchev: "You people are still close to your revolution. You've managed to rise from feudalism, just like we're trying to do. We have more in common with you than with the West."

Finally, our own ineptness contributes greatly to our difficulty. Too often we give the impression that the only people we care about are those who play the game our way. We insist that people be in our own image. We suffer from a kind of national superiority complex. What America needs most is to learn the meaning of humility.

Take for example a familiar attitude toward allies. We expect allies to agree with us and to do what we want. We object when they don't. Yet this pressure to conform only alienates our good friends.

After all our allies are independent nations with their own special concerns. They are, and should be, free to take positions which differ from ours on many issues.

We need allies. But we want allies, not satellites.

As another example, take a familiar attitude toward neutral nations. We think that neutrals are somehow not playing fair. We want them to choose sides once and for all and join our coalition.

When, however, we try to dragoon them into alliance with us, we simply drive them further away.

The underdeveloped countries are not pawns in the power game, as some Americans think. They are young nations with interests and goals of their own. Burdened by pressing domestic problems, a nation like India prefers neutrality to the added cares of an alliance.

Soft neutrals who become overdependent on Communist help are a hazard. Hard neutrals, however, who recognize the full danger of Russian tactics are not a hazard, so long as they remain as independent of Moscow as they do of us.

Granted that we now find ourselves on the defensive, what are we going to do about it?

First of all, we must alter our own basic attitude. We should stop trying to mold other peoples in our own image.

Moscow tells people to be themselves, but what she really means is for them to be Communists. We too often say, "be like us," when all we need say is "be yourselves."

We should adopt the principles of the good politician. A good politician recognizes that different groups have diverse interests. He makes it his business to understand the state of mind of his constituents. He gets around to learn what people are thinking. He finds out what they want and tries to help them reach their goals. Where possible, he strives to assist each group in pursuit of its objectives.

Ladies and gentlemen, this approach to other peoples has important implications for our entire foreign policy. I believe that if we took this approach seriously, we could get off the defensive. We could promote programs that will gain us the friendship and respect of other peoples.

Let me suggest three particular programs, which I feel deserve our most urgent attention.

First, we should substantially increase our technical cooperation program, and make it a vehicle of our traditional respect for human dignity and liberty.

The proposed technical assistance program for fiscal 1959 is very modest. It would cost only $163,500,000. I think we are missing a great opportunity and that we should expand the export of technical know-how to help people help themselves.

An increase in this area could be offset by reductions in military and economic aid. We get a better return for our dollars if we encourage more person-to-person cooperation and give less in the form of handouts.

Our friends abroad want material help. But they look also for intellectual and spiritual inspiration. Their hearts as well as their economic systems need a lift. One way to meet this need is to promote programs in which we work with other people rather than just do something for them.

Why should not our technical assistance program send thousands of Americans abroad each year to work together with the uncommitted peoples and so help strengthen the basis of common humanity that unites all people of good will? As nurses, doctors, soil conservationists, experts in mental health, and engineers, they could demonstrate by dedicated labor their genuine concern for the welfare of the people.

I wish we could arrange for large numbers of our young people, who are fresh from their college and technical training, to go abroad say for a term of 2 years.

No person should be recruited for the program simply because of his or her technical competence. Participants should also have these qualities: first, a catching idealism; second, an interest in people for their own sakes—they should genuinely want those with whom they will live and work to be better off and happier, irrespective of the Soviet threat; and third, they should be looking for contributions which others can make, treating their work as a 2-way street.

In summary, participants in the program should be guided by the true spirit of humility.

This country need not and should not carry the sole burden of an expanded technical cooperation program among the uncommitted peoples. The entire NATO community can join in the effort.

There is a prevalent notion that unless America runs the show, America will not get the credit. But this is far from the case. Today, we are likely to gain more credit if we do not insist on doing it all ourselves, but rather join in genuinely common undertakings.

There is no more important task than speeding common scientific and technical programs within the NATO alliance. Such programs will promote the security and welfare of the Atlantic community. They will also assure a greater reservoir of brains and know-how for technical cooperation in Asia and Africa.

Second, we should expand the exchange-of-persons programs in the free world, and offer a full-scale person-to-person exchange program to the Soviets.

We have many excellent exchange-of-persons programs in the free world, including the highly successful Fulbright program. But we could do far more than we are doing.

The best way to learn what other people are thinking and hoping is to go to see them, talk to them, and live among them. The best way for people to find out what we are really like is to come to see us.

When Nehru visited this country he went to see some of our most advanced welfare institutions, an insane asylum, a community center, and a public school. He reportedly commented: "If this is really typical of America, then I have certainly misunderstood you."

This is not the occasion to discuss the details of a greater exchange effort. I believe every proven and workable program should be pushed, both those financed by private money and those supported from public funds.

What I want to emphasize today is this: We should not limit our exchange efforts to the free world. I believe we should offer the Russians a full-scale person-to-person exchange.

We may find that Moscow wants only the present token program—a few students, a few technicians, orchestras and movie stars. Whatever the Soviets have in mind, however, we should be well out ahead of Moscow in our proposals.

Quite probably exchange programs with Communist countries will net few dividends for peace. But it makes sense to keep open the lines of communication with ordinary people behind the Iron Curtain.

During my trip to Russia in 1956 I was deeply impressed with the friendliness of every-day Russians. I had an opportunity to go into their homes and to meet them, both in European Russia and in Asiatic Russia. I found that the Soviet leaders had made little headway among their people in destroying the good name of western people, despite 40 years of vicious propaganda.

Even people who fall under the sway of evil ideas are not necessarily evil persons. One can talk to them and exchange ideas in many areas outside the realm of politics.

Perhaps we can make some headway if we send skilled specialists to Russia, for example, in surgery, in mental health, in family welfare, in classical studies, and even folk songs. These people can talk to their counterparts in Russia without becoming involved in ideological controversy. Some common understanding might be developed in fields of common interest. Certainly Soviet political ideology will be the last area to yield to any reconciliation.

Why should we not challenge Russia to give 50 Indian leaders the chance to go behind the Iron Curtain and then have those same 50 leaders come to visit us?

If Moscow accepted such a proposal, all to the good. If Moscow rejected it, still we could not lose. Neutral nations would be treated to a demonstration that Russian talk of freedom is a pretty shallow thing.

I am proposing that we maintain pressure on the Russians—that we keep them on the defensive in this field where they deserve to be on the defensive. Of all countries, America should never be caught reluctant to open its doors to those who want to visit us and get to know us.

Third, we should strengthen our education in the social and humanistic studies, including foreign languages, and assure ourselves the tools for working with other peoples.

Since sputnik we have heard a good deal of talk about our deficiencies in science education. These deficiencies are, indeed, serious and need correction. We cannot afford to be second best in technological progress.

Equally, however, we cannot afford to ignore the disciplines which can help us turn our technological progress to the benefit of mankind. A renaissance is needed in the teaching of the social and humanistic studies in history, economics, literature, philosophy, and foreign languages.

Every American should be steeped in the humane tradition including scientists, engineers, and technicians, themselves. When the critical issues lie, as they do today, in the area of the relation of science to human behavior, then science training by itself is not enough.

In particular, I want to urge greater foresight and greater effort in the study of foreign languages.

Compared to the Soviet Union we are doing a fifth-rate job in language training.

An estimated 10 million Russians are studying English. Less than 8,000 Americans are studying Russian.

Every child in a Soviet high school is required to study German, French, English, Spanish, or Latin. One-half of our American high schools do not even offer modern languages. In the American high schools which do offer foreign languages, less than 15 percent of the students take them.

Russian universities teach well over 40 different foreign languages including Manchurian, Uigur, and the Burmese, Vietnamese, Malayan, and Indonesian languages. I might point out that Russian universities also have to teach the 17 native languages spoken in the Soviet Union.

Some of the Russian grade schools now even instruct 8- and 9-year-olds in Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, Parsi, and Urdu.

One can almost anticipate what countries are next on the Soviet calendar of conquest from their language curriculum.

America still lumbers along emphasizing the colonial languages, French and German. How unimaginative can we be to send our emissaries to the former colonial areas speaking only the language of the old rulers?

For example, Telugu is the language of 33 million people in India. Not six people in this country, however, can read a newspaper in Telugu. Yet members of a Soviet

delegation arriving in India can speak it and read it.

In person-to-person contacts Americans should talk the native languages, even the dialects. We should equip our technicians to meet the village chief at his door, address him in his own tongue, and offer to work with him on a project he holds dear. This would promptly make us a new friend.

To prepare for mastery of a language one needs one elementary text, preferably with accompanying tapes or phonograph records, as well as a student dictionary and a series of graded readers. These works take years to produce and require the talents of highly trained linguistic scholars. And until these materials are available there is no possibility to teach the language on a sound basis.

Yet today there are about 40 important languages of Asia alone for which our working tools are sketchy or nonexistent.

Urgent steps should be taken to put this country's language-study program in good shape. This will take a national effort. We need a long-range plan. Then we need coordination among all the interested public and private agencies to get the plan implemented.

In conclusion, let me say this:

The past is littered with the wreckage of nations that made only a material response to the challenge of their times. We must not make that mistake.

In our struggle with the Soviet Union we have one weapon which the Soviets do not have, and cannot have. That weapon is our democratic tradition of respect for human dignity and liberty.

The Kremlin can build the same planes and missiles we do, it may build even better ones. The Kremlin can use the slogans of freedom, it may even use them better. But it does not have the respect for human dignity and liberty that really counts.

Our greatest strength is our intellectual and spiritual heritage. May we, in our time, prove true to that heritage.

Meet Chester R. Bartalini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that my friend of long standing, Chester R. Bartalini, was recently elected president of the California State Council of Carpenters. "Chet," as he is known to his hundreds of friends, is a remarkable man who has come to leadership in his union through his own efforts. He is a conscientious, hard worker whose ability is respected by all who know him.

In his climb to the top he has been assisted by his good wife, Flo, who has given unstintedly of her own time to civic affairs and PTA matters. The Bartalinis are a wholesome, American family and one that I am proud to know.

The California State Labor News Service, in its April edition, has an article that I am privileged to insert in the RECORD.

STATE LEADERSHIP CAPS TWO LIVES OF STRUGGLE

C. R. Bartalini, newly elected president of the California State Council of Carpenters, is a man who has lived two union lifetimes.

Active as a rank and filer and official hereabout for more than 20 years, he is generally regarded as a homegrown product.

Lean, of medium height, and soft-spoken, a stranger might guess him to be a sedate man who has led a quiet life.

Which proves only that you can't judge by appearances, because Bartalini cut his teeth on unionism in the faraway Illinois coalfields and helped write the pages of one of the toughest and bloodies struggles in American labor history—the battle between the independent Progressive Miners and John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers.

Bartalini was born in 1903 in the copper mining country of the upper peninsula of Michigan, where his father worked briefly in the mines, then resumed the meat-cutting trade he had learned in his native Italy.

An old-country Socialist enthusiastic about consumer cooperatives, the elder Bartalini threw himself into the cooperative movement in 1912 and began traveling around the Middle West, setting up cooperative stores, and finally, in 1917, the family located in Kincaid, in the heart of the southern Illinois coal country.

In 1919, at the age of 16, young Bartalini went to work as an apprentice carpenter and 2 years later was hired by the Peabody Coal Co. as a millwright and carpenter, becoming a member of the United Mine Workers.

There was a vigorous tradition of union democracy in the Illinois coal fields, and Bartalini became imbued with it. And when Lewis set out in the twenties to consolidate absolute power over the UMW it became clear that there would be a collision.

One abortive move to set up an independent union failed in 1929, but by 1932 the rank-and-file led local unions were stirred up enough to force the State officers of UMW to get a court injunction which prevented Lewis from interfering with the Illinois unions.

The Illinois contracts expired in April 1932, and the operators decreed heavy wage cuts. The miners walked out of the pits and voted down two contract offers. When it was obvious the second offer was going down to defeat in a vote count in Springfield, a mysterious holdup took place in which the tally sheets were stolen. Simultaneously Lewis met with the operators and signed an emergency contract.

The striking miners refused to go back under this agreement and formed a 9-mile-long auto caravan, a peaceful cavalcade with their women and children, to go to the next county and persuade the miners there to come out of the pits. They were directed into an ambush by State troopers, and at the county line the caravan was riddled with rifle and machinegun fire by sheriff's deputies.

By coincidence Bartalini was riding in the lead car, which was shot up like a sieve, but he was unhurt.

After the retreat there was an angry mass meeting at Gillespie, Ill., and the Progressive Miners Union was formed and embarked on its war with Lewis and with the operators who backed him.

In the years that followed there were shootings, dynamitings, and the slow violence of starvation, as the militant but smaller miners group was finally starved out. Bartalini became a rank-and-file leader, member of the strike committee, and was in the thick of things all the way.

As head of the relief committee for his area, he was instrumental in getting the first allocation of Federal relief, through a direct appeal to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The Progressive Miners also claimed the honor of winning the first representation election in the United States, for a mine at Mark, Ill., in 1933, under the newly enacted section 7–A of the NRA.

Later he toured the State as an organizer for the Progressives, unpaid, traveling on a tankful of gasoline and bumming his meals as he went.

Back at home, his wife, Flo, and six small children made out as well as they could. Some of the time they slept on pallets in the cellar afraid to sleep on the upper floor because the house had been shot up so often by the gun thugs. "Finally, we just stopped putting glass back in the windows," Bartalini recalls.

The unequal battle went on until 1936, in fact, the progressive miners never did give up, and hang on in some areas today. But by then the outcome was clear. Most of the real stalwarts never got back into the mines and had to move on.

For Bartalini that meant moving to California, because a branch of the family had settled out here, "and because it was as far west as I could go without getting my feet wet."

He came to Oakland in 1936, joined carpenters local 36, and by 1937 was settled enough to send for his family in Illinois to join him.

Within a year he had been elected secretary of the local and delegate to the District Council. He became the first rank-and-file member to win a place on the Carpenters Bay Area Negotiating Committee. There were suggestions that he run for business agent, but he refused, preferred to work at the trade.

Later he refused to run against the incumbent Bay Counties District Council secretary, Dave Ryan, even though he disagreed with him on policies, and it was not until Ryan retired in 1950 that he consented to become a candidate and was elected to this post, to which he has been reelected 7 times.

During these years, Bartalini notes with some pride the Bay Counties carpenters became the first of the basic construction crafts to win a health and welfare plan, and pioneered also with vacation and pension plans.

Meanwhile, as secretary of one of the biggest and most active district councils, he became active on the State scene and at this last State convention of carpenters was elected president.

Bartalini lives in Alameda and is active there in civic affairs. His hobbies, when he gets time for them, are hunting and fishing, and he is president of the Alameda Rod and Gun Club and active in the Associated Sportsmen of California.

Senator Cooper Speaks for TVA Self-Financing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, last week the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, addressed the annual convention of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association. In his address, Senator COOPER made some highly pertinent comments on the effects that would follow the passage of the TVA self-financing bill, presently pending before this House. The Nashville Tennessean, on Friday morning, April 18, presented a very brief and cogent report of Senator COOPER'S splendid address,

and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

COOPER SAYS TVA BILL BLOW AT RECESSION

(By Nat Caldwell)

The TVA self-financing bill is "the best kind of anti-recession measure," Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, said here last night.

Senator COOPER, speaking to the annual convention of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, pointed out that the self-financing bill could mean the investment of $2 billion in the valley in a 10-year period.

"Here in the Tennessee valley is an unparalleled opportunity to encourage the investment of wealth-creating funds," Senator COOPER declared. He pointed out that the original bond ceiling in the measure that already has passed the Senate is $750 million for the first 4-year period and, if the ceiling is raised in similar steps, the total figure for a 10-year period would be $2 billion.

WITHOUT UNITED STATES EXPENDITURE

All this stimulation of the growth and wealth of this section can be accomplished without any expenditure of Government funds, he said.

COOPER, interviewed following his speech, said that the 500,000-kilowatt Devils Jump and the smaller Laurel dam on the Upper Cumberland are "ideal projects for the Corps of Engineers to undertake on a cooperative basis with the TVA to create still more jobs."

Senator COOPER said he feels sure that the House of Representatives will vote favorably on a self-financing bill if it contains "roughly the same provisions of the bill the Senate passed last year."

G. O. Wessenauer, TVA power manager, speculated that the area's power requirements will multiply by 8 times in the next 25 years.

Wessenauer qualified his speculation upon the valley's ability to keep up with the Nation's population increase.

"IS REASONABLE"

"This is not a prediction," explained the TVA power manager. "But it is, I believe, a reasonable speculation."

He pointed out that electricity use in the seven-State power-service area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority multiplied by 20 times in the 25 years since TVA was established.

Wessenauer explained that his forecast did not include possible increased use by atomic energy or other large defense industries.

The breakdown of increased power use for the next 25 years in the speculation of the TVA official included:

Residential use, up 12 times—100 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

Farm use, not including farm residences, up to 10 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

Commercial and service use, a tenfold increase—30 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

Jobs for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of April 16, 1958, on the subject of jobs for disabled veterans who have received vocational rehabilitation:

JOBS FOR VETERANS

The Times-Leader Evening News wishes to acknowledge receipt of a letter of appreciation from A. G. Palmer, manager of the Wilkes-Barre regional office of the Veterans' Administration, on the current sequence in the Joe Palooka comic strip, featuring the rehabilitation of a disabled veteran and emphasizing that he can compete successfully in employment with his able-bodied fellow countryman, that he desires to stand on his own feet and that he asks only for the chance to prove himself.

The strip's Chip Shoalders is more than a comic strip character; he is a symbol of the self-respect and independence it is possible to achieve through vocational rehabilitation. The strip draws attention to the fact that rehabilitated disabled veterans, given an opportunity, are competent, valuable employees.

Approximately 8,000 World War II veterans (Public Law 16) and 450 Korean veterans (Public Law 894) have been trained and rehabilitated in the 32-county area, served by the Wilkes-Barre regional office of the Veterans' Administration. At the present time 250 Korean war veterans are in training.

Many of these veterans are residents of Luzerne County and are attending King's College, Wilkes College, Pennsylvania State University Extension in Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton, Wilkes-Barre Business College, McCann School of Business in Hazleton, Wyoming Valley Technical Institute, and Nanticoke Vocational School.

Like Chip Shoalders, they will be seeking employment when they complete their training and will have something to offer prospective employers. In fairness to them, the veterans want to be considered on their abilities rather than their disabilities. They have received vocational counseling and the medical staff of the Veterans' Administration has determined they have the physical capacity to handle the job for which they have trained. Despite service to their country, they ask no special consideration. Surely, they are entitled at least to the same opportunities others receive in the labor market.

Resolutions Memorializing Congress To Enact Legislation for the Protection of a Spouse and Children Who Have Been Deserted or Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the protection of a spouse and children who have been deserted or abandoned.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Boston, Mass.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF A SPOUSE AND CHILDREN WHO HAVE BEEN DESERTED OR ABANDONED

Whereas many women and children are being abandoned and deserted by their husbands and fathers; and

Whereas in many instances even though there be no desertion or abandonment, husbands, and fathers willfully fail to provide adequate support for their spouse and children residing in another state; and

Whereas the guilty spouse in these matters almost invariably has crossed over State lines and boundaries to accomplish the desertion or abandonment, and may be immune from any existing State or Federal laws: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges Congress to enact legislation for the further protection of abandoned or deserted spouse or children, making it a Federal criminal offense for a spouse to desert, abandon, or fail to provide adequate support for his spouse and dependent children where said guilty spouse has crossed State lines or boundaries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted March 24, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 31, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

[Attest]

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Address Entitled "What About the Budget Now?" Delivered by the Director of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the Houston chapter of the American Society of Chartered Life Underwriters, at Houston, Tex., on April 9, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT THE BUDGET NOW?—AN ADDRESS BY MAURICE H. STANS, DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, BEFORE THE HOUSTON CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHARTERED LIFE UNDERWRITERS, THE HOUSTON CLUB, HOUSTON, TEX.

It is a pleasure for me to be here this evening to talk with you about the Federal budget. My aim in doing so is to try to convey to you some idea of our problems and your responsibilities in connection with our Government's spending. I would like to take some of the mystery out of our Federal budget, in the hope that you will agree with me that there are some things we, you and I, can do about budgets and taxes, if we try hard enough.

To begin with we need a definition, and that is easy. One definition is that a budget is a set of calculations that confirm your worst suspicions. A budget is a financial plan. That's true if we speak of our personal budgets, our family budgets, our business budgets, or our Federal budget. They all answer the question: How much do we expect

to take in and how much do we plan to spend?

For the Federal budget our money comes in mostly from taxes. It goes out for national security, for agriculture, for veterans, for natural resources, and for other programs that the people, through their representatives in the Congress, want the Government to carry out for them. The President, through the Bureau of the Budget, prepares and proposes a financial plan each year. The Congress has full power to change it in any way.

Through that process of representative government, our Federal budget—and the same is true of our State and local budgets—is a reflection of how we as a people are choosing to divide responsibilities between public agencies and private individuals. In these times the Federal budget has a particular significance as a mirror of our overall policies for national security and national welfare.

THE 1959 BUDGET

I'd like to turn now to the 1959 budget which was transmitted to the Congress in January. Some things have happened to that budget in recent weeks. But these events do not change the basic validity of our recommendations in the budget for meeting our national security needs or for providing adequate, but not excessive, domestic programs in the years ahead. Therefore, I'd like to go over these recommendations for you.

The 1959 budget calls for planned expenditures of about $74 billion next fiscal year. I can tell you what makes up this amount in a few rounded figures:

	Billions
Security and international, including the Department of Defense, atomic energy, and mutual security	$47
Interest	8
Domestic programs	19
Including:	
Veterans	5
Agriculture	5
Labor and welfare	4
Commerce and housing	2
Natural resources and general Government	3

From the standpoint of our citizens, there are two basic things this budget set out to do:

First, to meet adequately and completely the security needs of this country. This is certainly an objective no one disagrees with.

Second, to lay the groundwork for significant reductions in expenditures for domestic programs in future years. Here there is a lot of disagreement.

SECURITY PROGRAMS

Now, I'd like to give some particulars about the portion of the budget dealing with our security. The important point here is that the budget provides much more in the way of funds for missiles, nuclear weapons, and space-age development than is indicated by looking at the relatively small change from the previous budget total. To show that, I want to call your attention to significant changes in emphasis which have been taking place.

First. Expenditures in 1959 for missiles, for nuclear armed or powered ships, for atomic energy, for research and development, and for science and education will increase more than $3 billion over 1957, which ended a few months before the success of the first Russia sputnik.

Second. Over this same period, spending for other military equipment and aircraft of declining importance will decrease about $1.5 billion. We are directing resources to highest priority needs rather than adding new programs to old ones.

Third. More than three-quarters of the total procurement funds in 1959 will go for new types of equipment which hadn't been developed or weren't being bought in production quantities as recently as 1955, the first full fiscal year after the Korean conflict.

Fourth. Nearly half of the missile program for 1959 will be for the five longer range ballistic missiles—Atlas, Titan, Thor, Jupiter, and Polaris. Only one of these was past the technical study stage 2½ years ago. In 1953, only $1 million was spent on longer range missiles. By last year, $1 billion was spent on them—1,000 times as much. In 1959, we will expand this program still more.

As you can see from these comparisons, the shift to modern weapons is not a sudden thing. We have been reshaping our military strategy and forces over a period of years. Now we are in a position to take advantage of the successful developments and to add immeasurably to the power of our forces.

As a matter of fact, since the 1959 budget was prepared we have found that certain of these developments can effectively be speeded up even more. The President last week requested $1.5 billion in additional funds from the Congress to step up and expand further some high priority activities, and defense expenditures will now be higher than the budget figure.

We are determined to keep our defenses up to date in the space age. We are equally determined that defense spending be devoted to essential items and that pressures for pump priming do not lead to unnecessary military expenditures.

Now let me say a few words about our cooperation with other free nations. We are going to spend almost $4 billion for this purpose in 1959. Over three-quarters of this amount is for military hardware and support of armed forces other than our own. Countries we have helped in this way today maintain 200 army divisions, 23,000 aircraft, and 2,300 naval vessels. Without our help, such large forces could not be maintained and our own military outlays would have to be much larger. This help certainly increases our own security and the security of the free world immeasurably.

To promote peace and lay the groundwork for a long-time expansion of our foreign trade, we are also helping other free nations to develop their economies. Up until now, this help has been largely in the form of grants. From here on out, we expect to put a larger part into loans which will be repaid to us.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

Now, more than ever, with pressures on the budget increasing, we should be selective not only in our military programs but in our domestic programs. We must be sure that we spend where it will do the most good and not just for the sake of spending. We should continue to press for economy in all areas where expenditures fail to meet the test of need or the test of Federal responsibility. Furthermore, we must make every effort to insure that fully justified Federal programs are carried out in an efficient manner and on a sound financial basis. We need to do these things to preserve fiscal soundness in Government.

With these objectives in mind, a good part of our total effort is directed toward better management of Federal programs. At the present time we have underway, for example, a governmentwide program for improvement of financial management that is focused on the development of financial information that will better portray the actual costs of agency operations. In addition, there is currently before the Congress legislation that would strengthen controls in the appropriation and use of available funds. This would be accomplished by placing a limitation in each appropriation on the amount of goods and services that could be received under that fund during a given fiscal year. Legislation for this purpose has been strongly supported by the President. Through improved practices such as these, we shall be able to control Federal expenditures better.

In this connection, however, I'd like to dispel one illusion and that is that the Federal budget can be cut severely simply by squeezing employment costs a little more. That just isn't so. Four years of close attention to this matter have produced large provable savings, but that well has just about dried up. Government civilian employment is down almost a quarter of a million since January 1953. Future reductions will still be possible in what we call bureaucracy, but they will not save billions, I assure you. Our civil servants, by and large, are devoted and competent. The fact to be emphasized over and over is that if we are to reduce Federal spending substantially, we must do it by changing the basic programs of the Government.

With this in mind, we took a good look at all of our domestic programs when we prepared the 1959 budget and we proposed changes in a number of them which would lead to sizeable savings. I'd like to tell you about some of these changes—proposals that involve revising programs where needs are changing, transferring responsibilities to the States, reducing subsidies, and encouraging private rather than Federal lending. These proposals could lead to several billions of dollars of savings within a few years.

The proposed revisions are the kinds of actions that ought to be taken even at a time like the present when we are doing things to bolster economic activity. About this, I want to stress two points:

First, most of these proposals for savings would not begin to be effective until over a year from now. Their full effect would come even later, when I am confident our economy will again be expanding. Government programs and expenditures have a strong momentum and can't be turned off at will. It takes time to get changes and a start has to be made.

Second, we should never stop trying to assure that the Government's resources are used in the best possible way for the long run good of the country. That is the idea behind our economy proposals. They are sound and moderate. Many of them are long overdue.

Altogether, we offered 17 proposals to reduce expenditures or increase receipts. The budget message tells more about them, but I would like to list them here.

PROPOSALS TO REDUCE EXPENDITURES

Three of these proposals dealt with programs where shifting emphasis or changing needs are lessening future requirements for specific types of Federal assistance. These are agricultural conservation, grants for hospital construction, and veterans' pensions. These programs can be gradually reduced.

Then there are six grant programs for which the administration proposed an increase in State and local participation and a decrease in the Federal proportion, but with no reduction in the total combined outlay. In two cases, waste treatment facilities and vocational education, we proposed to eliminate completely the Federal payments beginning in the fiscal year 1960. We would at the same time give up some revenue to the States. In four other grant programs, we proposed reducing the Federal share of costs gradually. These are grants for public assistance, for urban renewal, for schools in federally affected areas, and for natural disaster relief.

Next, the administration made proposals designed to free the agricultural economy from excessive controls. The President recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture be given greater discretion in establishing price supports for basic crops, that the Soil Bank acreage reserve be ended after the 1958 crop year, and that the use of private capital in the rural-electrification program be encouraged.

PROPOSALS TO INCREASE RECEIPTS

Now, let me turn to some recommendations which would increase receipts. These are also designed to reduce the burden on the general taxpayer.

When the Government provides a service which gives identifiable individuals or groups as quasi-commercial benefit above and beyond the benefits to the public generally, it should charge those groups for that service, rather than place the full burden of the cost on the general taxpayer. Accordingly, the President made several proposals in the field of user charges.

1. Postal rates: In every year since the close of World War II there have been large postal deficits. These have placed heavy and unfair burdens on taxpayers to the advantage of large users of the mails. Actually, the Post Office is operating largely on 1932 selling prices and 1958 costs. The postal legislation now pending would raise rates on all classes of mail except fourth class. The recommended increases should result in an addition of $700 million to postal revenues in the fiscal year 1959, with $175 million of that going to an overdue post-office modernization program.

2. Aviation gasoline taxes. The Federal Government provides a wide range of special services benefiting private users of the airspace. It is increasingly appropriate that these users pay their fair share of the costs. The cost of new facilities alone will total $1 billion over the next few years to meet the needs of the jet age. It is proposed that taxes on aviation gasoline be increased and that the same tax be levied on jet fuels.

3. Other service charges. Beyond this, all agencies have been instructed to prepare legislative proposals generally designed to permit them (a) to recover full cost of services that provide special benefits, and (b) to obtain a fair market value for the use or sale of Federal resources or property.

4. Interest. Next are the interest rates in Federal credit programs. When the Government lends money, it should receive an interest rate that covers the interest it pays to borrow the same amount of money. For programs under which the Government guarantees loans made by private lenders for various purposes, interest rates should be permitted to be high enough to attract private lenders. The President suggested that authority be provided to vary the rates for guaranteed or insured loans in line with market conditions and under proper safeguards.

I wish I could go into these proposals more fully, but that would take far too much time. However, I sincerely believe that if you will look into them you will agree with me that they are worthy and that they deserve favorable action by the Congress.

THE BUDGET OUTLOOK

Well, what's happened to our 1959 budget and its proposals?

As I indicated earlier, defense needs will cost more than we estimated in the budget. Even more strikingly, the current economic setback has also changed the budget outlook. The early signs of an economic downturn were just appearing at the time we prepared the 1959 budget last fall, and we have since gotten a better measure of the recession we are in, although it is still too early to tell what its extent and duration will be.

The impact, in many ways, has been unfortunate. In the surge to find ways of relieving the current swing in the business cycle, Congress has turned down most of our proposals to reduce the cost of Government activities. It has given the impression that it is not interested, right now, in economy. By turning on vast new programs for spending, it has moved far away from any hope of balanced budgets for 1959 and possibly several more years. The loss of our economy proposals is disturbing, especially since, even in times of stress, it should be the aim of Government to be selective in its course of spending.

I don't mean to imply that the recession doesn't require action. In fact, to date, the administration has taken a number of actions to do its part in promoting economic recovery. At the same time, the Federal Reserve authorities have eased credit and increased the supply of money. Highway construction, urban renewal, and other activities are being increased. Many steps have been taken to stimulate home building. Work on construction of needed facilities already underway, such as water-resource and reclamation projects, is being speeded up in orderly fashion, and we have also increased our 1959 appropriation requests for these purposes. We are accelerating repair and modernization of Federal buildings and the purchase of equipment and needed supplies. Other proposals are now pending before the Congress, such as the extension of present periods of benefits for the unemployed.

These are just some of the things which have been done so far. I would like to point out that the programs and projects which are being speeded up are useful and needed. They are generally the kinds of things that can be started up quickly and provide employment quickly, and do not drag out over extended periods of time.

With the resulting increases in spending over what we had estimated in January, present indications are that the budget deficit in the current fiscal year could be at least a billion dollars higher than the $400 million we estimated at that time. And this deficit could be more if tax collections fall off. It now looks, too, as though we will have a rather large deficit in 1959, instead of the surplus we had planned. An important factor in this picture is the amount of revenues we will collect, but we don't have a sound basis for making new estimates of receipts as yet.

What happens now? You have all heard much talk recently about various kinds of large scale new public works programs. Such programs, apart from their merits or faults, are not the answer. I repeat—large public works programs are not the right answer for the country now. We must remember that it takes a lot of time from the initial stage of planning to the point where spending is actually taking place on a construction project. In fact, the normal pattern is for only 7 to 10 percent of the total cost to be spent the first year. So what we get from these slow-moving projects are bigger budgets later on when that may be the last thing we want.

We've got to guard against the tendency to think that the way to start the economy upward again is for the Government to go on a spending spree. The President has pointed out that the administration will do everything that it can constructively do to bring about a resurgence of employment and production. At the same time he stressed the fact that the course of our huge, complex economy depends on what individual citizens do, and the millions of economic decisions which they freely make every day. The proper relation of Government to the growth and vigor of such an economy must necessarily be to stimulate private production and employment, not to substitute public spending for private spending, nor to extend public domination over private activity.

So let's not overemphasize the role of the Government in bringing about economic recovery. And let's remember that if we overdo the expenditure of money by the Government we may find ourselves back fighting inflation again as we were a short time ago.

In my personal opinion, if, and I underline this word, conditions reach the point where a large scale shot in the arm seems needed, a selective tax cut ought to come first. It could give more spending power to individuals and businesses quickly. This spending power would lead to more employment than slow public works programs. But we should take a long, careful, calm, look at conditions and give the economy a chance to show its strength before we embark on tax cutting.

Just last year, we moved up into a $70 billion budget, and there was a great public outcry. Now with the programs Congress is considering, we are threatened with $80 billion budgets for the next few years, which could well mean extended deficit spending. And we can't ignore one simple fact about running deficits now or later. If we spend, we must pay. Eventually we reach the day of reckoning. It's been truthfully said that unbalanced national budgets are like pants without suspenders. You can't keep them up forever.

A new billion dollar program for some purpose may sound like a good thing. But we might choose differently if we remember that it isn't going to be paid for out of one more billion dollar check from General Motors. It's going to be paid through millions of payroll deductions, and taxes on cigarettes and automobiles and washing machines and railroad tickets, and lots of other nickels and dimes collected on billions of transactions. It is we, you and I, and 173 million other Americans, who pay for what Congress appropriates. Sometimes I think that this is a fact that is completely lost on our lobbyists and lawmakers.

CONCLUSION

So, in conclusion, I want to urge upon you that we must keep a sense of perspective about our national problems and the budget. The President tries to maintain a rational and calm approach. Neither the challenge posed by sputnik nor the current recession should be allowed to stampede us into hasty, ill-considered action which will add unnecessarily to our future burdens. The desirable objectives of the proposals in the 1959 budget should not be lost because of frantic preoccupation with temporary conditions. Our economy has taken breathers before and has snapped back and gone on to higher and higher levels of prosperity. It will now.

As professional and business men, you in this group have a particular interest in stable economic growth and in the preservation of the value of our money. So I earnestly hope that each of you will make your views known, as often as you can, in favor of sound, sane financial policies for the Federal Government—policies which limit the Government's activities to those things that it can do better than the people can do for themselves, policies which insure 100 cents of value for every necessary dollar collected in taxes. In this way we will preserve our free incentive system. In this way we will use our resources most sensibly for our collective protection and well-being. In this way we will build security for the future—a future with a legacy of national strength and personal security in a world at peace.

Russian Hydroelectric Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have all listened with interest and deep appreciation to the reports the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has given us about his

several trips to the Soviet Union. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Senate Committee on Public Works had the benefit of his first-hand observation in joint hearings conducted earlier this year by the disinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on comparative river development in the Soviet Union, China, and the United States.

I was greatly pleased when the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and its general manager, the Honorable Clyde T. Ellis, invited the Senator from Louisiana to present his films and comments to an audience of some 85 persons from Capitol Hill, the press, and electric-consumers groups, last Thursday night. The Senator from Louisiana told the audience that Russian hydroelectric development is so huge it staggers the imagination. He showed and described electric turbines more than three times the size of the largest turned out in the United States, and hydroelectric dams tripling the output of Grand Coulee. The power being produced by this massive Soviet system is being tied together by a vast transmission grid system.

Mr. President, it is past time when the American public should wake up to the facts as to Soviet progress in hydroelectric power development. It is past time when the American public should compare that development in Russia with our Nation's paralysis in this field, thanks to the administration's fanatical opposition to desperately needed Federal multipurpose projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release dealing with Senator ELLENDER'S speech before the NRECA and the statement of Mr. Ellis in presenting Senator ELLENDER. I commend these statements particularly to the newspaper editors, the columnists, and the radio and TV commentators of the United States, who will, I trust, help report the facts as to Soviet progress and American decline, and arouse this Nation from the lethargy into which it has been lulled.

There being no objection, the press release and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET PROGRESS CONTRASTED TO IKE'S SHORTSIGHTED VETO

Russian hydroelectric development "so huge it staggers the imagination" was contrasted to President Eisenhower's shortsighted veto of the omnibus rivers and harbors development by Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana, Wednesday night at the headquarters of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Washington, D. C.

Speaking before an audience from Capitol Hill, the press and electric consumers group, Senator ELLENDER showed films he took during his trips to Russia each of the last 3 years. He showed and described electric turbines over three times the size of the largest turned out in the United States, and hydroelectric dams tripling the output of Grand Coulee.

Inventions to transmit electric power 1,000 miles without much loss were an eyeopener to Senator ELLENDER. Three hundred miles is considered the outside economic transmission distance for electric power in the United States.

Both industry modernization and increased agricultural output will result from Russia's big multipurpose river development, said Senator ELLENDER.

While acknowledging this progress, the Senator declared that the United States has an opportunity to make the people of Russia envious of us if the American economy is kept in a healthy condition. The Senator pointed to the educational system as a probable seat of the downfall of communism in Russia.

Meantime, however, the Senator observed that Soviet scientific education is being aimed at exploiting maximum water and mineral resources, and converting millions of acres of additional land to productive agricultural uses through irrigation.

While he termed agricultural processes antique compared to America, Senator ELLENDER said he observed a great deal of progress in the modernization of Russia's industries during his 3 annual trips to that country. The industries are being built as a consequence and at the dam sites where new hydroelectric plants are being installed.

The host, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, presented an outline of Federal hydro projects already authorized which can be undertaken to offset Russian gains in the race to demonstrate our economic superiority, at the meeting. NRECA general manager Clyde T. Ellis described it as strictly a minimum program but a realistic appraisal of the very least we can and must do to keep from being completely overwhelmed by the Soviet.

The NRECA proposal includes starts on 7 new projects already authorized by Congress, accelerated planning for 5 additional projects, and a speedup in 20 projects already under construction.

RUSSIA'S HEARTLAND ADVANTAGE—AMERICA MUST MOVE OR LOSE

(Statement of Clyde T. Ellis in presenting Senator ALLEN ELLENDER at meeting sponsored by Electric Consumers Information Committee)

Geography, population, and resources are the principal factors which determine the strength—or weakness—of a nation. To keep America strong, we must use our natural advantages as wisely as possible, because in the economic cold war the advantages are not all on our side.

Soviet Russia possesses more of these natural advantages than does the United States. For that reason, if for no other, our national security demands that we make the fullest and most efficient use of our resources and cease squandering some of them as we have in the past.

Look at a map of the Soviet Union, and you start to see what I mean. It contains most of what the geographers call the world island's heartland. It was the original theory of Sir Halford Mackinder that, based upon location, population, and natural resources massed there, if a single nation could control eastern Europe and western Asia that nation would be in a position to control the world militarily. One of the foremost authorities, Mackinder revised his theory many years later, but still pictured the heartland dominantly occupied by Russia at one end of a world power lever and America on the other. Both have defensive depth, but Russia has far more.

Russia's 8½ million square miles spread nearly halfway around the globe. The U. S. S. R. contains one-sixth of the earth's total land area. It is almost three times the area of the United States. Together with her satellite countries, the Soviet already possesses most of the world's geographic heartland.

Soviet Russia's population is almost as great as the combined populations of the United States and the United Kingdom. It totals about 200 million people. In utilizing manpower, the training or education and the organization of the people of a nation are as important as the numbers. Again, by sputnik and in other ways the dictators of the Soviet Union are demonstrating that they intend to use all of their resources to the fullest advantage, and to direct those resources first to attain world power.

But it is in the field of natural resources that we are losing a most significant race. While the Communists are driving ahead aggressively, many fear we are recklessly neglecting our Nation's strength. At a recent farmer's union meeting in Denver, Alex Radin, of the American Public Power Association, said that only about 25 percent of America's hydro potential has been developed. Of all the factors of national security, natural resources is the one which we could exercise the most control over and the one which we should be conserving and using most carefully.

An official United States military publication of a few years ago had this to say, (Armed Forces Talk, 359, Office of Secretary of Defense):

"The extent to which an area takes advantage of the natural resources available is always important. From the earliest days of recorded history, nations have developed into world powers as their skill improved at turning out their natural resources in such surplus quantities that they could use them for trading with other countries or could produce more and better weapons than other countries. Historians like to call this kind of progress technological advancement."

ELLENDER REVEALS RUSSIA'S POWER RIVALRY

I have seen nothing that demonstrates the peril of our neglect of our resources as well as the observations Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana, has made, and the Army's Corps of Engineers has confirmed, since the Senator's return from his third tour of the Soviet Union. From what I see, there is now ample proof that the United States past and present efforts to effectively develop its river resources will soon be dwarfed by the Soviet Union, both in individual projects and in the broad scope of the recurring 5-year plans.

From another source let me quote the December issue of News Front, an authoritative magazine published for management executives in American business, industry, finance, government, and the military:

"Most immediately important to the U. S. S. R.'s mushrooming—and menacing industrial growth is the vast increase in river-derived power. Output, 800 million kilowatt-hours in 1932, multiplies 29 times to 23.1 billion in 1955.

"The 1960 target is 59 billion, but this is only a fraction of future goals.

"Soviet plans can be expressed as a series of mammoth TVA's, moving ever eastward from European Russia into the heart of Siberia."

Other figures show that we are fast losing our advantage in producing electricity, the prime power of modern civilization and this is true despite the fact electric power is America's fastest growing major industry, doubling its output every 7½ to 10 years, come peace or war. In total electric power production—half of it hydro—the U. S. S. R. increased its output 13 percent in the 1 year of 1955, from 170.1 billion to 192 billion kilowatt-hours. This is much faster than the United States rate. The increase in total installed electric generating capacity in the United States between 1940 and 1956 was 268.8 percent, while in the Soviet Union it was 389.1 percent.

Ten years ago the United States had a 4 to 1 advantage in generating capacity. That margin has already been cut to a 3 to 1 advantage, and from everything we can learn the Soviets are determined to catch

up with us as fast as possible.[1] Our country's no new starts policy on multipurpose projects in fiscal 1959 will certainly help them.

AGRICULTURE ADVANCES, TOO

But the development of river resources going on in Russia should also be of concern to us from the agricultural standpoint. To quote the opinion of the editors of News Front again:

"Feeding and supplying the world's soaring population, which is increasing 43 million a year, is the challenge of our time: 70 percent of the world's people are still poverty-stricken and underfed."

"The imaginative exploitation of the world's rivers for irrigation and production of hydroelectric power is a key part of man's worldwide struggle to better himself."

More than half of the people there are engaged in farm work compared with one-fourth in the United States. With a third more people, Russia has been able to put less land under cultivation to produce food and fiber because too much of the land has been too dry or too cold. Good farming land covers only about 9 percent of Russia.

The new river development projects now undertaken by the Soviets are designed to help overcome these disadvantages. Not only do they intend to irrigate large areas, but, by the diversion of rivers, their scientists are convinced they can change the climate of some Siberian areas to make them agriculturally productive.

CAN WE AFFORD TO FIDDLE?

In the fact of these facts, I ask you one question: "How many more Hells Canyons can we afford?" We are still committed to squander 75 percent of its water storage, half of the power potential, and more irrigation benefits. Elsewhere similar situations exist. Look at the atomic power issue, where we seem content to sit back and use up other nonrenewable raw material resources at a geometrically accelerating rate, indefinitely, if necessary, rather than make use of the many times more abundant atomic energy to generate power as soon as we really can.

While we are intensely interested in obtaining more plentiful sources of hydroelectric power at lower costs for rural electrification and other uses, we are also interested in our Nation's security and world leadership. We think it is time that all Americans begin thinking about keeping our Nation strong, and ahead. It may be later than we think.

Right now the two national consumer-owned power groups of the United States—the American Public Power Association and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—are working together to develop a list of river development projects which we think should be undertaken immediately. (A list of mutlipurpose river projects authorized by Congress but not begun, is attached.) We are doing it at this time because we believe the stepped up activity is urgent to prevent our present recession from developing into a full-fledged depression. But with broader perspective, I believe it is equally urgent that the United States Government immediately review its river development programs, both those underway and planned for the future, from the standpoint of our national security needs.

Senator ELLENDER, at least some of us who heard you before the Senate joint committee felt that we were sitting in on the most startling story since sputnik. In my opinion the free world is indebted to you for shocking us out of our Rip Van Winkle resources slumber. The floor and screen are yours.

[1] See fact shee attached showing United States of America-U. S. S. R. comparisons.

The Recession—The Time To Get Ready Is Before It Happens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, whenever anyone suggests that the recession is serious, and can get worse, and that some really vigorous efforts ought to be made to end it, the cry is raised that he is a "prophet of gloom and doom." He is charged with undermining public confidence, and with setting up the kind of psychological mood that makes a depression more likely.

Mr. President, I do not believe that one who wants to meet a present danger is an alarmist. I do not believe that one who wants to prepare for a prospective danger that is even worse is a prophet of gloom and doom.

The last time I slept in a hotel, the fire escape was right outside my door. It did not destroy my confidence to know that the hotel had taken reasonable precautions. It made me sleep better. When I go back to that city, I am going to stay at that hotel again. And if I can get that room next to that fire escape, I am going to do that, too.

In his syndicated column published today, the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippman, sounds the warning that the time to prepare for disasters that can occur is before they happen. That is the way to keep them from happening, or to lessen the severity of what does happen. Now is the time, says Mr. Lippmann, to take massive action to stop the recession in its tracks, and to be prepared to prevent a slide into a situation even worse than the one that now confronts us. If these preparations prove not to be needed, that is fine; everyone will rejoice. But there is no reason to think that prudent precautions are wrong because they are not used. The lodger does not complain because he has not had to use the fire escape. The voyager does not grieve because he has not had use for the lifeboats.

The most important point in Mr. Lippmann's article, I believe, is this: If we do take measures to combat real depression, we shall almost surely not have to rely on them. The reason is that the assurance that the Government of the United States will not permit a real depression to happen, will not tolerate large-scale unemployment and bankruptcy, will have a salutary effect in restoring confidence. The postponed purchases, the delayed plans to build, will be carried out when people believe that the Government is ready for any economic eventuality and is determined to meet it resolutely and successfully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the article entitled "On the Recession."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECESSION

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is as yet no very general popular pressure for stronger measures to reflate the economy than the measures which the administration is taking. It does not follow, however, that stronger measures, such as a tax cut and larger public works, should not be prepared and made ready for early adoption. For the critical fact is that in the business cycle remedies do not work quickly. The sooner they are adopted—whether on the upswing or on the downswing—the less strong do they need to be.

It is evident enough today, for example, that in the upswing between 1955 and 1957, the authorities waited too long to check the inflationary rise of consumer credit and capital expenditure and wage and price increases. In reverse, it is probable that we have already waited too long before acting against the recession which began last summer. In fact, during autumn when the slump was already evident, the administration was actually cutting down expenditures in the Defense Department.

The moral of it is that public opinion is not a sound guide in the management of the business cycle. When the inflation of 1955–57 was under way, the politicians and the public resisted measures to restrain credit and the rise of the wage-price structure. When the cycle turned after the middle of 1957, the politicians and the public were demanding retrenchment which would have been very suitable 18 months earlier. Indeed it may be regarded as a working rule that for the successful management of the business cycle, the responsible authorities must be ahead of public opinion and prepared to take measures which cannot be popular until their delayed results are experienced. The authorities must not wait to be pushed but they must lead the way, be it to deflate a boom or to reflate a slump.

There are reasons for thinking, so it seems to me, that we are at a point where a turn for the worse is so distinct a possibility that it is the part of wisdom and prudence to anticipate it. It may, of course, be true, as Secretary Weeks and the President hope and believe, that we have reached the bottom and that in a few months the recovery will be underway. But it could be true that we have not reached the bottom of the recession and that if our policy is to wait and see, we may be depressed to a deeper bottom from which it will be still harder to rise.

Is this alarmist talk which undermines confidence? In the old days when banks were often in trouble and faced with a run by their depositors, the best way to stop the run was by such a powerful guarantee of the bank's solvency that nobody wanted to draw out his money. The same principle is applicable, it seems to me, to the current phase of the recession. To say that prosperity is just around the corner is less likely to restore confidence than it would be if the administration and the Congress set in motion such strong measures that confidence in the maintenance of employment and of profits is restored.

There are at least two reasons for thinking that we may not be at the bottom of the recession. For one, there is no good reason to suppose that there will soon be a rise, instead of the present decline, of what businessmen invest in plant and equipment. Unless, however, there is a reasonably prompt and substantial rise in private capital expenditure, there is no good prospect of a recovery without compensating outlays of public capital in defense and public works and subsidized housing and other facilities.

The second reason for being vigilant and alert is that there are many signs that, as regards the depressed durable goods, the consuming public are in a mood to save their money, to make do with what they have, to scale down their debts, to buy at secondhand, and to keep their affairs as liquid as possible. Why? Because they are afraid of unemployment, of part-time unemployment, of declines in retail purchases and profits. There is a danger here, psychologically not unlike the state of mind which used to lead to runs on a bank. "A decision," said Professor Schlichter recently, "of consumers to cut their debts rapidly could be dangerously deflationary."

This is a very vulnerable point, and a policy of wait and see is dangerous. There is no use preaching confidence, there is no use expecting a man to buy an automobile he does not have to have, if he is worrying about whether he may lose his job. What he needs to restore his confidence is the sight of the Government preparing to do as much as is needed, perhaps more than is needed, to reflate the economy.

In the debate about these matters there is an underlying issue of economic philosophy. There are those who believe with the classical economists that a recession is a necessary readjustment after an inflation of prices, wages, and debts. It is a painful readjustment. But it is necessary to the ultimate health of the economy.

On the other side, there are those who believe, as does for example Mr. Marriner Eccles, that humanly and politically it is impossible for a modern democratic society to endure and to tolerate the severe depression which would really readjust wages, prices, and debts.

They are, I believe, right, and that it is better, as Mr. Eccles said, "to accept the present price, wage, and debt structure," to support it by a reflation, than to take the enormous risks of a readjustment by a big depression.

Congressional Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant of March 23, 1958, entitled "The King Can Do No Wrong." The editorial has to do with the customs of the Congress, and I think will be very interesting to Members of both Houses.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG

There used to be an accepted belief among the people that there was a divine right of kings. A corollary was the theory that the king could do no wrong. In the new Republic of the West, those ideas were abandoned. Instead, we adopted in a general way the principle of Thomas Hooker that all power flows from the people. It's getting pretty obvious though that a new privileged class is being set up in this country. That privileged group is Congress, and its principal spokesman is SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House.

It was Mr. RAYBURN who announced pontifically that no Senator need respond to the call of the House investigating committee, to testify as to undue pressures on Government regulatory commissions. This was done on a quid pro quo basis, so that no Member of the lower House of Congress need ever fear that he will be subjected to inquiry by any Senate investigating body. The skeletons will lie buried.

All this legislative backscratching comes on top of Congress' miserable persistence in concealing its traveling expenses from the taxpayers. One must consider Hooker's famous dictum about the seat of all political power with cynicism, in view of the reluctance of Congress to tell the people what it spends on junketing, and how it spends the money.

There are perfectly good reasons for protecting Members of Congress against pressures, particularly in the expression of views. For that reason a Member's speeches are privileged on the floor of Congress. The people of a State have the right to pass that judgment. But in the present Congress, we have a refusal of Members of Congress to testify as to their activities in using pressure on regulatory bodies. It is a Congress that gave itself a raise in pay, contrary to all precedents. It is a Congress that hides its expense accounts, and says the people have no right to know where this part of their money goes. It is a Congress that set out once to investigate elections and auxiliary income of its Members, but stopped short. Indeed it is a Congress that has become more than an exclusive club. It sounds very much like a bunch of men who have forgotten where the seat of all power lies.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Sirovich Day Center as to the expansion of social-security benefits.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of the Sirovich Day Center, 203 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y., a cultural club of over 800 retired persons, in regular meeting assembled passed the following resolution:

"Whereas most of our members depend for their living on social-security benefits and whereas many of them receive small checks so that they have to live in substandard houses and to subsist on meager diets that create a health hazard; and

"Whereas many of them when sick cannot afford proper medical care, their sickness becomes aggravated as a result of such neglect; and

"Whereas these persons contributed so much to the building up of this country and have therefore a valid moral claim on the Nation to take care of them properly in their declining years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we ask the Congress of the United States to amend the social-security law. So as to improve our economic condition. We support the Forand bill wholeheartedly. It is a step in the right direction. We feel, however, that its provision for a minimum of $50 a month is far from sufficient in view of the prevailing high prices. We, therefore, beg of you to set the minimum at $75 per month; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of the resolution be sent to President Dwight David Eisenhower, Congressman Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; Senators Jacob K. Javits and Irving M. Ives, and Congressman Leonard Farbstein."

PETER J. GALLEGOS, *President*.

Construction Jobs on Lloyd Center in Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ground was broken on April 11 on the $21.4 million Lloyd Center development on Portland's east side. The Lloyd Center represents the plans made many years ago by the late Ralph B. Lloyd, who died in 1953, and this development will be a living memorial to him. The foresight by Mr. Lloyd, his four daughters and their associates who have carried forth this project will mean a great deal to my city, and it represents a firm belief in the future of Portland and of Oregon. In this time of severe unemployment, hundreds of workmen will find jobs in building Portland's future, as as result.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by Paul Hauser, staff writer for the Oregonian, which appeared in that newspaper on April 14, 1958. The article is entitled "Planner's Vision Nears Fruition With Start on Lloyd Center."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNER'S VISION NEARS FRUITION WITH START ON LLOYD CENTER

(By Paul Hauser)

The cab driver was sad. As he wheeled his cab along Lloyd Boulevard he told this woman fare the reason for his sadness.

"I and my friends are very sorrowful," he said. "A great man has died, a man who had great plans to build a fine thing on all this property. It would have put many, many people to work and have been a wonderful thing for Portland."

He said more things about this Mr. Lloyd who had died a week or so before at his home in Beverly Hills, Calif. Then he had arrived at his fare's destination, Ireland's at Lloyd's, and stepped out to open the door for the lady.

The lady recalled that ride in 1953 last Friday after the ground-breaking ceremonies for the multi-million-dollar Lloyd Center development, which will be an active, working memorial to Ralph B. Lloyd and his patient faith in Portland.

ASSURANCE GIVEN DRIVER

"I thanked that cab driver for the fine things he said about Mr. Lloyd," said Mrs. Richard Von Hagen. "He was my father, I told him. I tried to assure him that the rest of us would do all we could to fulfill the plans of our father. I hope he knows today that we are doing it."

"I think father always had confidence the rest of us would finish what he had planned," said Mrs. Mark Dees, the eldest of the four daughters of Ralph Lloyd and now chairman of the board of the Lloyd Corp.

"Of course, this will be a memorial to him," said Mrs. Dees, "but it's the only kind he would have had. He would never have been interested in a memorial building as such, a static thing."

Behind the groundbreaking and the award of $21,400,000 in construction contracts Friday were nearly 40 years of patient gathering of land and patient waiting for the time.

PORTLAND LAND BOUGHT

Ralph Lloyd's big fortune came first from oil, but he was in Portland, a Portland resident at a house at 375 NE. Multnomah Street, long before he struck oil. He bought his first Portland property then, in 1907, and kept on adding to it through the years. His first big acquisitions here came in 1926.

Where the ground was broken Friday across Multnomah Street from Holladay Park is just nine blocks east of where Lloyd lived when he was in Portland from 1905 to 1911 as vice president and general manager of the National Wooden Pipe Co.

Looking off past the Interior Building, built by the Lloyd Corp. for the Government, to the slope down to Union Avenue, one of the Lloyd daughters recalled that her father came back to Portland to buy the property around Holladay Park as soon as he made his first big strike.

CROWN PIECE ACQUIRED

"He always called it the crown piece," she said. "The top of this knoll he saw as a central place between the hills. He talked often of its marvelous location and especially of its fine drainage. He looked at things like that."

Lloyd was in his early thirties when he first came to Portland, but he was already experienced in large operations. He had been superintendent, following his graduation in 1898 from the University of California, of the Ventura Land & Water Co., his father's 12,000-acre cattle ranch.

Ralph Lloyd's father had been an officer in the Confederate Army. After the war ended he moved westward. Ralph Lloyd was born in Neosho, Mo., on February 28, 1875. A few years later the family moved westward again, this time to Ventura County, Calif. There Ralph Lloyd grew up, riding the hills after stray cattle and becoming one of the best horsemen in the valley. Until age and illness made it impossible he continued to find horseback riding one of his greatest relaxations.

MRS. CROTTY BORN HERE

When Lloyd came to Portland in 1907 to look after the family interest in the pipe company he was not long married. He married Miss Lulu Hull, of Los Angeles, in 1904. One of the daughters, Mrs. Homer Crotty, was born in Portland.

"Our mother was always a loyal rooter for Portland," said one of the daughters. "She loved it here and she hated the desert country. She liked it for the homes. She thought of it as a home city."

Lloyd obviously liked Portland, too, for through the past 30 years no one figure has more frequently expressed faith in the future of Portland than Lloyd and the corporation he left behind him.

The faith continued despite disappointments and blocks.

The greatest disappointment was inability to go ahead with the plan revealed in 1930 for a 24-story hotel because of the deepening of depression. The excavation for the hotel was dug. It was used in recent years as Holladay Bowl for the musical comedy productions of the Portland Symphonic Choir but the hotel never developed. When plans were almost set for another start, World War II stopped them again.

ORGAN GIVEN CHURCH

Lloyd began buying a little Portland property up and down Union Avenue while he was living here. He was a good neighbor, took an interest in the community, attended the Methodist Church that stood then at the corner of Northeast Union Avenue and Multnomah Street (where he donated an organ) and was always studying.

"He was an engineer type of fellow," an old neighbor recalls. "Very quiet and reserved, careful and competent."

Lloyd studied about oil.

He had an idea there was oil under the ground in Ventura County where as a boy and a young man he had ridden rounding up cattle. No one else thought there was oil there, but according to his daughters, Lloyd had been convinced it was there somewhere from the time he was 15 years old. There were peculiar outcroppings on the land that to him indicated oil-bearing strata. So he studied oil geology.

OIL STUDY CONTINUES

In 1911 the Lloyds sold out their interest in the pipe and tank company. Lloyd's father was getting too old to run the ranch. Lloyd went back to Ventura County and took over the management of the ranch. He became a farmer, for the ranch was becoming less and less a cattle ranch as acres of range were plowed into lemon groves. Ventura County was becoming the greatest lemon-producing county in the United States, as it now claims to be.

The ranch was a moneymaker. It also took lots of work. But whenever he had time to spare, Lloyd continued his oil studies.

"Instead of taking vacations when the time came for them, I rested awhile from the ranch work, and spent my entire time on oil matters," Lloyd told a reporter in 1929. "I studied the district from every angle. I was sure there was oil there. I submitted my proofs to men considered wise. Some of them were polite enough not to laugh."

GUSHER BLOWS IN

With a partner, also the son of a southerner, Lloyd kept at his theory. He saved as much as he could and put it into oil exploration. Then in 1920 his first gusher came in. More and more oil wells followed. Soon Lloyd was a millionaire, a figure in the oil industry and known as the father of the Ventura Avenue oilfield.

So Ralph Lloyd was transformed from a lemon grower with crazy ideas about oil to a capitalist. Before long he was back in Portland buying property again. One of the first pieces he bought was the property on Union Avenue alongside Sullivan's Gulch. After Lloyd built a boulevard up one side of it, it became the site of the Sears retail store, the first large building Lloyd built in Portland. It was completed in 1929.

Early the next year Lloyd announced he planned to build a big hotel as the first part of a development on the property he had been acquiring near Holladay Park. In September 1930, a model of the proposed hotel was unveiled before a committee of the National Association of Building Owners and Managers brought to Portland to go over the plans and assess their practicality.

DEPRESSION LEAVES HOLE

But the depression that had started with the stock market crash a year before grew worse. The model, the hole dug for the basement and the nine-hole golf course that was to have been the back yard of the hotel was as far as it came to realization then.

Now part of the Lloyd Center will be a 300-room hotel to be built by the Sheraton Corp.

When Lloyd made his hotel announcement in 1930, he was 55 years old. Men who knew him then recall him as a soft-spoken man whose words carried the ring of firm conviction.

Lloyd wasn't the man to sit back and relax just because he had some producing oil wells. Work was his rule of life. He kept expanding his oil interests and went into oil exploration. (With others, the Lloyd Corp. will soon be making a deep test near Prineville.) He bought city property, but particularly in Portland, and bought into banks.

WORK LLOYD'S HOBBY

At his death in 1953 the Lloyd Corp. properties included more than 50 oil wells in Ventura County, producing more than 5,000 barrels daily, lemon groves, walnut groves, cattle ranches, timberland, and business property.

Richard Von Hagen, now president of the Lloyd Corp. and a business associate of Lloyd beginning in 1938, said the other day that Lloyd's work was his hobby.

"He always took a brief case home and continued on after dinner. His work was always the most interesting thing to him."

Forthrightness and foresight were Lloyd's outstanding qualities as a businessman, Von Hagen believes.

"He was just a smart man. He had a lot of knowledge of a lot of things. He was not a lawyer, but he sure could have been a good one. He was very astute."

Through all his studies Lloyd maintained his belief that Portland, blessed with water resources and a great hinterland, will be one of the leading metropolitan centers of the West.

WATER DEEMED VITAL

"Water. That was one of the great things here to father. He was always discouraged with southern California because water was so hard to find," one of his daughters said the other day. "He always thought of the promise of Portland, because it has a great hinterland and, above all, water. He believed in its natural resources."

While he put no hourly limits on his business studies, Lloyd was not a business machine who never turned from his desk or his briefcase.

He maintained a small portion of the original ranch holdings as a cattle ranch and there he loved to go and invite his daughters, their husbands and his 10 grandchildren to come for an outing.

He loved to get us all together on the ranch. He enjoyed his grandchildren. He liked to take them riding into the hills. I think he enjoyed nothing more than to go out to see a heifer with a calf. He was a fine rider.

SOUTHERN SONGS FAVORITES

At night there would be songfests, for Lloyd loved music and liked to sing.

"He had a beautiful voice," Mrs. Von Hagen said.

The favorites were southern songs. He particularly liked the Stephen Foster ballads and of those Beautiful Dreamer was his most frequent choice. Sometimes he would sing and Lulu (Mrs. Von Hagen) would accompany him on the flute. Other times he accompanied himself on the player piano, which he dearly loved and for which he had a great collection of rolls.

After Lloyd died in 1953, it was revealed that about a third of his fortune was left to the Lloyd Foundation. It has carried on charitable and philanthropic donations of various kinds under the trusteeship of the four Lloyd daughters. Among its largest contributions have been gifts to the California Institute of Technology, in which Lloyd was long interested, and to various civic projects in Ventura County.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Discovery of the North Pole, April 21, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the following statement prepared by Mr. Robert Holder, of Snyder, N. Y. April 21, 1958, is the 50th anniversary of that date when Dr. Frederick A. Cook, a resident of New York State, discovered the North Pole and claimed it for the United States.

Dr. Frederick Albert Cook gave out the first descriptions of the North Pole which were published in the New York Herald of September 2, 1909.

Five days later, on September 6, 1909, Robert Peary announced that he had reached the North Pole on April 6, 1909. It is important to note this second conquest of the pole a year later.

If there is ever any dispute concerning the ownership of the North Pole, we can claim the top of the Arctic by the right of discovery by two brave Americans. The strategic importance of the Arctic is known to every schoolboy today; 50 years ago it was an almost useless mystery.

Arctic interest has been stimulated by the scientists during this International Geophysical Year when many nations are seeking the answer to the many Arctic mysteries. The work of the pioneer explorers serves as a springboard for present-day research. I would like to mention some highlights of Dr. Cook's epic journey across the unknown Arctic wastes.

In an airline measurement the distance from his Greenland camp is about 700 miles. This distance was for him to be extended to a walk of 4,000 miles over land and sea with the shadow of death daily on the horizon. It was the longest sledging record in history.

Dr. Cook's reaching the North Pole was the result of precision planning. Profiting from his studies of the work of other explorers he concluded that previous failures had been due to too heavy equipment and the attempt to maintain large parties. His equipment was specially designed. Hickory was taken to Greenland where the sledges were constructed. His special sled was the result of over 10 years experimentation which started when Amundsen and Cook served their apprenticeship together on the Belgian Antarctic Expedition, 1897–99. It is significant that both these men, who apparently were made of the same stuff reached the extremities of the earth because of streamlining their equipment—Amundsen, South Pole, 1911; Cook, North Pole, 1908.

Dr. Cook knew that, because of ice conditions, April was the best month and that a dash was important. He was certain that a small party could travel faster.

The expedition consisted of 2 Eskimos, young and in their prime; 26 dogs; 2 sleds loaded with 800 pounds apiece; and the leader, Dr. Cook, who was 43 and in perfect condition. They reached their goal in 34 days, sledging an average of 15 miles a day. These 520 miles were endless days of torture, of extreme thirst and slow starvation. Their ration of a pound of pemmican daily was not enough and their bodies slowly wasted away. They did not mind the cold which ranged as low as −50° but suffered from the bitter gale winds which peeled their skin from their cheeks and noses. It was a lifeless world, with no radios, no airplanes, no means of communicating with the world, and no hope of rescue. It is a story of forced marches beyond human endurance, yet the will and the mind somehow gave them the courage and strength for an almost impossible task.

Cook's route was over game lands discovered by Sverdrup, which gave the North Pole seekers another advantage. The liberal diet of raw meat kept the three men in top trim.

After the pole was reached there was the trip back. Instead of the return being easy, as it was expected it turned out to be the most heart-rending part of the entire trek. The story of the return is perhaps more exciting and pathetic than the dash for the pole.

Dr. Frederick A. Cook wrote two books about his North Pole experiences: My Attainment of the Pole, and Return from the Pole, and every American would do well to read these inspiring tales of what was perhaps one of the most heroic exploits in Arctic exploration, if not in the history of all exploration.

The Parade of Progress Sponsored by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials—one from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 14, 1958, and the other from the Wilkes-Barre Record of April 15, 1958—on the Wyoming Valley Parade of Progress sponsored this year by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 14, 1958]

PARADE OF PROGRESS

If the public will match the enterprise of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce and the enthusiasm of local business, the success of the Wyoming Valley Parade of Progress, opening in the West Side Armory on Tuesday evening, is a foregone conclusion. There is every reason to believe the community will cooperate. In fact, with so many attractions—displays, entertainment and prizes—it is difficult to see how local residents can stay away, no matter what their other engagements for the week.

The theme this year is Casual Living for Tomorrow. This provides tremendous possibilities for the participants and it has a general appeal, for it affects every household and, for that matter, every individual.

The parade of progress has made tremendous strides and the current recession, instead of having an adverse effect, actually has stimulated the sponsors and exhibitors, for it affords the community an opportunity to make a contribution to recovery. The timing is perfect.

For this initiative, the Jaycees and cooperating firms rate a salute.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, April 15, 1958]

PARADE OF PROGRESS

Every 2 years, members of the Greater Wilkes-Barre junior chamber of commerce sponsor Wyoming Valley parade of progress. Today marks the opening of this popular spectacle in the west side armory.

The show will be complete with all the trimmings. A street parade will be held this afternoon through central city, with fireworks at the conclusion to help focus interest on this evening's opening.

An Army floodlight will illuminate the night sky from in front of the armory to let the people of Wyoming Valley know something is going on all week in this community.

This year's show has large promise of being one of the best ever. There will be gifts for the children and grownups, and interesting showings for all the family to see.

Harry Powell and Carl Schmitt, Jr., directors, typify community leaders of the present and future who are giving freely of their time and efforts in this major Jaycee project.

Directors and members of their hard-working committee have been heartened by the response of Wyoming Valley merchants and business people in renting booths and floor space at the west side armory. It's a healthy sign for our region with its close to 350,000 people. It's an encouraging sign of the times, an indication that with progressive-minded young men like the Jaycees out doing things, our Wyoming Valley can well be on its way to an era filled with new promise.

Whether you have attended the parade of progress in other years, the 1958 show with its new features promises to be worth seeing. With 5 evening shows and 1 matinee listed, Wyoming Valley will have ample opportunity to stop in at the armory this week.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have recently concluded a poll among residents of the 39th Congressional District of New York, asking their opinions on 20 of the most important issues before the Nation. More than 7,000 persons replied to the questionnaire.

There has been great interest in the poll, among both the people whom I am privileged to represent and among many persons and groups outside my district. So that my colleagues and all these other interested persons and groups may have the benefit of the results of the poll, I include in the RECORD the results of the poll:

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor a greater Federal responsibility to increase science education?	67.6	28.5	3.9
2. Should Congress enact a Presidential disability law?	76.0	17.4	6.6
If such a law were passed, whom do you think should decide whether a President is disabled: (a) the Vice President (3.9); (b) the President's Cabinet (29.6); (c) a commission of executive and legislative officials (49.9); Undecided (16.6).			
3. Would you favor a system of pay television?	8.3	87.7	4.0
4. Do you favor extending statehood to—			
(a) Hawaii?	81.7	12.5	5.8
(b) Alaska?	85.3	9.0	5.7
5. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to reduce the annual postal service deficit?	70.1	26.3	3.6
6. Do you favor a pay increase for—			
(a) Postal workers?	58.7	32.1	9.2
(b) Other Federal Government employees?	34.4	49.6	16.0
7. Should Congress enact legislation to provide Federal regulation of welfare and pension funds now under—			
(a) Union control?	66.2	24.1	9.7
(b) Employer control?	50.5	36.4	13.1
8. Should the Federal minimum-wage law be amended to—			
(a) Raise the present $1 hourly rate?	46.8	46.8	6.4
(b) Extend coverage to more workers?	72.1	17.7	10.2
9. Should the social-security law be amended to—			
(a) Abolish the present annual $1,200 ceiling on earnings?	47.8	35.5	16.7
(b) Raise the $1,200 ceiling?	60.1	22.5	17.4
10. Do you favor increasing the present $4,200 social-security tax base, and the tax contributions, if benefits also are raised?	53.1	38.4	8.5
11. Do you favor reducing nonmilitary Federal spending to permit a tax cut?	62.1	30.8	7.1
12. Do you favor a wider farm price support formula of 60 to 90 percent of parity and an increase in acreage allotments, instead of the present 75 to 90 percent of parity?	27.6	52.1	20.3
13. Should these provisions of the agricultural Soil Bank program be continued:			
(a) The conservation reserve?	41.6	34.1	24.3
(b) The acreage reserve?	25.2	48.1	26.7
14. Should atomic energy for peaceful purposes be developed by (a) the Federal Government (11.1); (b) private enterprise (27.3); (c) a partnership of both (57.3); Undecided (4.3).			
15. Do you favor the proposed multibillion dollar program for construction of civil defense shelters?	26.3	64.9	8.8
16. Should we continue our foreign aid programs of—			
(a) Military assistance?	56.3	33.1	10.6
(b) Economic assistance?	60.6	30.3	9.1
17. Should the United States exchange atomic-weapons information with our allies?	58.2	32.1	9.7
18. Do you favor closer cooperation with NATO countries in political, economic, and cultural fields, in addition to our military alliance?	80.1	13.8	6.1
19. Do you favor increased cultural and commercial relations with Russia?	52.6	39.1	8.3
20. Do you believe the United States should seek new negotiations now with Russia on disarmament and world political problems?	57.9	34.2	7.9

Federal Aid for Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend and amend the Hill-Burton Act providing Federal aid for hospital construction.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Boston, Mass.

RESOLUTION MEMORALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO EXTEND AND AMEND THE HILL-BURTON ACT PROVIDING FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Whereas his Excellency, the Governor, in his annual message to the general court on January 1, 1958, stated, "The Federal law providing for Federal assistance for hospital construction expires in 1958. I urge that you recommend that the operation of this law be extended"; and

Whereas the basic distribution formula of the Hill-Burton Act, Public Law 725, should be reexamined in order to provide more fully for the hospital needs in States with a number of large cities and metropolitan areas; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of Public Law 725, 79th Congress, and to amend its provisions so as to provide more fully for the hospital needs in States with a number of large cities and metropolitan areas; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, March 31, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 2, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

[Attest]

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Secretary Seaton Commended by Conservationists as a Man of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in administering the public lands, the minerals, the wildlife, national parks, and other great natural resources entrusted by the American people to the care of the Department of the Interior, Secretary Fred A. Seaton has consistently demonstrated courage and devotion to the public interest. In an unusual tribute, the delegates to the 22d annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation, held in St. Louis February 28–March 1 and 2, 1958, adopted a resolution commending Mr. Seaton for a series of significant actions. The text of the resolution follows:

Be it resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation commends and applauds Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton upon several important actions taken in recent months for the benefit and protection of natural resources in the United States and Alaska, to wit:

1. New and protective regulations signed January 11, 1958, restricting and controlling oil and gas leasing and mineral development on the National Wildlife refuges and game ranges in order to protect the wildlife values.

2. An Executive order signed December 24, 1957, providing for the diversion of fresh water from the Colorado River to restore the Topock Marsh and maintain the Havasu National Wildlife Refuge as an important waterfowl-management unit in the Pacific flyway.

3. A preliminary order signed November 19, 1957, taking the initial steps toward withdrawal and establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range in northeastern Alaska.

4. Recommendation of legislation to provide for Federal acquisition of the Klamath Indian Marsh as a National Wildlife Refuge and for Federal acquisition or disposal of the Klamath Indian Forest in a manner to assure sustained yield management.

5. His unqualified declaration made before this convention that he will render in the immediate future a decision upon the vexing problems relating to National Wildlife Refuges and waterfowl management in the Upper Klamath Basin of Oregon and California.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted here that with respect to point No. 5 in the above resolution, Mr. Seaton has again shown he is a man of action and a man of his word. He recently announced his decision in this vexing and long-unsolved controversy. The existing waterfowl refuge lands in the Upper Klamath Basin will be held intact for conservation purposes until or unless substitute wildfowl habitat along the flyway has been provided. Legislation is being prepared to back up this decision and safeguard the waterfowl resources of the Pacific flyway.

Mr. Seaton made a speech at the opening session of the National Wildlife Federation convention which sounded a realistic and forward-looking keynote not only for the Federation's meeting but for the 23d North American Wildlife Conference which followed immediately in the same city. His address, described in the federation's news bulletin as 'bristling with specifics,' follows. Under leave to extend my remarks, I commend it to the study of my colleagues.

MR. SEATON'S ADDRESS

Mr. Swift and gentlemen: As you may have noticed, I paid rather close attention to those generous remarks which my old friend Ernie Swift made about me, and I suppose that I would be a whole lot less than honest if I didn't tell you that I enjoyed every word he said. The only difficulty, I think, is that because he is a friend and a fellow worker in this conservation cause, he perhaps gilded the lily a little too much. Of course, you understand I do not say that as any criticism of him. I simply say that out of common honesty and candor.

I understand that the Annual Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit meeting was

temporarily adjourned this morning so the people in attendance could come here, and, of course, I am particularly thankful. What the final reaction will be to the decision that they should come listen to this speech remains to be seen, of course, but then I am also told that this program is now 22 years old and that in that time more than 2,700 students have been graduated. I think you will all agree with me that this is a very considerable and worthwhile accomplishment.

I thought I would talk to you today about some matters with which some of you are certainly much better acquainted than I. Nevertheless, I think we ought to talk about those matters for a few minutes, not only to get them on the record, but also to make certain that we understand one another.

Back in 1903, at Stanford University, Theodore Roosevelt, speaking on the subject of natural resources, exhorted the Nation "To leave to future generations the heritage unimpaired and, if possible, even improved."

It seems to me this clarion call sounded by President Roosevelt continues to echo in our own day and that it is a call which all Americans, regardless of their business or profession, would do well to heed.

In the 50 intervening years since that speech I think it is a fair statement to say that conservation practices, by private citizens, State agencies and the Federal Government, have greatly increased. Moreover, I think it is admitted that today there is unprecedented citizen interest in the management of this Nation's natural resources, particularly those under Federal jurisdiction. Now, only with such public interest, understanding and action can we ever hope for effective legislative and administrative results.

Here I would like to point out that organizations such as yours have long recognized that fact. To you and to them is rightfully due a major share of the credit for the progress made thus far in the proper husbanding of our natural resources in America.

Then, if you don't mind, I should also like to make a personal observation. As Secretary of the Interior, I owe much to all of you. Many times your representatives have spent long hours with me discussing difficult and complex problems, benefiting me with information and counsel. Time and again members of local units of your organization and others have written or spoken to me their opinions and their suggestions.

Let me assure you here and now with complete sincerity that I am aware of that debt of gratitude and conscious of my responsibility because you have been so cooperative with me.

Now, we know that there are a multitude of major Federal laws, old and new, which today govern the use of publicly owned resources and that many of those laws are complex. Sections of some of them appear to collide with sections of others. Nevertheless, they do set the framework within which the officials of the executive branch of Government must act.

You know, in trying to make right and proper decisions within the framework of those laws, I sometimes recall to mind a famous cartoon character of some years ago. Many people in this room, I am sure, will remember him. His name was Skippy, drawn by a British cartoonist who died a few years ago.

I am thinking of a cartoon which appeared one Christmas Eve. It showed little Skippy about age 8, in his night clothes, down on his knees by his bed making his prayers. This is what he said: "Dear God, please make me a good boy." Then he thought, and I think with all reverence added, "But God, please don't make me too good a boy because you know better than anybody else what an awful tough neighborhood this is."

Sometimes when people with conflicting opinions gather in my office and the time for decision arrives, I must confess to you that I think a little bit about Skippy and his prayer. Nevertheless, in spite of all the difficulties, these laws, taken together are, I believe, inspiring evidence of a people's determination to deal as prudently and wisely as they can with the bounty that nature has conferred upon them. On that fact, I am sure all of us can agree.

Now then, what are some of these laws? Well, for public lands, we have major legislation dating from 1801; for the water we have similar legislation dating from the Reclamation Act of 1902; for minerals we have the basic mining law of 1872 and its successors; for timber we have the Forest Reservation Act of 1891 and subsequent amendments; for grazing we have the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934.

The development of our unparalleled national park system has taken place under a variety of general laws which date back to 1906. I think that a major victory of this area certainly was the launching, in 1956, of the Eisenhower administration's program to improve the national park system of this country. That program is widely and commonly known as mission 66.

Major legislation for fish and wildlife is, as you know, relatively recent. It includes the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918; the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929; the all-important 1934 Duck Stamp Act; the 1934 Coordination Act, with its later amendment of 1946; the Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937; and finally the Dingell-Johnson Act of 1950.

These measures, I remind you, came into being largely through the efforts of many of you.

Similar efforts received a long-due, if not overdue, reward in 1956, when the Fish and Wildlife Act was passed by the Congress. With the passing of that act, we were able to create, in the Department of the Interior, the office of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

Through the cooperation of many people in and out of the Government, of both political parties, this historic forward step was taken.

Now, then, despite the progress that has been made, I believe this Nation's natural-resources program could still be better balanced. Administratively, we are making every effort in our national planning to protect fish and wildlife, recreation, and associated values. Nevertheless, if these are to receive full and appropriate protection, they must have appropriate additional recognition in Federal law. Of that, I am, personally, deeply convinced.

I will say to you here and now that as Secretary of the Interior I shall continue to do everything possible to further the enactment of such legislation in the Congress.

Now, for a moment, if you please, let's consider the real and justifiable need for such legislation.

The demands on our recreational and wildlife resources are growing with incredible intensity. Cities, roadways, and industrial plants, for example, are devouring land in America at an annual rate of almost a million acres, and that, I do not think I need to remind you, is an area larger than the State of Rhode Island itself.

Moreover, our country's population is growing at a fantastic rate, and by 1968 it may well be that we will number 200 million people.

Nevertheless, there is a growing awareness in America, again fostered to a major degree by you people and your associates in the conservation movement, that we simply have got to get on with the job of getting ready for tomorrow and a whole series of tomorrows.

As a matter of fact, in the past few years the Nation has accomplished much to meet the challenges posed by such trends. Since 1953, the Government has added almost 50,000 acres to its Federal wildlife refuges, not enough, no, but plenty if you consider some of the opposition that has been registered to putting a single acre more in wildlife refuges.

In the current fiscal year, the Department of the Interior is investing nearly $57 million in sports fisheries and wildlife programs. That $57 million is almost 60 percent more than the corresponding amount for the fiscal year 1953, and yet I confess that there is much, much more to be done in that area.

In the past 2 years alone, the Department has had nearly a 5-fold increase in its investment in river basin studies. One of our immediate problems in that area is the proposal to erect a dam at the Nez Perce site in Idaho on the Snake River just below its confluence with the Salmon. Unless there is conclusive evidence that such a structure would not do irreparable damage to the anadromous fish runs up the Salmon River, I must oppose it.

The Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson funds are now providing $21½ million to States for sports fisheries and wildlife programs. Perhaps this is not enough yet, but it is the largest annual amount in our history. In the Havasu Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona, water is now being diverted from the Colorado River into the Topock marsh. This, as you know, will end stagnation due to Federal dredging operations which began in 1949. This action is helping to restore that area to its former excellence as a winter ground for migratory waterfowl.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army last year reached an agreement acceptable generally to conservationists by which a buffer strip was made available to Fort Sill in the southern part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. That agreement eliminated a serious threat to the refuge and its intended purposes, and I say now to you that the Department of the Interior has no intention whatever of reducing the effectiveness of this outstanding wildlife area by opening more of its acreage to military use. I might add further that my ability to maintain that position will be quite a bit due to the cooperation I know I shall get from you and your associates.

The Congress has recently passed the so-called military lands withdrawal bill, H. R. 5538, which makes applicable on military lands the fishing and trapping and hunting laws of States and Territories in which they are located. This legislation also stipulates that no military withdrawal of more than 5,000 acres can be made without specific consent of the Congress.

As I am sure you know, the Department of the Interior has wholeheartedly supported this legislation.

In case the word has not reached you today, I was called from Washington a couple of hours ago and told that the President had today signed that legislation.

Well, I think that a fair summary is that much has been accomplished but that there is still much to do.

It is time, for one thing, to make constructive amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1946. In my opinion, that is a legislative must and the sooner it is done, the better. The Department of the Interior is now working with other Federal agencies on just such amendments, which, among other things, would legally require that greater consideration be given to fish and wildlife conservation in the planning of Federal water resource projects.

In brief, the proposed amendments will go beyond the present legal protection against damage to fish and wildlife values. The amendments will actually require the enhancement of those values, and I am happy to report to you that we have made good progress toward getting an agreement

with other Federal agencies. As soon as that job is done, in, I personally believe, a few days or weeks at the most, I shall at once submit proposals to the Congress and strongly urge their enactment.

Second, we urgently need legislation to establish a national outdoor recreational resource review commission. The administration is enthusiastically supporting that proposal before the Congress. It will lay a base for application of recreational resource criteria to include wilderness and associate values in any comprehensive survey of this Nation's lands. I say to you that the sooner that commission can get on with its job, the better for all of America.

Because of the impending termination of Federal trusteeship over the lands of Klamath Indians, we need legislation which will continue the sustained-yield management of the forest, and preserve the marsh as a wildlife area. The administration has sponsored such legislation, and it is now before the Congress. The marsh, once purchased by the Department of the Interior, would become a wildlife refuge. The forest, kept intact, would continue in perpetuity to produce timber on a sustained-yield basis, to help prevent floods and to protect the migratory waterfowl and other wildlife which now find refuge within it.

There came to my desk yesterday a recommendation for solution of the Klamath-Tule Lake problem. Because of its complexity, it has required intensive and sympathetic study by my staff and by the assistant secretary for water and power and also the assistant secretary for fish and wildlife. Upon my return, I shall resume work on this problem myself. We will make every effort to announce a decision within the next few weeks at the most.

As a matter of fact, this subject came up for discusison informally in my room last night, and one of my good friends from out in that area pleaded with me to make this decision as soon as possible. In the course of that conversation, we got a little curious historically and discovered that the problem has been pending in the Department of the Interior since the days of Secretary Krug. I don't say say that as a criticism of one of my predecessors, of course, because it was pending there not only under him, but also under Secretary Chapman and Secretary McKay. This is just an example of how complex some of these problems are.

Around the Department of the Interior we are determined not to let these things lie on the shelf. We will try to make decisions—right decisions—as soon as possible so that people will have a chance either to object or approve.

Well, another thing we badly need is special legislation enacted in this session of the Congress to authorize metalliferous mining by lease or permit only for the proper protection of the proposed new Arctic Game Range. As you know, I have taken steps to set aside this 9-million acre area of Northeast Alaska for the protection of grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, wolverines, caribou and migratory waterfowl. This single addition to the Nation's wildlife system will send the acreage of Federal wildlife lands soaring to a new record total.

Informally, just last week I had a discussion with the Canadian Ambassador, and members of the Department of the Interior have had informal and exploratory conversations with members of the Canadian Government, hoping to work toward the day when the Canadians will find it proper and right to do on their side of the international boundary the same thing we have now done on our side.

As you all know, what we must do above everything else is to make certain that nothing defeats the purposes of the new regulations which have been issued to govern oil and gas leasing on Federal wildlife lands. I am sure we are all together on that.

These regulations provide that on Federal wildlife refuges there will be no leasing, except when Government oil reserves, in other words, oil belonging to the people of the United States, are threatened by drainage because of nearby drilling. On the game range lands of the United States, the Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service will together determine which areas should be recommended to be opened for leasing and drilling. Similar legislation will also apply to the Federal-State cooperative lands and the wildlife areas in Alaska. In any case, the approval of the Secretary of the Interior must be obtained. I have not the slightest intention either of shirking my responsibilities or hiding my mistakes behind somebody else.

Recently a congressional question has been raised about the validity of this new departmental regulation of which I have been speaking. I have been informally told that hearings will be scheduled on that subject. Let me assure you here today that I stand ready to defend my action, both as to its legality and as to its contribution to the public good and, again, I must say that I shall need your help in that battle on Capitol Hill.

Finally, more than ever before, we need to continue to strengthen public support for all constructive conservation measures. The half century behind us is rich in legislative, administrative, and organizational achievements in the field of Federal natural resources management, conservation, use, and development. Even so, as I indicated a few minutes ago, we must continue to forge ahead. So I propose to each of you today that each one of you launch a sort of a personal mission 2,000, not for one resource, but for all of them. With the utmost diligence, let us continue to work together to assure that the latter part of this 20th century, as the first, will be an era of outstanding brilliance and accomplishment for the cause for conservation in America.

Glen Alden Corp. Announces Changes in Its Executive Positions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 16, 1958, which comments on the changes made in the executive positions of the Glen Alden Corp., with headquarters at Wilkes-Barre, and the world's leading producer of anthracite coal:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 16, 1958]

GLEN ALDEN CHANGES

Announcement that Harry W. Bradbury, former vice president of Lehigh Valley Industries, had been elected to a similar post with the Glen Alden Corp., and that Harold B. Wickey, former Lehigh Valley vice president, would be named a vice president of Glen Alden and assistant to Mr. Bradbury indicates that List interests, now in control of Glen Alden, are not going out of the coal business. Mr. Bradbury will have charge of the corporation's coal division.

This is good news to the community from payroll and tax viewpoints and ends speculation about the immediate future of the industry as a result of the retrenchment program and subsequent moves. With two seasoned executives like Mr. Bradbury and Mr. Wickey named to these important posts, it is apparent that, for all the pressure, Glen Alden or List Alden, if merger plans are not disturbed, not only will carry on operations, but possibly will expand them.

Glen Alden must have something in mind when it hires two men of the caliber of Mr. Bradbury and Mr. Wickey, while retaining the services of William Everett as consultant. Francis Case, president of Glen Alden, will remain in an advisory capacity and the indications are he will devote his time and talents to other subsidiaries.

The decision to bring Mr. Bradbury into the Glen Alden was no surprise. It had been reported for several months and it now develops he actually had been elected to the post last December.

Timely Proposals for the Solution of Our Present Economic Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which was written by a small-business man, Mr. E. H. Hardinger, from my hometown of Butler, Mo.

Mr. Hardinger's article reflects serious thought and makes timely proposals for the solution of the present economic dilemma in which we find ourselves today. It would be well for each Member of the House of Representatives to read Mr. Hardinger's thought-provoking article:

Beware, lest we talk ourselves into a disastrous national depression. Every newscast, newspaper, and almost everyone one meets is talking about a depression. True, we have millions of workers out of jobs, but idle, thoughtless talk cannot help, and without realizing it we may create a doubt or fear in the listeners' minds, doing much harm. True, we all should be much concerned about our present local and national economic conditions, which, in some respects, differ from anything we have experienced in the past.

Those of us who went through the unforgettable depression of the 1930's see similarities to conditions preceding that national calamity. However, we must all keep a level head at this time and realize that, should we go down into a depression with our national debt and other conditions as they are today, this would mean a national catastrophe such as we, who are living today, have never known.

Whatever mistakes we have made in the past 40 or 50 years are history—they cannot be righted now. Let us be careful we do not make bigger mistakes in the future. Our present economic dilemma is being aggravated by our constantly inflated price-squeeze situation which is bringing about a depressive condition caused by inflation. A depression caused and brought about by inflation is a new and very dangerous situation.

As a descendant of several generations of conservative thinkers which were right in

their day, and being a progressive, conservative thinker on my own, I am forced to liberalize my views and thinking to the point of the foreseeable and long-range future in very liberal terms. It is too late to turn back now. We must go forward or else we will fall. In the long span ahead, 5, 10, or 20 years, I see nothing but constant inflation. Where or how it will end, I don't think anyone knows.

I believe our large present-day unemployment will dwindle during the spring, summer, and early fall months, then reoccur again during the late fall and winter months next year and will continue to follow this pattern for no telling how many years unless, of course, some national emergency arises which would incur full employment. As one who certainly does not like to pay higher and higher taxes, I feel the time has come for the Government to establish, or make possible the establishment by the various States, a national public-works program of a permanent nature to take up the slack in unemployment as soon as it starts to occur. The idea behind this would be that a man working at his regular job, but got laid off, would have a job waiting for him sponsored by the Government. The average American worker spends his money as he makes it—sometimes before. Full employment has always resulted in prosperity and good conditions for all. With inflated living costs, the average worker can only stand a few weeks of unemployment before it begins to hurt. When layoffs occur, these men and their families must be fed, clothed, and kept warm some way.

What good is a tax cut going to do a man who is out of work and isn't paying any taxes or any prospects of a job? To further increase or extend their unemployment compensation only tends to destroy their incentive to work and earn an honest living. With a properly organized and administered public-works program in readiness, the day a worker is laid off his regular job, he could apply in his county area and be put to work within a few days. This type of help is twofold, the worker earns his living and everyone shares in the results—better roads, streets, more schools, recreational facilities, and dozens of other worthwhile public improvements would be made which are needed and useful to all. The public-works wage scale need not be high but livable; thus, when skilled workers jobs are open, these workers would return willingly. The physiological effect of a man having assurance of at least a job, if only at a minimum wage would have a stimulating effect on consumer buying.

I know there are many things happening today which we do not like and conditions are not as many of us would like them to be. But, again, we must face facts and reality, and in my opinion, this simple, uncomplicated public-works program can and will be, if put into effect, the cheapest and best way of solving the periods which appear certain to occur from year to year. It will keep our country in a continued prosperous condition. With so many interests connected with our vast economy, I believe a plan of this nature would help the most and do the least harm at a minimum cost of any other proposals to date.

If we must talk, don't let us talk idly, but with commonsense to the right people. As it has always been, the average man or woman can do more on election day than others more powerful. Let us remember to elect on election day men and women for important places in our Government who stand for the things that best represent our own interests and the interest of those about us.

Readjustment of Life Adjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the pages of the RECORD have contained many indications of the great interest of the people of the United States in education. The pros and cons of our educational system have been given a fairly thorough review.

I include herewith an editorial from the Raven Review of St. Benedict's College for April 1958. It is a thoughtful, objective presentation, shedding more light than heat on the matter:

READJUSTMENT OF LIFE ADJUSTMENT

We had made a resolution to let the subject of education rest for a while. But a gentleman with whom we have been arguing violently for as long as we can remember made a characteristically outlandish remark at our last encounter which has been bothering us ever since. The supreme irony of the age, he says, is that our democracy has evolved an educational system eminently suited to totalitarianism, while the Russians seem to have developed a program that would be just right for a democracy.

The Russian system, he points out, emphasizes the ideals of intellectual excellence and self-discipline proper to a society of freemen; the American way, on the other hand, neglects the training of both mind and will in favor of life adjustment, coddling, and conditioning our youth to unthinking conformity with the mass.

Close upon these subversive observations comes the campaign of the Luce publications to revitalize the American school system. Time and Life have come out with an unprecedented assault on the ideals of the Deweyites entrenched in the entire program of primary and secondary education. And the facts they cite are a startling confirmation of our friend's cantankerous assertions. The neglect of intellectual discipline had long been fairly obvious from our contacts with products of the system in college classes. But the fostering of group pressure to conformity was something we had only suspected.

The stupidity underlying this preposterously anti-democratic procedure baffles the understanding. Even Life in its portrait of a typical high school student frittering away his time and talents in ignorant self-indulgence, maintains that this kind of nonsense develops qualities of leadership. Our critical friend anticipated this claim also. To his own lethargic high-school students who are complacently submitting to training for leadership, he challenges: Leadership for what?

The least that can be expected of a leader is that he should know where he is going and where he is now. If he is unconscious of the intellectual tradition that produced him, of the roots of his own government and the economic principles of his society, not to speak of the revolutionary scientific developments of his own age, he is not likely to have any definite goals toward which to lead anybody. The prospect of the blind leading the blind in this fashion is enough to make the scalp crawl.

The question of the goals of education itself has been raised by the editors of Life in an emphatic manner: "Exclusive devotion to techniques and group adjustment should never again be allowed to hide the fact that American education exists first of all to educate the individual in a body of learning, with a tradition and purpose behind it." With this we heartily agree. But what tradition and what purpose the editors fail to state.

The fundamental disagreement in our society about what a man is and what he is for lies at the very root of the question of how to educate him. Some think he is the end result of accidental biological mutations; others, that he is the chance product of a complex of economic forces; others again, that he is a creation of intelligent love, with a destiny beyond space and time dependent on the responsible use of freedom.

The difficulty of reconciling these conflicting concepts led the Deweyites long ago to ignore them altogether and devote themselves to mass conditioning processes. And we have made little progress in solving the dilemma since that unhappy day. But we can take this grain of comfort from the obvious bankruptcy of life adjustment programs, that it may force us back to a reliance upon intellectual values before the thought police are ready to take over.

Alcorn Too Optimistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ocala, Fla., Star-Banner of Wednesday, April 16:

ALCORN TOO OPTIMISTIC

In a speech delivered at a Republican fundraising dinner in Birmingham, Meade Alcorn, GOP national committee chairman, predicted that the Republicans can make net gains in the South this year if more GOP candidates will challenge incumbent Democrats.

He does not agree with those who say the Republicans cannot duplicate their 1956 successes in the South. He reiterated a prediction that his party could increase its present House membership of 9 out of 114 seats in the South and border States if it did not let the Democrats win by default in so many districts.

"It is my firm belief," he said, "that an incident such as Little Rock will never lead thinking voters to turn their backs on the great overriding accomplishments of this Republican administration."

Mr. Alcorn is too optimistic. All the straw polls indicate that the Democrats will sweep both Houses of the Congress, if they do not become too cocky and confident. Some of the best informed political writers in the country, including David Lawrence, Roscoe Rrummond, and we believe, Walter Lippmann, agree that the Democrats will extend their majorities in the House and Senate.

Nearly everyone who has no political bias is agreed that the odds are with the Demo-

crats for many reasons, not the Little Rock school incident alone.

Take the Senate races as an example. The Republicans will have 22 Senate seats at stake while only 11 Democratic Senators will be up for reelection. For the Republicans to make any gains, it would be necessary for them to hold their 22 seats and gain some of the 11 Democratic seats.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, chairman of the Senate Democratic campaign committee, recently made some predictions about the congressional elections this year and the presidential elections in 1960.

Florida's junior senator believes the Democrats will ride high in November, but that big gains in both House and Senate could backfire on them in the 1960 presidential race. He predicted that the Democrats will pick up from 5 to 7 Republican Senate seats, and that they will elect all of their candidates in the South handily.

SMATHERS is on sound ground when he says his party will have no difficulty in holding the South in the congressional races. He also believes it stands to gain in the Far West and Middle West because of economic troubles there. In support of this prediction he pointed to the dissatisfaction in the farm belt over the administration's farm policies.

SMATHERS predicts that the big issue in November will boil down to the Nation's economic situation, not satellites, outer space problems, foreign policy or Little Rock. He thinks the United States should be caught up with the Russians in the race for outer space by election time, so that should not be an issue.

He points out that the Republicans are hard hit in that five of their top Senators are not seeking reelection. These include Senators JENNER of Indiana, SMITH of New Jersey, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, PAYNE of Maine, and KNOWLAND of California.

If the sentiment in Florida is any indication of the political feeling in other States, the South will swing back into the Democratic column this coming November. It is difficult to find a Florida Democrat who voted for President Eisenhower in 1956 who is willing to say he will support the Republican ticket this November. In addition, reports are coming in from south Florida that some Republicans of many years standing are changing their registration to the Democratic Party.

It is of interest in connection with the Alcorn and SMATHERS statements to mention the reason SMATHERS thinks that big gains this year could backfire in the presidential election in 1960. He points out if the party makes substantial gains in Congress this year, and world or domestic conditions worsen later on, the Democrats, not the Republicans, would be responsible, as he says "when things aren't going too well, the voters like to make a change."

Facts Should Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written and said about the natural gas bill—both in this Congress and in previous sessions. The real need for, and the true benefit of, the legislation has been virtually lost in the maze of information which has been disseminated relative to this vital legislation. The issue has been forcefully and succinctly stated in a very fine editorial which appeared in the Vega (Tex.) Enterprise of March 28, 1958. This fine newspaper which serves the community of Vega so well is owned and published by Mr. John R. Hines. Under unanimous consent, I insert herein the editorial entitled "Facts Should Rule":

Human fallibility and downright bad judgment continue to plague the effort to relieve natural-gas producers of some of the burdens of Federal regulation—burdens which, in the view of many, were never intended by Congress.

About 2 years ago, it will be remembered, a corrective bill passed Congress. But improper lobbying methods had been used in its behalf and because of this the President used his veto. Significantly, in the veto message, he expressed himself as being in general agreement with the bill's intention.

This year it seemed that another and similar bill, known as the Harris-O'Hara bill, had an excellent chance of gaining approval. Then the sponsor of a fund-raising dinner for a leading Congressman solicited money on the grounds that this Congressman supported the gas bill. A furor resulted and it is now said that the bill's chances are poor, if not actually dead.

If that is so, the country will be the loser. As one observer points out, "The entire gas-producing industry is being charged with an act it did not authorize and with which it had no responsibility." There is only one way to view such proposed legislation, and that is on its own merits. Natural-gas production is a highly competitive and extremely risky undertaking. Prolonged regulation of the kind now in effect cannot help but discourage exploration, and deprive the country of gas it wants and needs.

There is not question here of excusing unethical conduct as it may have been applied to this or any other piece of legislation. But facts should rule.

Israel's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, when the courageous and farsighted Zionist leaders in Palestine proclaimed the birth of the State of Israel, they took the destinies of the Jewish nation into their own hands. At the time this seemed a daring, and somewhat dangerous act. Today, 10 years after that momentous and epoch-making event, it is abundantly clear that their courage paid off. In a single decade Israel has moved from a struggling newborn state to a powerful political and cultural force in the Middle East. Israel is not only a safe haven for refugee Jews, but also a model democratic state in a sea of ancient feudal countries.

Our friendship and respect for Israel continued as we have seen the desert blossom and a democratic society spring up in a part of the world that knows mostly feudal and autocratic governments. It is widely recognized that Israel has used American foreign aid to better advantage than any other state in the Middle East. A well-educated, industrious people they have set forth with the enthusiasm and vision that only pioneers can muster to their cause. They have worked hard and have built a thriving modern nation where formerly there was little but desert, poverty, and disease.

But there is also a close friendship between our two countries because of the compatibility between our deepest national interests. We share a common interest, the development and preservation of international conditions that make it possible for democratic societies to grow and to survive.

On the anniversary celebration of Israel's Independence Day, I wish them more power and full success in their efforts to make the desert bloom and to provide security for their people.

Funds for the Construction of Armories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide forthwith for the allocation of funds for the construction of armories or related facilities.

The resolutions follow:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide forthwith for the allocation of funds for the construction of armories or related facilities

Whereas by Public Law 783 of the 81st Congress there was established a program whereby the Federal Government would contribute approximately 75 percent of construction within the States for military purposes; and

Whereas Public Law 302 of the 84th Congress extended this program of assistance to the States in their armory construction to a period of 8 years from 1951; and

Whereas Congress has already authorized construction of 8 armories or related facilities for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but the allocation of the funds by the defense or Budget Bureau has been made for only 3 of the 8 projects; and

Whereas the delay in the allocation of the funds after authorization by Congress has resulted in serious delay, inconvenience and loss to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges Congress to enact legislation which will eliminate the delay on the part of the Budget Bureau and Department of Defense in allocating the funds authorized by Congress for the construction of armories or related facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member therefor from this Commonwealth.

Centennial of Temple B'rith Sholom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the congregation of Temple B'rith Sholom in Springfield, Ill., is celebrating its centennial. The Springfield Hebrew Congregation was organized on April 2, 1858. This event must have been one of unusual interest for Abraham Lincoln. For the first President of the congregation, Julius Hammerslough, was a friend of the Springfield lawyer who soon was to become President of the United States.

In recognition of Temple B'rith Sholom's 100 years of spiritual leadership to the Jewish people of central Illinois, I include here an editorial from the April 17 issue of the Illinois State Register.

CENTENARY OF TEMPLE B'RITH SHOLOM TO BE NOTABLE EVENT

Into observance of the centennial of Springfield's Temple B'rith Sholom, countless inspiring elements in the religious, moral and material progress of this community are woven. Among notable personages to participate will be Rabbi Herman Eliot Snyder, for 19 years (1928–47) Rabbi in Springfield, now honored with life assignment at Sinai Temple in Springfield, Mass.; and Dr. Abram L. Sacher, president of Brandeis University.

Rabbi Snyder will speak at services tomorrow night. Dr. Sacher will deliver the anniversary address at the gala centennial dinner, Sunday, April 20. Dr. Sacher also served Temple B'rith Sholom while associated with the history staff of the University of Illinois.

Springfield congratulates the entire congregation of the Temple headed by Rabbi Meyer M. Abramowitz, spiritual leader; Louis Schwartz, president of the Temple; Albert Myers, Jr., general chairman of the centennial committee, and Mrs. Jerome Lewis, president of the Temple sisterhood.

The cornerstone of the present Temple at Fourth and Scarritt Streets was laid May 18, 1916, and the building was completed and dedicated September 9, 1917. Historically the congregation was organized under the name of the Springfield Hebrew Congregation on Sunday, April 2, 1858, 18 years after the Springfield city charter was issued, and 40 years after Illinois was admitted to the Union.

Among the original incorporators were men who pioneered in Springfield; Louis Benjamin, Silas Leon, David Gottlieb, Morris Myers, William Myers, Benjamin Nusbaum, Samuel Rosenwald, Elias Salzenstein, Daniel Seligman, and Solomon Stern.

The first president was Julius Hammerslough, a friend of Abraham Lincoln, who was followed by Morris Myers, Samuel Rosenwald, Sigmund Benjamin, Albert Myers, Joseph Hammerslough, Louis J. Samuels, Michael Eckstein, M. J. Kellner, Adolph Lubin, Caspar Brown, Herman Cohn, Albert Myers, Jr., Clyde A. Meiers, and Louis Schwartz. It is interesting that Sigmund Benjamin served as president for 40 years. One of the secretaries, Simon Hammerslough, served for 25 years, and Treasurer B. A. Lange served for 52 years.

The first house of worship was located at 426 North Fifth Street and the building, erected at a cost of $7,500, was dedicated September 10, 1876. The North Fifth Street Temple served its congregation for 40 years. Springfield is a community in which racial and religious distinctions are respected. The congregation of Temple B'rith Sholom, under the capable and consecrated leadership of Rabbi Meyer Abramowitz, will move forward in a steadily expanding program of community service. Interfaith fellowship and understanding flourish in the kind of soil Springfield provides. The same should be true throughout America and the world. All nations must travel toward this great goal if the world is to have a just peace.

The Turn Is Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the Humboldt Standard of March 15, 1958.

The lumber industry is one of the most sensitive industries in our country and it is refreshing to find such a editorial when pessimism seems to be the vogue.

The editorial is as follows:

THE TURN IS COMING

Passage of the $1,850,000,000 emergency housing construction bill in Washington recently, came as good news for the entire Nation. For this region it was especially stimulating, for obvious reasons. It was well timed, since springtime naturally brings building revival.

Already, lumber companies here had reported an increase in new orders. Now, with ample money becoming available, the pace is bound to quicken. In common with everyone hereabout, we hope the machinery of government will function quickly, that work may commence.

We are fortunate, here in Eureka and Humboldt, that our great basic industry caters to mankind's most fundamental need, next to food. In fact, food and shelter might well be rated as one, since men's primal objective is to provide security for their wives and families.

As has been noted before, a record-breaking crop of young people is growing up throughout the Nation. Every day, now, sees more and more of them coming into the market for new homes. Anyway you figure it, the lumber business must of necessity increase its output.

First reports indicate that the Federal housing appropriation should provide 600,000 jobs, nationally. That means that such lumber producing centers as this region will get a high pro rata of the newly created work, since ours is the basic source of supply.

The proposal to increase interest rates on GI loans by one-fourth of 1 percent, though, seems to fall short of both commonsense and purpose desire. The rate will still be too low to interest private capital and, conversely, will have a dampening effect on borrowers.

Rather, shouldn't Government finance GI loans directly, at the present 4½ percent rate? No donation is involved there. The money would be hired out for good and constructive purposes at a reasonable return. Better to lend to our own people, as versus foreign giveaways.

Be that as it may, large additional sums of money soon will be at work supplying a fundamental necessity. And rest assured we will feel it here. A fast growing nation will not be denied new housing.

Financing Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1958, the Federal Reserve Board transmitted to the chairmen of the Banking and Currency Committees and the Select Committees on Small Business of both Houses of Congress a document on the financing of small business which was very clearly labeled a study of financing of small business. The Board of Governors was very careful in the letter of transmittal not to refer to the document as a report. The four chairmen of the congressional committees joined in the statement, submitting this study to the Congress for its attention. They, too, carefully referred to it as a study and not as a report.

In the preparation of the document as a committee print for use by Members of Congress, unfortunately, somebody placed upon the cover of the document the word "report" instead of "study."

That has brought about an unfortunate situation, due to careless reporting and careless editorializing on the part of some members of the press. One editorial in the Wall Street Journal editorialized about this study, indicating "it would be well if Congress paid attention to it" and further stated that the "report" indicated the Small Business Administration was a temporary and a "distress organization," holding out no promise to small business primarily because the agency was set up "to grant loans to applicants who cannot get them anywhere else." It then goes on to say that this is unsound business practice, and the Government should not encourage loans to poor credit risks.

It is easy to write, but it takes real hard work to become properly informed before writing.

Not only was the study not a report but the study itself very plainly states that no member of the Board participated in the writing of the material submitted, and, on the contrary, the "views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank."

Now let us turn our attention for a moment to the contents of the study to determine whether or not there is anything there to sustain the criticism and improper conclusions found in the news item.

The study very properly states that the law has always required of the Small Business Administration and its predecessor lending agencies, that before the Government makes any credit available,

it must appear that the loans cannot be obtained from private financing.

This provision has been found sound and workable. It is necessary in order to protect private enterprise from Government competition.

That does not mean, however, that loans are to be made to bad risks. As a matter of fact, the Government lending agencies, and particularly the Small Business Administration, have a very good record in that respect. Actually, there have been more complaints made against the Small Business Administration because it adheres too strictly to the requirement of the law that no loan be made unless there is "reasonable assurance of repayment." The loss ratio by the Small Business Administration is much, much smaller than that experienced by private lenders.

There are many reasons why small business can get no loans from private lenders other than the fact that it is a bad credit risk. There are plenty of good credit risks among the small-business men of the country who have been unable to get private loans. The Small Business Administration is filling that void to the limited extent permitted by existing law.

There is nothing in the study as presented by the Federal Reserve Board which justifies the conclusion that Government encourages private lenders to consider poor credit risks.

There is no doubt that the Government can and should play a greater role in connection with making risk or equity capital available to small business and there is much to be said for making loans available for a term beyond the 10 years permitted by the existing law to the Small Business Administration. Constructive criticisms along those lines will be helpful to the Congress in performing its duty. News items and editorials, such as referred to above, will do nothing except to create confusion.

In connection with the foregoing, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the following letters written to and received by the ever-vigilant George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Experiments by Teen-Age Rocketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of articles by George Allen, which have been appearing in the New York World-Telegram on experiments by teen-age rocketeers, and was published on April 17, 1958:

OUR TEEN-AGE ROCKETEERS: LETTERS TELL OF THE BANG BOYS GET FROM MISSILES

(By George N. Allen)

Teen-age rocketeers who are answering First Army questionnaires describe their hopes and frustrations with candor few adults could muster. The hundreds of pleas for aid and advice pouring in to Capt. Bertrand R. Brinley, First Army news chief, display fearlessness, determination, scientific ability, and much unconscious humor.

A 15-year-old wrote:

"I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the wonderful work you are doing for us.

"P. S.: Only two of our rockets have exploded."

Another rocketeer has taken tragedy in his stride:

"Our launching date is March 7, 7:32 p. m. (This is the date last year when the vice president of our club blew his left thumb off at the first joint with a bomb we composed.)

"Our club will gladly accept any technical and safety advice as well as constructive criticism."

Captain Brinley said he answered this request by return fast mail.

An upstate would-be astronaut sent an appeal for help in finding more like-minded boys:

"When I got your questionnaire on junior rocket societies I found that my answers were all noes, none, or I don't know. You see, there is only one of me."

RESULT OF SUPPRESSION

Another boy writes of the result of suppression, and the dangerous attitude it may engender:

"I agree with you on your view that amateurs shouldn't experiment with fuels that they know nothing about. But as for having an adult with you whenever you set off a rocket, I can't agree with you in all cases (mine for example). A friend and I are planning to put up a rocket this spring and I'm sure that if I let [my father] find out about it that it would be the first and last one that I put up. He would say that it was too dangerous or he might not give any reason at all. He's not stupid or anything, it's just that all he ever hears about rockets is that they explode and kill people. So the only way that you can do something that they think is 'too dangerous' is to keep quiet about it."

THRILLS OF SPACE

A high-school junior wrote Capt. Brinley of the thrills of space science:

"I plan to become a chemist, eventually specializing in rocket propulsion and its problems. * * * With me rocketry is no passing fad concentrated just on firing rockets into the air. I admit I love to hear the roar of the rocket's exhaust and watch it climb into the sky balanced on a jet of white-hot gas. But I want to know what makes the rocket tick, what keeps it from falling over, how could it perform better, and so much more. I want to know all kinds of physics and chemistry; I want to build and fire all kinds of rockets."

A group of rocketeers at Riverdale Country School are among the lucky few who have adult help. Science teacher Anthony Keasbey acts as a safety brake on their enthusiasm, buying their fuel, storing it and permitting them to mix it only at the isolated launching site. The Riverdale Amateur Rocket Association (RARA) has launched about 40 rockets.

COORDINATOR EXPLAINS

Club Coordinator Martin Baker, 14, and eloquent beyond his years, explained how he feels about amateur rocketry and Captain Brinley's efforts to help:

"Rocketry is much too dangerous to do merely as a hobby. It is a scientific project to gain knowledge of the world about us. After 4 years of amateur rocketry and then study in college, I'll have a pretty good knowledge.

"I think," he continued, "that Captain Brinley's plan is wonderful, and I wish he could get cooperation from people. Wernher von Braun got help from the German Government in his rocket experiments, while our police departments were chasing American fooling with rockets. The result is that the Germans got the V-2 and the United States got nothing."

RIGHT TO EXPERIMENT

A member of a group working on a 100-mile-high 2,000-mile-an-hour instrumented rocket declared firmly:

"Of course, we have a right to experiment. Don't forget that we teen-agers are the ones who will be designing, launching, and maybe riding in those space ships to the moon everyone is talking about now."

Mark Edmiston, 16, a member of the 6-month-old Yonkers Rocket Research Society, asked this reporter:

"Please show them we're not a bunch of nutty teen-agers throwing caution to the winds."

Brooklyn's Future—Extrapolated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, before the Rotary Club of Brooklyn, on Wednesday, April 2, 1958, at the St. George Hotel in Brooklyn:

BROOKLYN'S FUTURE—EXTRAPOLATED

My fellow Rotarians and guests, this is my fourth visit with the Brooklyn Rotary, and I am deeply grateful for the privilege. First we discussed public housing; later we treated with Brooklyn's contribution to our social pattern and last year it was my great honor to point up Brooklyn's enterprises.

My topic today, Brooklyn's Future—Extrapolated, covers a lot of territory. So does this variation on my consistent theme—our community.

Extrapolation is a word used in mathematics and statistics and particularly associated with graphs and charts. Extrapolation, then, may be defined as predictions based on virtual certainties rather than upon mere prophecy.

Allow me, please, to state my conclusion right at the outset. I visualize a great future for this community, and I will make an effort to justify my forecast on a single premise, and that is the integrity of the Brooklyn pattern, the integrity of the people of Brooklyn.

This meeting reminds me of an occasion some years ago when I delivered the commencement address of the American Savings & Loan Institute in Troy, N. Y.

At the end of my speech, I was charged by Father Kennedy, professor of sociology at Siena College, with being at heart a philosopher. I had said that economics, political science and sociology are branches of philosophy, branches of human principle. Perhaps I am a philosopher in the sense that I believe that economic functions cannot be studied in a vacuum. And I do believe that our great democracy represents a moral plan in which economics, political science and sociology are parts of the human pattern designed for the greatest good for the greatest number. I further believe that the American scheme, in general, and the Brooklyn scheme, in particular, are so nearly ideal that unless the relationship between these

three branches of philosophy-economics, political science, and sociology is properly synchronized, "the gears simply will not mesh; the machinery will break down." Our Brooklyn machinery may have slowed down, but the machine is there and can again roll at higher and higher speeds, if that is what we want.

Let me illustrate my point. This borough in 1950 had attracted 12 percent of the total family income of the 10 leading American cities. In 1956 its total "take" was 10.4 percent although the average income almost doubled. This means that we in Brooklyn have not shared in the national prosperity to the extent of the other 4 counties of the greater city as well as the other 9 cities. In 1950 the average family income in Brooklyn was almost the same as that of the greater city, but in 1956 we were $800 per family behind the other four counties. This is indeed disconcerting.

How did we get here?

Our national economy is progressing at a tremendous pace, and we are living in a highly competitive era. States and cities, as well as the individual enterpreneurs, compete for economic attainment. Our State has been losing business to other States steadily and we, in Brooklyn, have been losing business to other communities consistently. The State, the city and Brooklyn must meet the grim factors of more advantageous labor markets, tax exemptions, bonuses, cheaper power, longer daylight and better transportation facilities offered by other areas.

We are told that other areas with vast empty spaces offer greater opportunities to industry in contrast with the problem of assembling industrial sites in fully occupied older cities.

Then there were other factors. Industry is of great importance to a community because local industry generally employs local labor. A community's income consists of the income of its residents employed within the community as well as the income of its residents employed outside of the community. The aggregate of the earning power of those families employed outside of local commerce and industry is a very important factor in the pool of community prosperity. This second group composed of residents employed beyond the immediate area is attracted to a community by the atmosphere of that community, its social conditions and, of course, its housing accommodations. Families in the modest income group will work and live in communities where shelter is available within their means just as families in the middle income and the high income class reside in communities where they too, can buy the most for their money by way of shelter and living conditions.

Obviously, from our statistics, we can arrive at the conclusion that we have lacked the kind of housing facilities in a volume that appeal to the high middle income class and the high-income group.

Our statistics further indicate that an impressive percentage of our families are in the lower middle income class and the low-income group. A large group of small-income citizens naturally affect the aggregate family income, the buying income, the community prosperity. Ethnically, Brooklyn residents consist of 2,350,000 whites, 280,000 negroes, and 140,000 Puerto Rican Americans. Some of the whites, negroes, and, if such information as we have is correct, a considerable percentage of the Puerto Rican Americans are in the low-income group, with many families depending on our public agencies for their shelter and daily bread.

Other factors have made strong impact upon Brooklyn's economics and social structure.

After the First World War and more particularly during the early stages of the depression, we developed a new pattern of cooperation of government with enterprise. The Government collects taxes from local areas and redistributes these taxes in many different forms through Federal aid to our waterways, road system, and the price support of farm products, and as well through subsidies to other sectors of our scheme, such as the construction of Government office buildings, including post offices. Added to these efforts are the defraying of some of the cost of local social welfare effort and, last but not least, contributions to housing standards by the Public Housing Administration or its insured agencies, such as the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration. During the war, Government-enterprise partnership was probably best expressed through the encouragement of the construction of industrial plants.

Many communities have taken full advantage of the benefits of this partnership and have built new industrial plants as well as a gigantic number of title I middle-income housing and some public housing, including projects to aid the problems of relocation of tenants from areas selected for accommodating the middle-income group.

How many new industrial plants did we build during the war? What percentage of title I middle-income housing have we attracted to Brooklyn in contrast, as compared to Manhattan? Did we take full advantage of the endless millions of the great Federal Home Loan Bank System to encourage the construction of new 1- and 2-family homes during the thirties and immediately after the war? Have we availed ourselves to the fullest extent of the opportunities that this Government-enterprise partnership have provided?

The answer is "No." The responsibility of taking advantage of opportunities thus presented is not up to the Government, but rather to private enterprise. We see a fantastic redevelopment program in Manhattan. When you see the new Bowery at night, you almost pray that the same street lighting could be afforded to at least some of our streets in Brooklyn.

That public improvements attract new business and new residents is no longer subject to debate. Therefore, we must have greater public improvements to attain greater community prosperity.

Yet despite this disheartening picture, we have a great borough. We have almost 3 million people occupying 260,000 residential buildings, of which almost 180,000 are 1- and 2-family homes erected on a comparatively small area of 80 square miles. And of these dwelling units 1,500 1- and 2-family houses were built in 1956 and almost 15,000 during the past 6 years.

Florida is not the only community that was ingenious enough to pump the water out of swamps to create land. Our borough government has reclaimed thousands of acres in Bergen Beach, Canarsie, and elsewhere for useful purposes, and our parkway commission has pumped the ocean out to provide the world's most magnificent parkway.

Our downtown area, which in Brooklyn follows the same pattern as many other cities, contains not only the civic center, but also a great education center, a veritable campus of colleges of national and international distinction as well as great department stores, banking institutions, insurance companies, utilities companies, and professional buildings.

We find that our economy is stable, the exodus of industry notwithstanding, and that there is every indication that the present recession has not affected Brooklyn to the extent of its impact in other cities. Living conditions in Brooklyn, considering the cost of living, are far better than in many other cities in the United States. The merchandising policies of our great department stores and their mass purchasing power, the benefits of which accrue to the most modest specialty shop, are able to provide good merchandise at very reasonable prices, enabling that low wage dollar to buy a whole lot more than can be bought in other communities.

Our utilities and banking institutions provide services with greater economic benefit, thus meeting the competition of other communities. And while the overall picture in Brooklyn perhaps is somewhat disconcerting, the essential soundness and stability of our community promise a foundation upon which a glorious future can be built.

We have our great waterfront; we have our port authority. We hope to see in the field of housing the enterprising ingenuity of some of our real-estate people to promote the planning of sound title I middle income housing projects.

Our civic center very shortly will become a utopia of civic pride. And while the loss of some of our enterprises in the retail field is unfortunate, the throngs seen on Fulton Street on a Monday morning are certainly an indication that downtown Brooklyn remains one of the busiest of American shopping centers.

But we need more dynamic enterprises; we need greater support of our public officials in their efforts to obtain a fairer share of the redistribution of tax dollars. We need a new post office. The efforts of Postmaster Quigley and that of our Congressmen alone cannot provide us with a badly needed new center of postal activities. Mr. Quigley and our Congressmen must have the support of the rank and file of the citizens of Brooklyn. The leaders of our community must be ready to examine the success of competitive communities and meet that competition. If what we have is worth preserving, worth developing, it is worth struggling for.

We need more than that.

Under the heading of economics and social problems comes the treatment of the needs of our most modest income group. There we need vigorous, forthright, forward thinking. Perhaps some cold-blooded thinking. While we fully appreciate the humane objectives of any social program, we might study the economic side of a long-range project designed to bolster our community assets. Let us presume that our annual direct and indirect relief bill (and I am taking these figures out of the air), may amount to $100 million. A soundly conceived program calling for an accelerated adjustment of our destitute citizens may return much more than the cost of rehabilitation in increase of withholding taxes and in sales taxes. Are we ready to consider a broader program of relief and human rehabilitation? If the cost of such investment is put at a billion dollars, should we fear, should we falter? What we must determine is whether we shall allot $100 million each and every year for many, many years to come or face the problem, spend the money, and do the job of human rehabilitation and thus convert what now appears to be a liability into a great community asset.

We have talked a lot about the problems of our low-income citizens. We have talked endlessly about the Puerto Rican problem. We have heard some beautiful presentations. We learned that the people in Puerto Rico have settled in fine new one-family homes, some of which were financed by our institutions; they are the same people and they are making great progress. And at the same time, our Puerto Rican Americans living in overcrowded slums or in some of those great vertical slums which we call public housing portray a different picture. Yes, we have talked a lot. I believe we have made some progress, but the process seems very slow. Brooklyn can go along at the current pace

and still be a prosperous community. If during the past 6 years our average family income fell $800 behind the average family income of the other 4 counties, we can visualize that during the next 6 years, we might fall behind $1,200, $1,400, or $1,600 in family income in comparison with the other 4 counties, even though our average family income may increase substantially. This, however, means that our progress will not be as substantial as that of the other 4 counties of the greater city and the other 9 leading cities. It would seem to me that the time has arrived to stop talking and to do something about this problem.

Aside of the humane angle we must recognize the impact of a large group of small-income citizens upon the economy of Brooklyn, the city, and the State. There are billions and billions invested in the greater city, and I cannot believe that the managers of these investments would want to see their collateral impaired by permitting Brooklyn to become a slum colony. I cannot believe that in this great age when we have broken the sound barrier and have brought, on the horizon, sunset and sunrise to the same point, that this economic and social problem cannot be solved. The time has arrived for analyses and action. We could start the ball rolling right here.

If you, my fellow Rotarians, who have contributed so much to this community are willing to espouse this project, my associates and I are ready to turn night into day to participate in this great effort.

I visualize that you and I can invite moral and substantial support and evolve a sound and constructive program. Such a program must provide:

(a) Decent shelter at reasonable rentals.

(b) Education designed for the youth and the adult to the end that social adjustment in a new community may be less harsh than at present and, above all, to the end that potential skills and mental resources shall be employed purposefully to attain higher wages and a higher standard of living.

(c) A forthright social-welfare plan to eliminate hunger and substandard living in periods of industrial recession or adjustment.

(d) Just, relentless, moral support and continuing vigilance to the end that there shall be no exploitation of any American group by labor, by enterprise, or by both, for such exploitation can lead only to corruption, crime and despair.

If we do this I visualize Brooklyn as America's most prosperous community. We have our waterfront, we have our commerce and industry, we have our homes and churches, we have almost 3 million people and we have integrity. Yet history may well question our integrity if we allow hopeless, entrenched poverty to continue as we stand idle.

Integrity is a word that cannot be qualified—it is not divisible. It means wholehearted, complete devotion to total truth and honest, objective thinking. Brooklyn is a great community. It will grow and prosper as long as you and I and its leaders insist on its integrity—its human needs, its destiny, its duty to its people and to our great Nation.

Rural Population Changing Rapidly in Webster and Adjoining Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, recently the officials of the Department of Agriculture held a book-burning ceremony in order to destroy 2,500 copies of a report which was considered unfavorable by the administration. The books which were destroyed quoted farm people the country over as to why people were leaving the farms. Personally, I do not think we should try to destroy the evidence, I believe we should get it into the open and study the situation so we can get at a solution. Farm people love the type of living which is afforded on the farm. I was born on a farm and lived nearly half of my life on a farm. I know why people love living on a farm. But it is not good when an economic situation disrupts the living patterns of our people.

Recently the Fort Dodge Messenger printed a very important article along this line. This article is factual and relates what our people on the farms are facing:

RURAL POPULATION CHANGING RAPIDLY IN WEBSTER AND ADJOINING COUNTIES

"Having deciding to quit farming, I will hold a closing-out public auction of my livestock and machinery on the farm located at ——."

How many times have these words appeared in newspaper advertisements, or in handbills on the lumberyard wall, or tacked on the barn of another farmer?

Perhaps this is not unusual in itself until one begins to realize that many homes on these farms will not be lived in again. The land will just merely become a part of a nearby farming operation. Another farmer has been lost and another farm has been made part of a larger unit. More than 1,000 fewer farmers began tilling the soil this spring in Iowa.

There are two major problems in agriculture today. One involves the amount of mechanization and manpower for an existing farm unit. The other is in regard to the oversupply of farm products that are being produced with the aid of modern technology in relation to the demand from the consumers.

The excess output is one of the major causes of the part of the farm-income problem that shows up in unfavorable prices today.

Modern mechanization plus excess output is causing the dwindling number of farms and the loss of farm population to the city.

This article will deal mainly with the latter problem, that of the changing rural population.

Changes in rural America between 1910 and 1940 were relatively slow. That slower pace makes the changes of the past 15 years seem unusually dramatic. For example, in 1910, 32 million persons lived on 6.4 million farms; in 1955, 22 million persons were living on fewer than 5 million farms.

Iowa is losing farmers to the city at the rate of the population of one county each year. Over the Nation as a whole 100,000 farmers leave the soil each year to compete for jobs with the city worker.

Ronald Doster, who farms 3 miles northwest of Knierim, is an example of what is happening.

"I have been farming 120 acres for several years but it just hasn't been enough to take care of my family and all of the expenses incurred on the farm," Doster commented.

Doster's father, John, sold out this winter and retired from the 160 acres that he had been farming. Ronald will take over the operation of the home place this year.

"Now I can justify owning my own combine and corn picker on the 280 acres. Otherwise I needed almost as much machinery on the 120 as I will on the 280 acres," he stated.

Mechanization and lower farm incomes together have made the rapid changes in farming in recent years. In order to make the huge, new, modern equipment economical under times of lower farm prices farmers have competed for existing farmland. Those who were not able to obtain more land to make the best use of their potential labor force and machinery are gradually moving off the farm.

The average size farm in Iowa is approximately 180 acres. "The average farm should be nearer 240 acres for the most efficient unit to utilize the modern equipment of today," Carl Malone, farm economist of Iowa State College, said at the farmer-guest day of the Fort Dodge Kiwanis Club last fall.

Farm population, number of farms, and city population in the Messenger area is changing rapidly as is other areas of this great agricultural State. The following information will be of interest to many who are concerned with Iowa's changing population.

The table below shows the average size of the farms in the State and in a seven-county area, the percentage of decrease in numbers, and the percentage of increase in size in a period from 1939 to 1954:

	Average size of farms (1954)	Percent of change	Percent increase in size
Iowa	177	−9.6	10.6
Calhoun	183	−8.0	6.8
Greene	187	−11.4	13.4
Hamilton	175	−5.8	5.4
Pocahontas	190	−1.1	1.0
Webster	186	−6.5	8.6
Wright	191	−6.7	5.6

The rural population is dropping in every county, a fact known to most people but many perhaps do not realize that the total population in many counties, including the towns and cities has also dropped. The following chart shows the trends in rural as well as total population from 1940 to 1950, including the State:

	Percent change rural population	Percent change total population
Iowa	−14.7	2.3
Calhoun	−14.3	−1.7
Greene	−20.0	−4.4
Hamilton	−14.9	−1.3
Humboldt	−10.0	−2.5
Pocahontas	−11.6	−4.7
Webster	−16.1	6.6
Wright	−10.8	−1.9

The total population of Iowa has increased. This is due largely to the increase in the larger cities in the State. An example of this can be seen in the above chart. Webster County is the only county in the group that has shown an increase in total population. This is due mostly to the increased population in Fort Dodge because the rural population has dropped by 16.1 percent and the rural towns have shown a very small increase and in some cases have actually shown a decrease.

Population trends in the towns in Webster County from 1940 to 1950 are:

	1940	1950
Badger	231	201
Barnum	184	198
Callender	377	357
Clare	233	179
Dayton	732	703
Duncombe	341	378
Fort Dodge	22,904	25,115
Gowrie	1,028	1,023
Harcourt	268	205
Lehigh	1,004	991
Moorland	215	203
Vincent	192	193

Other larger towns in the area in addition to Fort Dodge have increased in size but because of their original size were not able to compensate for the large decreases in farm population. The following chart lists county-seat towns in the seven-county area of over 2,000 population. Pocahontas was excluded because its population was less than 2,000.

	1940	1950	Percent change
Eagle Grove	4,024	4,176	3.8
Fort Dodge	22,904	25,115	9.7
Humboldt	2,819	3,219	14.2
Jefferson	4,088	4,326	5.8
Rockwell City	2,391	2,333	−2.4
Webster City	6,738	7,611	13.0

Most of the above figures do not go beyond 1950, the latest year figures were available. Since that year even more drastic changes have been indicated, but these figures give the general trend.

The total farm population in the United States has dropped to 13 percent. This compares with approximately 25 percent in Iowa, the largest agricultural State in the Nation, in percent of total population. This has caused and will continue to cause many social changes and problems in the church, school, small business, and elsewhere, farm economists point out.

Assistance to States for Research and Training Programs Combating Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation granting financial assistance to States for research and training programs combating juvenile delinquency:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation granting financial assistance to States for research and training programs combating juvenile delinquency

Whereas the problems of juvenile delinquency are national in scope; and

Whereas the cost of research and training programs to combat juvenile delinquency exceeds the financial resources of the local communities and States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting financial assistance to States and local communities to enable them to carry on research and training programs to combat juvenile delinquency; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted March 25, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence March 31, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Country Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you will remember, I am sure, my remarks in this body last spring concerning the award of the National Editorial Association to the Nation's top columnist. This award was tendered to Mr. H. M. Baggarly, the brilliant editor and publisher of the Tulia (Tex.) Herald. Mr. Baggarly's weekly column, The Country Editor, of April 3, 1958, reflects in a most sensible and profound manner on certain ills which beset our country currently. In order for all the Members to have the benefit of Mr. Baggarly's remarks, I, under unanimous consent, insert herein a portion of his fine column of April 3:

THE COUNTRY EDITOR
(By H. M. Baggarly)

Whenever Americas' thinking is focused on a popular topic of the day—the shortage of scientists, delinquency in the New York schools, and the Little Rock incident all are examples—editorial opinion invariably follows two streams, both at extremes.

Of course, current editorials are primarily concerned with the business recession.

On one hand, we have those who paint dismal pictures of our 5½ million unemployed, who see a depression such as the one of the 1930's just around the corner and under every rock, and who are in fact prophets of gloom.

Then there is another group which refuses to see anything in the immediate future but a rosy, glamorous, expanded picture of Utopia. They ignore statistics showing unemployment and farm depression. Their philosophy seems to be that thinking makes it so, so they determine to live in a sort of dream world completely apart from reality.

This newspaper cannot follow either of these extremes. In the first place, we are completely aware of the pitfalls and unhappy results of negative thinking. It isn't good for a patient. It isn't good for a nation. We must always be as optimistic as conditions permit. When we can't see around the corner, it is always best to assume that nothing sinister lies ahead. We must never borrow trouble.

Ever since the close of World War II there have been persons who expected the bottom to drop out at any moment. Some people here in Tulia sold their property in 1946 and 1947 because they just knew the peak had been hit and depression would descend within weeks.

We always have prophets of gloom about us. When times are hard, they tell us that we cannot afford to progress or build and that the worst is yet to come. When times are booming, they tell us that we cannot afford to go forward because prices are too high and there's a rainy day coming.

Certainly we must never forecast depression for political reasons. We must never exaggerate adverse business or farm conditions in order to strengthen a political point.

On the other hand, only fools and ostriches bury their heads in the sand, refusing to face reality. Our world is real as well as psychological. Thinking does not always make it so. The cemetery is full of people who refused to believe their ailments were real.

Somewhere in between these two extremes is an intelligent attitude toward the various aspects of this world in which we live.

Depression might be compared to cancer. Both are deadly. Both are to be feared. Both are real. Neither is immediately recognizable. By the time either becomes obvious, it often is too late to halt its progress. Although the experts have not affected a sure cure for either, progress has been made. Many cancer cases are being cured. Likewise many things that once created depressions have been conquered. We have such safeguards as unemployment insurance, social security, and other things which would soften the impact of any depression, regardless of its severity.

They tell us that cancer has 7 danger signals. They tell us that if we would only look for and report any of these signals to our physicians, 'cures could almost always be effected.

They insist that we be realistic about these signals. They insist that we report these apparently harmless signs even though usually they have no significance. More times than not, the doctor will tell us that we have nothing to fear. But certainly we have everything to gain and nothing to lose by being alert to any of these 7 danger signals of cancer.

We don't know how many danger signals depressions have. We do know that experience has—or should have—taught us some of these signals. One is economic trouble on the farm. Another is anything that adversely affects the buying power of any large segment of our society, whether it be the farmers and smalltown businessmen, or labor.

Depression's danger signals should be watched with the same vigilance we exercise in watching for cancer's danger signals.

And if we find an economic malignancy, it must be treated immediately before it has time to spread—if a cure is to be expected.

The depression of the 1930's was the most severe and lengthy in our Nation's history. This was due to the fact that those in charge of our country refused to do anything about it in its early stages. They were like those today who refuse to believe that they might have cancer. They just refuse to believe it. We were told that "prosperity is just around the corner." They told us that the law of supply and demand would eventually solve our economic crisis. They told us to wait for nature to take its course.

Depressions are as normal as cancer. No one ordinarily can be blamed for causing a depression just as ordinarily one can't be blamed for the cancer which afflicts the body. But one can be blamed when he does not take advantage of treatment, when he ignores danger signals.

Certainly we must not talk ourselves into depression. We must look for every sign of economic well-being. It is well to rejoice when our particular business is good. This is no time to halt expansion and improvement. This is no time to preach the doctrine of inevitable depression—the doctrine that we have always had depressions, we always will, and there's nothing we can do about it. Time was that the tubercular patient was given no hope. He became reconciled to his fate because "people always succumb to the disease and they always will."

Today the cancer patient often has hope. Someday, no doubt, most all cancer cases will be cured. Yesterday it wasn't so.

Poland's Constitution Day To Be Observed on May 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Charles Burke, Washington representative for the Polish American Congress, Inc., as well as a statement on Poland's key position in central eastern Europe, also by the Polish American Congress, Inc.:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1958.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: May I draw your attention to the approaching anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, Polish national holiday, which for 167 years is being celebrated on May 3.

This act of wise statesmanship, enacted by the Polish Diet in 1791 in Warsaw, by unanimous solemn vote, brought about important political, social, and educational reforms destined to strengthen the Polish state at a time of threatening dangers from imperialistic neighboring powers.

Men who undertook the task to guide the Polish nation on the path of social progress, belonged to the most enlightened brains of 18th century Poland. They were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and influenced by the French proclamation of the rights of man and citizen.

The principles laid down in the May 3 constitution survived while Poland was struggling for independence and were referred to in the constitutional laws of the reborn Polish state after World War I.

Free Poland's Constitution Day was May 3, and it is still observed in the hearts of the people within the country and throughout Polish communities in the world.

The imposing on Poland in 1953, under Soviet directives, of a constitution on Communist pattern, similar to that of all other peoples' republics, did but reaffirm the attachment of the Poles to their historic charter of 1791.

It became a tradition for Members of the United States Congress to commemorate on the floor of their respective Houses Poland's National Day on May 3, to evoke links of friendship between both nations, and to stress United States interest in the fate of Poland.

Members of the United States Congress, who visited Poland lately, unanimously agree that although the Polish Government is Communist, the Polish people are not. American visitors are impressed by the friendly feelings of the population toward the United States of America. As a matter of fact, the western trend in Poland has not been eradicated in spite of great efforts of Communist propaganda to discredit the western democracies.

The commemoration of the May 3 constitution by the United States Congress will undoubtedly find a favorable response among the people in Poland.

Your support of the cause of Poland on that occasion will be greatly appreciated by the Polish American Congress.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a memorandum listing a few items of actual interest concerning Polish problems.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish American Congress, Inc.

POLAND'S KEY POSITION IN CENTRAL EASTERN EUROPE

The subjugation by Soviet Russia of the formerly free and sovereign countries of central eastern Europe after World War II proved to be—as time went on—one of the main sources of international tension. A direct consequence of this shift of power was the division of Europe, totally artificial from a historical, cultural, and economic point of view, and detrimental to the very idea of a united Europe.

The demarcation line dividing Europe is based solely on Soviet power policy considerations with the purpose to serve farther expansion of international communism.

Thus the ideological conflict between communism and the free world was brought nearer to Western Europe and therefore to the United States of America resulting in a state of cold war in the relations between East and West.

Poland, by her geographical situation, number of inhabitants, and natural resources, formes a key position in central eastern Europe.

As a general rule United States foreign policy has in the past concentrated its main interest on Germany and Russia, and less attention was paid to the countries situated between those two powers.

This attitude was largely responsible for the fact that wartime agreements, such as Teheran and Yalta, were concluded with the U. S. S. R. in disregard of Poland's vital interests as well as of the other Eastern European countries.

Similarly the idea of finality with regard to European nations under Soviet hegemony which found some adherents in the United States of America, and was expressed by certain American writers—curiously enough on the very eve of the events in Poland and Hungary in 1956 which contradicted flagrantly this assertion—showed underestimation of the importance of Poland and other captive nations as potential factors of security and peace in Europe.

CONDITIONS IN POLAND AND UNITED STATES ECONOMIC SUPPORT

The people of Poland, in spite of ruthless Communist subjugation on the Stalin pattern, have maintained their patriotism and moral resistance. Their feelings and beliefs did not flinch under Communist indoctrination and terror. This also applies to the much exposed young generation.

The Poznan revolt and the October events of 1956, which took place under popular pressure, have shown the resistance of the Poles against Soviet rule and their aversion to every form of communism. Ideological slogans, like "Polish road to socialism" proclaimed as a new program by the Gomulka regime are regarded by the average Pole merely as tactical moves, Communist-style.

It is fully realized that the country finds itself in a compulsory situation toward Soviet Russia. The suppression of the Hungarian freedom rising by Soviet troops, practically without any reaction of the Western powers, remains as a threatening memento.

Under these circumstances but a slim restricted margin is left for the development of direct relations with the West and the United States of America in particular.

It seems therefore profitable to the United States of America to take advantage of every possibility to give the people of Poland moral encouragement by proving interest in their fate through concrete facts such as economic support recently granted. Although this might represent a calculated risk it is in line with psychological and political necessities, considering the feelings of the Polish people who looked to America for economic support.

SOVIET INSISTANCE THAT THE STATUS QUO IN CENTRAL EASTERN EUROPE BE RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Soviet recent successes in intercontinental missiles and sputniks are being exploited by the Kremlin to obtain final recognition of its domination over the countries of central eastern Europe.

In his address of December 20 last, delivered to the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev asked the West "to recognize the status quo—that is the situation characterized as it is by the existence of Socialist and capitalist states."

His language became violent in Minsk, on January 22, when he replied to President Eisenhower's proposal, that "in the interest of peace and justice the right of free choice of the captive nations be discussed at the summit conference."

In the subsequent exchange of letters and memoranda with the United States of America and the Western powers, the Soviet Union took a menacing attitude with regard to every proposal to place on the summit agenda the problem of the captive nations. The U. S. S. R. termed such a request as an insulting interference in the domestic affairs of those countries, in spite of the fact that this request was motivated by agreements and treaties binding the Soviet Union.

It is evident that Soviet Russia reserves for herself the exclusive right to exercise control over these countries using the respective Communist parties as docile instruments of action.

It is useful to remember that any country subjected to communism is considered by Soviet Russia as virtually conquered for the Soviet bloc with all consequences deriving therefrom. This means in practical terms that any effort on behalf of the people of that country to replace the Communist system of government by a democratic one, through free voting expressing the popular will, is regarded as a hostile interference in the omnipotent right of the Communist Party to rule the country and therefore as an act of aggression against Soviet Russia and other member-states of the bloc. The use of Soviet troops to extinguish the Hungarian freedom rising constitutes an evident proof of Soviet policy methods.

Judging from a wider perspective of possible future developments in other parts of the world—this shows a real menace of international communist infiltration.

The obstinacy with which the Soviet Union opposes any discussion of problems relating to the captive nations and insists so strongly now on the sanctioning of the status quo finds additional explanation in the following consideration:

The Poznan revolt of 1956, followed by subsequent developments in Poland and the

Hungarian uprising, are proofs that the countries behind the Iron Curtain are in fact a weak spot in the Communist Empire. The more so that the repercussions of these events were far reaching as far as the Soviet bloc is concerned, and their influence strongly felt in the Communist Parties abroad.

U. N. O.'s reactions to brutal methods applied by Russia to Hungary, although expressed by resolutions, which were without practical consequences, had a negative effect on Soviet propaganda. The Kremlin is therefore anxious to close once and forever the Hungarian chapter.

In addition to that the Soviets try to obtain a complete disinteressment of the Western Powers, and United States of America in particular, with regard to the countries submitted to their influence.

In this way the U. S. S. R. would acquire a totally free hand in their action against all efforts of the people to gain more independence.

From our American point of view even tacit acquiescence to Soviet maneuvers aiming at the sanctioning of Moscow-sponsored Communist domination of formerly free and sovereign countries—would alienate the people of those countries and be detrimental to the United States of America from a moral, political and military point of view.

Florida Canal Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, has announced his support of the proposed Florida cross-State barge canal. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Ocala (Fla.) Star-Banner, which follows:

GOVERNOR COLLINS SUPPORTS CANAL

In his monthly radio address last night from Tallahassee Gov. LeRoy Collins announced his support for the Florida cross-State barge canal.

Governor Collins said that the canal proposed for construction across north Florida from the St. Johns River near Palatka to a point near Yankeetown on the gulf coast, passing just south of Ocala, would be a tremendous boon for industrial development of the State. Furthermore, he said the canal is nearer to becoming a reality than the people of Florida generally recognize.

The Governor repeated a statement he has made previously that the project might be a source of some antagonism, but that he considers it worthwhile and that it deserves the support of the whole State.

Governor Collins reached his decision after the most careful study of the proposed canal. Some months ago, when asked about the canal he said that he considered the project to be dormant. He also expressed some concern about the effect digging the canal would have on the underground water table of Florida.

As the canal has been dormant over a period of years, and the Governor was not conversant with steps that have been taken to bring it to life again, it is understandable why he was not too well informed about the project.

To obtain up-to-date information about the proposed barge canal, the Governor addressed a letter to the Florida Canal Authority, and made particular reference to the effect the waterway would have on the groundwater table of the State.

This information was recently furnished the Governor in a comprehensive brief prepared by H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer for the canal authority. This brief consisted of a condensed review of the more salient facts relative to the cross-Florida barge-canal section of the Intracoastal Waterway system, together with maps and charts which were prepared to explain the physical features of the proposed waterway, and its more important economic and defense aspects with respect to both the State of Florida and the United States.

Contained in the review brief were statements by the United States Corps of Engineers and Herman Gunter, director of the Florida Geological Survey.

The Chief of Engineers of the United States Corps of Engineers, in submitting his report on the canal to the chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, made this statement:

"A lock canal for barge traffic following route 13–B would in no way affect the ground water supply in the area. By providing 3 locks on the east slope and 2 on the west slope with total lifts of 55 feet, the water surface of the summit pool could be maintained between elevations 42 and 55 feet which is the range through which the water table in the adjacent area has fluctuated in the past."

Herman Gunter, in a letter addressed to the canal authority (July 3, 1956) made this statement:

"The members of this department feel that the engineers have accurately summarized the effect that a controlled lock-barge canal would have on adjacent water levels. The Florida Geological Survey personnel believe if the normal average ground water levels are maintained along the profile of the proposed barge canal, there should be no change in the ground water levels throughout recharge areas centered in Polk County, southern Clay County and southern Georgia, nor would there be any damage to the water levels of the southern peninsula. The stage levels of Silver Springs and Rainbow Springs would be free to fluctuate within their normal range * * *."

This information, together with a full review of the economic and defense value of the proposed canal, is contained in the brief placed in the governor's hands just prior to the meeting of the executive committee of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas in Jacksonville, March 24.

Governor Collins was invited to meet with the Texas-Louisiana group and he held informal talks with the executive officers of that association. It is evident he was impressed by the enthusiastic support of the ICALT for the Florida barge canal, and also by the resolution of support previously adopted by the Mississippi Valley Association at its annual meeting in St. Louis February 10.

At that time the MVA pledged its support of the barge canal in these words:

"We offer the project our wholehearted approval and ask that the officers and staff of the association cooperate with other organizations interested in the project in the same fashion as they work with various groups on other matters affecting the national interest."

The more information Governor Collins has obtained about the canal, the greater his interest has been. Now he has come to the logical conclusion that the barge canal is a great project that "will be a tremendous boon for industrial development of the State," that it is nearer to becoming a reality than the people of Florida generally recognize, also that it deserves the support of the entire State.

Previously, at his conference with the Louisiana-Texas delegation in Jacksonville, the Governor suggested that a statewide conference to be held for a discussion of the canal project to sound out public opinion.

Canal proponents would welcome such a conference. Opposition to the canal, centered in two small areas on the lower west coast and lower east coast, is based on sectional jealousy and not shared by the general public.

There are thousands of new residents in Florida who have no knowledge of the canal project, or the feeling prevalent when it was proposed to construct a ship canal which many feared would damage the ground-water table.

These people need to be told of the tremendous impetus to industrial development that would follow construction of an inland waterway across the State. A statewide conference would provide the forum for full and accurate information about the project and its possibilities for industrial development.

A sizable delegation will go Washington at some date to be decided upon, in early May, to appear before a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the House to ask an appropriation of approximately $1 million to start work on the canal.

Governor Collins' endorsement of the proposed waterway, if he is represented at that hearing by the director of the Florida Development Commission, R. B. Fuller, Jr., and Rear Adm. S. P. Ginder, director of the industrial services, division of the FDC, should be most helpful.

Canal proponents are confident if the House Committee on Public Works recommends an appropriation to start work on the canal, with the support of the Mississippi and Louisiana-Texas Waterways Association, Congress will approve the project. Senator Holland has said that if such an appropriation comes to the Senate from the House he will work for its approval by that body.

Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the April 18, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report which should cause widespread interest and concern. It begins on page 83. Its title is "Recession's Toll: 45 to 50 Firms a Day."

The part that immediately struck my eye was this:

Failures in States around the Great Lakes held close to 1957 levels in the first 2 months of 1958, but now, on the basis of weekly reports, have risen sharply over a year ago.

In speaking of the rising rates of failures, the U. S. News article asserts:

Failures among retail clothing stores are running about 15 percent higher than a year ago. Liabilities involved in these failures are about double the volume of a year ago.

There is a considerable increase in the number of eating and drinking places going broke, indicating that people are eating out less often, taking more meals at home.

Failures are nearly half again as high among stores selling hardware and building materials.

While casualties among furniture stores are running about the same as in 1957, there

is a considerable increase in the liabilities of the firms that are failing.

Overall, failures among retailers are up more than 13 percent over a year ago and there is an even bigger increase—34 percent—in liabilities involved.

Failures are higher than a year ago among wholesalers of food and farm products, apparel, dry goods, lumber, building materials, and hardware.

In manufacturing, failures are up for lumber, paper, leather and leather products, coal mining, and iron and steel products.

Now to go back to the lead paragraphs of this U. S. News article:

On an average day in this recession period, 45 to 50 American firms close their doors and go out of business.

If the present rate continues through the year, more than 14,000 businesses will go to the wall in 1958. This will be the highest annual total in nearly 20 years.

So far in 1958, business failures are running 12 percent higher than in 1957 and 27 percent higher than in 1956.

In addition to the businesses going broke, others in growing numbers are closing down voluntarily, getting out while they are still solvent. Many others, hard pressed, are merging with competitors, hoping to make a go of it.

The increase in business failures, in general, is greatest among retailers.

Older firms, in business 10 years or longer, account for a growing share of failures.

Mr. Speaker, this trend in business failures is nothing new. A like situation prevailed in the late twenties and early thirties. In those days, as it is now, statistics had a way of hiding the grim facts. The U. S. News says that from 45 to 50 businesses a week are closing up shop in this recession. This amounts to one firm per State. On the surface, it does not sound like a catastrophe.

But let us go into it.

For instance, Peterson's Paper Mill—the main industry of a Minnesota county-seat town—closes its doors. The entire population of the town is around 3,000 people. The paper mill employs about 150 men. These 150, plus their wives, plus their children, make up one-fifth of all the inhabitants. The usual customers stay away from Schultz's Hardware Store. The regulars do not show up at Red's Cafe. Schultz closes up. So does Red. Their customers begin to look worried every time they pass the First National Bank. That makes the officers of the bank look worried, too.

What has been a recession takes on the identifiable earmarks of a depression. A depression, as we well know, is a chain reaction of closed business places, bankrupt banks, and empty wallets.

It cannot be cured by having the owner of a family farm be a part-time farmer and a part-time town jobholder. Only part-time economists go for that.

It can be cured by doing everything humanly possible to stabilize the security of the family farm. If—and when—this is done, community and State and Nation can, once more, be brought back to prosperity.

Fourth Year of Hot War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Parade magazine:

FOURTH YEAR OF HOT WAR
(By Victor Lasky)

ALGIERS, ALGERIA.—In a largely desert area four times her size, France is grimly waging a war now in its fourth year, a conflict not only splitting the free world but threatening to spread far beyond Algeria's borders.

Yet, in the United States it still is a war not many people understand. We are very much involved. We were involved in last February's French bombing of a Tunisian village, in which scores were killed or injured; American planes were used. We were involved when Robert Murphy, No. 3 man in the State Department, then undertook to help settle the hard feelings between Tunisia and France; those feelings stemmed largely from Algeria. We remain involved because both France and the Arabs are—or should be—our friends.

France has some 550,000 troops—four times the number used in Indochina—trying to crush a rebellion by a shadowy, elusive enemy backed by the Cairo-Moscow axis. France's fate as a major power is at stake. "Without Algeria," a cabinet member said emotionally, "we are another Portugal." Involved, too, is the fate of 1,200,000 Algerian-born French who know no other land, and some 150,000 Jews are whiplashed by Arab hatred.

And in the Sahara's potential mineral riches, France sees economic salvation. For one thing, the oil beginning to flow in the desert lessens France's distasteful dependence on Nasser's Suez Canal.

In short, this is no simple conflict between die-hard colonials, seeking to hold a last bit of empire, and a liberty-loving populace led by an Arab George Washington. It's far more complicated. And there is no George Washington.

If anything, the rebels take their cue from Egypt's Nasser, whose Voice of the Arabs, broadcasting from Cairo, tells Algerians: "The French overlords will only clear out in an atmosphere of constant terror. Kill them unmercifully. Wipe them out. Butcher them.

DEATH WITHOUT WARNING

But here among bustling crowds, crawling traffic, expensive shops, banks, modern apartment houses, cinemas, it is hard to visualize Algeria's capital as a city whose streets only recently ran with blood.

"It's a new kind of war," said newsman Maurice Gaubert at the Hotel Aletti bar. "No front lines. No major battles. Just boredom punctuated by sudden death. Someone leaves a package under that table. No one hears the ticking. Then—boom—we're blown to bits."

Other things jar you: The bulletproof vests sold in men's shops, the clerk explaining, "Just the thing to thwart an assassin's bullet, Monsieur" * * * the midnight-to-5 curfew making a silent Algiers resemble a movie set * * * being frisked for weapons by department store guards * * * the endless military patrols.

And optimism everywhere—the feeling that the war is in its last stages. Or almost everywhere. In the Oranais region, a short car hop from Algiers, you run into a rifle-toting French farmer. The other day his two foremen, driving to town, narrowly escaped ambush. "For us," he said, "the war continues." Like many farmers, he lives as if under siege. At night, his farmhouse becomes a tiny fortress in constant touch by wireless with a nearby army post.

"This is my land," he said quietly. "It was handed down by my father and his father before him. I'm ready to die for it."

The war abounds in paradoxes. For example, while its $4 million daily cost nearly bankrupts France, Algeria itself enjoys unprecedented prosperity, rising agricultural and industrial output, a construction boom.

And this is a war-within-a-war, Moslem against Moslem, as two groups seek to control the rebellion. And neither the National Liberation Front (FLN) nor the Algerian National Movement (MNA) is adverse to bumping the other off, gangland-style.

The French cite the vendetta as one reason they won't sit down with the rebels. "Which faction?" they ask. "Who besides themselves do they represent?" They point out that of the 10,000 men, women, and children so far killed by rebels, over 8,000 were Moslems.

Actually, the term "native" is a misnomer if applied only to Moslems. Most of the 1,200,000 Europeans were born here and consider themselves Algerians. These settlers, whose ancestors took hold of a barren land, reclaiming thousands of acres of brush, swamp, and desert, constitute the major argument for the contention that Algeria is a part of France.

Meanwhile, the war has spilled into France where last year FLN-MNA terrorists killed or wounded over 3,000 Algerian Arabs. At stake are funds exacted from 350,000 Moslem workers to aid Algeria's freedom fighters. So terrorized are the Moslems that many contribute their hard-earned francs to both factions.

Curiously, when the war first flared on November 1, 1954, it was treated lightly. Only when hundreds, then thousands, then tens-of-thousands of troops failed to restore order did the French realize this was a full-scale rebellion.

Soon the straggling rebels with shotguns became commandos with mortars. In the big cities—Algiers, Oran, Bone, Constantine—terrorists struck indiscriminately, shooting, stabbing, strangling, and bombing.

Before long the Europeans too were committing mayhem. Last summer, following a dance-hall bombing in which dozens of youngsters were killed and injured, hysteria—fanned by agitators—swept Europeans. Soon mobs headed for Arab districts, burning shops, overturning cars and waylaying passing Moslems.

In the buff-tinted government General Building, that towers over Algiers, the French proconsul angrily banged his big mahogany table as reports flowed in the mobs were out of control.

ORDER—JUST IN TIME

At stake was Robert LaCoste's pacification program designed to show Moslems they can live in peace with Europeans. And LaCoste knew the terrorists were seeking to infuriate Europeans against Moslems to bring about an irreparable break.

LaCoste ordered the rioting curbed at all costs—none too soon. A dozen Moslems and a French woman were dead. Meanwhile, the army was routing the FLN killers hit by hit and terrorism began to subside. Though it may not rank with Napoleon's exploits, the Battle of the Casbah had to be won if control of this city of 600,000 was to be regained.

In the office of tweedy, half-American Mayor Jacques Chavallier hangs a map on which a red dot pinpoints each act of terror in Algiers. "Got so you couldn't tell the map for the dots," he said. "Now, thank God, the dots are fewer."

Son of a Louisiana-born mother, Chevallier, who once attended a New Orleans Catholic college, has long been the pessimistic, lonely man in the middle because of pro-Moslem views. But since a recent law increasing Moslem self-government, Chevallier is more optimistic about Moslems rallying to the French.

In the midst of terrorism, Chevallier waged a battle of housing by building 6,000 houses for Moslems living in bidonvilles, so-called because their shacks are made of bidons, large tin cans. One such shanty-town in the heart of Algiers consists of 24 slum acres perched on a hill overlooking the Mediterranean. Its 15,000 inhabitants only a year ago were dominated by FLN terrorists. Now the area is peaceful. On the success of bidonvilles all over Algeria may depend the future of the French populace that currently is outnumbered 8 to 1.

Meanwhile the war continues. The French keep pursuing an elusive enemy who, greatly outnumbered and with no fixed bases, avoids direct contact. Instead, slipping down from the mountains in small groups, the rebels strike hard and disappear into the landscape. They stage hit-run attacks on isolated outposts, blow up rail lines, and ambush French patrols.

"Sure, we're winning the war," said a colonel at an outpost on the Tunisian frontier, "but at this rate we'll be winning it 50 years from now."

The colonel was bitter. The night before a large rebel arms convoy had crossed over from Tunisia. Several of his men were wounded.

"As long as they can run in arms from a privileged sanctuary in Tunisia, we'll never crush this rebellion," he said.

UNSEALING THE FENCE

The French had hoped to seal off the border by erecting an electrified, mined, barbed-wire barrier, running 200 miles from the Mediterranean to the desert. "Our electric chair," the colonel said, grimly. "At first, dozens were electrocuted."

And mule and camel arms caravans were largely curbed. But soon the rebels learned to cope with the "fence." Now, they blow up isolated sections with grenades, explode the mine fields by running cattle through them, then slip past.

The colonel's bitterness reflected top-level French frustration in not being able to invade Tunisia to destroy the training bases and arms depots supplying the rebels inside Algeria.

"If we were to do that, America would condemn us," said Robert LaCoste, Algeria's tough, blunt-talking Socialist boss. Interviewed exclusively by Parade, the governor general indicated that Tunisia was uppermost in his thoughts. LaCoste expressed perplexity as to why the United States regarded Tunisia's President, Habib Bourguiba, as trustworthy when he constantly devises intrigues to deceive the West. LaCoste also criticized the aid which Bourguiba is openly giving the rebellion while professing friendship for France.

United States strategists are aware of Bourguiba's faults, including his dictatorial inclinations and his ambitions to dominate all of North Africa. They were, of course, happy over his March 20 statement that Tunisia will stay with the West.

As for his support of the rebels, United States strategists say he has no choice since FLN forces could quickly overwhelm his small army. Any anti-FLN action would reinforce pro-Nasser Tunisian elements.

Toward all this, the United States has tried to steer a middle course. It has attempted to keep Bourguiba happy while not offending the French, who last fall blew their stocks when we shipped some small arms to Tunisia.

The Arab world, meanwhile, was fit to be tied last January when the United States backed a $655 million loan to France—the FLN immediately charging the United States with "supporting French colonialism."

The upshot of it all was that the United States found itself in the incredibly awkward position of indirectly aiding both sides of the rebellion, satisfying neither.

The United States is desperate for Arab friendship. But the French, too, are sensitive, believing strongly in their case. Without this historic ally's industrial and military potential there can be no effective NATO alliance. And as made clear to me by their table-pounding diplomats, the French can be pushed just so far.

So the United States is on the spot. Only Moscow is happy. Moscow has long been fishing in Algeria's troubled waters. A Soviet foothold here would outflank Europe's defenses, could mean control of the Mediterranean and confront the United States with an Atlantic-based enemy. Moreover, Algeria is a potential gateway to all Africa.

"It's not that the rebels are Reds," explained an intelligence officer. "But they're being used by the Reds who've infiltrated their ranks, providing leadership and know-how."

More ominous is the FLN's acceptance of Moscow's overtures. FLN leaders showed up at the recent Cairo parley where Moscow unveiled its newest Trojan horse, the Nasser-blessed Afro-Asian Committee. The FLN announced it would welcome Communist arms. Soon after, the French intercepted a Yugoslav ship 45 miles off Algeria, with 150 tons of Czech-made arms.

But to an elderly Arab shoeshine "boy" in Algiers, all this is insignificant compared to the recent sight of an American who had dropped in for a shine. It was a most welcome omen, a reminder of far happier days when GIs did the town and tourists headed for the Casbah.

As he briskly shined the Parade correspondent's shoes, the Arab appeared steeped in thought. Pausing, he asked hopefully, "Monsieur, do you think the Americans will be visiting us soon?"

Medical and Hospital Payments Within the Provisions of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation which will include medical and hospital payments within the provisions of the Social Security Act:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation which will include medical and hospital payments within the provisions of the Social Security Act

Whereas there are a large number of persons in the Nation who are unable to meet the increasing cost of medical and hospital expenses: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfuly urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will include medical and hospital payments within the provisions of the Social Security Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted March 24, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence March 31, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Surplus Foods for Needy Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. BROWN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, among the many problems that plague the Nation—our gravest domestic problem, I think, is that we have too many people trying to pay 1958 living costs with a 1948 income. People who established their social security or railroad retirement base when the average annual wage in this country was $1,000 are caught in a vice. People getting a $55-a-month old age assistance check—or $60 from the Veterans' Administration—are, too. A young industrial worker, temporarily unemployed, trying to keep a big family of growing youngsters together on a $30-a-week unemployment compensation check, is in the same vice.

Just the bare necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter—have become a nightmarish problem to some 20 million American people.

For years, the retired and disabled have clung fast to the hope that, sooner or later, the cost of living will come back around to their level.

But it has been over a decade now since the inflation spiral started. Every day, we get more and more on a wartime footing—more and more of a wartime economy; and the end is nowhere in sight.

We are a Nation renowned for its abundance and its capacity to produce; but we have always had trouble distributing what we produce.

In recent years some progress has been made in housing, especially in the cities. Public housing projects have provided some of our retired people with shelter at discount prices. But too many of our people are trying to exist on inadequate diets. To them, food is a problem.

It is absurd for even one person to be hungry or on a totally inadequate diet when the Nation's Government is accumulating and maintaining stockpiles of surplus foodstuffs.

Surely, within the framework of our free enterprise system, there is some way to get our food surplus into the stomachs of those who need and should have it.

Every once in awhile, I hear the Secretary of Agriculture say that he wants to get some of this blessing of abundance into the mouths of people instead of in Government warehouses.

The Secretary has made some commendable progress in getting his surplus food into foreign mouths—at a 50 percent discount under Public Law 480.

But we are making no progress at all getting this food into 20 million American mouths—the pensioned, the needy, and the unemployed. There is no 50 percent discount for our own—that is only for the Pakistanians, the Japanese, the Yugoslavs, and others overseas.

I question the wisdom of this foreign discount policy not alone on the grounds that charity begins at home. I think we are overlooking a real opportunity for expanding the American farmer's market here at home, and the Government is buying the food, anyway.

Any good sales promotion manager would probably take one look at what we are doing and say: "Look—you are so fascinated with the green grass on the other side of the ocean that you are ignoring completely the best territory you have for increasing food sales.

"Get to work on these 20 million pensioners, disabled, and unemployed Americans who have been forced to cut down to one-half the milk they really want, or who are buying a half-dozen eggs when they really want to buy a dozen. There is your sales opportunity.

"And do not kid yourself that you will get the business by cutting the price one-half cent or 1 cent. Go after it the way the soap companies do—with a coupon operation. That is one of the fastest sales stimulators there is."

Mr. Speaker, this committee is holding hearings on a food-stamp program. At long last, the Congress is getting down to business on a device by which this Nation can extend to 20 million deserving people a cost-of-living pension raise, in the form of a food-coupon program that will really stimulate sales and consumption of some farm commodities—a double-barrel job, if it is done right.

Now, what kind of a program would it have to be, to be right?

Well, I am no expert, but let us think together a little bit:

First, it must be handled through established channels of trade. We believe in the free-enterprise system and we must not circumvent or injure processors, wholesalers, or retailers.

Second, the regular channels of trade are familiar with coupons. They redeem and cash in coupons at grocery stores all over America every day. Why not call the program a food coupon plan instead of a food stamp plan?

Third, if we expect the program to increase per capita consumption—and I feel it should—there is where we get into merchandising.

I respectfully suggest that food coupons should not cover 100 percent of the retail price of a quart of milk or a pound of butter, except in cases of dire need. The coupon should be good for 50 percent of the retail price and the purchaser pays the other 50 percent in cash.

In this way, coupons can be distributed to twice as many worthy people for the same redemption cost; and it would stimulate more net increase in total food consumption.

If 20 million purchasers went into stores with coupons worth 12 cents on a 24-cent quart of milk, you would get more real stimulation into milk consumption than if 10 million purchasers went in with coupons worth 24 cents on a 24-cent quart of milk.

A per capita increase of 10 quarts of milk a year, multiplied by 20 million people is a total increase of 200 million quarts. But if the coupons were made redeemable for 100 percent of the retail price and thereby could be made available only to 10 million people, even if consumption increased 15 quarts each—the total increase would be less.

In instances where the sole purpose is relieving dire need, where people have no money, coupons would have to be worth full retail value. But to do the double-barrel job of getting food to people who cannot buy enough of it and at the same time stimulate consumption for producers—I wonder if the coupons should not be good for 50 percent of the retail value, with the purchaser putting up 50 percent of the retail price in cash.

There is another reason for the 50-percent-of-retail price coupon; and that is the farm value of surplus foodstuffs that best lend themselves to a food-coupon program represents less than 50 percent of the retail cost of the food through normal trade channels.

A coupon good for 24 cents on a 24-cent quart of milk actually is getting into consumption only about 10 cents worth of farm surplus milk. There is 14 cents for processing, transporting, distributing, and so forth.

Now, if you could move that quart of milk into consumption with a 12-cent coupon and 12 cents consumer's cash, the Government coupon is about the equivalent of what the CCC will pay for that much dried milk to put it in a warehouse.

And do not underestimate the power of a 12-cent coupon to get a housewife to purchase a 24-cent quart of milk, or a 40-cent coupon to get her to purchase an 80-cent package of flour.

The soap companies, the coffee blenders, the cereal manufacturers can prove to you that it works.

This is a way to stimulate increased consumption and take a big step forward toward eating our way out of some of this surplus production.

Now, everyone knows that it will not make any real dent in the 1 billion bushels of corn or the 900 million bushels of wheat now owned by the CCC.

Coupons cannot solve the problem-crop difficulties which plague us.

Certain commodities will lend themselves to a food-coupon program; and others will not. But let's not give up on the food stamp idea just because every commodity might not fit into it. Let us take those that do fit and see how it works.

The commodities that lend themselves most favorably to a food-stamp program, in my opinion, are fluid milk and cream, butter, cheese, wheat flour, dried beans, poultry meat and eggs, and red meat.

Right now the CCC does not own any red meat, poultry meat, or eggs. They do hold quantities of every other commodity I mentioned, and are apt to acquire additional quantities at any minute.

Now what about costs?

Here is what the average American spends at retail price for the following foodstuffs, now in surplus:

Commodity:	Per year
Fluid milk	$34.90
Cream	4.35
Butter	6.30
Cheese	4.85
Wheat flour	4.70
Dried beans	1.05
Cornmeal	1.05
Oatmeal	.55
Rice	1.05

Retail expenditures per capita for other foodstuffs run approximately:

Product:	Per year
Eggs	$16.80
Broiler meat	8.40
Turkey	1.68
Red meat	85.00

The average American consumes about 14 quarts of fluid milk a year. This is an average. Obviously, many people drink more than 14 quarts a month.

Chances are, our pensioners and our needy did not drink 7 quarts of milk a month last year. But if they got $1.50 worth of food coupons each month with their Government check—the coupons good for one-half price on each quart—they could buy their 14 quarts for the same amount of cash they have been spending for 7 quarts.

This would be really expanding markets. And the program can be as big or as small as Congress wishes to make it.

If the 5.5 million people now receiving public assistance were to receive coupons for milk, and flour, and other products now in Government surplus, and each got $29.40 a year—the cost of the food coupon program would total $165 million a year—or about $75–$80 million more than it costs the Government to hold the food in storage as is done now.

Actually, it may not run even this much, because present surplus disposal policies, wherein the food is sold in foreign markets at a 50-percent discount plus ocean transportation costs, are quite costly.

Personally, I would like to see this coupon program include more people. Everyone in the lower brackets of social-security retirement, railroad retirement, veterans, unemployment compensation, and so forth, need it.

There are some 16 million receiving retirement, disability, and survivor benefit checks from United States Government agencies.

Say, 8 million of them get less than $80 a month. They could well be included in this program and not exceed the $1 billion authorized.

For less than $200 million a year, the unemployed could get a 50-percent discount on food in surplus. Why not coordinate this program with any changes in unemployment compensation now under consideration?

Milk, cheese, butter, flour, cornmeal, eggs, and poultry meat could move into the mouths of 20 million deserving Americans—our disabled, blind, our needy, and our sorely pressed retired. Instead of piling it up in warehouses, or selling it all to the Japanese or Pakistanis at a 50-percent discount, we could sell some of it to 20 million of our own people at the same 50-percent discount.

Surely, we can summon enough wisdom among us to devise a food-coupon program that will help alleviate some inflation problems and move surplus food into American stomach instead of storage.

Resolution Protests Administration's Farm Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Marshall County Democrat-Farmer Labor in convention assembled April 19, 1958, passed a resolution condemning the disastrous administration farm policies. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the warning and proposal as to remedies.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it is the planned policy of the present Secretary of Agriculture and the Republican administration to force the small farmer out of farming; and

Whereas should this policy continue it will have serious economic consequences for the farm population as well as for the United States as a whole; and

Whereas it is morally wrong for a powerful branch of the United States Government to deliberately set out to ruthlessly eliminate a large segment of our population; and

Whereas since 1952, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, farm income has declined from $14.3 billion to $11.5 billion; and

Whereas the farm population has been reduced from 15.5 percent of the population in 1952 to 12 percent of the population in 1957, according to the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas during the past 5 years of the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson farm program the farmers share of the food dollar has dropped 7 percent while prices to the consumer went up 2 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Marshall County Democrat-Farmer Labor in convention assembled this 19th day of April 1958, do hereby deplore the depression in farming brought on by the policies of the Republican administration, and hereby request that farm prices be restored to 100 percent of parity; that the present provisions of the Soil Bank law be most carefully studied with a view toward improvement or substitution of a better program; and that farmers, rather than processors, be allowed to set the policies and administer the farm program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congresswoman Coya Knutson and to Senator Hubert Humphrey, and to Byron Allen, State commissioner of agriculture, and to the State Central Committee of the Democrat-Farmer Labor Party.

Free Enterprise and the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article form the San Francisco Examiner of April 20, 1958:

FREE ENTERPRISE AND THE RECESSION

NEW YORK, April 19.—The insistent clamor for action in Washington to reverse the recession trend raises questions about the nature of our economic system.

Whether for better or for worse in the last quarter of a century the New Deal and the Fair Deal introduced assumptions about the responsibility of the Federal Government which alter the philosophy behind the American system.

Under a pure competitive system of free enterprise, Government's role is largely restricted to setting up the traffic rules.

But under the guise of advancing social responsibility, the role of government in economic affairs has significantly widened.

While neither of the two major parties show any disposition to resist the new trend, there are differences of degree to which the new philosophy of government in the economic arena is accepted.

This was dramatized at a recent press conference when President Eisenhower was asked by a reporter how to make the recession recede. The Chief Executive's reply was "buy." When pressed as to what to buy, he indicated "anything."

Contrary to the impressions of some, this expression by President Eisenhower was neither frivolous nor haphazard.

It stems from his profound philosophic devotion to the American free society in which the selection of goods and services, of jobs, and of ideas and spiritual concepts are subject to individual determination.

While through the long decades of American history such dependence on self-reliance, rather than Government crutches, has produced the greatest level of popular material well-being that the world has ever known, it takes courage to defend a free economic society in interludes of dips in the near-term economic trend.

When the national economy is taking 1 step backward before taking 2 steps forward, the incidence of trouble bears down heavily on that group which is temporarily squeezed out of opportunities for gainful employment.

Both parties accordingly now accept a compromise with pure individualism to the tune of favoring Federal-State unemployment benefits. Both the administration and the political opposition also advocate extending the time of the payments during the current recession.

But humane adjustments to the rights of unrestrained competition are not tantamount to accepting the principle that the creation of job opportunities is a Central Government function.

Yet implicit in the clamor for passing new Federal laws is the assumption that job opportunities spring from governmental action.

The President's emphasis on buying helps to clarify the manner in which the American national economy differs from a regimented centralized planned economy in the Communist mold.

Behind the Iron Curtain, the area for individual discretion in the choice of goods and services, jobs and ideas is extremely narrow. The decisions as to what should be produced and in what quantities is made by little commissars in big jobs. The risk of anticipating future customer behavior is reduced by the arbitrary and dictatorial policy of substituting the judgment of dictators for that of the people.

Thus, under Soviet type dictation, a central decision can be made whether to concentrate on rockets and de-emphasize passenger automobiles. While such directness may superficially seem to simplify the whole complicated problem of making and exchanging things in the contemporary world, such regimentation robs contemporary living of much of its graciousness, charm and self-expression. Furthermore, the spiritually satisfying free economy has proven to be, through the decades, the most successful and productive.

A price we pay for freedom is some intensification of business risks and of fluctuations.

It is academic to dwell on the inherent merits of our system unless it satisfies popular yearnings.

Accordingly, at this juncture, it behooves men in business management to be active in talking steps specifically calculated to deal with the causes of recession. These foci of infection in the national economy stem from maladjustments, imbalances, and disparities accumulated during the boom. The recession can be shortened by dealing thoroughly with these casual factors, and thus responding to the evident mandate of customers for better values.

Union leadership, which also should be devoted to free enterprise, should show responsibilities this year in bringing to the bargaining table concepts which will make for economic health. Unless the unions and management make freedom work, there will be unreasoning clamor after the European precedent for governmental intervention in setting wage and other standards for employment.

Thus, personalities in business who through better advertising, better merchandising and product improvement create an expansion in demand will be responding to the public desire for an increment in employment opportunities.

Thaw Rather Than Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two fine editorials of the 2d of April which appeared, respectively, in the Washington

Evening Star and the Christian Science Monitor. These editorials summarize the President's wise veto message of the bill freezing farm price supports.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1958]

TO THAW FARM CONTROLS

There are honest differences of opinion about how best to help American farmers who are in economic trouble. There is also politics. We shall not attempt to judge what motives dominated the move in Congress to freeze crop price supports and acreage allotments at last year's levels. But we do believe President Eisenhower displayed wisdom and courage in vetoing the bill.

It is easy to understand why many farmers feel crop prices should be artificially supported. They see big labor and big business boosting their own prices year by year. Since farmers cannot so readily limit supplies to hold up prices, they believe that the Government should give them special help. Such help has been attempted through limiting acreage and buying crops at an above-market price.

But this has proved largely self-defeating. The little farmer and the marginal grower who most need help seldom raise enough to get much benefit from price supports. The big corporation farms, which often can make a profit at half the current price-support levels, get the big Federal payments. And surpluses are piled up which overhang the markets. Meanwhile growers tend to price themselves out of markets and to become dependent on Government aid.

It is this situation which causes the President to say that a thaw rather than a freeze is needed. Last year, by tremendous efforts—and at the risk of incurring retaliation from countries which object to dumping—the Government sold surpluses abroad and cut its holdings by $1 billion. It naturally does not wish to cultivate new surpluses with high price supports. We believe Mr. Eisenhower is right in saying that the best interest of the Nation and the farmers lie in loosening controls.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 2, 1958]

FAVORING A THAW

The essence of President Eisenhower's veto message on the bill freezing farm price supports was that what the farm economy needs is a thaw rather than a freeze. He supported his thesis adequately in reciting the consequences that would result from even a temporary return to the inflexible support formula. These consequences would be the piling up of more surpluses in Government warehouses, restricting the growth of markets, doing little or nothing for the small operators and merely postponing the time when agriculture can be released from the straitjacket of controls.

At the same time, the President offered some rather impressive evidence that administration efforts to gradually relax controls and whittle down the structure of jerry-built subsidies have been more beneficial than otherwise. Under the flexible support program, for example, the farm price index is 9 percent higher than when last under rigidly high supports, and the brightest picture is found in the segments of agriculture without production controls and price supports. In addition, Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that extending 1957 supports to 1958 despite changes in demand, in supply and in surplus stocks * * * would completely disregard economic fact."

In place of this ill-advised and at least partly politically motivated legislation, the President has proposed an alternative program—administrative and legislative. It tends, in brief, toward a further removal of Government restrictions and with increased authority to move burdensome surplus stocks abroad. It is not a formula for going backward as was the vetoed legislation. Both the farm economy and the Nation as a whole could expect to benefit if these recommendations were translated into action.

Funeral Sermon for Congressman August H. Andresen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my sad mission earlier this year to attend the final services for our beloved colleague, the late August H. Andresen, of Minnesota.

Those of us in attendance had the privilege of hearing a most eloquent sermon from a distinguished United Lutheran Church pastor who knew well our departed colleague. Rev. Orville K. Wold choose his text from II Kings 20: 2–3, 19, 20, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including this beautiful tribute to August Andresen which I know many of his friends will enjoy reading:

A STATESMAN AND HIS GOD—FUNERAL SERMON FOR CONGRESSMAN AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH, ORVILLE K. WOLD, PASTOR, JANUARY 20, 1958

Text from II Kings 20: 2–3, 19, 20.

This is the second time in a period of 8 months that this family has come into this church for similar reasons. The first was the funeral for Mrs. Andresen last May.

The Honorable August H. Andresen has been memorialized in eulogies in the many groups in which he has been a figure.

His colleagues in Congress spent 90 minutes last Tuesday paying him tribute.

Local groups all over the First Congressional District of Minnesota, and elsewhere in our State, and wherever the influence of Mr. Andresen touched, have recalled the work of this public servant.

Few conversations on the streets in this area have not included his name this past week.

There is neither the need nor the time this day for me to compile or edit these things that have been said so well—by so many of you.

We can feel particularly well pleased that so many of these things did not wait for review until this week. A year ago last fall, August had an opportunity to hear these things with his own ears at a testimonial banquet in Winona. At commencement at St. Olaf College last spring, his alma mater recognized him with a distinguished alumnus award. That which has been said on these occasions counts immeasurably more than that which is being said about him this week.

In the Old Testament there is a record of a statesman, whose name was Hezekiah, King of Judah. It could just as well have been the name of any God-fearing man in public office, no matter where or when or whom he may have served. In the 20th chapter of the Second Book of Kings there are details surrounding his death.

We shall not press this account into a perfect likeness of any other person or situation in life; yet there are some things here that speak to us for such an occasion as this. There is above all a glimpse of a relationship of this statesman with his God that comes through an experience of the king with his pastor.

First of all, the passage reveals a prayer of the king; secondly, a conviction of the king about the source of his faith; and thirdly, his record. When you have said that much about a man, there is not much left to be said.

I. A PRAYER OF A MATURED STATESMAN

This was a moment of extreme grief, in which the king was calling upon his spiritual counselor, Isaiah. He was sick unto death. He prayed: "Remember now O God, how I walked before Thee in faithfulness and a whole heart." Then he wept bitterly.

It takes a brave man to call God's attention to one's past at any time, and especially on one's death bed. When a man as wise as Hezekiah prays it, it must mean that he has lived life circumspectly. The gist of his prayer seems to be, "Let God be the judge. It is my business to be faithful."

The remarkable thing about life is that God expects more of us by way of faithfulness than by way of perfection.

We make our moral and spiritual errors, and call them sin.

We make our errors of judgment. Men may be impatient and unsympathetic with us, but we find in the mercies of God a great sympathy.

God does ask for perfection too, but he knows the problems which we have in contending, and he is sympathetic.

The claim to mercy which Hezekiah made was on the basis of his faith and faithfulness to his God.

We are not in a position to pass final judgment on each other, but we do recognize a sense of duty in our departed public servant which demonstrates a faithfulness to one's task. In the issues of government as in religion you do not expect to find all men agreeing with you at all times. That is not the purpose with which one pursues his service. He does it to fulfill the interests that bring in the purposes of the Creator God in the domain of men.

No man is indispensable, but some men serve the interests of, God and men better than others and in larger fields of endeavor.

There are services to the whole of society which men in the position of Congressman Andresen and his colleagues are committed to make.

There are services to individuals that need to be recognized apart and above the group. In our type of society this is important. There are times when exceptions need to be made to the rule; conditions that surround the person that may make the rule do him an injustice. August seemed to be a master as determining when such exceptions could be made without jeopardising the whole.

He was faithful to his constituency. He was sensitive to their needs, and never did he separate himself from the folks he represented. He recognized that he could reserve the right of his own judgment; but people respected his attention to their needs, so that when his judgment was contrary to their requests or expectations, they understood that they too could be wrong in what they expected.

He was faithful to his conscience. He sensitized this conscience in divers ways; one of which was attendance at public worship. When he was in Washington he worshipped with the congregation of the Church of the Reformation under Dr. Folkemer. When he was home, he was faithful in attendance at this, his home congregation.

He was faithful to his calling. His father heeded the call to the Christian ministry. August heeded a call to another duty; first to the profession of law; and from there into the service of government. This, too, is of God, and for this too, God gives gifts,

and sets men apart for particular service to Him and to men whom He has created.

Different men at the close of their lives having been given different assignments have expressed themselves to their Creator. It must have been satisfying for Hezekiah at the close of his life to look back and be able to say: "I have walked before Thee with faithfulness and a whole heart."

As Jesus drew near the close of his earthly life, there arose out of that magnificent high-priestly prayer, a similar satisfying surrender: "Father, the hour has come; glorify Thy Son that Thy Son may glorify Thee. This is eternal life, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Thy Son whom Thou hast sent. I have glorified Thee on earth. I have accomplished the work which Thou gavest Me to do." Most men may not be that certain of their assignment. We are not able to be that sure. Jesus was.

We may be able to express ourselves better with the apostle Paul: "The time of my departure has come. I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith. I have finished the race. Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will award to me on that day, and not to me only, but also to all who have loved his appearing."

II. A GLIMPSE AT THE KING'S CONVICTION ABOUT A WORD FROM GOD

Toward the close of the conversation of the king and his pastor, come these words of Hezekiah: "The word of the Lord which you have spoken is good."

There is a word from the Lord for such times as these in which we live; for such a duty as was that of Mr. Andresen; and for such grief that he was destined to bear this last year.

There are some laws which man does not make, and some conditions which man's laws cannot control. There are some parts of his destiny made on man's behalf about which he does very little.

Some men spend a lifetime searching creation, and are guided by natural laws which God has written into them.

Others will spend a lifetime taking God's cues to determine moral laws which govern their relationship to each other, and to their God. In our Judeo-Christian heritage these spring from 10 simple commands of Moses.

As free creatures, God holds us responsible to adapt His wise and loving desire to fluctuating circumstances. He speaks to us. God works through men who are chosen by Him to make these adaptations and applications for their times within the framework of His desire.

We thank God for men who are sensitive in their search for the will of God.

His word and His will have been made known to us through His Son, Jesus Christ. Laws that men made sent Him to a cross. Yet there is more to the cross than that. It was here that He shared the experience of death, as He has shared in all of the other experiences of flesh with men. Yet it was here, the writer to the Hebrews reminds us, that "He destroyed him that has the power of death * * * and delivers all who through fear of death were subject to lifelong bondage."

This is the victory invested upon man in the Christian faith. We may still weep. We may still grieve, for we are complex creatures. Some have said that the grief of August these 8 months has hastened his demisal.

It is not strange. Our Christian faith is not some anasthesia to provide an escape from reality. Our faith is a direction of life. It is not a "do-all." It is simply a trust in One who can do all. They said of Jesus, "He does all things well."

It is not surprising that August should grieve. Without being blessed with children in his home, he and Julia were drawn to depend upon each other that much more.

He leaves a host of friends, here and in Washington. No one but those in public life know how lonely public life can become. Reisman, a sociologist, has described our modern American society as "the Lonely Crowd;" man, lonely, though surrounded by crowds.

The word that Hezekiah spoke to his pastor, I have heard Mr. Andreson speak as he left the church on a Sunday morning, "The word of God, spoken, is good." The message of the Holy Scriptures is relevant and good.

III. THE RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

"The rest of the deeds of Hezekiah, and all his might; how he made the pool and the conduit and brought water into the city are written in the book of the Chronicles of the Kings. And Hezekiah slept with his fathers". This is the record for Hezekiah.

That which August has accomplished may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in the memories of the people whom he served. The details may lean in the area of agriculture, conservation and labor.

There is also a Book of Life which God must keep. Something which God chooses to record may be written there.

But this is the record of the moment of greatest victory: "Now after the Sabbath, toward the dawn of the first day of the week; Mary Magdalene and Mary went to see the tomb. And behold, there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from Heaven and came and rolled back the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. For fear of him, the guards trembled and became like dead men.

"But the angel said, 'Do not be afraid; for I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified. He is not here; He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where He lay. Then go quickly and tell His disciples that He has risen from the dead and that He is going before you to Galilee" (Matthew 28). Jesus is the King who mastered death, man's final enemy.

Here is the fulfillment of Job's anticipation: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and because He lives, I, too, can live."

Wilderness in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of the national interest in wilderness preservation that is now focused on the wilderness bill has developed through the years from beginnings in my own State of New York. At the latest annual convention of the New York State Conservation Council held in Albany, the speaker at the banquet, on October 4, 1957, had as his subject Where Wilderness Preservation Began. That speaker was Howard Zahniser, one of our national conservation leaders, the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society. Speaking of Albany, the Adirondacks, and the Catskills he said: "This is where wilderness preservation began." He then traced the development of New York's early appreciation of wilderness values and after discussing New York's present conservation program, led the banquet audience in a reading of article XIV, section 1, of our State constitution, which requires that the Adirondack and Catskill Forest Preserve shall be forever kept as wild forest lands. Finally, he related New York's experience to the natural need for a firm wilderness policy. "New York State," he said, "with such excellent experience in perpetuating wilderness in the forest preserve, can be of great help in seeing such a program firmly established naturally."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "Where Wilderness Preservation Began," by Dr. Howard Zahniser, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

WHERE WILDERNESS PRESERVATION BEGAN

(Address by Executive Secretary Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society delivered at the annual banquet of the New York State Conservation Council in Albany, October 4, 1957)

I am very happy to be here to bring you the greetings of the Wilderness Society and those throughout the United States and in other countries whom I represent as the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society. People everywhere—some 12,000 of them are on our own roll of membership—people everywhere are doing their best to see that wilderness preservation needs are met anywhere. I mean anywhere there is a need for bringing to a focus the interest of the people dispersed through the country, who are concerned with these problems. In a sense I represent them all here tonight.

Last summer, the summer of 1956, on the 9th of July, my wife and our four children and I left our home at the Nation's Capital and drove that day through the metropolis, New York City, and camped that night, along the Sacandaga River, on the edge of a stretch of wilderness that extended for some 20 miles beyond the river along which we made our camp. Had we walked half way across that stretch of wilderness, we would have been at least 10 miles from a road in any direction. In one day, at this late date in our American history, we had been able to travel from the capital of the country, through its metropolis, and camp that night on the edge of a vast expanse of wilderness. Such is the opportunity that we still have in this country.

PIONEERS IN WILDERNESS APPRECIATION

A century ago this year, in 1857, a writer by the name of S. H. Hammond wrote a book entitled "Wild Northern Scenes." In this volume he talked about his own Racquette River country. He began to express fear lest civilization push its way to that wild country. Here is what he said:

"Had I my way, I would mark out a circle of a hundred miles in diameter and throw around it the protecting aegis of the Constitution. I would make it a forest forever. The old woods should stand always as God made them, * * * and new woods should be permitted to supply the place of the old so long as the earth remained."

That was written in 1857. Next year the Atlantic Monthly in July carried an article by Henry David Thoreau about a series of trips he made in 1853 in the Maine woods and, at the close of the article in the July issue, Thoreau first presented a question as to why shouldn't we have our national preserves, in which the bear and panther, and some even of the hunter race, might still exist, and not be civilized off the face of the earth—"not for idle sport or food, but for inspiration and our own time recreation?"

Some years earlier in 1833, George Catlin, a Philadelphia lawyer who became a great western artist and painter of western scenes, writing a letter to the Daily Commercial

Advertiser in New York City, made a suggestion about having great national parks. He had suggested a Government policy that would preserve some of these lands "in their pristine beauty and wildness, in a magnificent park."

J. T. Headley in his 1849 volume The Adirondack; or Life in the Woods, wrote: "I love nature and all things as God has made them. I love the freedom of the wilderness"—a phrase that is of great interest and is used a great deal by us. That was back in 1849. The book was a compilation of letters that he had written to his friend, Henry J. Raymond, a fellow reporter on the New York Tribune, who later founded the New York Times, who, himself, later became a writer on the Adirondacks. In 1855, he published a series of articles describing a Week in the Wilderness.

Most of us have heard about the Rev. William H. H. Murray, "Adirondack" Murray, whose 1869 book stirred so much interest and enthusiasm. One of the most interesting suggestions he made about the use of, and the appreciation of, the wilderness was a suggestion that churches send their pastors to the wilderness for vacation. He said when they came back—his words are too good to paraphrase:

"For when the good dominie came back, swarth and tough as an Indian, elasticity in his step; fire in his eye; depth and clearness in his reinvigorated voice, wouldn't there be some preaching. And what texts he would have from which to talk to the little folks in the Sabbath school. How their bright eyes would open and enlarge as he narrated his adventures, and told them how the good Father feeds the fish that swim, and clothes the mink and beaver with their warm and sheeny fur. The preacher sees God in the original there, and often translates him better from his unwritten works than from his written word."

Of equal interest to me is a complaint the Reverend Mr. Murray made that, while he was writing these words, there was so much city noise in Boston, where he was writing, that it bothered him very much. To me, living in the midst of the clamor and roar of airplanes and the rush of traffic, I am interested to know that back in the midst of this earlier century, which I have considered quiet and serene, he was complaining:

"How harshly the steel-shod hoofs smite against the flinty pavement beneath my window, and clash with rude interruptions upon my ear as I sit recalling the tranquil hours I have spent beneath the trees."

So noise, I guess, is a relative thing.

VERPLANCK COLVIN AND WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Those expressions of appreciation and those innovations from George Catlin in 1833, S. H. Hammond in 1857, and others are pleas for preserving areas of wilderness which must have fired the imagination and determination of Verplanck Colvin.

One of the reasons I like to come to Albany is that I remember that, a decade and a century ago—I think in 1847—Verplanck Colvin was born here in Albany. He walked the streets of this capital city and worked in its halls and corridors for the preservation and appreciation of the Adirondacks, which he knew better than any other man ever yet has known them. (I have read such tributes made by those who should know better than I the degree of his acquaintance and that of his possible rivals.) He took the measurement of these mountains. He was a surveyor, and, as William Chapman White says, lectured without stopping for 20 years on the need for the creation of an Adirondack Park or timber preserve. When the State Park Commission was established in 1872, he became superintendent of the State survey. He was largely responsible for the creation of the Adirondack Forest Preserve in 1885.

When the legislature created a Forest Preserve and Commission it said: "The lands now, or hereafter, constituting the Forest Preserve shall be kept forever as wild forest lands." That was confirmed by and strengthened by the 1894 constitutional convention, which adopted article 7, section VII. (Later you took 7 and 7 to make article XIV.)

Let's all stand and read that article XIV, section 1. It is in your program opposite the menu.

(Convention rises.)

(Reads article XIV. Section 1:—"The lands of the State, now owned or hereafter acquired constituting the forest preserve as now fixed by law, shall be forever kept as wild forest lands. They shall not be leased, sold or exchanged, or be taken by any corporation, public or private, nor shall the timber thereon be sold, removed or destroyed.")

(Convention is seated.)

That was an historic declaration of a sovereign State of the United States declaring in its basic, fundamental law a purpose to keep forest lands forever wild.

Among the "Selected Papers and Addresses" in the recently published volume entitled "Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty" edited by Charles Reznikoff, I have read with special interest the record of the debate in the 1915 constitutional convention on the forest preserve. Mr. Marshall said then, in leading the debate in defense of the forest preserve—he had been a member of the 1894 convention also—"If I were asked to state what the most important action of the convention of 1894 was, I should say without the slightest hesitation that it was the adoption of section 7 of article VII of the constitution which preserved in their wild state the Adirondack and Catskill forests."

As succinct a statement as I have yet seen on the forest preserve was in a January 14, 1952, editorial in the New York Daily Mirror. It says:

"The single most valuable possession that we, the people of New York State, all 15 million of us, own in common, and hope to maintain for our children and grandchildren forever is the forest preserve."

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION IS AMERICAN PURPOSE

This recognition of the value of wilderness as wilderness is something with which you have long been familiar here in New York State. It was here that it first began to be applied to the preservation of areas as wilderness.

The Federal Government, by an act of Congress approved by President Abraham Lincoln in 1864, granted the Yosemite Valley to the State of California upon the condition that it should be "held for public use, resort and recreation."

Two decades later, by an act of Congress approved by President Grant, Yellowstone National Park was dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, and provision was made for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition.

But here in New York, in 1885, by State legislative action and then in 1894 with constitutional force, you, the people of New York State used the term "forever wild" to describe a land management purpose. The people of this State thus began to cherish wilderness in a way that became more and more explicit as our great National Park System came to be valued because it not only protected for the public its superlative areas of scenic wonders but also included areas of wilderness, and as the United States Forest Service began to establish primitive, wilderness, wild, and roadless areas within the national forests.

It was in the southwest in 1924 that the type specimen of these national forest areas was established by regional administrative action in the Gila National Forest. Aldo Leopold had begun in the 1920's to point out to the Nation the importance—recreational and ecological—of the national forest wildernesses and also the growing threats to their persistence; and it was he who was chiefly responsible for the establishment of the Gila wilderness.

ROBERT MARSHALL AND NATIONAL POLICY

By the 1930's, when a national policy for wilderness preservation in the national forests had emerged, the great wilderness interpreter and champion from New York, Robert Marshall, had not only written his now classic interpretation entitled, "The Problem of the Wilderness" but had also achieved his position on the staff of the United States Forest Service where he was able to contribute so notably to the establishment of areas for preservation and to the formulation of regulations for their protection. He was a forester, a thinker, a writer, a philanthropist. He had learned wilderness in the forever wild Adirondacks. Here, with two companions, he had been the first to climb all 46 of the peaks 4,000 feet high or higher. He had also seen the great western areas of still living wilderness melting away "like the last snowbank on some south-facing mountainside during a hot afternoon in June." Activated by those observations and inspired by his own knowledge he set out to see preserved as many as possible of the areas of wilderness throughout the United States under his jurisdiction.

Paul Schaefer has told me also how, on Mount Marcy, he once saw Bob Marshall stirred with the need for mobilizing people who would, as citizens, support such governmental policies. It was Robert Marshall from the Adirondacks who was the principal founder of The Wilderness Society. In our country, you know, when any public purpose becomes distinct, some organization is formed. We are "experts" in the formation of organizations. The Wilderness Society in the fullness of time became the American people's public evidence of a distinctive purpose, and it was Robert Marshall from the Adirondacks who was central in that organization.

THE FOREST PRESERVE CONCEPT

The concept of the forest preserve is one that I know is deeply cherished. It is indeed a noble and brilliant concept. To sense the practical idealism of this concept—this establishment of a forest preserve within the Adirondack and Catskill Parks—is to feel a deep admiration and a pride too in the noble realism of the people of the State. Here are these great parks with their intermingled State and privately owned lands. Within their "blue line" boundaries there is established a special and unique kind of human land use. Here the public purpose is the preservation of wild forest lands in their unspoiled wildness, in the public interest.

Elsewhere the people of New York State, I also recognize, are realizing the similarly great and noble public purpose of providing State park and other recreational areas for the enjoyment of the outdoors developed and improved by all our various kinds of modern conveniences. But, within these blue lines the public purpose, in the interest of all the people, of the present and succeeding generations, is the preservation of wild lands in their primitive splendor and beauty.

An impressive aspect of the program that has developed in carrying out and developing this forest preserve concept is its recognition of the way in which private enterprise can meet the needs and convenience of the public. As time goes on and generation succeeds generation, there can thus be realized in an orderly, harmonious, democratic

fashion, the perfection of the forest preserve as a perpetuation of these wild lands, with areas in private ownership near and adjacent for the accommodation and assistance of the ever increasing number of visitors who will most assuredly be seeking out these wild retreats.

NO NEED FOR NEW-FANGLED ZONING

Thus there has been developed here in New York State this unique concept. Here we do not need any new-fangled zoning. Here we already have one of the greatest pioneer zoning programs that has been developed in our great American, modern experienced management of public lands. The forest preserve itself is a zone, if you wish to call it that. The Adirondack and Catskill Parks are zones. This whole concept of the forest preserve within specially established State parks is New York's own zoning program.

The citizens of New York State, with their often demonstrated concern for the preservation of these wild forest lands, should most assuredly, in my opinion and observation, look most searchingly at any zoning programs proposed as substitutes for their own wise provisions which so effectively began accomplishing zoning purposes long before ever the term became as popular as it now is. Surely, it is much better, in safeguarding the Forest Preserve, to be old-fashioned with parks and preserves that protect the wilderness, than to be brilliantly modern with something called zones that permit the destruction of the wildness of these forest lands that is being cherished.

The citizen who lives in a Class A Residential Zone is nonetheless distressed by the intrusion into his neighborhood of a commercial development simply because the intrusion was preceded by the zoning action of an up-to-date board of zoning adjustment. Similarly, the loss of New York State's wilderness will be no less shocking to its people simply because it may be accomplished by means of a zoning program.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL PROGRAM

New York State, with such excellent experience in perpetuating wilderness in the Forest Preserve, can be of great help in seeing such a program firmly established nationally. That possibility now exists in some legislation we refer to as the wilderness bill, based on the same assumption in our national program that we have been discussing here: that our civilization is such that it is destined to occupy all areas except those we deliberately set aside for preservation unmodified; and, secondly, that if we are to have areas of wilderness existing in perpetuity, existing forever wild, we must have them through a public program for designating areas and protecting them faithfully through the years, as you have done here.

As we face this problem nationally, we do not have the opportunities that existed in 1885 and 1894. We come to the preservation of the wilderness—the raw material out of which we have fashioned our civilization—we come to the preservation of this basic resource, last.

The first and greatest of our resources is the last we have recognized as being in need of protection. As we come to it, we find that the first of the assumptions to which I referred has already been realized in our national programs. Every area of wilderness we have within our national public lands is now dedicated to some other purpose.

Fortunately, some of these purposes are absolutely consistent with the preservation of wilderness. The national forests contain areas of wilderness that can persist while still serving their multiple purposes as national forests for the preservation of watersheds, for the use of sportsmen, and other recreationists, for research, and so forth. In many ways they can continue to serve their basic purposes as national forest lands and still be preserved as wilderness.

Similarly our national parks—48 of them we calculate—have areas of wilderness. Out of 274 wildlife refuges, some 20 of them have areas of wilderness.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

We therefore propose, as a national policy and a national program, to stabilize these areas as areas of wilderness within a National Wilderness System. That is the Wilderness bill purpose. We do not propose to change the administration of these areas. We do not propose to interfere with their integration with other areas of land handled by various agencies. We are suggesting merely at this opportune time in our history that we say to the administrators of these areas: "Treat them as wilderness." Wilderness is a character that land has while serving maybe another purpose that is consistent with it.

FOREVER WILD

After all, it is not so important to know where wilderness began as it is to know that it is going on and on for generation after generation. You have a wonderful phrase here "forever wild" which is an inspiration and a characterization of the nature of our own undertaking.

We are not fighting a rear guard action. We are not simply trying to delay the inevitable taking over of all our wilderness lands by a fast moving civilization. We are trying—in this time of emergency, which is also a time of opportunity—to fashion a policy and develop a program that, if successful, will persist in perpetuity so that we shall always have these areas of wilderness.

Let us not think that we are minority fighting against a great majority which is inevitably going to crush us. We are not. We are representatives of a great majority.

Every time in my experience of a dozen years in working intimately in this field—every time that the people of the United States or of any State, have had an opportunity to express themselves on this issue, they have said, "Let's preserve our areas of wilderness."

If nationally we can do this, as I think you have done it here in New York State, through a policy which is enunciated and put firmly into our basic laws, and then can develop a practical reasonable program within that policy, I think we can expect to have these areas of wilderness persist on and on. I know that it is a daring thing—a bold thing for a man whose life lasts 40, 50, 60, 70, or 80 years to be talking in terms of eternity, but that is indeed what we are doing. We are thinking of the eternity of the past that now exists in these areas of wilderness, and we have the presumption to say that we are going to do our best to make it possible for those areas from the eternity of the past to exist on into the eternity of the future. That is our faith.

Tree Farming and Land Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most interesting and informative article written by Mr. Ivan R. Martin, extension forester, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, entitled "Tree Farming and Land Ownership" which appeared in the March 15, 1958, issue of Alabama Business, published by Bureau of Business Research, School of Commerce and Business Administration, of the University of Alabama:

TREE FARMING AND LAND OWNERSHIP

(By Ivan R. Martin)

One hundred thousand acres a year are going back to trees in Alabama. This has been going on for the past 20 years. It is no cause for alarm. It helps prove that Alabama farmers are smart. A row-crop farmer wisely shies away from his submarginal land and concentrates his efforts and fertilizer on his best acres. Aggressive pines come back on land left out of cultivation. Farmers know that pines are profitable and raise land values. As these trees grow they are attractive to our wood using industries. The owner is then in the enviable position of having two profitable paths from which to choose. He can manage his woodland and enjoy returns from timber sales or he can sell out for a price equal to many times his original investment in these unproductive acres. Either path is his right under our zealously guarded system of free-tree economy.

The land-ownership pattern in Alabama deserves more honest analysis than it has received by some in later years. Inaccurate analysis gives rise to statements such as this: "Paper mills are buying up all the land. They bought up all the farms and ran the people off. That is why we have fewer farmers, less cotton, less milk, fewer rural schools, broken communities, and lower income for farmers."

Comparatively few farmers have chosen the sellingout road. This may seem strange, considering the bird in the hand attitude that is so prevalent. On the contrary, a rapidly increasing number of our farmers are keeping their land and applying good cutting and management practices. Alabama Land Statistics, an August 1957 release of the United States Forest Service, comparing 1945 Reappraisal Report figures with 1953 Timber Resource Review statistics, comes as a shocker for those quoting dolorous phrases about farmers selling out.

This release shows that during that 8-year period Alabama's farmer-owned woodland acreage increased by 855,000 acres. It also states that during the same period pulp manufacturers increased their timber holdings by only 329,000 acres.

Another highly important and rapidly growing group of woodland owners can be found among professional people and businessmen. For example: a doctor with 5,000 acres; a lawyer with 1,500 acres; a probate judge, a Government worker, an insurance man, a preacher and an automobile dealer with acreages ranging from 600 to 4,000. This adds up to a huge acreage and is seldom considered as being objectionable. When this type of forest ownership plus farm woodland ownership are added together, we reach a startling total. Most of these are under 5,000 acres (which surely includes few pulp mills). In this size group, Alabama Land Statistics shows an increase in number of ownerships from 147,800 to 169,583—or 21,783 more than in 1945. The acreage jumped by a whopping 1,478,000 acres to a total of 14,601,000 acres. Ownerships of 50,000 acres and over, by comparison, dropped from 23 in 1945 to 20 in 1953 and picked up only 354,000 acres. The acreage of the under 5,000 acres group increased nearly as much in 8 years as the total woodland ownership of all pulp company lands in Alabama. These small woodland owners have one thing in common—a desire to find a good place to put some extra money. Most of them manage their woodlands very well. The Forest Service sadly stated in 1953 that "only 34 percent of the farmers and 44 percent of the other small owners are cutting their timber so as to keep their land in highly productive

condition." This is cause for jubilation, not sadness, because the same agency reported that in 1945 only 2 percent of such holdings were cut correctly.

Let's check on another oft-heard remark, "land bought by wood-using industries is forever taken out of agricultural production."

Another quick look at Alabama Land Statistics indicates that there might be something to the story. This release indicates a rapidly dropping acreage of Alabama cropland from 10,397,000 acres in 1945 to 7,123,000 acres in 1953. These 3,274,000 acres didn't all go to trees. Pasture land showed a 2,684,000 acre increase that probably came primarily from seeding down cropland to permanent pasture in our rapidly expanding cattle program. Some pastures were made by clearing scrubland and other unproductive areas. However, county agents' annual reports for the last 5 years of this period showed only 154,236 scrub acres reclaimed for pasture.

An actual check on the land acquired by one of Alabama's paper companies revealed that 96.48 percent of their land was purchased in large tracts, primarily from lumber companies. Only 3.52 percent from small landowners. In that area, the Alabama Division of Forestry statistics show that 84.2 percent of the land is in forests. But let us use the figure of the agricultural economist that states that the average Alabama farm is 35.9 percent cropland. Then 1.26 percent of this company's land is cropland. Just out of curiority, let's see who this company chased off the land, by their own admission, quoting their woodlands manager as follows:

"In our land acquisition activities—and this is true of the land acquisition activities of other paper companies—we have changed the ownership pattern of timberlands little, if any. The bulk of the lands which we now own, and which other paper companies now own, were acquired from other large owners and only minor and incidental areas have been acquired from farmers and small landowners. On the lands which we have acquired from other large landowners there are farms and pastures, some of which have tenants living on them. In fact, we have well over a hundred farm tenants and have encouraged them to stay on the property because of our belief that people are indispensable in this business of raising trees and delivering wood to the mill yard. This is by no means the only importance of people because we also know that each and every one of us is important as neighbors, as employers, as employees, as customers and in every other way that involves living and working together."

Let's check another paper company and see what is worrying its woods division manager. By his own statement, "The bulk of southern pulpwood is produced by a steadily shrinking pool of farm labor."

Trend	Millions		Percent change
	1945	1975	
United States population	140.00	212.00	+51
Total civilian labor	53.80	88.20	+64
Farm labor	8.56	4.90	−43

"We do regard land ownership and its intensive management as the essential ingredient in timber planning—and timber planning as the only logical and reliable guarantee of company earnings—or as a friend of mine recently said, 'A mill without land is like Sally Rand without a fan.'"

"Only 30 percent of our wood requirements are obtained from company lands; however, with continuous advance planning in the purchase of market timber (farm wood, etc.) we have been reasonably successful in stabilising wood deliveries. Sixty percent of our daily wood usage arrives by truck, and feeds our chippers with pulpwood less than 12 hours from the living tree—green wood yields more fiber and by-products, a properly attended forest is a living, self-supporting storehouse, always on tap, to supply our basic needs. Agricultural production responds to short-range planning. There is no such thing as 'short range' forest management." Here we see the trend toward partial control over perishable raw materials, as in our meatpacking industry, and can realize its importance. We also see the industry's desire to keep farm labor available as pulpwood cutters—of mutual benefit to both.

Apparently, these companies are not living up to their Simon Legree reputation. And, granted that foresters are usually poor farmers, their bad effect on the few hundred acres of cropland the mills own should not seriously reduce Alabama's total crop production on over 7 million acres.

A far more important factor in reducing cropland acreage has been our allotment program which landowners themselves repeatedly vote for by overwhelming majorities. In 1930 cotton acreage alone, 3,596,000 acres, accounted for over half of our present cropland. During the decade ending in 1955, we averaged about 1,500,000 acres; 1956, 1,050,000 acres; 1957, 735,000 acres in cotton and 265,000 acres in the Soil Bank. Our farmers, in their efforts to stay within the law, consistently underplant their allotments on a statewide basis. This brings on another cut in allotted cotton acreage based on 5-year averages of acres harvested. In 1955 cotton acreage allotments were cut 7 percent—4 percent national cut plus 3 percent because of underplanting. Trees have had no hand in this change in land use.

A 1958 release of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association also reveals some important facts on land ownership as follows:

Less than 1 acre in 20 is in paper company ownership.

Less than 1 acre in 10 acres of all woodland is in paper company ownership.

To be specific, SPCA states that "paper companies own in fee simple and manage for others on long-term leases only 1,567,800 acres of forest land out of our total of 32,689,900 Alabama acres." If valued at $40 per acre (some cost them more, most cost less), they have approximately $1 invested in land to guarantee the even flow of raw materials necessary to supply $4 worth of paper-making equipment and buildings. They could be accused by their stockholders of being a little lax for depending so heavily on outsiders since such a huge investment is at stake in pulp mills—over $219 million at the end of 1957, and they are still pending.

Few critics of land ownership by wood using industries have adjusted their thinking to the realization that wood, like any vegetable crop, is perishable. Some crops, like baled cotton, can be stored. Most animal and vegetable products can not be stored long without deterioration. Every industry that requires fresh raw materials is realizing that some control over the arrival of these materials is essential. Only one other industry among the top five in the United States requires perishable materials. That is the meatpacking and distribution industry. The meatpacking industry now owns feed lots with capacities of up to 50,000 head of steers. These are slaughtered as the market demands. Frozen foods industries own their own farms. Poultry products processors supply, under tight contract, pullets, or chicks, feed, cases, medicine, inoculation, pickup service, culling service, and a strict timetable to control the arrival of their raw materials into their plants. Canneries own farms and grow much of their produce. Partial control over raw materials is an essential element in the profit pattern of any industry requiring fresh raw materials. By comparison, control over the 25 percent (average in the South) of the pulpwood requirements coming from company-owned woodlands is not up to quota. However, when market wood, 75 percent, varies, the company wood can be increased or decreased to guarantee 100 percent of the mill's daily requirements. Otherwise, temporary shutdowns and lower pulp yields could readily rob a paper company of profits and with no profits we soon have no mill in operation.

Alabama's paper mills have no desire to reach a position where they can supply all of their wood needs. In The Forest Is the Future, by Jonathan Daniels, the author states that Alabama's largest mill, with perhaps the most extensive holdings, requires nearly $14 million worth of wood a year. Eighty-five percent of this money goes to nearby farmers and small woodlot owners. Therefore, only approximately 15 percent of their wood requirements come from their own lands. Another mill owns no timber land. It leases some of the lands in its vicinity. Still another mill purchased only sufficient acreage to guarantee their prospective creditors that they would be able to obtain a constant supply of raw materials. This specification was set up by the creditors, not by the mill.

In studying pros and cons of pulp industry land ownership, we must also stop and think about the contributions these mills make to the economy. The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association states that pulpwood purchasers in Alabama amounted to $43,748,000 last year. These mills paid an average hourly rate of $2.12 to mill employees. This amounted to nearly $33 million last year. In addition, over $3 million went to wages of woodland employees. They paid $13½ million in freight charges alone and gave away nearly 9 million pine seedlings. They brought six new supporting industries into the State just by being here. These supporting industries in themselves are not small, but are industries such as chemical plants, wet felt plants and Fourdrinier wire plants.

In an analysis of our changing land use we must realize that trees are not causing the reduction in cropland acreage. Our higher crop yields on fewer acres are resulting in more acres in trees. Surpluses produced on closely controlled acreage underline this concept.

The return of croplands to woods will doubtless continue for some time, but at a reducing rate. As the percentage of submarginal cropland shrinks, fewer acres will be allowed to revert to trees. Our total crop production on fewer acres will doubtless increase when surpluses are gone and the demand increases.

Trees will not replace row crops as a source of income to the farmer. They will become increasingly important as a supplement to his row-crop income and may even become a larger percent of the farmer's income dollar. In individual cases, large farmers on relatively poor soil may obtain the major part of their income from trees. But Alabama's total bales, bushels, or pounds produced annually will not be reduced by trees. Jobs in factories, old age, various government programs and similar factors may reduce the man-hours spent tilling the soil and help continue the process of concentrating efforts on the best land.

With nearly 33 million acres of land under consideration, it is difficult to see much change, percentagewise, in the ownership pattern. Large acreages are usually exchanged by large industries—small acreages by farmers and other individuals. Percentagewise, few acres of cropland are tied up irrevocably by wood-using industries.

Of far greater importance to our economy than statistics on cropland reduction is the realization on the part of our landowners

that Dr. Charles Herty was right many years ago when he stated, "Forestation for profit is the best basis for the reforestation and for the protection of forests of the South. Teach the southern landowners that there is profit in trees and they will grow trees as they grow cotton."

Six Americans in Prague Win Medals, Hands, and Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from TAM, the archers' magazine:

SIX AMERICANS IN PRAGUE WIN MEDALS, HANDS, AND HEARTS

(By Betty F. Schmidt)

It would, perhaps, be wiser to wait until we have rested and regained some of our lost weight before writing this—and yet, with our impressions so very vivid now and our emotions still deeply stirred, this story should be told.

We six members of the NAA team who shot in the 18th world championship matches in Prague, Czechoslovakia, will be eternally grateful to all of you who made our trip possible. We, in turn, shot our hearts out to make you all proud of us, and to justify the warm friendship extended to us by the people of Czechoslovakia. The tons of luggage with which we staggered home were not our real reward; our trophies were twofold—the choking lump in our throats as our national anthem was played as we received our medals, and the sight of tears streaming down the faces of all who watched the ceremony. Men and women, alike, crying unashamedly, as we six, proudly, yet humbly, received the medals—and cheers—we had won.

We did our weeping—actually and figuratively—in the privacy of our rooms. Privacy? Who are we trying to fool? Informed sources advised us that every room in our hotel had a microphone in it. We didn't learn of this until almost the day we left—and we had been entertaining visitors in our rooms all the time. We were told that Prague was ours—but just try to go somewhere by yourself. You were never alone—even shopping. Talk to a group over a glass of wine in the cafe—and the omnipresent men, reading newspapers, moved in right to your shoulder and stayed there until you left, be it midnight or 4 a. m. You learned real fast to shift the discussion to shooting technique or tackle: our friends would tip us off by smoothly changing the subject.

Some of our experiences were hilariously funny. We had no knowledge of the Czech language, people by the thousands paid to come to the stadium to watch us shoot—and an announcer kept up a running fire of enthusiastic announcements for the benefit of the spectators. You have no idea of how confusing it is to have a loudspeaker blare a jumble of words, to hear interspersed "Amerikana Meinhartova," followed by another jumble; then a shout "Bravo, Meinhartova," at which point the stadium would jump with thunderous shouts of approval and applause. Poor Meinhartova (or Clarkova, or Schmidtova, or American Smathers, Fries, or Chessman). They might have been calling us all kinds of names and we would not have known. To be on the safe side, we'd smile at the crowds, or laugh when they did, which seemed to work pretty well.

Some of our experiences were heartrending. To have a voice come out of a dense crowd seeking autographs (yes, we were like Hollywood personalities), saying, "Bravo, Americans," and then have a warm hand of some unknown person press a small gift into your hand with an agonizing handshake. Our tackle boxes are loaded with those little remembrances. Or to be suddenly embraced in the middle of a crowd, and have a broken, whispered, "Please win—all of you"—it was more than we could take sometimes.

Some of our experiences were frustrating. We had the best this little country could offer in the way of food and accommodation—and yet we couldn't eat. Day after day, as hungry as archers can get, we'd send our plates back untouched: Poor food, poorly prepared, its shortcomings dimly disguised with pounds of mayonnaise. We'd feel guilty, yet our stomachs would rebel. Most of us lost weight.

There were times when we were highly annoyed and embarrassed. The Czech newspapers were full of this tournament, which was a big event there, and the newspapers had our pictures and stories of the Americans on every page. Schmidtova even had a streetcar conductor know who she was when returning from church in the wee small hours, and ask for her autograph on the picture he was carrying. The British Ambassador made a ceremonial visit to the stadium to visit and greet his countrymen, and advise them on things they should know. The French Ambassador did the same. And where was even a clerk from the American Embassy? We surely can't tell you—and there were a couple of times when we could have used him—but good. Like the time when, in front of 4,000 spectators, the Russian observer came up and asked to be photographed with the American women's team. Split-second decision to be made, with no knowledge of what the people's reaction would be to either answer. So we bowed, smiled, and posed, and refused his offer of money for one of our arrows; we gave it to him, Plastifletch and all. So let them copy it; we'll still have better shooters.

There were times when we were highly elated. Europeans shoot, rain or shine, and they dress for it, boots, waterproof suits, and all. So, as we should have expected, the third day was a miserable one, with rain and high wind and cold. We got out on the field, in our whites, and huddled in our raincoats—with saran wrap fastened around our feet to protect them—to be told that the other shooters figured they had us at that point. They knew we were unaccustomed to this sort of condition. So, we planted our feet a little wider, literally kept our powder dry, and let fly—and gained even more on the opposition than in dry weather. Soaked through, and miserably cold, our interpreter brought us hot coffee and lots of cognac—and it didn't hurt our shooting one bit.

There were many times when all six of us would have loved to start a real old-fashioned riot. We would very politely be called liars—and there was nothing we could do about it. Czech and other satellite newsmen would interview us: dozens of them talked to us at various times. One of their main questions was: how often we trained, and who selected our coaches and trainers. When we told them that archery was a family sport in America, and that we shoot when we felt like it, for fun, they'd smile, shake their heads, and say—more or less—Oh, come on, now—who're you kidding? Or, in a very snide manner, we'd be asked, "How come America suddenly fields 2 complete teams just at the time they have 6 people who can walk off with this tournament?" We'd try to describe our elimination tournament, and tell them that the N. A. A. never had the money before to send six people—that it was all done via voluntary donations. They simply wouldn't believe us: thought it was all propaganda. They had made up their minds that we were professionals, and we were hard put to it to dissuade them of the idea. Or we were asked why we were not planning to go on to Moscow to the Youth Festival—to which the Soviet Union had invited us, with most expenses paid—and we answered "Not enough money." They would not believe we weren't loaded with cash. They should have seen our wallets at Idlewild Airport on our return.

We were strictly nonconformist in several respects, but it caused amazement rather than caustic comment. The Americans were the focal point of the tournament held in a nation of sports-loving people. Therefore, hordes of journalists descended on us for interviews at every conceivable opportunity—mostly on the shooting line. We were told that no other team would interrupt their shooting to such an extent, but we instinctively felt that we were there not only to shoot—so we posed, demonstrated and gave interviews whenever asked. It didn't seem to bother our shooting.

There were times when our eyes would hunger for a spot of color, other than the Red flags and bunting left from the Russian visitation. Everything is drab and dingy and sad looking: our total impression was one of sombre, miserable sadness. As a group, the people do not look happy, they look depressed and cautious. Particularly the very old and the very young. The unutterable sadness almost killed us—the first thing we noticed on our return to Switzerland was the fact that people were smiling.

We had a time of rest, relaxation, and pure unadulterated fun; that was the 4-day interim between leaving Prague and leaving Europe for home. We found it difficult to relax, and even more difficult to avoid a feeling of guilt that we—lucky Americans that we were—had only a short visit behind what to us was really an Iron Curtain and would then board giant luxurious airliners to return freely to what we knew and loved.

It is difficult to make a good job of giving you our impressions: one searches for words to describe nebulous impressions, and the words are not adequate to describe our deep emotions at what we so briefly saw—and felt. None of us are skilled in diplomatic observations; we're just 6 Americans who went to do a job and feel that we actually performed 2 jobs; we won the tournament, and we won hundreds of new friends. We worked harder at making friends than we did at shooting and are not sorry.

We th ank you all again for what will be one of the most memorable experiences in our lives.

The Financing of Small Business—Long-Term and Equity Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the House Select Committee on Small Business yesterday introduced legislation amending the Small Business Act to provide long-term loans for small business in increased amounts and to provide an additional method to help small business secure equity capital. My bill is H. R. 12026. The other Republican members of this committee and

their bill numbers are: Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, H. R. 12027; Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut, H. R. 12028; Hon. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, H. R. 12029; Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois, H. R. 12030; and Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, of West Virginia, H. R. 12031.

There is almost complete agreement that a practical way must be found to increase the availability of credit and risk capital to our small-business concerns. This does not mean for any particular endeavor, but it means for small-business concerns whether they are engaged in manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, retailing, or the service industries. The question is by what means or methods may the Federal Government properly assist in solving the financing problems of small business. There have been many approaches to the problem as is evidenced by the number of bills which have been introduced on this subject. Each bill has its good points; the question is which points outweigh others in making a final decision which the Congress will enact into law.

Many of us believe that the best approach is by amending existing legislation. The Small Business Administration, through its nationwide organization, is equipped to carry out the will of Congress when legislation is enacted for the financing of small business. At the present time it would seem that once a sound program has been decided upon, getting it into effective use at the earliest possible moment would be of the utmost importance.

STATE COOPERATION AND PARTICIPATION

The central core of our proposal is to have the Federal and State Governments working together in encouraging private capital to assist and finally take over the job of providing long-term loans and equity capital for the small-business sector of our economy. We propose that each State, Territory, and Commonwealth, 51 in all, establish under State law a development, investment, and credit corporation. It is contemplated that each State development, investment, and credit corporation would operate under a State charter and would in turn be chartered by the Small Business Administration. Both long-term loans and equity capital would be provided through the State development, investment, and credit corporation. At the same time, none of the present duties of the Small Business Administration would be diminished. In fact, the responsibilities of the Small Business Administration would be materially increased.

INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT AND TERM OF SMALL-BUSINESS LOANS

We feel in making these proposals that it is important to the success of any plan to provide financing to small business that the term of the loans be of sufficient length and the loans be in sufficient amount to encourage the several State governments to cooperate and participate to the limit. Therefore, we propose that the maximum amount or regular small-business loans be increased from $250,000 to $500,000 and that the maximum maturity be extended from 10 to 15 years.

On the equity-capital side, the Federal Government is permitted to supply on a matching basis a maximum amount of $5 million. This is the total which may be outstanding at any one time for each of the State development, investment, and credit corporations.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS WITHIN A STATE

Our bill provides that under no circumstances can any of the money borrowed or invested be utilized to relocate a business concern. We believe this to be very important because the whole intent and purpose is to build up small business within the State and in localities within the State. We feel that if a concern desires to relocate, it should not be at the expense of the State or the Federal Government, but that the money should be otherwise provided.

EXPLANATION

The Republican members of the House Select Committee on Small Business believe that the best features of its bill are reflected through its simplicity; through the fact that a new agency does not need to be established; and through the fact that the Federal Government will be supplementing rather than replacing private financial institutions. In fact, the whole proposal contemplates private capital taking over this job as soon as is practicable. A short explanation and the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The first section provides that the act may be cited as the Small Business Investment and Development Act.

Section 2 sets forth the finding of Congress that the continuing growth and development of small business is essential to a sound national economy, but that such growth and development is impeded by the inability of small-business concerns (because of various factors, of which the principal ones are specifically stated) to obtain equity capital. It is therefore declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of the act to promote the sound development of small business by providing a source of such capital.

Section 3 adds a new subsection (c) to section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953.

Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (c) authorizes the Small Business Administration to purchase investment securities issued by State development investment and credit corporations and having specified rates of interest and maturities. The administration could not hold investment securities of any such corporation in an amount exceeding $5 million at any one time and purchases of such securities by the Administration would have to be matched by other purchasers of such corporation's securities.

Paragraph (2) provides that the Administration shall not purchase investment securities from a corporation unless, first, the corporation will use the proceeds exclusively to assist small-business concerns of stated types in its State and will not use any of such proceeds to finance the relocation of existing concerns; second, the corporation, in furnishing such assistance, will meet the conditions and standards set forth in the act and those prescribed by the Administration, and third, the corporation, in furnishing such assistance, will use funds obtained from other sources in an amount at least equal to the funds obtained from the Administration.

Paragraph (3) provides that only one corporation per State can participate in the program of assistance, and requires any such corporation to have been chartered by the State for substantially the same purposes as the purpose of the act and to meet minimum standards and criteria prescribed by the Administration.

Paragraph (4) authorizes the Administration to obtain the funds needed to carry out the program by issuing notes and obligations in an aggregate amount not exceeding $255 million and selling such notes and obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury. The proceeds of such notes and obligations would be used to establish the special revolving funds which would be used to purchase investment securities under the program.

Paragraph (5) allows any State development investment and credit corporation or its shareholders to repurchase any of its investment securities purchased by the Administration.

Paragraph (6) directs the Administration to impose reasonable service charges in connection with its purchase of investment securities; and such charges would constitute a reserve fund for the payment of any losses under the program.

Paragraph (7) provides that assistance under the program would not reduce or otherwise affect any similar assistance being furnished under State or local programs.

Paragraph (8) provides that the Administration's claims for repayment on investment securities which it purchases from a corporation shall not be subordinated to any other claims against such corporation.

Paragraph (9) contains definitions of the terms "State development investment and credit corporation," "investment securities," and "State".

Section 4 authorizes the Administration to make grants to State agencies, State development investment and credit corporations, and schools, for studies, research, counselling, and information concerning small business. Such grants would be limited to one—not exceeding $40,000—per State, and $2 million annually in the aggregate.

Section 5 replaces the present administrator of the Small Business Administration with a 5-man Small Business Board appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from among individuals truly representative of small business and thoroughly experienced in small-business operations. Each member of the Board would serve for a 5-year term, and would receive a salary of $20,000 plus travel and subsistence expenses. The functions, powers, and duties of the Administration and the Board would be exercised by an Executive Director subject to the Board's direction and supervision.

Section 6 increases the maximum amount of a regular small-business loan

under the Small Business Act of 1953 from $250,000 to $500,000, with a corresponding increase—subject to a ceiling of $5 million—in the maximum amount of a loan to a corporation formed and capitalized by small-business concerns. It also increases the maximum maturity of a regular small-business loan from 10 to 15 years.

Section 7 permits the securities of a State development investment and credit corporation or a small-business concern to be exempted from the provisions—principally those requiring registration—of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 if the Securities and Exchange Commission finds that enforcement of such provisions with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

Section 8 repeals section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act and provides that future repayments of loans made under that section, as well as amounts available for such loans but not yet used, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to provide a source of equity and long-term loan capital for small-business concerns in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment and Development Act."

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the continuing growth and development of small business is essential to a sound national economy, but that this growth and development is being impeded by the inability of small-business concerns to obtain sufficient amounts of equity capital. The Congress further finds that this situation is a result of many factors, chief among which are (1) the possession by the small-business concerns of insufficient ownership capital, with too much reliance on borrowed funds, at the time when they are established; (2) the existing narrow market for small-business securities, resulting in excessive costs for small-business security issues; (3) wide fluctuations in small-business profits over periods of time, deterring outside investment in small-business concerns and causing investors to prefer security issues of large and established businesses; and (4) inadequate retained earnings resulting from the current tax rates. It is, therefore, declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this act to promote the sound development of small business in the United States by providing small-business concerns with a more adequate source of equity and long-term loan capital.

SEC. 3. Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) The Administration is empowered to purchase investment securities issued by State development investment and credit corporations which have been chartered under paragraph (3) and meet the conditions set forth in paragraph (2). The Administration shall not purchase investment securities of any such corporation in an amount exceeding the amount of the securities of such corporation which are held by other purchasers; and in no event shall the Administration at any one time hold investment securities of any one such corporation purchased under this paragraph in an amount exceeding $5 million. Investment securities purchased by the Administration under this paragraph shall bear interest at a rate not less than the rate of interest paid by the Administration on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (4) plus one-fourth of 1 percent per annum, and shall have maturity dates of 20 years or less.

"(2) The Administration shall not purchase the investment securities of any corporation under paragraph (1) unless it has determined—

"(A) that the corporation will use the proceeds thereof exclusively to provide equity capital or make loans to small-business concerns within the State where it is located;

"(B) that the proceeds thereof will not be used in whole or in part to finance the relocation of existing business concerns or their affiliates or subsidiaries;

"(C) the character and field of operations of the small-business concerns to which assistance will be furnished by the corporation with the proceeds thereof;

"(D) that any loan made by the corporation with the proceeds thereof will have a maturity not exceeding 15 years and will be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administration may deem necessary or appropriate;

"(E) that, so long as the Administration holds any of the investment securities of the corporation, the governing body of such corporation will include such representatives of the Federal Government (including the Administration), State, and local governments, and other groups having an interest in small-business development as the Administration may deem appropriate;

"(F) that the corporation, in furnishing equity capital or making loans to small-business concerns, will use funds obtained from other sources in an amount at least equal to the funds obtained through the sale of its investment securities to the Administration under this subsection; and

"(G) that the corporation will comply with such other conditions and meet such other standards as the Administration may prescribe to carry out this subsection.

"(3) The Administration shall grant to not more than one State development investment and credit corporation (either existing on the date of the enactment of this subsection or hereafter organized) in each State a charter authorizing such corporation to participate in the program of assistance to small business established by this subsection. Such charter shall be granted to any corporation only after the Administration has determined that it has been chartered by the State in which it is located for purposes substantially similar to the purpose of the Small Business Investment and Development Act, and that it meets such other minimum standards and criteria as the Administration may deem appropriate to carry out this subsection; and any charter issued to a corporation by the Administration under this paragraph shall constitute formal recognition of such corporation's exclusive right in its State to participate in the program of assistance to small business established by this subsection.

"(4) To obtain funds for the purchase of investment securities of State development investment and credit corporations under paragraph (1), the Administration may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding $255 million. Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, and be subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administration with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and obligations of the Administration issued under this paragraph, and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended; and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, and extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes and obligations acquired by him under this paragraph. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes and obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Funds obtained under this paragraph and any proceeds therefrom shall constitute a revolving fund which may be used by the Administration in the exercise of its functions under paragraph (1).

"(5) Any State development investment and credit corporation whose investment securities are purchased by the Administration under paragraph (1), or any shareholder or shareholders of such corporation, may at any time, under regulations prescribed by the Administration, repurchase any or all of the securities so purchased.

"(6) The Administration shall fix and impose reasonable service charges in connection with the purchase and handling of investment securities under paragraph (1), and the charges so imposed shall be placed in a special reserve fund in the Treasury and used from time to time as needed to reimburse the Administration for any losses resulting from the purchase and handling of such securities.

"(7) The assistance furnished small-business concerns under the program established by this subsection shall not affect, and shall be in addition to, any State or local programs established to provide assistance for such concerns.

"(8) In purchasing the investment securities of any corporation under paragraph (1), the Administration shall impose such requirements as may be necessary to insure that its claim for repayment with respect to such securities will not be subordinated to any other claim for the repayment of funds owed by such corporation.

"(9) As used in this subsection:

"(A) the term 'State development investment and credit corporation' means an enterprise which is incorporated under the law of any State and one of the primary purposes of which is promoting and assisting the growth and development of small-business concerns within such State as a means of assisting, developing, and expanding its economy;

"(B) the term 'investment securities' means any obligations evidencing the indebtedness of a State development investment and credit corporation in the form of bonds, notes, or debentures, or in such other form as may be prescribed by regulations of the Administration; and

"(C) the term 'State' means the 48 States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 4. Section 207 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to make grants to any State government or agency thereof, to any State development investment and credit corporation (as defined in subsection (c) (8) (A)), or to any land-grant college or university or any other college or school of business, engineering, commerce, or agriculture, for studies, research, and counseling concerning the management, financing, and opera-

tion of small-business concerns, and for the dissemination of technical and statistical information needed in order to carry out paragraph (4) by coordinating such information with existing information facilities within the State and making such information available to State and local agencies. Only one such grant shall be made within any one State in any 1 year, and no such grant shall exceed $40,000 in the aggregate. Not to exceed $2 million annually shall be made available for the purposes of this paragraph from the amounts provided for the purposes enumerated in this subsection from the revolving fund established by section 204 (b)."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 204 (c) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The management of the Administration shall be vested in a Small Business Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), which shall consist of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are truly representative of small-business interests and thoroughly experienced in matters affecting small-business operations. No more than three of the members of the Board at any time shall be members of the same political party.

"(2) Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years; except that (A) of the members first appointed, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, 1 for a term of 2 years, 1 for a term of 3 years, 1 for a term of 4 years, and 1 for a term of 5 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of his predecessor's term.

"(3) Each member of the Board shall receive basic compensation at an annual rate of $20,000.

"(4) Each member of the Board, in addition to receiving compensation as provided in paragraph (3), shall be reimbursed for necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses actually incurred in the discharge of his duties as such member.

"(5) No member of the Board shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while he is serving as a member of the Board.

"(6) The Board shall annually elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(7) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business."

(b) Section 204 (d) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "chairman of the Small Business Board."

(c) Section 204 (f) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board."

(d) Section 204 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) The Board shall appoint an executive director, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board and shall, subject to its supervision and direction, be responsible for the execution of the functions of the administration. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act or as otherwise directed by the Board, all of the functions, powers, and duties vested in the administration and the Board shall be exercised and performed by the executive director and may be exercised and performed by him through such officers, employees, or other personnel of the administration as he may designate.

"(2) The executive director shall receive compensation fixed by the Board at an annual rate of basic compensation not exceeding $17,500; and he shall in addition be reimbursed for necessary traveling and subsistences expenses, or paid a per diem allowance in lieu thereof within the limitations prescribed by law, while away from his official station upon official business.

"(3) The executive director shall comply with all orders and directions which he receives from the Board; but as to all third persons his acts shall be presumed to be in compliance with the orders and directions of the Board."

(e) Section 205 (a) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Board."

(f) Section 205 (b) of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Administrator" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Board";

(2) by striking out "him" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "it";

(3) by striking out "his" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "its"; and

(4) by striking out "he" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "it."

(g) The first sentence of section 205 (c) of such act is amended by striikng out "he" and "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "it" and "Board", respectively.

(h) Section 206 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Board".

(i) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, provided for under the Small Business Act of 1953 as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this act, shall continue in office until the members of the Small Business Board (established by section 204 (c) of such act as amended by this section) have been appointed and qualified. Nothing in this act or the amendments made by this act shall be construed as requiring or preventing the appointment of such Administrator as a member of such Board.

SEC. 6. (a) (1) Section 207 (a) (2) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "$250,000" the first two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(2) Section 207 (a) (2) of such act is further amended by striking out "$250,000 multiplied by the number of separate small businesses which have formed and capitalized a corporation as hereinbefore provided for in this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000 multiplied by the number of separate small businesses which have formed and capitalized a corporation as hereinbefore provided for in this section, but in no case more than $5 million."

(b) Section 207 (a) (2) of such act is further amended by striking out "10 years" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "15 years".

SEC. 7. Securities issued by State development investment and credit corporations (as defined in section 207 (c) (9) (A) of the Small Business Act of 1953) or by small-business concerns (as defined under section 203 of that act) may be exempted by the Securities and Exchange Commission from any of the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 or the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, or issued under special regulations, if the Commission finds, having due regard for the purposes of the Small Business Act of 1953, that the enforcement of such provisions with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

SEC. 8. Effective 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 352a) is repealed; but such repeal shall not affect the power of any Federal Reserve bank to carry out, or protect its interest under, any agreement theretofore made or transaction entered into in carrying on operations under that section. Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act, each Federal Reserve bank shall pay to the United States the aggregate amount which the Secretary of the Treasury has heretofore paid to such bank under the provisions of section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act; and such payment shall constitute a full discharge of any obligation or liability of the Federal Reserve bank to the United States or to the Secretary of the Treasury arising out of subsection (e) of such section 13b or out of any agreement thereunder. The amounts repaid to the United States pursuant to this section and any remaining balance of the funds set aside in the Treasury for payments under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Another Attack From the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before on the floor of this House, the Farmville Herald, a biweekly newspaper published at Farmville, Va., is one of the outstanding papers of America. It has an equally outstanding editorial staff and brings forthright to the public the burning issues and problems of our time. The paper is dedicated to the preservation of the rights of our people, the sovereignty of our States and the saving of our republican form of government in America. I only wish that every county and city in America had such a paper so that our people would fully understand what is taking place in this country and what is happening to the rights and privileges of our people.

On Friday, April 18, 1958, there was published in this paper a very forceful and timely editorial entitled "Another Attack From the North." The editorial shows very pointedly how the people of the South are being misrepresented in other sections of the country. Realizing the importance of the facts being put truthfully before our people, I desire to include with my remarks the editorial which is as follows:

ANOTHER ATTACK FROM THE NORTH

The churches and church people are under attack by those who seek integration of the races. Virginia is the immediate point of attack. Prince Edward County in particular. Court actions center in Virginia. Divide and conquer is the strategy being employed. Synchronized are legal moves and propaganda moves. The latter is being fomented largely through the churches.

The NAACP target for 1963 outlines the plans. Legal procedures are planned to force (1) equality of job opportunities, through FEPC laws, State and Federal; (2) integrated housing; (3) increased Negro registration and voting; (4) integrated education; (5) integrated traveling; (6) integrated public accommodations, such as hotels, restaurants, bars, movie houses, barberships, etc.; (7) integrated hospitals and health services; (8) change of Senate rule 22, to prevent filibustering.

Reaching the end of legal procedures the target for 1963 has this to say about voluntary associations:

"There remains a vast area in which racial discrimination is free from such (legal) restraints * * * our concepts of democracy and brotherhood are challenged * * * The churches cannot be called to account in the courts * * * NAACP through its church division and its branches, will continue to confront the churches with moral contradiction * * * will provide educational materials to other voluntary organizations."

National publications and national church organizations are being used to effect the latter purpose.

The Christian Century, published in Chicago, and now the current issue of Esquire parrot the NAACP line to "confront the churches with moral contradiction."

An article in Esquire written by Dr. Wesley Shrader, former pastor of First Baptist Church in Lynchburg, now a theology professor at Yale Divinity School, takes Prince Edward County to task because private citizens plan to save schools for at least half of its citizens. Public schools now continue at the sufferance of the NAACP.

"The lowest and perhaps the most embarrassing level in church relations has been reached * * * in Prince Edward County, Va., writes Dr. Shrader. "Here the various churches of the major denominations * * * have become conspirators in the fantastic plan of destroying the public-school system in that county."

Dr. Shrader also attacks the majority of ministers (in the South). He says:

"The race issue has created (in the South) three distinct classes of ministers. The first class of ministers interprets compulsory segregation not only as the correct social custom, but as being blessed by the Christian faith * * * such men comprise a small and ineffectual group. * * * The second class of ministers also represents a small minority. These men who believe that segregation violates human dignity as well as the spirit of Christ, and who believing this, have proclaimed it from their pulpits * * *. The third class of ministers, and by far the largest, includes those who hate segregation in every form and who believe it to be directly opposed to the will of God and the spirit of Christ, but who, instead of openly defying the practice, have decided for the time being to remain quiet and compromise with existing conditions * * * Occasionally they will open up to one person in an effort to make a convert. They also work quietly in small groups with children and young people, teaching them what the application of the love of Christ means. They work on the assumption that much ground can be gained by slowly and carefully working with young people."

We quote these paragraphs to show our people what is being published in the northern press. This is not the first time that the people of this county and the South have been misrepresented and maligned in the national press, nor will it be the last time. We decry Dr. Shrader's charge that the majority of ministers (in the South) practice intrigue and sutlety. If true, it points up the need to return to the fundamental teaching and preaching of Christianity instead of sociology.

Good Guys and Bad Guys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to invite the attention of my colleagues to a very splendid article entitled "Good Guys and Bad Guys," which appeared in the Review and Outlook section of the Wall Street Journal of today.

This succinct and simply stated analysis of our current economic dilemma is deserving of attention and careful study on the part of every Member of this body.

GOOD GUYS AND BAD GUYS

The last TV western we glanced at, like all the others, divided its cast into good guys and bad guys. This simple black-and-white way of looking at the world is not particularly convincing, even when applied to the once-wild West; one can imagine that if it were applied to the intricate interactions of modern American business the results would be outrageous. But no one would do that.

Or wouldn't they?

The United States oil industry is in trouble—its prices weak, its sales slow. And we hear some bad guys are doing it in, the fellows who import foreign oil. The same is heard about other industries with foreign competition.

Now this foreign oil is not really so foreign; it is produced mostly by American companies who have invested American capital and employ American technicians abroad; nevertheless the conviction that the importers are bad guys is so strong today that it is national policy to submit them to "voluntary" controls. And the clamor is great for sterner action.

The script-writers who grind out the TV serials would appreciate the merit of this. It does not confuse the audience.

It just happens, however, that economics tends in real life to be more complicated than that. A news article in this newspaper the other day elaborately documented the fact that much of the damage to the United States oil market has actually been caused by booming natural gas sales. By some calculations, gas has had more impact than oil imports.

Oddly enough, the people who produce the gas are the same ones who produce the oil, though you don't hear much about that. So blameless is gas, in the minds of the public and of officialdom, that hardly anyone has even noticed that some natural gas, too, is imported—from Canada and Mexico.

In politics, natural gas must be cut out of the script of the oil drama. But in real life it exists; if one were to look at the United State petroleum industry through eyes of economic realism, what would one see? He would see an industry, segments of which encourage what are in effect legalized cartels operated by State governmental agencies to curtail production in an attempt to keep prices high, among other reasons. In the most important producing State, the Texas Railroad Commission this month and next is permitting oil wells to fulfill their function only 8 days out of each month. Meanwhile, the competing gas supplies are subject to no restraint on output beyond commonsense conservationist practices. It hardly is surprising that United States oil producers are losing customers.

But it is not surprising, either, that many should blame it all on imports. There's nothing new in such psychology. When cottons and woolens got in trouble it was the cheap foreign import which was to blame; not the rise of synthetic fibers. When hand-fashioned glassware suffered it was the competitive import which was guilty; not the machine-made domestic product. When bicycle makers retreated before imports few stopped to reflect that it was the efficiency of the United States auto industry in supplying adult transportation which had kept domestic bikemakers from achieving the mass-production of their European competitors.

Certainly an American industry can be hurt by foreign competition, especially if it is inflexible. But the clamor about imports often obscures more potent sources of competition at home. The good-guy-bad-guy complex goes far to explain such political successes as protectionism achieves in America. But it is so distantly removed from the whole truth that it can, in the end, be self-defeating.

American capitalism has attained an age at which it ought to know that in the long run no industry and no company can insulate itself from competition; safety lies nowhere except in competing efficiently. And competition is not static—it is a swirling riptide which certainly must include international trade.

It would be interesting to watch what might happen if all these domestic industries were thrown open to the normal operations of free enterprise. Some surprising things might well happen—such as the stimulation of old and the springing up of new industries.

And we suspect such competition would offer certain benefits to the United States consumer—not such a bad guy himself.

State's Industrial Expansion Biggest in Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March issue of Indiana Business and Industry:

STATE'S INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION BIGGEST IN ENTIRE NATION

For the 6th consecutive year, Indiana leads the Nation in per capita industrial expansion, it was announced February 24 by Lt. Gov. Crawford F. Parker, ex officio commissioner of commerce and industry.

"Contracts for industrial construction in Indiana in 1957 totaled $245,773,000 in more than 200 major new industries and plant expansions," Mr. Parker stated in the following progress report:

"For the years 1956 and 1957, Indiana's per capita industrial expansion was $208 per person.

"Ohio, with more than two times Indiana's population had a per capita expansion of $101 in these 2 years. Texas had $87, Illinois $56, Michigan $27, and New York $18.

"In 1957 Indiana's total industrial contracts were more than those of Michigan and New York combined. These are two of the largest industrial States in the Union.

"Increased plant capacity means more payrolls. And more payrolls mean more jobs for everybody. When these plants are built, their operation will be virtually continuous.

"It is fair to say that Indiana's debt-free status and our right-to-work law are two of the most important fatcors in bringing more and more payrolls to Hoosierland, whereas States without these features are declining in their relative importance to us.

"The industrial growth which Indiana is experiencing has been amazing, even to the specialists in national development work. They attribute Indiana's continuing strong position to its fiscal situation, the right-to-work emancipation law, our strategic geographical location in the midst of supply

and markets, and the large number of healthy and ambitious communities throughout the entire State geared to invite and support industrial expansion."

The Real Reason for the Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to present a letter which I recently received from Mr. Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst, who presents some very meaningful facts which we should consider during these days of recession. Mr. Wilken has the experience of many years of study behind him on this subject and he is known to many Members of the Congress. Mr. Wilken's letter follows:

APRIL 15, 1958.

Hon. MERWIN COAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been watching with a great deal of interest the many proposals which are being advanced to cure the current depression. I am using the word "depression" due to the fact that at the present time the economy of the United States is losing $80 billion of national income. Such a huge loss is more than a recession. The facts proving this loss will be set forth later in my letter.

The real reason for the depression, namely, the relatively low farm price structure and the price of other raw materials, is not being discussed. The 35 rural States, primarily dependent upon the production of raw materials for their income and ability to buy factory goods are being underpaid approximately $50 billion, as compared to their normal ratio to national income and payrolls which existed in the 25-year period 1929–53. This income balance can be clearly ascertained with the use of the 5-year period 1946–50.

The economy has been operating at a loss ever since 1951 when farm prices were permitted to drop below the 1946–50 parity. During 1951–53 the loss of earned income was offset by adding an average of $39 billion to the total debt, public and private.

In 1954 as the rate of debt expansion slowed up our economy started to recede toward the base of earned income from our raw material production. This recession was halted by expanding the total debt an average of $48.7 billion per year in 1955 and 1956. In 1957, when the debt expansion dropped back to approximately $30.5 billion, not sufficient to offset the loss of earned income from new wealth production our economy receded to the present point.

Further debt expansion will not solve the problem. It will merely postpone and aggravate the serious dislocation between the incomes of rural communities and industrial areas.

Since 1946–50 (third quarter of 1957) our total payroll was expanded from $136.5 billion to $257 billion. (Economic Indicator published by the Joint Economic Committee.) This was an increase of 88.3 percent and therefore the recession could not have been due to low wages which normally represent 65 percent of the national income.

The debt expansion for installment credit and other forms of capital expenditures for new plants and equipment, homes, etc., approximated $270 billion the highest rate in any 7 year period in our economic history. Therefore, the one reason and the only one is the failure to maintain raw material prices at parity thus protecting the earned income of the 35 rural States and the Nation as a whole.

Our economy at the present time has the labor force and factory equipment to produce 160 percent of 1947–49 as 100. This production at current price levels would turn out $413 billion of national income.

Instead of 160 percent of 1947–49 production, the production index for March was 128 percent. This production times the present price level on an annual basis would create a national income of $330 billion. It might be of interest to note that our production index in July 1953 had reached 137 or 7 percent more than our production in March 1958.

The difference between our potential of $413 billion and the actual rate of output and income in March 1958 of approximately $330 billion represents a loss of $83 billion in operating the economy of the United States.

It is indeed very doubtful that enough funds can be borrowed to create the market which is needed to provide full employment of our labor and facilities. Even if it were possible, such a step would not solve the basic problem of income balance between rural areas and industrial America, a dislocation directly traceable to raw material prices which are approximately 70 percent of 1946–50 parity.

The intelligent use of about $3 billion could restore the price of raw materials to parity and restore the markets which are being lost in rural America and which are needed to consume our production. Very little legislation would be required.

I would like to have you discuss this with the chairman of the committee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The committee can have the benefit of 20 years of research work devoted to analyzing the record of our economy over the past 50 years. I am willing to give the committee my views if they desire them. I am not a lobbyist nor do I have the backing of any large organization. I can, however, analyze the record on a factual basis to prove what I have pointed out in this letter.

In closing, I would like to point out that in this loss of $80 billion of national income we are losing approximately $18 billion of tax revenue for the Federal Government which could be used to provide tax reduction on a sound basis. Without restoration of parity for raw materials, tax reduction will merely force an addition to the national debt without solving the depression.

Sincerely,

CARL H. WILKEN,
Analyst.

President's Veto of River and Harbor Bill Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, among many newspapers which editorially have approved President Eisenhower's veto of the omnibus river and harbor-flood control bill is the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The Deseret News calls the bill a pork barrel one and says the veto was right.

The editorial of the Deseret News follows:

VETO THE HIGHWAY BILL

President Eisenhower made his second courageous and wise veto of the year yesterday—and now has one more to go.

He started, as will be remembered, by vetoing the farm price-support freeze bill. Apparently, despite a good deal of political noise, any attempt to override that veto has been forgotten.

Yesterday, he vetoed a $1.7 billion rivers and harbors authorization bill. This will win him a few more political enemies; the pork-barrel appropriations represented in this bill have considerable political power. But the veto was right. Any project that has not been thoroughly researched and approved by the agency concerned, and been worked into the Government's total economic picture by the Bureau of the Budget—and this bill was full of such projects—has no business being approved by Congress.

We trust, now, that Congress will lose no time putting the justifiable, approved projects back into a new bill and getting it before the two Houses for approval.

The Recession and the Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, since it is becoming increasingly difficult to pry information—even the most simple information—from the reluctant administration leaders, I am more than ever placed in the position of the late Will Rogers, who said, "All I know is what I read in the papers."

The lead story in the Washington (D. C.) Post of April 8, 1958, has this to say:

Unemployment rose 25,000 in March to 5,198,000—the highest jobless total in 14½ years. * * *

The 25,000 increase in unemployment, compared to an increase in February of almost 700,000 over January, indicated the rate of the economic slump may be slowing.

Twenty-five thousand does not seem to be, at first glance, a world-shaking advance in unemployment.

But it would be a world-shaking advance in unemployment if one of these 25,000 happened to be you.

In thumbing through the April 11, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report I came across 2 timely, but seemingly unrelated items.

On page 23, I read:

"Unemployment" in the recent recession is tending to center in younger workers. "Among jobless" 1 out of 4 is age 24 or younger. These often are young heads of families, in debt for a car, furniture, maybe a house, and with 1 or 2 young children. The squeeze on these jobless is severe.

"The reason" why younger workers are hit hard? Often it's seniority rules. Union contracts usually call for the last worker hired to be the first laid off, and for the last laid off to be the first rehired.

"The younger worker" tends to be left out in the cold. Yet that younger worker usu-

ally is least able to stand unemployment. His children are growing, not grown; his debts are at the peak, not paid off. It is the younger worker who tends to be the biggest customer of business, and he is being hurt.

The words which are quoted in the above quotation were quoted by U. S. News & World Report editors; not by me.

There is no percentage figure in this article about the actors in this American tragedy of 1957 who come from family farms. We are well supplied with economic statistics. We have plenty of census statistics. But with all of our scientific advances it has been impossible to represent living human beings by lifeless calculations.

The best I can do is, as briefly as I can, to bring you a picture in words.

Gus Hanson does not exist. I have literally picked his name from a hat. Yet Gus Hanson is a symbol, an archtype. What is happening to him is happening to scores of thousands of young Americans, born and raised on a family farm.

Gus graduated from high school. Like so many of his contemporaries, he did his hitch in the armed services. After his tour of duty in the Army was completed, he came home. It didn't take Gus long to find out how things stacked up. There wasn't anything for him at home. The way things were going, the farm could barely support Mom and Dad and the two younger children still in school. So Gus took off for the city. He was hard working and ambitious. He got a job. He met a girl—the girl. They were married. Their first baby was born. A second was on the way.

Then, without warning, Gus found a pink slip in his pay envelop. There were a few extra dollars instead of the usual 2-week notice.

I want to know what will happen to Gus Hanson's family. I want to know what will happen to Gus Hanson's brothers and sisters, his mother and father. I want to know what will happen to America's Gus Hansons.

Why do I want to know this?

Another article in the U. S. News & World Report of April 11, 1958, has the answer.

On page 50, I read:

Russian farmers do not, cannot, own the land they farm. * * * There is little incentive to spur the peasants to more efficient work or greater production.

It was the land-owning peasant who stood in the way of those trying to communize Russia 40 years ago. Millions of peasants were liquidated before the Communists could fasten their yoke on the Soviet people. And, today, the Soviet farmer is still a foe of communism—a source of constant fear to the rulers of the Kremlin.

I want to know what will happen to America's Gus Hansons because the family farm is, at one and the same time, the backbone of American financial stability and the first line of defense against communism. Gus Hanson deserves a future. He is our Nation's insurance against whatever comes tomorrow. No institution in the United States—our farms, our fields, our mines, our industries, our commerce—is as valuable to the United States as our Gus Hansons.

All this talk about "conquering outer space" is just jibberish if Congress and the administration do nothing about conquering the vast inner space in the hearts of young Americans—from the family farm, or whatever their origin—who have lost their jobs.

Let us get busy on our Gus Hansons.

Return of Alien Enemy Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Hyman Bravin of New York City, commander, Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, on March 22, 1958, voiced strong opposition to any return to former enemy alien owners of external assets vested by this country of its Allies during World War II.

Speaking in terms of dollars and cents, the New York State commander said that any form of a return to former owners could in effect give the present German taxpayer a $428,500,000-tax benefit at the exepense of the American taxpayer.

The United States vested about a half billion dollars of farmer enemy assets in World War II of which some $450 million was from Germany. The New York State commander pointed out that pleas have ben made to this country by the German Federal Republic to return such assets because of "hardship cases in Germany."

This comes from a country—

Commander Bravin said—

that enjoys the foremost economy of any nation in Europe.

Legislation providing for the return of these assets to Germany is now pending before the United States Congress—

Commander Bravin pointed out—

at the same time, the German Federal Republic has published its budget for this year providing for a tax reduction of $428,500,000.

If this were postponed for 1 year the German Government could make payment to all Germans whose property was vested by the United States Government during World War II and such payment would be in accordance with the terms of the Bonn Convention agreement.

But if the German Federal Republic follows through with its tax reduction and then obtains a general return of the vested assets through an act of the United States Congress, the net effect would be to give the German taxpayer a $428,500,000 tax benefit at the expense of the American taxpayer.

A general return—

He said—

would in effect result in the United States paying for both sides of World War II.

The Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, Member of the House of Representatives from the 30th District here at Albany and who is being honored here tonight, is one of our strongest supporters in the Congress in opposition to return of the assets. In that regard he has the distinction of being the author of the original bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act which he first introduced in the 83d Congress, the 84th, and again in this session of the 85th Congress. Congressman O'BRIEN's legislative measure would amend that section of the act to permit General Aniline & Film, here in our State, to be sold to American interests immediately at public auction and the proceeds placed in the Treasury of the United States.

Bravin pointed out that in the Bonn Convention agreement of 1952, and in the Paris protocol of 1954, between the German Federal Republic and the United States, Britain and France, Germany agreed not to object to the vesting by the allies of the external assets of Germany for the purpose of reparation, and at the same time agreed to compensate its own nationals for their losses in World War II.

Just what would our allies think of us if we broke the Paris and Bonn agreements?

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America has repeatedly gone on record opposing return of this so-called alien property and as our national commander, Benjamin H. Chasin, recently said, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America will use every resource at its command to inform Members of Congress that any attempt to return these alien enemy property assets will be vehemently opposed by every member of the organization—

He said.

Rensselaer is the location of one of the manufacturing operations of the dyestuff and chemical division of General Aniline & Film Corp. which is the largest of the alien property assets held by this Government since 1942 and which has an estimated value now of $100 million. The plant there is the oldest dyestuff manufacturer in the United States. The company's other divisions, Ansco and Ozalid, have their main manufacturing operations at Binghamton and Johnson City, N. Y.

The Free Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following letter from Mr. Harrison Doyle, of Vista, Calif.:

VISTA, CALIF., *March 30, 1958.*

Hon. JAMES UTT,
Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. UTT: Many of us here in Vista are extremely fearful that the free trade bill, which comes up for renewal in June, will be railroaded through by its vociferous adherents, without safeguards written into it to protect the Nation's vital defense industries. It is in view of these aspects that this letter is written. I would like your comment it before I fashion it for publication.

Most Americans are unaware that there is something far more sinister behind the free trade bill, and that is, the terrific buildup

by Russia of her steel, iron, ferro-alloys, aluminum, manganese, and other strategic mineral and oil potentials—all within her own borders or behind the Iron Curtain. It is her wherewithal to wage a long and possibly victorious war, while our strategic industries atrophy because of indiscriminate imports.

She can wage this war in two ways: She can flood the world's mineral markets with her aluminum, steel, gold, ferro-alloys, and manganese ores (she has already wrecked the Canadian aluminum and ferro-alloy market in Britain), further depressing world prices, or she can arm herself with cheap minerals, and wage a decades-long cold war. Along with this, she has some 500 submarines with which to put a stop to overseas shipments of strategic minerals to the United States, and hamstring our vital industries.

Against this, we Americans are listening to a barrage of do-good-for-the-world thinking, with our complacent heads buried like ostriches in the glittering sands of an internationalistic fool's paradise. In our apathy we are letting our country become almost totally dependent upon cheap foreign imports of the strategic materials with which a country defends itself. Under free trade thinking, without tremendous stockpiles, we cannot fight a long war.

Today, we have a smattering of those stockpiles; on a few, a 3-years supply at best including manganese and chrome. Ninety-five percent of the manganese we use today is imported from foreign sources, some of them Communist controlled. Forty percent of it comes from the Port of Goa, in Portuguese India, through the Suez Canal. An average of 50 percent or more of all our strategic minerals comes from outside our country. It stands to reason that in times of future emergency, without a tremendous stockpile, Russia's 500 submarines will cut this supply off—our steel mills will shut down, and we are dead.

The Germans were aware of this weak link in our economy, that is, our almost total dependence on imports of vital manganese and other strategic materials: that it was the life to our steel mills and heavy industries, and the Germans built their submarine fleet mainly to pick off these mineral and oil cargoes. They kept on building submarines, and those submarines got a great part of our cargo ships. They missed knocking us out of the Second World War by an eyelash—and that war lasted 4 years.

To make steel and win wars, you need prodigious amounts of iron, manganese, and very substantial amounts of such critical items as tungsten, chrome, mica, quartz crystals, mercury, tin, nickel, aluminum, columbian-tantalum, beryl, zirconium, uranium, rubber, asbestos, and many other strategic materials including lenses, jewelled movements in missiles, and above all, the technical knowledge to produce all these and a thousand others.

Manganese is by far the most important, because of the enormous amounts needed. It not only hardens and toughens iron, to make steel, but because of the millions of tons needed each year, it is the only material which will economically harden, deoxidize, and desulphurize the steel. Without manganese in vast quantities, you just do not have steel except in limited quantities made with high priced alloys.

We solved the rubber problem by building synthetic plants. We know how that is done, and can quickly begin making rubber again; we can solve the manganese and chrome problems in only one way—by exploration and development of our known vast areas of low grade ores; by building processing mills within our own continental borders, and stockpiling ample quantities—at least a ten years supply. Make the climate right, and our mining companies will process manganese and chrome here instead of in South America, Indian, and Africa.

At one time during the early part of the Second World War, the steel mills of this country had less than thirty days supply of vital manganese, without which we could not have won the war. We managed to muddle through at a terrific cost, barely scraping out enough of the mineral in pea and walnut sizes, with which, with a little help from our good neighbors to the north and south, to get by.

We lost 1,800 shiploads of manganese in the Carribean Sea alone, to less than one hundred German submarines. We lost other ore carrying ships off South Africa, and in the Pacific, too. Few loads of manganese and chrome got through. It was root hog, or die.

Khrushchev, like Hitler, knows this Achilles Heel in our defenses, and today five times the number of Russian submarines that the Germans had, roam the open seas, and Russian war strategy is largely based on the long war concept. Those 500 Russian submarines, some armed with atomic-headed missiles which can be launched from below the surface, are not there to blast our cities, but to hamstring our steel and industrial capacity, our critical industries, and consequently, our war capacity.

America (with Canada and Mexico) has lots of all the strategic minerals such as chrome, nickel, manganese, tungsten, mercury, etc. The United States has tremendous deposits of low-grade chrome and manganese. But with our high wage standards, these minerals can be acquired so much more cheaply in times of peace from foreign sources than we can obtain them here from our own deposits. Here, miners get $20 or more pay day, while in some foreign countries less than $2. Taxpayers' moneys today are financing American—and other mining corporations all over the globe—the products of which in time of war will be useless to us—they simply will not be available.

Regardless as to how cheap foreign minerals are to acquire, we must at all hazard keep our mines and mills here ready to produce adequately at the first shot. And we must have stockpiles large enough to tide us over until we can produce here at home, enough to make us absolutely self-sufficient in time of war.

Due to cheap foreign imports already a great many of the strategic mineral mines are full of water. It will take a year to pump out and retimber some of them. Mills are rusted, or have been sold for salvage. All that is left of the great Mother Lode of California is a few rotting timbers surrounded by pear orchards. Congress failed to carry out its obligation to the tungsten miners under Public Law 733—the money going to Korea instead, and most of our tungsten comes from there now. To show how slowly remedies work: a Senate committee has been formed to investigate this, to come up with an answer next December.

The chrome stockpile is closing. Manganese hasn't far to go. Lead, zinc, copper, crying loudly for help. Supplies far less than we will surely need in time of stress. Far less than will get us by while our mines are being dewatered, and capital raised to get them in production again. It takes time to build a mill from scratch. Or to work out processes for the differing kinds of ores in the same area. Today, because of the cheap foreign imports, the banks of America—or the SBA either—won't touch a domestic mining loan with a 10-foot pole.

Some of our leaders are aware of the problem. Many are not. There is a suspicion that a powerful block of left wingers, for want of a better name—are aware of the problem, but want it that way. Some of our leaders base their thinking on a short—days long—hydrogen war. Stockpiles are set for 3 years. What we should all understand, is that barring a terrible accident, any coming war will be a long drawn out peripheral affair, and not a short fission or fusion affair. The presence of those 500 Russian submarines off shore should give us a hint of their thinking.

The Russians want us intact. They perfectly well know that to drop a hydrogen bomb on or launch a guided missile from a submarine upon one of our cities, or to attack our mainland, will mean instant and disastrous retaliation upon their homeland. They are as much afraid of a hydrogen war as we are. They want a long war and a resulting stalemate—a stalemate which they think, and may rightly think, will work for them.

So, consequently, they intend to use the weapon they have used so well in the past, the long-sustained cold war. Bleed us to death economically, by cutting off our overseas strategic supplies while the one-world freetraders, for a few pieces of silver, get in their licks here. And by waging a series of brushfires around the world while we exhaust ourselves trying vainly to raise the living standards of the underprivileged of the backward nations of all the world.

The name for it will be Operation Hamstring.

There is no basis or justification whatever for argument as to whether any coming war will be a short or long one. Good generals prepare for any eventuality. They do not gamble with the death of a nation. They will prepare for either a 10-day war or a 10-year war.

The American citizen today is beset with a barrage of free-trade propaganda. It comes from TV, newspapers, magazines, radio. The leftwing crowd of one-worlders are definitely calling the shots. The administration is wholeheartedly behind it. They should be, for it means more power for the executive branch, and less for Congress.

But Congress can call the shots on this one, as it should, under the Constitution: Safeguards should be written into it, including protection to our defense industries, especially for all strategic minerals and materials, so that all war-critical industries will be functioning and at the ready at all times. And this is going to take a bit of doing, separating them from the purely economic.

Stockpiles of minerals are nondeteriorating; they will increase in value with the years. There should be a 10-year supply of every strategic and critical mineral or material put away in a safe place in the interior. And import duties added to every strategic item, to enable American labor and know-how to compete, and keep competing. Only that will give us time to adjust in time of emergency.

We have no quarrel with giving away dollars to foreigners for their copper, lead, zinc, tungsten, tin, beryl, mica, manganese, or, for that matter, their little cars, cameras, binoculars, watch movements, tuna, plywoods, carpets, dishware, and a thousand other things. But, when free trade is carried so far that it destroys our capacity to defend ourselves nationally, it may be laying the foundation to get a number on our collars, or our throats cut in a losing war.

This is the thing that is hidden away in that bill, and which few see or understand.

Very truly yours,

HARRISON DOYLE.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the RECORD the following letter which I received from the National Guard Association of the United States:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: On Monday, March 3, the Department of the Army announced plans for the reorganization of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. It is our understanding that you have received a communication from the Department, setting forth the general objectives to be attained by such a reorganization.

The Army states that it desired to modernize its Reserve components in light of changing concepts of warfare and the development of new weapons systems. This statement infers that the present organization of the Reserve components is archaic and antiquated. It might better have been stated that (1) the structure of the National Guard units is precisely as directed by the Regular Army and follows the same organizational tables as the Regular Army; and (2) that it is only recently that the active professional Army has been reorganized to cope with the changing concepts of warfare and now desires its Reserve components to reflect that organization.

The National Guard is in hearty accord with any reorganization that will increase its capability to perform its historic role as a first-line defense force of this Nation. Ever since the establishment of the post-World War II troop basis, the units of the guard have undergone a series of modifications, conversions, and redesignations at the request of the Army. We point this out to illustrate that such a procedure is not new to the National Guard, and to show that the National Guard today is organized exactly as the Army previously has prescribed and requested. It has been hinted that the States and Territories oppose the reorganization of the National Guard. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that the guard is highly desirous of being molded in the identical pattern of the Regular Army and has, for many months, been agitating for that authority.

The Army proposed reorganization plan contains two separate and distinct features, both of which are highly detrimental to the security of this country. They are:

1. A 1959 budgetary program to reduce the Army National Guard by 40,000 officers and men from an existing strength of 400,000 voluntarily participating citizen-soldiers to 360,000;

2. A staff inspired directive to eliminate six existing Army National Guard divisions and several hundred of additional non-divisional units, aggregating—

(a) in excess of 1,800 organized and federally recognized units; or

(b) approximately 34 percent of the existing organized units of the Army National Guard.

It should be clearly understood that these are independent plans, bearing no direct relationship to each other.

Under the guise of modernization, the Nation is being told that we are to attain greater strength and combat capability by destroying our existing units—the men and organizations which constitute our shield of survival now.

It has been stated by those in authority that the Army National Guard is the largest, best-trained, best-equipped, and best-housed of the Reserve components of the Army. Why, then, does the Army propose to eliminate these units and troops?

In the interest of efficiency, economy, and security, any reorganization of the Reserve components should be accomplished with due consideration to the strength, capability, equipment, and facilities of existing units. It is neither logical nor economical to write off, in these times of international tension, a large segment of our reserve military strength—particularly that portion which gives body to the term "balanced forces."

Recent investigation by Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee of the House exposed the weaknesses and inconsistencies of the Army plan.

The States and Territories have recommended that they be authorized to reorganize, convert, and redesignate their existing units to those required to support the active Army upon mobilization, and thereafter to mutually determine with the Army units and facilities which may no longer be required in the defense of the country. This appears to be a logical and reasonable approach to the problem and one which is certainly in the best interests of the United States.

We trust that you will accept this communication in the cooperative and explanatory spirit in which it is forwarded to you as a matter of information concerning the security of our Nation.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. HARRISON, Jr.,
Major General, AGC, Massachusetts
National Guard, President.

Distribution Formula for Federal Aid for Fisheries and Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions recently adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to change the distribution formula for Federal aid for fisheries and game so as not to discriminate against large populations and limited land areas:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to change the distribution formula for Federal aid for fisheries and game so as not to discriminate against large populations and limited land areas

Whereas His Excellency, the Governor, in his annual message to the General Court on January 1, 1958, stated: "The present Federal formula for the distribution of Federal aid for fisheries and game discriminates against States with large populations and limited land areas. Massachusetts is one State so affected. This discrimination should be corrected"; and

Whereas the operation of the present formula is unfair to the 300,000 citizens in Massachusetts holding fish and game licenses: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending Federal aid in the Wildlife Restoration Act, Public Law 415, of the 75th Congress, and Federal aid in the Fish Restoration and Management Projects Act, Public Law 681, of the 81st Congress, by revising the distribution formulas to 60 percent on the basis of population and 40 percent on the basis of area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, March 31, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 2, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A Timely Editorial From the Schulenburg (Tex.) Sticker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there is a community called Schulenburg, located in Fayette County. It is an agricultural community. The people are descended from the finest kind of stock, many of them Americans from far back into colonial times, others from Germany and still others from Czechoslovakia. The latter 2 groups were particularly aware of the impact of the launching of the Russian sputnik last fall. Their fathers and their grandfathers could remember life in the old country with its constant threat of aggressor nations and its predominantly military character. Many of them had come to America to escape these very things and to them the sputnik was a far more real threat than it may have been to those of us who do not have such close ties with the old country.

The weekly newspaper in Schulenburg is called the Sticker. It is published by Mrs. Florence Bosl who maintains unusually close touch with the people whom she serves. Her reaction to the concern of her subscribers is reflected in a first-page editorial published in her issue of December 6, 1957. Incidentally this is the first time in the 64 years of the Sticker's life that the front page has been used for editorial purposes. The sentiments expressed are so fine that they bear reading by all the people of our country. With this in mind, I submit the text herewith and I recommend that every Member of Congress read it with care:

[From the Schulenburg Sticker, Fayette County, Tex., December 6, 1957]

Fellow Americans are we putting first things first?

Schulenburg is a community very much like many thousands of other communities in a country we proudly call, our United States. We are a people with faith in God, love for our families and friends, deep trust in our fellow men, respect for our laws, and courage to hold up our ideals for all the world to see.

What can harm a nation built on such a solid rock of basic values? Nothing unless—and here we pause and repeat—nothing unless we let ourselves lose sight of these basic values.

Bluntly, we will face the facts:

Russia is not stupid. She put her satellite in outer space to frighten us. She did not, and still does not, know how to bring it down. A top American scientist, Dr. Leslie A. Chambers made this statement to your Sticker editor in an exclusive interview in Fort Worth on November 23:

"We will put a satellite into outer space and bring it down. Our instruments will record the impressions made in outer space. Russia planned a clever stunt, one to create mass hysteria among Americans. If she succeeds, it will be because we let a satellite cloud our practical, down-to-earth reasoning."

Russia reasoned that a frightened United States would curtail normal living, become pessimistic, stop routine activities, in short, would go into a depression. She saw a way to scare us into business panic. Could she hear us talk hard times, a nation with abundant food, warm clothes, sacred houses of worship, good schools, and endless list of blessings, she would laugh to her communistic gods with glee.

She wants us to look with distrust at our Government. She wants us to criticize our leaders. She wants us to fight over internal issues. Yes, she even wants a small town like Schulenburg to quit trying to build a better community. In short, Russia wants most of all for us to become a dis-United States.

These are our basic values, hold them close to your heart: Faith in God, love for mankind, courage for today, hope for a peaceful tomorrow.

These are America's most valuable allies.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a recent release by George J. Burger, vice president, of the National Federation of Independent Business, with regard to tax relief for small business:

It is our belief when Members of Congress return from the Easter recess they will have heard from the grassroots. "When is the promised tax relief for small business going to take place?" said George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business.

He continued: "Small business is well aware of the pledges made to them in the presidential campaigns of 1952 and 1956 by both political parties. Small business is well aware that the overall financial position of our economy then was in a healthier state than now, but, notwithstanding, such pledges were made to small business and they must be fulfilled, or," he continued, "are these pledges merely forgotten mouthings?"

A justifiable demand for tax relief for small business is exemplified in a recent communication from a small business institution—typical of the run-of-the-mill problems—where they state:

"We are a copartnership employing 50 to 60 people. We purchased the business 12 years ago. What we bought was outmoded equipment which has all been replaced. To make payments on the equipment and pay income taxes has kept our working capital at a very low figure. Working capital has been our big problem.

"That machinery we purchased 8 to 10 years ago is going to have to be replaced. The replacement cost averages better than two times more than the original cost. We have not been able to accumulate adequate capital but, to stay in this competitive business, we must do something."

Burger concludes: "Congressional action—making good on these pledges of tax relief for small business—could result in stimulating our domestic economy through 4 million or more small businesses making capital investments for improvements, inventory, etc., and added employment which, in turn, could result in the spiral in our domestic economy heading toward an even keel, and the responsibility now rests with the Congress to act immediately on needed tax relief for small business."

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack at 30th Anniversary Banquet of Northeastern Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1958, the northeastern region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., held its 30th anniversary banquet, at which our friend and colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was honored for his distinguished service in the field of human relations.

I am pleased to include in my extension the remarks made on that occasion by Majority Leader MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK's remarks follow:

To be present as we are this evening, to meet and hear the principal speaker, Dr. Frank Graham, educator, statesman, diplomat, gentleman, and one of the greatest Americans of this challenging period, is an honor and treat in itself.

To be the recipient, as I am, of your great organization's award of this year is an additional honor, which Mrs. McCormack and I appreciate and will always treasure.

The fact that your organization without regard to religion, race or color, and dedicated to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation, feels that I merit this award brings a feeling of happiness to me that I find difficult to express in words. For Mrs. McCormack and myself I express our sincere thanks. And I am proud to say that the guidance and protection of Mrs. McCormack has been my constant inspiration.

While I am the recipient of this award and honor tonight, there is in it a transcendent significance far more profound than any glory that may accrue to me personally. It is the deeper implications of the purposes and objectives of your organization—its spiritual origin and beneficial results, and the atmosphere of nobility of mind created by those present that impresses and dominates my mind.

For brotherhood is at the very heart of the issues that divide the world.

If my life's work had been different and this award were given me for inventing and launching an American earth satellite that would recognize America as the leader in this field of research and technology, important as that would be, I would not treasure it as much as I do the honor I have just received. For is it not true that in the age in which we live, brotherhood must be equated with survival?

Coexistence, as advocated by international communism, is a subzero atmosphere.

It is an expediency to deceive, to subvert, to dominate, with resultant enslavement, persecution, imprisonment, and even death and martyrdom.

It is the nearest communism and the Kremlin can come in implementing its dishonest interpretation of peace.

For the alleged brotherhood preached for temporary purposes by the Communist world is based on hatred. And brotherhood cannot result where hatred exists, whether in the minds of peoples, or in the minds of individuals.

Brushing aside the honeyed by insincere utterances of the Communist world, what they are really saying is that we are to get along with them, under their terms and conditions, until the time has come, as Khrushchev says, when they will bury us.

For we live in a world where the Communist regime does not want to understand the rest of the world.

For those with the origin of hate are men who fear to be men, and prefer to be robots.

On the international level the problem with brotherhood is that just as it takes 2 or more to make a fight, so it takes 2 or more to make for brotherhood.

To Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, now Khrushchev, brotherhood lacks the note, the stomp, and the brutishness of the dictator and master, and was and is synonymous with decay, social and otherwise.

But if history has proven anything, it is that what they stood and now stand for, was compounded with fear, of the unconscious arrogance of an inferiority complex, and of a disturbed sense of insecurity.

For a moral voidness or a vacuum exists in their lives.

And history shows what happened to Hitler. And while the form was different, in substance, nazism was the same as communism.

And Stalin lies in his Moscow mausoleum denigrated as a military phoney, blackened as a coward, a murderer, and a maniac by the very accomplices and his group of world killers who now rule in his place.

And if they are wise they will take recourse to history and govern themselves accordingly.

For the forces of hate, hatred of God and neighbor, cannot overcome and defeat the forces of love, love of God and love of neighbor.

Such forces might temporarily gain an advantage—they might win battles in a cold or hot war, but where the forces of hate try to defeat those of love—they cannot win the war.

One of the great weaknesses of the Communist world is lack of faith, lack of understanding, lack of brotherhood, of the hate of its dictators.

And if our foreign policy is positive—and takes this into consideration—we can effectively capitalize the same.

For the desire for liberty—which is directly connected with faith and brotherhood, may be temporarily suppressed by a dictator—but never destroyed. For the inherent desire for liberty comes from God, Himself. And what God bestows, man cannot destroy.

Brotherhood is something that has to be fought for with reservoirs of human energy, patience, and wisdom, beyond anything imaginable by a mind charged with aggression and brutality, and a mind charged with hatred and greed.

Brotherhood exacts the noblest manifestation of the human spirit. It is enjoined in the old and new testaments of love of God and love of neighbor. For love of God and neighbor, with brotherhood as the immediate result, is the rock upon which Judeo-Christianity stands.

"And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Without confining myself to our country, it is, however, imperative that America be strong militarily and in our material resources and productive capacity.

We must utilize our brains and facilities, which we have, on a high decision making level, with the authority to carry out such decisions, so that even for a short period of time the Soviet Union may not have a decided advantage over us, when they can attack our targets and we cannot attack their targets.

For if that day should arrive they will probably offer us terms which if accepted would be capitulation on our part, and if we failed to accept, in my firm opinion, they would carry out a surprise attack.

With our avowed policy of nonaggression, which I do not completely agree with, it is imperative that our country always be in a position where we can, if attacked, retaliate and so so effectively and decisively.

For while the Communists hate and deny God, and as a result idealism does not exist in their minds, they cannot deny that the law of self-preservation applies to them as well as to others.

And if we keep strong militarily always having the power to retaliate, that power might be a deterrent to attack, and as time passes, out of evil might come good. But we cannot rely on that. While we can hope for the best, we must be prepared for the worst.

And the spirit of brotherhood must be strengthened, intensified, and broadened, not only here but abroad.

For brotherhood brushes aside misunderstanding—it brings about unity.

For we of America are not a race. We are a people, of all races, colors, and creeds. The areas of agreement are so wide there should be no bigots amongst us.

For lower than the lowest animal that roams the woods; meaner than the meanest animal, and more cruel than the cruelest animal is a human being who hates another, and particularly because of a difference of race, color, or creed.

For the animal does not know better. But the human being is gifted and endowed by God with a mind, with the power to think and reason, to resolve his or her reason into a will, and to exercize that will for good or for evil.

The advancement of brotherhood, in deeds as well as words, means a unified and strengthened America, better able to meet the challenge of today.

For the undeniable fact is that spiritual strength is necessary to ultimate victory.

And while we must be strong in this period of strain in things material, we must above all be strong spiritually. For spiritual strength is the reserve strength that could be the difference between victory and defeat.

And in your dedication to brotherhood and understanding your organization is playing an important part in the real strength of a nation, in this case our beloved country, its spiritual strength and unifying results.

It is with a spirit of humbleness that I accept the award you have conferred upon me, an award which Mrs. McCormack and I shall always treasure.

And in a broader sense, I am representing tonight men and women everywhere of good will.

City's Water Study Timely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and following up my extension of remarks on yesterday, I want to include an editorial which recently appeared in The Nashville Tennessean entitled, "City's Water Study Timely."

Water storage is becoming more and more necessary, and the additional water facilities which would be afforded by the construction of the Stewarts Ferry—Percy Priest—Dam would be most helpful in justifying this project from a cost standpoint.

I hope all of my colleagues will take time to read this very excellent editorial:

CITY'S WATER STUDY TIMELY

Nashville's request that Stewart's Ferry Dam be constructed on Stones River to afford the metropolitan area added water supply facilities could be helpful in justifying that important project from a cost standpoint.

But until the basic law for computing cost ratios on such projects is changed, Nashville's need unfortunately may not be counted unless the city stands ready to reimburse the Federal Government a sizable sum of money.

Water storage, a necessity in a Nation quickly coming to face water shortages, cannot be considered as a factor for justifying such projects as Stewart's Ferry under the present law unless a benefiting community is willing to pay for that part of the project.

An amendment to the basic law to include water shortage as a cost factor has been offered twice, but each time the legislation sent to President Eisenhower has been vetoed.

Actually, Stewart's Ferry project was not in the bill which the President vetoed since it has already been authorized, although it has not been justified costwise. But the water storage amendment was. When Mr. Eisenhower vetoed the bill this important amendment went down with the entire bill.

At this point, it is difficult to tell whether Congress will override the presidential veto. If it does, the water storage section of the bill is safe and advocates of Stewart's Ferry will have gained a major point. If the veto stands, however, it should be incumbent upon Congress promptly to rewrite the bill and get it into committee.

It is not known with certainty whether the President favors the water storage proposal but sooner or later, because of a growing water shortage, storage is going to be considered a cost factor on the asset side of the ledger.

When that time comes, it will be well that the Nashville water engineering study is already on hand, but the first job is getting approval by both Congress and the President of a bill which allows consideration of water storage.

On Hiring the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my unusual privilege to call your attention to an essay by a Granton, Wis., high school youth who had done some excellent work on this question of hiring the handicapped. Wayne S. Gardner, Route 1, Granton, is scheduled to receive a second-place award from the hands of President Dwight D. Eisenhower on May 8 for his excellent work in writing, How Hiring the Handicapped Helps You and Me.

Certainly it is going to be a high spot in the young life of this Wisconsin student to be honored by his President for putting into words some worthwhile thoughts on this subject. On behalf of his fellow residents of Wisconsin's ninth district I want to congratulate him and his English instructor, Mrs. Olivia Ruchaber.

While May 8 will represent a brief pinnacle of success in this young man's life it is also comforting to know this generation of high school students has young men capable of applying John Donne to modern life so precisely and who show such an astute grasp upon the importance of the individual.

He writes:

One of the greatest weapons in the cold war is the way this country bases its importance on the individual. Our Asian-African neighbors are weighing the attributes of a society that has a religion that recognizes the individual against a godless religion that debases mankind and enslaves the individual.

I am pleased to recommend to your attention this prize-winning essay:

HOW HIRING THE HANDICAPPED HELPS YOU AND ME

"No man is an iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the continent, a part of the maine: if a clod bee washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a promontorie were, as well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankinde: and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; It tolls for thee."—JOHN DONNE.

This view of humanity expressed by John Donne in the 16th century very well explains the purpose of this essay; how hiring the handicapped helps you and me. Living in a society based on the importance of the individual, as we do here in America, it concerns each of us to see that everyone has his God-given right to prove his merits. It is well to remember that all of us, although, perhaps not physically, are handicapped in one way or another. However, we are not deprived, because of our incapacities, of our rights of success in this world. We are still free to seek opportunity, free to face life's

challenges, free to face the world proudly with the security and satisfaction of having a good job. It is only when each person is considered on the basis of his abilities; not rejected because of his disabilities, that we can live to fulfill the heritage of our Nation. It is then that "every man is a peece of the continent, a part of the maine."

Hiring the handicapped helps you and me because it is helping the handicapped person. Giving the disabled worker employment in the proper place is healthy because it focuses attention on capacities, not incapacities. Pensions, aid, pity are all poor substitutes for a productive life. I. R. Freelander, the president of Come Play Products, tells how their first employee was a deaf mute from a State hospital, suffering from alcoholism. Given employment, he became foreman over three people within a year. Later he was released completely from the hospital and became subforeman over 12 people. Given a chance, he became a well-adjusted and productive member of society. He, like the "clod," could have been washed away by despair and we would be the losers. Think how this example could be multiplied by hundreds of rehabilitated handicapped workers.

Just as "a promontorie is the lesse when a clod bee washed away" so also is the employer the loser when the handicapped are not hired. According to employers who have hired partially disabled workers, they not only do work equal to their able-bodied friends, but in many cases do a superior job. This proves that being physically handicapped doesn't make one job handicapped. In many cases where people have lost a limb or sense, they have developed other senses to an above normal degree as in the case of Helen Keller. By using these people in jobs where they can use these well-developed senses, industry and trade can benefit from a maximum of skills. Maj. A. P. Seversky in his article, I Owe My Career To Losing a Leg, tells how he developed both mental and physical powers because of his handicap (he lost his leg in an airplane crash at the age of 21). He later learned to fly again and organized the Seversky Aircraft Corp., now known as the Republic Aviation Corp.

Hiring the handicapped helps the community. A community which hires the handicapped finds it to be good business because it takes names off the relief rolls and places them on the tax rolls. A physically disabled person without work often becomes despondent and is a more likely candidate for a mental institution. Aside from the added burden each such patient throws on the well members of society, there is also the very human urge you and I have to prevent such things from happening. "Any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankinde".

By giving the handicapped his rightful place in society the Nation as a whole is enriched. "No man is an Iland, entire of itselfe; every man is a peece of the Continent." Recent events in the world picture, sputnik, muttnik, show the need for us to conserve rather than waste any talent. Proper placement means the right man for the right job. The greatest harvest will be reaped only when we use the talents of all. We need a highly productive society to insure our democratic way of life. Statistics show that the handicapped worker has a higher production rate and a lower accident rate than the normal man working beside him. Hiring the handicapped helps the military potential because it builds the labor force of our country. "If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse as well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were".

One of the greatest weapons in the cold war is the way this country bases its importance on the individual. Our Asian-African neighbors are weighing the attributes of a society that has a religion that recognizes the individual against a Godless religion that debases mankind and enslaves the individual.

Dr. Howard Rusk tells how when he returned from a United Nations mission into Poland to set up a program for amputees, he felt it had been most successful because the Polish Minister of Labor had told him it had been a good mission, not only because they had learned much to help them with their amputees, but more than that, they had learned that people in America had problems in common with people in Poland.

Thus we find that hiring the handicapped helps you and me because by giving him his rightful place in society we find it builds the handicapped, serves as an asset to the employer, enriches the community, helps to build our country, breaks wider the crack in the Iron Curtain, makes us worthy of our American heritage because you, because I, because all of us are involved in mankind.

High Tariffs Would Bring Disaster to Whole World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Mr. Max Schafer in the Seaside Signal on the subject of Reciprocal Trade Versus High Tariffs:

HIGH TARIFFS WOULD BRING DISASTER TO WHOLE WORLD

When there is unemployment in the country there is an almost irresistible demand for high tariffs. That is as true today as it was in 1929 and 1930. It is to be hoped that we learned our lesson from those days and that the good sense of the American people will strike down any attempt on the part of vested interests for higher tariffs. Nothing but disaster would result from them.

To reivew a little history, the high-tariff advocates used the growing unemployment of 1929, which resulted from an inflationary spiral somewhat similar to that which has caused the present recession, to force the Hawley-Smoot tariff on the world. The result was worldwide retaliation and the virtual disappearance of trade between nations. We lost more than any other country because we have always sold to others more than we have bought from them.

The disastrous results of the Hawley-Smoot tariff were fantastic. First, of course, a recession which needed only a slight price adjustment to cure itself, became a depression, with 15 million unemployed at its peak. But that was just the beginning. The worldwide depression which followed the disruption of trade wa the direct cause of the Second World War, and out that war came the opportunity for the Communists to gain control of nearly half of the population of the world. We are still paying the piper in the cost of the cold war.

To increase tariffs at this time could be even more disastrous. For instance Japan is the principal target of the high-tariff people, in spite of the fact that Japan buys far more from the United States than she sells to us. To cut off her imports, which provide her with the money to buy the products of American labor and capital, would force her into the arms of Russia, and if we lose Japan as an ally we have lost the eastern Pacific, as all of the Far East would follow her into the Russian orbit.

If we force Europe out of our market, in spite of the fact that Europe buys more from us that she sells us, we will force all of Europe into an economic, if not a political alliance with Russia. We will destroy the system of alliances which we have so carefully, and at such expense, built up during the past 10 years. We will have isolated ourselves politically and economically, and we will have put these nations in a position in which they must look to Russia for their trade and welfare.

But that is far from all. We would, with high tariffs, turn the present mild recession into the same sort of a depression we experienced during the thrities. Several million Americans depend on foreign trade for their livelihood. Deprive them of that livelihood—and high tariffs would do just that—and we would have a growing depression which would eventually bring disaster to the whole world. Those who believe they would become beneficiaries of the tariffs would suffer along with everyone else.

The best thing that can be done today would be the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreement law sought by President Eisenhower. And the sooner the better. That is our best chance for increased employment in the future.

Education Is a Problem of the School and of the Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rosebud News, Rosebud, Falls County, Tex., of April 18, 1958:

EDUCATION IS A PROBLEM OF THE SCHOOL AND OF THE HOME

A year ago, if someone had asked you what Nation had the best system of education, no doubt you would have answered that we do, that the United States system is superior to all others.

But that was before sputnik, and before muttnik. It is popular today to answer that Russia has the best system of education if that question comes up for discussion. It is popular, but is it true?

Some searching questions have been asked about our system of education during the past few months. They are the questions that should have been asked years ago. They are questions that should be continually asked as the best thinkers ponder and think and try to come up with something that is an improvement over old methods, or now and then, something new.

More classrooms and more teachers is not the answer. It is probable that more classrooms are needed, and it is for sure that more teachers are needed in many places. But these can be had for a cash price, and we have the cash.

But cash alone is not enough. We have been stressing dollar values too much. A dollar mark cannot properly nor adequately price a child's future, nor a teacher's worth.

And teachers alone are not enough. Dollars can hire more teachers, but all the teachers in the world, yes all the good, fine, excellent teachers of sound, and tested, and approved methods, are not enough.

HOME IS FIRST SCHOOL

Some of the great values are taught only at home. Parents are the first teachers for

every child. The older children are the first teachers of the younger ones. Every observant grandparent watches with interest and satisfaction as he sees the younger do exactly what the older child does. This is a part of education. It is more difficult to observe that the child often does exactly what his parent does, because the parent is so often gone. Gone to work, to play, to party, to shop, to cook, to clean house, to visit neighbors, or to do something else with more or with lesser value as something to be taught to your very own pupils.

It is in the home that children first get their idea of what is right and what is wrong, what to laugh about, what to cry about. The ethics of the parents become the ethics of the children. This is the broad base of education, and it is the education that children get first.

This area, this time of life when the child is young and in his formative period, is the time and the place where success or failure; respect for excellence, respect for duly constituted authority, the desire for survival, or the inspiration for triumph is gained. It is during this time that good students are born. It is during this time that juvenile delinquents are born. Parents cannot escape the responsibility for either. Neither is a gift of God. Both are the result of what goes into the life and spirit of the youth from his first teachers, the persons he knows and learns from when he begins to learn.

A DUAL PROBLEM

Borrowing two statements from one of America's eminent educators we remember: "In school, the teachers can do a very great deal to teach our children that their own ideas are good and worth having and expressing, even in the face of disagreement."

"At home—it is in the home that children first learn what to want and respect, what is important, what trivial, what worthy to be admired, these are the roots of education."

"The imperative today, in my judgment, is that we reassert—so that every person in this country is not left in any doubt about it—every man and woman, every politician, yes, every teacher and every child—our conviction that the children's needs have first priority over all other civilian wants."

DISCIPLINE IS EDUCATION

A part of education is the discipline and the rigors by which it is gained. There ought to be a fuller realization that there is more to success than making money. There are achievements that have a greater value than dollars. To achieve is to accomplish something by overcoming difficulties by the use of skill, by perseverance. Athletic contests in schools help teach players that they must train, must strain, must persevere in order to be good enough to make the team.

The sudden surge toward scientific studies in America has been spurred on by events that have occurred lately in the space world. Such cause is temporary in its nature. When we have outdistanced our adversaries in achievements in the world of outer space there will be a tendency to let things slide again, slide back to the place where we again value everything in dollars instead of truer values.

EDUCATION IS POWER

Back in the days when chautauquas came to town I once heard a lecturer speak on the subject of power. He proved, among other things, that to have money was to have power, but in the climax he said and proved that education is power.

SOME DEFINITIONS

A synonym for education is discipline.

Education is the process of nourishing or physically rearing a child; the impartation or acquisition of knowledge, skill, or discipline of character. Training suggests exercise or practice to gain skill and endurance, facility; discipline, severe and systematic with a view to the right conduct, or prompt and effective action at the right time.

It is something that requires a continuing stimulus, not a temporary one. It starts in the home. It is continued in the public schools. It is furthered in the colleges. It is put to work and it is useful as long as we live. It is desirable for a full and complete life. It is not the answer to all the questions and all the problems, but it will help you cope with them. Right education is helpful to the individual mentally, physically, and morally. A man's education does not stop when he is awarded a diploma. It is just beginning, in a new school, the school of experience. It is an arduous task, but in the end it may not only help us to survive but also to triumph over the difficulties that beset us.

"Nature Irresistibly Wills That Right Shall at Last Prevail," Wrote Immanuel Kant of Königsberg—The Case for the German Expellees With Special Emphasis on the Sudeten German Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the birth of one of the world's greatest thinkers, the German philosopher, Immanuel Kent. Born on April 22, 1724, at Königsberg in Prussia, he studied, taught, and at the age of 80 died there, seldom leaving his hometown and never venturing beyond the confines of his home province. Yet, to this very day, his thoughts have stirred the minds of people all over the world so much so that in the wake of World War II a new crop of reprints and republications of, and reedited commentaries on, his famous essay, On Eternal Peace, has appeared.

During Kant's lifetime his friends used to gather at his birthday to do him honor and a curious custom grew up: To address so wise a friend on his birthday was a task that required preparation. Therefore, the birthday cake, which the well-wishers brought, contained a bean. Whoever drew the slice with the bean was the bean king and entrusted to prepare—next year's birthday speech. After Kant died, in 1804, his friends, forming a self-perpetuating group, continued the custom of meeting on his birthday and choosing the bean king in Königsberg until April 1945, and since then in Göttingen.

To me, the city of Kant still is Königsberg. That the Communists and their parrots should now call it Kaliningrad, is a blasphemy on civilization to which the free world cannot, and should not, reconcile itself.

Immanuel Kant was a patient and tireless student of the political systems which he then knew. His watchful and penetrating mind observed the political developments of his time and he maintained an impartial and enlightened attitude toward all political questions. It was with great reluctance that in his 77th year he felt it necessary to abandon the long cherished project of writing on a System of Politics toward which his tract, On Eternal Peace, was to be but a first stage.

The small tract, On Eternal Peace, which Kant wrote at the time of Washington's second administration looks rather inconspicuous when compared with the weighty volumes that modern publishing mills are grinding out by the score. Nonetheless, it may be fitting and proper to quote from that tract a few lines which may well serve to guide those who earnestly search for a genuine solution to the world's problems. These are the words of Immanuel Kant:

Act so that thou canst will that thy maxim shall become a universal law.

Right must never be compromised to a line of policy, but policy always be subordinated to right. Woe to him who adopts a line of policy other than that which holds sacred the rule of justice.

A true policy, therefore, cannot advance a step without first paying homage to the moral law; and, although politics taken by itself is a difficult art, yet its union with morals removes it from the difficulties of art. For this combination of them cuts in two the knots which politics alone cannot untie whenever the two come into conflict with each other.

The rights of men must be held sacred, however great may be the sacrifice which the maintenance of them lays upon the governing power. We cannot divide right into halves, or devise a modified condition of right intermediate between justice and expediency. Rather must all politics bow the knee before the principle of right.

Nothing is more infuriating than an act of injustice. All other wrongs which we may suffer do not compare with it. No conclusion of peace shall be regarded as such, when it has been made with the mental reservation of conflict matter for a future war.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps few people in the world today are more firmly united in opposing communism than are the 16 million Germans expelled from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, the Sudetenland, and other parts of Europe. These sturdy people, outnumbering the total population of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark combined, experienced in 1945 the full impact of the Red invasion of their ancient homelands. Their expulsion to Western Germany resulted in the tragic death of more than 3 million of their number.

In the struggle against the Red octopus of Communist imperialism of the free peoples the Germans, because of their geographic location, play a notable role. No wonder that, when other plans miscarried, the Kremlin rulers launched the Polish Rapacki plan with the obvious intent to neutralize and immobilize West Germany. Removal from the society of free nations of the Germans surely remains to be a major policy objective of the Communists. It should not go unnoticed that this plan also wants to neutralize, that is to freeze, most of those parts of Europe which were eased into communism by the expulsion of the Germans, besides neutralizing West Germany where these expellees are now living.

There can be little doubt that the expulsion 13 years ago from their home-

lands, the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, the Sudetenland, and other regions of central and east Europe, of a considerable part of the German people has greatly helped bringing about the communization of these areas of the European Continent. Mr. Speaker, the Kersten report—House Report No. 2684, 83d Congress, 2d session—of the Special House Committee on Communist Aggression, in 1954, has given an account of Czechoslovakia's communization. I like to add to this excellent report by pointing to the important part—perhaps hitherto not fully recognized in its true proportion—which the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans had in bringing about the communization of that country.

Among the 16 million German expellees, mentioned before, were 3.3 million Sudeten Germans, the latter group equal in size to the total population of either Eire or Norway. They were expelled in 1945 and 1946 from their ancient homeland by the Communist-led Czechoslovak Government of the so-called national front. About 300,000 of them died during the process of expulsion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish here to emphasize once more that the expulsions of all these Germans established a wrong. They constituted a flagrant violation of the rules of international law, of the laws of humanity, of the basic principles of international morality and, thus, actually served the cause of Communist imperialism.

Then, as you may recall, 10 years ago, an out and out Communist regime took over in Czechoslovakia. That sad event in February 1948, shocked the free peoples throughout the world. However, Communist control had already asserted itself in 1945, when the Sudetan Germans were expelled. What we witnessed in 1948 was merely the shrewd legalization of a system illegally foisted upon the people in 1945.

When speaking of the Sudetenland, I refer to the territory comprising the border regions of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, that is, the border regions of the western part of present-day Czechoslovakia. In 1921, 3.2 million Sudeten Germans and 6.8 million Czechs were living in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia while, in 1935, the figures showed 3.3 million Sudeten Germans and 7.4 million Czechs.

As a political entity, a state, Czechoslovakia does not antedate the year of 1918 when Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia with its Czech and German population were combined with Slovakia, the latter comprising 2.3 million Slovaks and 692,000 Magyars, and with Carpathian Ruthenia inhabited by 549,000 Ruthenians. Nevertheless, Czechs and Germans have been living side by side in those first-named regions for nearly a thousand years. About one-third of the Czechs today have German family names while a great many Sudeten Germans have Czech names.

HISTORICAL SURVEY: (1) EARLY HISTORY

In order to get a clear picture of the whole case it will be helpful to start with a historical survey showing the background of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. Germanic tribes, namely the Marcomani, Quadii and Langobardi inhabited, exclusively, these provinces between the 1st and 6th centuries after Christ. It was not until the sixth century that Czech Slavic tribes came in from the east and settled in the interior area of these provinces among the remnants of the Germanic tribes most of whom had left. The border region, the later Sudetenland, was mainly primeval forest, sparsely inhabited and not settled by the Czechs. The sixth century then saw the invasion of Europe by the Asiatic Huns and Avars. The Slavs were liberated from the rule of the Avars with the help of a German chieftain, Samo, who later became their first duke.

In 845 A. D. 14 chieftains of Czech tribes came to Regensburg, Germany, and accepted the Christian faith. Since these early beginnings, Czech-German relations have been distinctly friendly, perhaps interrupted for only a brief period by the Hussite wars, those religious quarrels in the 15th century. Bohemian dukes intermarried with German princely families. Bohemia itself became a fief of the German empire or, stating the full title, the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation. Bohemian dukes, since 1198 kings, received their title from the German emperor; but they themselves were electors of the empire choosing at the death of an emperor the successor to the crown.

From the 12th century on, Bohemian dukes and lords began to welcome to Bohemia and Moravia German settlers who cleared the primeval forest of the sparsely inhabited border region, cultivating the new soil and developing the area that later became known as Sudetenland. Other Germans were welcomed to other parts of Bohemia and Moravia where they founded towns and, at an early date, began mining activities. Most towns in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia have a German background. The Germans brought with them the great municipal codes of Magdeburg and Nuremberg; they cultivated crafts and trades. In 973, the first German bishopric was established in Prague and in the 14th century, during the reign of the German emperor, Charles IV, was raised to an archbishopric. Charles IV was, at the same time, king of Bohemia. He resided in Prague, spoke German as well as Czech, and was acclaimed by both peoples "father of the country." In 1348 Charles IV established at Prague the first university in Central Europe and decreed it to be a study center for scholars of all nations of his realm.

HISTORICAL SURVEY: (2) DURING THE CENTURIES OF THE HAPSBURG DYNASTY

When in 1526 a Hapsburg prince succeeded to the Bohemian throne, Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia became part of the Hapsburg domain, but continued to be an integral part of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation until its end in 1806. The Hapsburg dynasty reigned there for nearly four centuries. In the early years of the 17th century, the German emperor, then Rudolf II of Hapsburg, again resided at Prague in the Hradschin castle. In 1649, however, the Imperial Court was moved to Vienna and the latter, owing to its more central location, then became the residence of the emperors.

Individual nations within the Hapsburg realm enjoyed considerable prosperity in trade and commerce and there was much intermarriage among the various peoples. Though both languages, Czech and German, were used in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, Emperor Josef II decreed in 1784 that German be the official language in his domain which, at that time, included Belgium and Italy. It provoked opposition and was not long upheld; from 1790 on, German and Czech continued to be used side by side in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. By a ruling, in 1880, of the then Austrian Minister of Education, Julius von Stremayr, it was expressly stated that both tongues were the official languages in that area. This was reaffirmed by Count Kasimir Badeni, the Austrian Prime Minister in the late 1890's.

From the beginning of Austrian constitutionalism in 1860 to the end of the Dual Monarchy in 1918, the Czechs were represented in the imperial parliament at Vienna by their own deputies and were free to use their own language, build their own schools and establish other institutions of learning. Besides, in the provincial legislatures of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia the Czechs had a majority and often outvoted the Sudeten Germans. At Prague in the governor's office, which at that time may have been more important than the ministry of interior at Vienna, Czechs held many influential positions. Provincial administration of schools, agriculture, and welfare was properly apportioned to both nationalities.

However, the 18th and 19th centuries had seen the rise in Europe of nationalism. Johann Gottfried Herder, born in 1744 in Mohrungen, East Prussia, became the great philosopher propounding his ideal of an enlightened humanitarian nationalism. Oddly he found the most ardent disciples among Slavic intellectuals. His ideas served as a guiding light for Czech nationalism which, thoroughly roused in 1848, then took a Pan-Slavic direction. This was manifestly evident in 1849 during the first Pan-Slavic Congress at Prague when the Russian anarchist, Mikhail Bakunin, as if in anticipation of what was to happen there a century later, played a leading role. Into the concept of the national state the Czechs introduced a dangerous element of their own. They began to mistake the Bohemian kingship for a Czech national kingship and the Bohemians for Czechs, claiming the country altogether for themselves and regarding Sudeten Germans as a minority of aliens.

In 1867, the Austrian empire was reorganized into the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary and the Magyars thereby obtained a status equal to the Germans. People of Slavic nationalities then tried to have this arrangement widened into a triple monarchy by establishing under the Hapsburg crown an autonomous state of Bohemia. Because of Hungarian opposition the plan failed. Czech refusal to guarantee as a precondition to the Sudeten Germans the right of self-administration contributed to the failure.

HISTORICAL SURVEY: (3) THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

Led by T. G. Masaryk and Eduard Beneš, Czech politicians saw in World War I the opportunity for their people to secede from the Hapsburg empire and set up an independent republic. Promising the Slovaks full autonomy, Masaryk persuaded them to join the Czechs in forming one state when he concluded with the Slovak League of America the Pittsburgh Agreement of May 30, 1918. The new Czechoslovak Republic then came into being on October 28, 1918.

At that hour the Sudeten Germans, on their part, decided to establish the provinces of German-Bohemia and Sudetenland, and to associate these with the new Republic of Austria. Head of the provincial government at Prague was at the time Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen. He is today the president of the National Union of Sudeten German Expellees and a co-chairman of the Sudeten German Council. Dr. von Lodgman had long urged a solution of the problem of Austria-Hungary on lines of federalism. He advocated freedom—his ancestors had fled England at the time of Elizabeth I in search of freedom—and he stood for the right to self-determination. But in spite of the fact that Austria-Hungary was ostensibly dismembered so as to realize that right, firmly proclaimed by our President Woodrow Wilson, it was squarely refused to the 3.2 million Sudeten Germans who were forced against their will to be part of the new Czechoslovak Republic.

To subdue the demands of the people, the Czechs even dispatched troops to the Sudetenland and when, in March 1919, there were public demonstrations the Czech military fired into the crowds causing many casualties. Leading the resistance movement in those days was Josef Seliger, chairman of the Sudeten German Social Democratic Party.

Headed by Dr. Beneš, the Czech delegation to the Paris Peace Conference did not shrink away from using such tricks as presenting maps showing a Sudeten German area falsely reduced. The deceit was later contradicted even by the official Czechoslovak census figure. In an oral statement to the Big Four, Beneš admitted that the Sudeten Germans, if given a free choice, would probably secede from the new republic. To compensate for denying them the right to self-determination Beneš, in a written memorandum to the peace conference, went on record in favor of a Swiss type of constitution for Czechoslovakia. It remained an empty promise.

Dr. von Lodgman and the Slovak spokesman, Msgr. Andrew Hlinka, as well as leaders of the Magyars in Czechoslovakia also managed to go to Paris to attend the Peace Conference. But they were kept in their hotels behind barbed wire and were not given a hearing.

THE PROPHETIC WARNING OF A TRUE AMERICAN

Today we recall that it was a man representing the United States who objected to the flagrant violation of the right to self-determination in the specific instance of the Sudeten Germans. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a sense of gratification to remind the Members of this House of that great citizen of our country and to quote his prophetic words. I refer to Prof. Archibald Cary Coolidge, the well-known Harvard historian. In December 1918, he was appointed by the Secretary of State to be political observer in Austria-Hungary, assigned to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace and instructed to head a field mission to the former dual monarchy. Professor Coolidge incidentally is a founder-member of the New York Council in Foreign Relations and served as first editor of its quarterly, Foreign Affairs.

Reporting to the Commission from Vienna on January 12, 1919, Dr. Coolidge wrote:

> The great argument on which the Germans of Austria and Bohemia rest their case is, as they are never tired of repeating, the principle of self-determination. * * * When after the cessation of hostilities the Czechs, instead of disarming, called their men to the colors and occupied the German parts of Bohemia, people in those regions were inclined to resist by force. The government of Vienna, however, forbade all such resistance, declaring that the matter could be settled only by the Peace Conference in Paris, and that the Germans of Austria and Bohemia should peaceably await its decision trusting to the justice of their case. * * * To tear away some three millions of Germans from their fellows and to unite them against their wills to a Czechish population of barely double their numbers would not only be a most flagrant violation of the principles which the Allies and especially the United States have proclaimed as their own and which have been accepted by Austria, but would utterly destroy any hope of a lasting peace. * * *
>
> A decision which shall place one-third of them under the heel of a foreign people who have already begun to take steps to denationalize them will mean and end to any hope of a permanent peace in this part of the world. Sooner or later the question must and will come up again, and in the meantime the Balkanization of the former territories of Austria will be a source of woe and peril, not only to the territories themselves but to the rest of the world. In the eyes of the German Austrians today the issue is a clear one between the new doctrine of self-determination from which so much is hoped and naked imperialism of the old discredited type.

Dr. A. C. Coolidge summed up his observations in a detailed memorandum of March 10, 1919, which he submitted to the Peace Commission. He dealt with the problem of nationalities and new boundaries in all parts of the former Hapsburg monarchy and set out stating:

> The opinions which I shall now venture to submit represent in many cases ideas of long standing confirmed or modified by unusual opportunities of observation in the last few months. I shall merely state my conclusions with but a few words of explanation, as it would take far too long to attempt anything like adequate treatment of the various questions. * * *
>
> To grant to the Czechoslovaks all the territory they demand would be not only an injustice to millions of people unwilling to come under Czech rule, but it would also be dangerous and perhaps fatal to the future of the new state. * * * The bloodshed on March 3 when Czech soldiers in several towns fired on German crowds * * * was shed in a manner that is not easily forgiven. * * * For the Bohemia of the future to contain within its limits great numbers of deeply discontented inhabitants * * * will be a perilous experiment and one which can hardly promise success in the long run. * * * I am aware that political and other considerations at the present time may make it impossible for our Commission to support all of the solutions I have advocated. Nevertheless, I am presenting them as those which seem to me best in themselves.

Three weeks later, on April 1, 1919, the Sudeten German question was taken up at a Peace Conference meeting discussing the report of the Czechoslovak Commission on the frontiers between Czechoslovakia and Germany. It was at this meeting when our Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, objected to including into the Czechoslovak State large Sudeten German areas and declaring that—

> The American delegates objected to the whole method of drawing frontier lines on strategic principles.

And that—

> The fixing of frontier lines with a view to their military strength * * * was directly contrary to the whole spirit * * * of the policy of the United States as set forth in the declarations of President Wilson.

M. Laroche of the French delegation, upon being asked at this meeting whether the commission would approve of a plebiscite in the area, replied that a plebiscite could not be proposed without extending it to the remainder of the German Bohemians, which would reduce the Czechoslovak state to very slender proportions. Mr. Lansing thereupon plainly said that this was not a good reason to justify an injustice. However, the views of the French Foreign Minister prevailed, namely, to strengthen Czechoslovakia, which M. Pichon trusted "would remain an ally of France" as against Germany which, as far as the French Foreign Minister was concerned, still remained a country to be feared.

The clear analysis given of the situation in the reports of Archibald C. Coolidge and the correct attitude of Robert Lansing will remind us of the equally prophetic warning issued at about the same time by the South African statesman, Gen. Jan Smuts, and dealing with the injustice about to be done to the Germans in Prussia by turning over some of their homeland to the Poles:

> I think we are building a house of sand. * * * I shudder to think of its ultimate effect.

Mr. Speaker, these warnings should be remembered today by those who may tend to place again expediency above right and justice.

The United States, however, then began to withdraw from the scene of European political intrigues. The constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic was devised by a mostly Czech commission and not by a duly elected convention. Czech became the official language. The Sudeten Germans were not given a fair chance to participate. The facts of the undemocratic beginnings of Czechoslovakia should not be overlooked.

The Czech land reform law of 1919 allotted 2,025,400 acres of German property in the Sudetenland to proteges of the Czech political parties. Only 7 percent of the land taken from Sudeten German owners was given to Sudeten German farmers, while 93 percent was handed over to new Czech settlers. In addition, land property expropriated in

the central parts of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, that is, outside of the Sudetenland, amounting to another 3,818,064 acres and owned by Germans, was also handed over to the Czechs. In the Sudetenland proper, 31 percent of the entire land area was confiscated in 1919. The Czech colonists were settled and Czech schools were built with the aim to break up the German language area.

Although the Sudeten Germans represented about 30 percent of the total population of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, they made up only 10 percent of the employees of the general civil service, 13.1 percent of the postal service, 12.8 percent of the judicial administration service, 12.4 percent of the railway employees, and only 5.4 percent of the army officer corps. The police force was almost exclusively Czech. Administrative reforms in 1927 must also be regarded as discriminatory, though a smoothly working publicity machine was able to show the outside world the picture of what appeared to be a democracy.

In the 1920 parliamentary elections the Sudeten German parties won 74 out of the 300 available seats. Some of these parties, the so-called Activists, entered the government coalition and, since 1926, most political parties of the Sudeten Germans participated in the government coalition, thus showing their honest desire to cooperate. But they were unable to gain any ground toward reforms on federative lines. Even a late-in-the-day palliative assurance of more posts to be assigned to Sudeten German civil servants remained an empty promise.

Upon being nominated ministers in the Czechoslovak Government, two Sudeten German politicians, Mr. Spina, of the Farmers Party, and Mr. Mayr-Hartig, of the Christian Social Party, accepted the call, but declared that Sudeten German representation in the Prague government was not to be interpreted as a solution of the nationalities problem of Czechoslovakia. They then requested Czech agreement to basic reforms and recognition of minority rights by allowing to bring the issue before the League of Nations. Their efforts failed.

The worldwide economic crisis at the end of the 1920's imposed a heavy burden on the Sudeten Germans. Czech bankers and administrators gave preference to Czech enterprises. Out of 800,000 unemployed 500,000 were Sudeten Germans. Little wonder that they began looking more and more for support from abroad.

In 1935, the Sudeten German Party, a union of a number of political groups, polled 1,249,530 votes and thus emerged as the largest political party in all of Czechoslovakia, but was forced to remain in opposition. Early in 1937, several younger members of those German parties that participated in the government coalition made once more a concerted effort to convince the Czechs of the urgency of thoroughgoing reforms. Hans Schutz, of the Christian Social Party, sternly demanded equal rights, while Wenzel Jaksch, of the Social Democratic Party, bluntly asked whether or not there was still a place in the Czechoslovak Republic for genuine Sudeten German partnership. Incidentally, both men are today distinguished members of the German Bundestag, the former also a cochairman of the Sudeten German Council. Though these parties, until 1935, had held about 75 percent of the Sudeten German share of seats in the Prague Parliament, the Benes government refused to make any concession.

Now the British became increasingly concerned about this situation in Czechoslovakia. In the growing crisis of 1938 Lord Runciman was chosen to head a mission of mediation and, after a close study on the ground, he reported:

> It is hard to be ruled by an alien race. * * * In the last elections in 1935 the Sudeten German Party polled more votes than any other single party. * * * But they can always be outvoted; and consequently some of them feel that constitutional action is useless for them. * * * Even as late as the time of my mission, I could find no readiness on the part of the Czechoslovak Government to remedy (the complaints) on anything like an adequate scale. * * * Just as it is essential for the international position of Switzerland that her policy should be entirely neutral, so an analogous policy is necessary for Czechoslovakia—not only for her own future existence but for the peace of Europe.

However, Czechoslovakia refused to admit its multinational status and did not strive for a position of neutrality. In spite of its vulnerability because of the large percentage of citizens of non-Czech nationality it allowed itself to be used as a political pawn, and since the treaty in 1935 with the Soviet Union, increasingly as a pawn in the hands of the Kremlin, thereby causing its own gradual disintegration. The case was correctly diagnosed in the Kersten report—page 18:

> Fateful for the people was the fact that they were misinformed by many fellow traveling intellectuals, by means of newspapers, books, and through all mediums of communication as to the real nature of communism, cleverly described for years even prior to World War II as undergoing an evolution toward a democratic humanitarian ideology.

The Kersten report correctly also points to the Slovaks as being thoroughly dissatisfied. The Prague government treated them in much the same way as the Sudeten Germans. About half of Czechoslovakia's total population was tired of being bossed by the 7.4 million Czechs. No wonder that the foundation of the republic began to crumble, when the Anglo-French démarche of September 21, 1938, demanded the cession to Germany of the Sudeten region. It was soon followed by demands of Poland and Hungary for the cession of areas inhabited by their conationals, 131,000 Poles and 692,000 Magyars, and finally by the declaration of independence of the 2.3 million Slovaks who sought recognition as a nation.

From the beginning the Czechs had been showing a lack of realism, a lack of willingness to plan, in good time, for constitutional reforms. If in the years after 1918 a Swiss solution had earnestly been sought, events might well have taken a different course. The word "Munich" has since been linked in our mind with a short-sighted, dangerous policy vis-à-vis an aggressive dictator. Surely the right to self-determination should not be exercised by employing violence which would only bring about new injustice. Nevertheless, the right to self-determination is today recognized as a canon of international law. A brief glance at the map of Asia and Africa will suffice to convince everybody of its potency and potentiality, of its full meaning in the realities of present-day world affairs.

As to Munich, it should be remembered that neither the Czechs nor the Sudeten Germans were partners to that agreement. It was made by the four European big powers. When Hitler, in 1939, under a flimsy pretext occupied the central area of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia he openly violated the right to an independent national life of the Czech people just as the Czechs, two decades before, had violated that same right of the Sudeten Germans. Thereafter, the Sudetenland was separated by state boundaries from the rest of Czechoslovakia.

To charge the Sudeten Germans with treason against the Czechoslovak Republic is beside the point, when the charge is made by the Czechs who themselves set the example. In opposing Austria-Hungary, Masaryk, Beneš, and their adherents had solicited during World War I the support of foreign governments and had organized thousands of Czech deserters from the Austrian Army to join Czech legions on the side of the Allies. It was hard to make Sudeten Germans later believe that as to their own case "sauce for the goose was not to be sauce for the gander." The expulsion of the Sudeten Germans cannot be based on treason allegedly committed by them against the Czechoslovak Republic nor upon the charge of association with Hitler's policy of suppressing the Czechs.

SUDETEN GERMAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Before going into the events leading up to the expulsion it seems appropriate to refer to some of the contributions which Sudeten Germans have made to western civilization. These contributions are truly a part of the history of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia and remain to this day an integral part of the picture of this area. It started, as we have seen, with the first traders and settlers, the founders of towns in the early Middle Ages. They brought Christianity and the culture of the West, the chivalry of medieval knighthood, the great legal codes of Magdeburg and Nuremberg, the sciences taught in schools. When the Hussite era temporarily interrupted this wholesome German influence it resulted in the decline of municipalities, of the liberties of its citizens and it brought about the rise of an oligarchic rule and a system of peasant bondage. During the 16th and 17th centuries Czechs and Sudeten Germans, united under the royal banner of Bohemia, fought side by side in defending European Christianity against

the Mohammedan Turks. It was in Prague where the new High German language was developed, the same in which Martin Luther wrote his translation of the Bible.

Present Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia publish quite an amount of propaganda material to have tourists visit the beautiful cities of Bohemia and Moravia. Yet they as well as their fellow travelers in the West painstakingly omit to mention how much of all this is principally the accomplishment of the same Sudeten Germans whose descendants they have cruelly expelled. They try to nationalize, ex post facto, the history of the land and where; in 1787 at Prague, Mozart's opera, Don Giovanni, was first performed; where, in 1823 at Marienbad, Goethe wrote his Marienbader Elegie; and where, in 1844 at Karlsbad and Marienbad, Richard Wagner composed Thannhäuser.

Here are some more of the facts: During the reign of Charles IV, Peter Parler built the famous St. Vitus Cathedral and gave to Prague an individuality of its own when he also built the Town Hall, the Charles Bridge and the castle of Karlstein. Many other fine Gothic buildings were erected by Germans. The picturesqueness of Bohemian cities which we find so charming owes much to the Baroque period. The list of artists and architects of that time includes: A. Leithner, Christoph and Ignaz Dientzenhofer, Santin Aichel, Ignaz Bayer, Peter Brandel, Reiner Mathias Braun, Hartmann Balthasar Neumann, F. Dietz, Fischer von Erlach, Lukas von Hildebrandt, Anton Zimmer, J. M. Lassler, Ferdinand Max and Johann Brokoff—all of them German; Franz M. Kanka, Jakob Blazejovsky and Karel Skreta were Czech; in addition there was 1 French and 6 Italian architects. Castles, churches, monasteries, and town houses in all of Bohemia and Moravia bear evidence that Sudeten Germans cannot now, ex post facto, be separated even from those parts of the country which were inhabited by the Czechs.

Natives of the Sudetenland who made their mark in history include: Albrecht von Wallenstein, who led the Imperial armies in the Thirty-Years War; Prince Schwarzenberg, the Austrian statesman of the Napoleonic era; Count Radetzky, the Austrian field marshal; Hans Kudlich, known for his part in the struggle to liberate the peasant from bondage; Gregor Mendel, founder of modern genetics and author of the Mendelian law; writers like Karl Postl, known in this country by his pen name of Charles Sealsfield, Maria Ebner-Eschenbach, Berta von Suttner, and Adalbert Stifter; Alois Senefelder, who invented the stone press; Joseph Ressel, who invented the ship screw; Mathias Schoenerer and Franz Josef Gersten, who built the first railway in Bohemia, and Anton von Gersten, who built the first railway in Russia; Johann Liebig and Johann Schicht, the industrialists, and Ferdinand Porsche, who constructed the Volkswagen; Johann Nepomuk and Clemens Maria Hofbauer, who were later canonized by the Catholic Church, and the late Cardinal Theodor Innitzer, of Vienna; the recent Austrian Presidents Karl Renner and Theodor Koerner as well as Adolf Schaerf, who occupies this high office now. We might add that the parents of the composer Franz Schubert came from the Sudetenland and that Archbishop Aloysius Muench, of Fargo, N. Dak., the papal nuntius in Germany, is of Sudeten German descent.

The following figures will illustrate the extent to which Sudeten Germans constituted an integral part of Czechoslovakia's economy. Their share of that country's various industries was as follows: Raw materials, 70 percent; coal mines, 66 percent; lignite mining, 80 percent; iron and steel foundries, 70 percent; sugar refineries, 58 percent; textile machinery factories, 80 percent; electrotechnical industry, 70 percent; porcelain and chinaware, 90 percent; glassworks, 80 percent; wool industry, 75 percent; textiles, 89 percent; silk factories, 100 percent; artificial silk, 80 percent; fringe and gimp industry, 100 percent; paper, 80 percent; chemicals, 70 percent; fertilizers, 60 percent; musical instruments, 90 percent.

In addition, Sudeten German farming and timberland property amounted to 11,095 square miles. Their property holdings had an estimated total value of $19.5 billion. This figure does not include the Sudeten German share of Czechoslovak state property, natural resources, art collections, libraries, the value of Sudeten German international firms. Numerous products, such as some of the beer—Pilsener and Budweiser are German, not Czech names—and the Gablonz glassware and custom jewelry industry, carrying the imprint "Made in Czechoslovakia" were distinctly Sudeten German. Then there is the good will of people seeking the cures in world-famous health resorts like Karlsbad, Marienbad, Franzensbad, St. Joachimsthal, and Teplitz-Schönau. Also, not included, is the value of the recently developed uranium mines of Joachimsthal. Incidentally, students of history will recall that our own dollar, by way of abbreviation, derived its name from the Joachimsthaler Gulden, a coin minted from silver that was mined near this town.

The Potsdam decisions, by removing what a diobolic Communist propaganda had portrayed as a troublesome minority and thereby furthering the establishment in that area of a Communist regime, actually cut Bohemia's links to the West reaching back over nine centuries and thus pushed that country into the lap of the Kremlin rulers. What has been through hundreds of years a vital part of Central Europe is now serving as an advance base of Soviet imperialism.

POLITICS DURING WORLD WAR II

Dr. Beneš unfortunately seems to have blamed the Sudeten Germans for his own shortcomings and considered them instrumental in his downfall in 1938. His mind was beclouded by Germanophobia. He did not seek a just and fair solution in his dealings with those Sudeten German politicians who were, like he himself, exiled by the Nazi regime and living in London during World War II. I refer to Wenzel Jaksch and Richard Reitzner, both of whom now are members of the German Bundestag.

According to his "Mémoires"—"Paměti"—published in Prague in 1947, this is what Beneš at a reception in London on January 7, 1942, told Wenzel Jaksch in an effort to have him agree to deportation from Czechoslovakia of all Sudeten Germans, excepting a limited number of anti-Fascists:

> During the social revolution which will certainly occur we shall have to rid our country of all the German bourgeoisie, the pan German intelligentsia and those workers who have turned Fascist. This would be the final solution and, so far as we are concerned, the only possible solution which we would be able to implement, namely combining our social revolution with the national revolution.
>
> I added to Jaksch and his friends: We must have the courage to speak about this openly; and especially you Social Democrats should have the courage to do so. This plan even contains an element of Marxism and Marxist dialectics in the revolutionary process which must inevitably accompany the changes in the social structure of the nation as an outcome of this great and worldwide catastrophe. After the First World War * * * I foretold that the German nationalist bourgeoisie in our country would some time in the future attempt a counter-revolution and that there would be no peace between us until this bourgeoisie was subjected to a similar revolution to that which the Czechs had gone through in past centures. Now, after the Second World War, this revolution is inevitable; and the entire nationalities problem in our country will be radically solved at the same time.

It is only fair to say that some Czech opposition was voiced against these plans, notably from army Gen. Lev Prchala.

It is rather unfortunate that Beneš apparently had no scruples as to how he would gain his end. For instance, in a conference on May 12, 1943, with President Roosevelt he asserted that the Russians were willing to agree to the transfer of the Sudeten Germans. Then, 17 days later, on May 29, Dr. Hubert Ripka explained to Mr. Bogomolov, the Soviet Ambassador in London, that the Americans had already agreed to the transfer, and that in these circumstances the Czechoslovak Government in Exile expected the Soviets to consent. On June 6, Ripka telephoned Beneš, who was at the time in the United States, that Soviet Russia had just agreed to the transfer—the same agreement which Beneš had used as a lever in his conference with President Roosevelt on May 12, 1943.

The Soviets were the first allies granting to the Czech Government in Exile de jure recognition. Against the advice of western statesmen Beneš went to Moscow and in 1943 signed a new treaty with the Soviet Government. Eager to show his ability of playing an important role in the arena of world politics he may have thought of himself as a man who would build the great bridge between the West and the East. As seen in retrospect, however, he seems to have been prior to the Tehran Conference more than perhaps any other person active in strengthening Roosevelt's ill-conceived

trust in Stalin. In this way, I regret to say, he certainly proved to be a valuable tool of the Kremlin.

Toward the end of World War II, Beneš returned to Prague by way of Moscow, accompanying the Red army, as it advanced from the east into Czechoslavakia, and himself being accompanied by a Czech Government group led by a Communist, Zdenek Fierlinger, who is today the President of the Czechoslovak Republic. At Košice in eastern Slovakia Beneš and his colleagues proclaimed on April 5, 1945, the so-called Košice program according to which the country for the time being was to be ruled by presidential decrees. The program was signed by: Zdenek Fierlinger, Josef David, Klement Gottwald, Viliam Široky—today the Prime Minister, Dr. Jan Šrámek, Jan Ursiny, Jan Masaryk—son of the first President of Czechoslovakia—Ludvik Svoboda, Dr. Hubert Ripka, Václav Nosek, Dr. Vavro Srobar, Dr. Zdenek Nejedlý, Dr. Jaroslav Stránský, Václav Kopecký, Bohumil Laušman, Julius Duriš, Dr. Jan Pietor, Antonin Hasal, Frantisek Hála, Dr. Jan Soltezs, Dr. Adolf Procházká, Václav Majer, Dr. Vladimir Clementis, Dr. Mikulaš Ferjencik, and Jan Lichner.

Czechoslovakia was now restored within the pre-Munich boundaries, except for Carpathian Ruthenia which the Soviets had seized and incorporated into the Soviet Ukraine, and which the new Czechoslovak Government then ceded to the Soviet Union. The Slovaks were once more subjected to Czech domination. The new government announced the formation of a so-called National Front, supposedly a coalition of the Communist Party and three parties willing to collaborate with them, that is, Social Democrats, National Socialists, and People's Party. All Czech political parties of the center and the right side were declared illegal, among them the National Democrats, the Artisans, and the Republican Agrarians, the latter being the biggest political party in pre-war Czechoslovakia. Their leaders and functionaries were jailed. All Slovak parties were likewise outlawed and, instead, new leftist parties such as the so-called Slovak Democratic Party and other puppet groups were artificially created. In this way, political parties were abolished which, before World War II had long represented the large majority of the non-Communist Czech and Slovak peoplies. In addition to these millions of Czechs and Slovaks all Sudeten Germans and Magyars were disfranchised. Only by applying this method of outlawing political opponents—exactly copying Hitler's procedure in Berlin in 1933—and of exploiting the prejudice of their willing collaborators, did the Communists succeed in 1946 to show up as the largest political party.

Now free elections, freedom of speech and press were abolished. Kangaroo courts, called people's courts were established in order to liquidate the opponents of Communism. So-called National Committees, fashioned after the Russian local "Soviets," were set up to take over the work of administrative offices. The economy was nationalized. While Benes himself assumed the office of President, Communists were appointed to key positions at all levels and, from the beginning, were in control of police, army and the state propaganda machine.

The non-Communist ministers collaborated at every turn and supported the Communist line. Since some of these people later escaped to the West it may be of interest to mention, in addition to those who signed the Košice program, some of the prominent politicians of the era of the so-called National Front: Dr. Peter Zenkl—Vice Premier, Dr. Jozef Lettrich—leader of the Red puppet Slovak Democratic Party who, after the 1946 elections when the Slovaks had failed to vote for the Communists, signed the agreement abolishing Slovakia's autonomy, Dr. Jan Papánek, Dr. Juraj Slavik, and František Němec—who represented as ambassadors abroad the Red regime of Prague, Ferdinand Peroutka—a Socialist journalist, and Milos Vanek—one of the original bosses of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

As the previously mentioned Kersten report—page 17—stated:

> It should be pointed out that the Communist advance in Czechoslovakia was greatly facilitated by the behavior of the non-Communist parties and their leaders. The signing of the Soviet-Czechoslovak Agreement of December 12, 1943, and especially the proclamation of the Kosice program of April 5, 1945, opened the door for an unreconstructed drive on the part of the Communists to seize full power in the country.

We know, however, that the so-called National Front represented merely a minority of the people. The last free election in Czechoslovakia returned a parliament of 300 deputies. Only 118 of them were of parties that later adhered to the so-called National Front. On the other hand, 107 deputies were of those Czech and Slovak parties that were declared illegal in 1945, while 75 deputies were of Sudeten German and Magyar parties.

THE REIGN OF TERROR—EXPULSION AND DECREES

A reign of terror began with the arrival of the Soviet Red army and the regime which was to become the government of the so-called National Front. One of the first administrative measures provided for the hasty construction of concentration camps into which tens of thousands of Sudeten Germans were driven. The late R. R. Stokes, a former British minister, has given a vivid description of conditions in those camps which he himself had visited. Beneš' inciting words, "Annihilate the Germans where you find them," broadcast from Košice, led to a wave of cruel murder. The bloody Sunday at Aussig in July 1945, the massacres in Saaz, Brüx and Landskron, the death march of Brünn are only some of those outrages for which the Czechoslovak government of that time will be held fully responsible.

The Sudeten Germans were outlawed. Before being expropriated their homes were open for pillage either under the pretext of a raid for hidden weapons or merely by groups of police guards or plain Czech plunderers. In some towns orders were issued that homes of Germans must not be locked. Strict curfew was imposed on them. They were forced to wear white badges so as to make them conspicuous. They were forbidden to use public conveyances and the sidewalks, visit restaurants, write letters, change places of residence. They were restricted for buying groceries and shopping in stores to certain hours of the day, and special ration cards discriminating against them were issued. Schools and kindergartens were closed to their children. Adult Germans were called up and transported to the interior of Bohemia to provide forced labor on farms, in mines, and industry, at first without pay, later at low wages that were seldom paid. Still worse was the treatment in prisons, where overcrowded cells, brutalities and disease, in addition to insufficient rations, increased the death toll.

Article XIII of the Potsdam Protocol outlined the procedure for what was then called the transfer of the German population from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. We know now that the Communists, by means of the expulsion, pursued the following objectives:

First. By eliminating the German element from the area, they wished to hasten the communization of those countries.

Second. In the depopulated regions, they wanted to introduce collective farms and state industrial enterprises fashioned after Russian Soviet examples before proceeding with those schemes on a general scale.

Third. The confiscated property was also to be used for bribery purposes, since destroying the sense of honesty turns people into more pliable tools of immoral communism.

Fourth. By inciting violence and acts of cruelty against the Germans, the Communists and their collaborators hoped to build up hatred between the Germans and these Slavic peoples so as to make the latter wholly dependent on the alliance with Communist Russia.

Fifth. The German expellees were to create social disorder and to be a hotbed of communism in overcrowded West Germany.

As to the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, it may safely be said that this was not a spontaneous reaction of the Czech people against the German occupation of their country, but an act planned by Czech politicians in exile and carried out by the government of the so-called National Front with all possible haste before the large majority of the Czech people would have second thoughts about it. Presidential decrees were supposed to give the proceedings a cloak of legality. Quotations from some of these decrees will point toward the responsibility of the government of this so-called National Front.

First. Constitutional decree of the President of the Republic of August 2, 1945:

ARTICLE 1

1. Czechoslovak citizens of German or Magyar nationality who acquired German or Magyar citizenship under the regulations of

the foreign occupational forces shall have lost their Czechoslovak citizenship by so doing.

2. The other Czechoslovak citizens of German or Magyar nationality shall lose their Czechoslovak citizenship on the day when this decree will come into force.

Signed by Beneš, Fierlinger, Masaryk, Nosek, Svoboda.

Second. Decree of the President of the Republic of October 25, 1945:

Any immovable and movable property shall be confiscated without any compensation to the benefit of the Czechoslovak Republic * * * which is * * * owned:

1. By German or Magyar legal persons; or

2. By natural persons of German or Magyar nationality.

Signed by the signers of the Košice program.

Third. Decree of the President of the Republic of January 21, 1946:

ARTICLE 1

1. With immediate effect and without compensation and for the purpose of the land reform such land property shall be confiscated as is owned by—

(a) all persons of German or Magyar nationality without regard to their citizenship.

Signed by Beneš, Fierlinger, Nosek, Dr. Srobar, Dr. Stránsky, Duris, Majer.

Fourth. Law of May 8, 1946, passed by the provisional National Assembly:

ARTICLE 1

Any act committed between September 30, 1938, and October 28, 1945, the object of which was to aid the struggle for liberty of the Czechs and Slovaks, or which represented due reprisals for actions of the occupation forces and their accomplices, is not illegal, even when such actions may otherwise be punishable by law.

Signed by Beneš, Fierlinger, Drtina, Svoboda.

The last mentioned parliamentary act, which I have added to the decrees, provided for a general amnesty for all crimes committed against Germans, Magyars, and anti-Communist Czechs and Slovaks and thus gave ex post facto a semblance of legality to the law of the jungle.

Though Czechoslovakia was practically controlled by the communists since 1945, the process of communization was completed when on February 25, 1948, the President of the Republic, Dr. Beneš, accepted the resignation of 12 non-Communist ministers of the Cabinet and appointed a new out and out Communist Cabinet, headed by Klement Gottwald, who had been the prime minister since 1946 and merely continued in office. Thus the process of communization was completed in an apparently legal way. In the National Assembly both Communists and non-Communists, 230 out of 300 deputies, voted for the new government on March 10, 1948. Beneš remained President of the Republic. The whole tragedy shows a striking similarity to Hitler's taking over in Germany 15 years earlier with old Hindenburg continuing in the presidency.

EXPULSION WAS A VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

The expulsion of the Sudeten Germans from the homes which they had inhabited for a thousand years violated the principle of the right to self-determination of peoples. We should remember that this right was solemnly proclaimed by our own President Woodrow Wilson, who in his Mount Vernon address of July 4, 1918, declared:

The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement or political relationship, must be upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the peoples immediately concerned.

It is well known that this Government has taken a prominent part in establishing this principle and in the development toward incorporating it in the law of nations. The expulsion of the Germans stands in direct contradiction to this great principle. I can here refer to a previous speech of mine in this House on May 16, 1957, wherein I have tried to show this Government's policy on the pertinent questions as it was clearly evolved during the last 4 decades to a point which should leave little room for doubt.

I might add that this Government was also strenuously opposed to arbitrary displacement of persons during both World Wars. We protested against the transfer during World War I of Belgian workers and condemned, as a grave violation of international law, the displacement during World War II of Poles and other peoples within the then Nazi orbit. We asserted the right to resettle in their home countries, of all displaced persons. As to our own fellow citizens of Japanese descent, temporarily displaced after Pearl Harbor from their homes near the Pacific Ocean, we reaffirmed by an act of Congress the right to their homes. Let me also point out that article 9 of the United Nations Human Rights Declaration of December 10, 1948, regards arbitrary expulsion as contrary to international law and states that "no one shall be subject to arbitrary exile."

Also relevant, it would seem to me, is the Convention on Genocide of December 11, 1946, which declares to be a crime, under international law, (a) killing members of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part. About 300,000 Sudeten Germans, that is, a considerable part of their total number, did not survive the removal from their ancient homeland, a fact which proves that they were victims of this crime.

Let me finally quote from the draft code, prepared in accordance with the resolution of November 21, 1947, of the United Nations General Assembly, to define "offenses against the peace and security of mankind" that would be "crimes under international law, for which the responsible individuals shall be punished." Article 2, paragraph 11, lists:

Inhuman acts such as murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, or persecutions, committed against any civilian population on social, political, racial, religious, or cultural grounds by the authorities of a state or by private individuals acting at the instigation or with the toleration of such authorities.

This adequately covers the expulsion of the Germans from Sudetenland as well as those from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, and from other parts of Eastern Europe, and proves it to be—let me here repeat the words of article 1 of the penal draft code—among the "crimes under international law, for which the responsible individuals shall be punished."

I may remind this House of the fact that the offenses against the peace and security of mankind were drawn up by a commission of legal experts upon the direction of the United Nations General Assembly to formulate the principles of international law recognized in the charter of the Nuremberg tribunal and in the judgment of the tribunal. The above-cited articles cannot be dismissed as mere suppositions and theories or as a mental exercise in hypotheses. Their contents have been confirmed by the series of death sentences pronounced on the war criminals, sentences which speak the grim language of fiat justitia. Justice does not know a double standard. Justice is indivisible. It is, in the words we read on the face of our Supreme Court Building, "Equal justice under the law."

VOICES RAISED AGAINST THE EXPULSION

Many courageous persons have raised their voice against the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans. Even at the heyday of the so-called National Front regime, Roszevac, a Catholic paper in Olmütz, dared to protest on October 31, 1945, against cruelties in internment camps and the rape of Sudeten Germen women; and in another newspaper, Obzory, Dr. Helena Kozeluhova, a journalist, objected to the cruelties of the expulsion. Of course, such voices were quickly suppressed and Dr. Kozeluhova, for instance, was forbidden to write another line—curiously by men who themselves are now in exile and professing to be anti-Communist.

Czechs and Slovaks of the political parties that were suppressed by the Communists undoubtedly disapproved of the expulsion. Many of them opposed it while in exile, among them Dr. Josef Cerny, a leader of the Agrarian Party and former Czechoslovak Minister; the Christian Democrats Josef Kalvoda and Simeon Ghelfand; Karel F. Stekr, the Artisan Party functionary and secretary general of the Union of Czechoslovak Industrialists in Exile; the former deputies, Dr. Bohdan Chudoba, Dr. Michael Zibrin and others of the National Democratic as well as other parties.

In 1945, the Czech National Committee in London under its chairman, Gen. Lev Prchala, issued a declaration denouncing the expulsion and condemning all acts of the so-called National Front regime as illegal and not binding upon the Czech people. A stand against the expulsion was also taken by most Slovak exiles such as the Slovak Liberation Committee, the Slovak National Council Abroad, the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia, and by that large organization of Americans of Slovak descent which, in 1918, signed the Pittsburgh agreement creating the Czechoslovak Republic.

In a speech before the National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent at Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1954, which was attended by 5 Members of the Senate and 26 Members of this House, the president of the Slovak League of America, Philip A. Hrobak, declared:

The Slovaks do not want, nor do they request, the Czechs to represent them in any field of human endeavor, whether cultural, political, or spiritual. And, of course, the Slovaks do not want to be credited with the criminal acts committed by the Communist-dominated National Front government of Dr. Eduard Benes and Clement Gottwald. The Slovak nation has nothing to do with the criminal expulsion of Germans and Magyars from Czechoslovakia, nor with the brutal persecution and suppression of religion and of all anti-Communist opposition in that hapless country (Cf., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1954; Mr. MUMMA, of Pennsylvania.)

The preparatory committee of the Ecumenical Council of Churches asked on February 23, 1946, for a review of the policy which expelled the Germans, and called article XIII of the Potsdam Agreement a challenge of the Christian conscience.

On November 6, 1946, the Catholic Bishops of America at their annual convention in Washington, D. C., declared:

By agreement among the victors millions of Germans, who for centuries have lived in Eastern Europe, are being forced from their homes, without resources, into the heart of Germany. * * * We boast of our democracy, but in this transplantation of peoples we have, perhaps unwittingly, allowed ourselves to be influenced by the herd theory of heartless totalitarian political philosophy.

Pope Pius XII, in his letter of March 1, 1948, to the German Catholic bishops expressed his wish that the expulsions be renounced.

POSITION TAKEN BY THE GERMAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

What, then, is the position taken by the German Federal Government with regard to the Sudeten German expulsion? With all votes except those of the Communist deputies, the German Bundestag on July 14, 1950, adopted the following resolution:

Subsequent to the abandonment of the territories east of the Oder-Neisse line, the fictitious government of the Russian occupied zone of Germany signed the Prague agreement on June 23, 1950, in which the illegal and inhuman expulsion of the Sudeten and Carpathian Germans is acknowledged as irrevocable, just, and final. On this occasion the German Bundestag declares once more that this fictitious government is not authorized, politically or morally, to speak for the whole German people or nation, not to sign any agreements whatsoever.

The Prague agreement is incompatible with the inalienable right of man to a homeland. Therefore, the German Bundestag solemnly protests against the abandonment of the right to a homeland for those Germans of Czechoslovakia, now under the protection of the German Federal Republic, and confirms the invalidity of the Prague agreement.

On the other hand, the German Bundestag appreciates the rejection by the High Commissioner of the Prague agreement. Moreover, it earnestly urges all free nations to work toward a peaceful solution in the true spirit of the Atlantic Charter which guarantees to the Germans, too, the natural rights of man.

The executive branch of the German Federal Government has also repeatedly stated its policy on the pertinent question of the expellees. Germany recognizes the boundaries of 1937. However, it also stands for the right of other expellees to return to their respective countries. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has made this clear in various messages to Sudeten German expellees. On Palm Sunday of 1955, Dr. Adenauer declared:

General human rights must, in the opinion of the Federal Government, also include the right to a homeland.

Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano, speaking for the German Federal Government, declared in the Bundestag on June 28, 1956:

The right to their homeland and to self-determination is the inalienable prerequisite for settling the fate of men and peoples living in exile or in bondage.

The Under Secretary of the German Foreign Office, Dr. Walter Hallstein, stated on September 28, 1956:

When furthering on an international level the right to a homeland on the basis of the right to self-determination, the Federal Government relies principally on the provisions of the Atlantic Charter of August 12, 1941, the Charter of the United Nations of July 26, 1945, the General Declaration of Human Rights of December 10, 1948, and the European Convention for Protection of Human Rights and Basic Freedoms of November 4, 1950, with its supplementary protocol of March 26, 1953, all of which have been formulated in the spirit of the above mentioned principle.

In a statement before the Bundestag in October, 1956, Under Secretary Hallstein added:

The Federal Government will at every suitable occasion point out to the nations concerned and to the world that the eleven million expellees now living in the Federal Republic, have never waived the claim to regain their homelands in justice, peace and freedom. Moreover, the Federal Government will call attention to the fact that this position is shared by the whole of the German nation.

ACTIVITIES OF, AND POSITION TAKEN BY, SUDETEN GERMAN EXPELLEES

Let us now take a look at the expelled Sudeten Germans. Where are they today? What is their life and work in the country where they have found a refuge? What are their political activities? What, in particular, is their position with regard to their Czech neighbors? Are they perhaps planning a bloody revenge for the long suffering they have had to endure?

There are Sudeten German expellees today in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany, in Austria, Great Britain, Sweden, the Argentine, Brazil, and the United States. But the great majority of them, more than 2 million, are living in West Germany. They have used their skill and industry in building up for themselves a new life in the West. They reopened markets which they had supplied at the time when their products bore the imprint "made in Czechoslovakia." They created new industrial enterprise and even built new towns, such as Neu-Gablonz in West Germany, thereby notably contributing to that country's present-day economy. Quite a few, however, particularly farmers, are still compelled to a dismal existence in West German refugee camps. Generally speaking, despite their tragic fate they went to work in a free and competitive economy and show no sign of turning toward communism.

To the contrary, because of their past experience with the Communists they are contributing to an understanding of the danger to free institutions by creeping and cryptic Communist subversion. Recognition in this respect should be given to Dr. Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Legislature and who is also secretary general of the Sudeten German Council, an organization of Sudeten German members of West German legislative bodies functioning under the joint chairmanship of the venerable Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen and two distinguished members of the Bundestag, Hans Schütz and Richard Reitzner. Their principal organization, however, is the National Union—Landsmannschaft—of Sudeten German Expellees, also headed by Dr. von Lodgman jointly with Dr. Hans Christoph Seebohm. The latter is Federal Minister of Transportation and as such a member of Chancellor Adenauer's cabinet. Sudeten Germans are taking an active part in the political life of West Germany and are serving in important posts in the legislative and executive branches on the federal as well as state—Land—level.

While the Sudeten Germans have stood up for the right to return to their ancient homeland, they have expressly renounced any thought of vengeance on the Czech people. They have given solemn notice of their firm stand on these two points. As early as 1949, a number of Sudeten German politicians including Dr. Walter Becher, Dr. Emil Franzel, Hans Schütz, Richard Reitzner, Wenzel Jaksch, Dr. Hermann Goetz, and Dr. Walter Zawadil had signed in Eichstätt, West Germany, a declaration stating:

The nations behind the Iron Curtain should be aware of the fact that the restoration of their own rights and their freedom is inseparably bound up with the recognition and realization of the right to their homelands of all expellees. In making this publicly known we do not wish to indict, collectively, the Czech and Polish nations. Sudeten Germans do not seek vengeance, but ask for justice. Though the overall recognition of right would require that legal measures be taken against criminal acts, we emphatically do not desire that fear of a collective revenge should impede the deliverance from Communist shackles of these unfortunate nations. We shall use the whole weight of influence with our own ethnic group as well as with other expellees to insure that the struggle for a return to our and their homelands will be part of the overall effort toward a Christian and humane rebirth of Europe.

Then on August 5, 1950, the chosen representatives of all German expellees, including the Sudeten Germans, signed at Stuttgart, West Germany, a solemn declaration which has become known as the Charter of the Expellees, and which is already being recognized as a great

human document. I should like to quote from it these passages:

We • • • renounce all thought of revenge and retaliation. This is a solemn and sacred resolution, in memory of the infinite suffering of mankind, particularly during the past decade. • • • To separate a man from his native land by force is to kill his soul. We have suffered and experienced this fate. We feel qualified, therefore, to demand that the right to the native land be recognized and that it be realized as one of the basic human rights, granted to man by the grace of God.

The expellees then publicly declared that they will support every endeavor toward a united Europe in which the peoples may live in freedom from fear and coercion. They called upon all nations and men of good will to join them in this great undertaking. Since then, the German expellees have persistently followed the policy to which their representatives had set hand and seal at Stuttgart in 1950. Rejecting Communist and neutralist temptations as well as appeals to narrow nationalism, they are, today, perhaps the most dedicated adherents of a united Europe.

But the Sudeten Germans did not rest their case with a solemn declaration of faith. They took practical steps toward an agreement, on the basis of mutual respect and a genuine search for a real solution, with their Czech and Slovak neighbors, now also in exile. In 1950, the Sudeten German Council concluded an agreement in London with the Czech National Committee, headed by Army General Lev Prchala. The agreement recognizes the right to self-determination of both nations, Czechs and Sudeten Germans.

Since then, satisfactory meetings were had, and encouraging steps taken toward cooperation, with leading members of the Republican Agrarian Party, largest political party in prewar Czechoslovakia; the Artisan Party; the Czechoslovak Industrialist Union in Exile; the Christian Democratic Movement in Exile; the National Democratic Party; and even with politicians, now in exile, who defected from the so-called National Front; leaders of the Slovak Liberation Committee; the Sovak National Council Abroad; the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia; and the Slovak League of America. Slovaks today are resolved that, unlike 1918, they shall not again compromise on the question of national independence. Their independence day is March 14, the day in 1939 when the Slovak Republic was established.

At a meeting held at Herrenchiemsee, West Germany, from May 24 to 26, 1956, Sudeten German members of the Bundestag declared in another statement that they will seek to realize the right to self-determination within the frame of a federated Europe and side by side with the Czech people.

Dr. Walter Becher recently submitted to me a statement from which I quote the following Sudeten German program:

The Sudeten Germans believe that for a future settlement of the problems of a free Central Europe certain basic principles of justice should be accepted as prerequisite. Accordingly they wish to advance the following aims which, in their belief, will guarantee freedom and justice to all nations of former Czechoslovakia: (1) Restoration of the status that existed prior to the Nazi and Communist interventions, including the restitution to Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Carpathian Ruthenians, and Sudeten Germans of property; the return to their homeland of those who have been expelled; restoration of freedom of speech, press, and elections, of an independent judiciary, of private property; in short, full political and economic freedom; (2) the unrestricted exercise for all nations of former Czechoslovakia of the right to self-determination.

It is hoped that aims such as these would tend to unify the nations of former Czechoslovakia and, moreover, inspire other captive peoples and their exiles in the common task of overcoming the forces of communism. Since the Communist doctrine aims to eradicate any thought of property rights, the captive peoples in the Soviet-dominated countries develop a general attitude of apathy and indifference toward their places of work, collectivized farms or state enterprises. The return of the German expellees and the restoration to them of their properties may therefore prove to be less difficult than is sometimes anticipated.

SUGGESTING A REALISTIC APPROACH TOWARD A SOLUTION

In closing, I should like to revert to the tenor of an earlier speech, made in this House on May 16, 1957, on the subject of the expellees from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers. The general line of thought which I had then developed may be equally relevant to the case before us today.

A realistic policy for Central as well as East Central Europe, that is, concerning Czechoslovakia and the Sudeten Germans, as well as concerning Poland, the Germans of East Prussia, and the other German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers can only be a policy that is both just and moral. It must be firmly based upon historical truth and the rule of international law. To assume that any government can ever develop a successful policy on the shaky structure of a wrong, and on perpetuating that wrong, is an illusion and, let me emphasize it with all solemnity, a dangerous illusion.

Moreover, a realistic policy for Central and East Central Europe must perforce take into consideration the magnitude of the Communist threat. It cannot but take an uncompromising stand against that threat. No one will deny that communism is an evil. To compromise with evil betrays weakness which is, at the same time, dangerous; for it encourages the forces of evil and allows them to become more firmly entrenched. A moral policy, refusing to compromise with evil, is thus the most realistic policy.

The case for the East Prussians, Pomeranians, Silesians, and others from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, and the case for the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia show, in some respects, common features; but they also show, in other respects, differences that should be clearly understood and pointed out to the people concerned so that the issues will not be confused by minds that are perhaps not given to legal thinking.

The East Prussians and other Germans from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line have been illegally expelled from an area which, by international agreement, has been certified as part of the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany. Their expulsion from this part of Germany is a criminal act in utter defiance of the rules of international law. Moreover, the purported annexation by the Soviet Union and Communist Poland of part of this Soviet-occupied zone of Germany is a flagrant violation of international law and is, therefore, null and void. So long as the German expellees from east of the Oder-Neisse line, and in fact, all Germans with the German Federal Government speaking on their behalf, do not renounce their inalienable right this area is part of Germany and will continue to be part of Germany, regardless of the jabbering to the contrary of a few muddle-headed individuals. Incidentally, students of linguistics may know that the verb jabber is also a German colloquialism of the East Prussians. It may have been introduced there by the English dissenters who found in East Prussia refuge from religious intolerance.

As to the Sudeten Germans, they also have been expelled from an area to which their ancestors had come, not as aggressors but as sturdy pioneers, eight centuries ago, and which they also have developed by their own skill and industry, by peaceful and patient labor to a high state of civilization. This fact cannot be disputed. Though the area was in pre-Hitler days part of the Czechoslovak Republic, the expulsion from their ancient homes of the Sudeten Germans was, as I have shown, a flagrant violation of the right to self-determination and, in its execution, a crime under international law. The Sudeten Germans continue, therefore, to have a valid legal title to their homes of which they were illegally deprived.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the German expellees should be encouraged to stand firm upon their right. It is in the best tradition of American foreign policy to denounce the wrong and to uphold the right. Moreover, wavering would be tantamount to further tightening the stranglehold on the captive peoples by the Kremlin and would thus actually support Soviet imperialism.

Just as the Soviets dangled before the dizzy eyes of the Poles the enticing bait of the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, so the Czechs were being dazzled by Kremlin stooges with the rich spoils in the Sudetenland. To the same degree that the Poles accepted the German provinces, and the Czechs accepted the Sudeten properties out of the bloody hands of Stalin, they both permitted themselves to be chained to Moscow. This has been the fateful and deadly but logical result. Both Czechs and Poles who think of keeping these spoils must continue to lean on Soviet Russian backing and thus render themselves subservient to the Kremlin.

Would the present regimes in Warsaw, and possibly also in Prague, like to assure the free world of a new trend

toward what some people in the West wishfully call independent communism? Very well, then they should unmistakably renounce any claim on an area, respectively, on properties to which they have neither legal nor moral title. Nothing less will and can convince the free world of their sincerity. Holding on to these spoils can only serve the purposes of the Kremlin and must logically subject them to a never-ending game of extortion. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the executive branch of this Government, in administering our foreign-aid program, keep this fact firmly in mind.

In proposing this realistic approach I am, as I believe all of us are, aware of the fact that this Nation of ours is the hope of the free world and of the captive peoples longing to be free. We should, therefore, never think of suggesting a solution which would jeopardize the principles of right and justice. Instead, we should insist with firmness and perseverance that a status conforming with international law be restored. This will provide the only realistic basis upon which to develop good German-Czech and good German-Polish relations and promote a climate conducive to the growth of a united Europe.

Mr. Speaker, today being the birthday anniversary of Immanuel Kant it may be fitting to end my remarks with yet another quotation from his essay, On Eternal Peace. Recalling to our mind the very memory of this, one of the world's greatest thinkers should make us feel uncomfortable in knowing that his home is now ravaged by the Communists, and it should make us resolve to insist that this wrong cannot last forever. As stated by Immanuel Kant:

> Moral evil has this quality inseparable from its nature that, in carrying out its purposes, it is antagonistic and destructive to itself, especially in relation to such others as are also under its sway; and hence it must give place to the moral principle of goodness, although the progress to this may be slow. * * *
>
> For the moral principle in man is never extinguished, and his reason, pragmatically trained to realize the ideas of right according to this principle, grows without ceasing through its constantly advancing culture, while the guilt of such transgressions also comes more clearly into light. * * *
>
> It may then be said that nature irresistibly wills that right shall at last obtain the supremacy.

Uncle Sam's Great Land Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of Man's Illustrated magazine. The letter was written by Edward Woozley, Director of the Bureau of Land Management. Mr. Woozley's letter is in response to an article which appeared in the May 1958 issue, entitled "Uncle Sam's Great Land Giveaway."

The newspaper article contained errors concerning policies established by the Congress for the wise use of our public lands and natural resources. Articles such as the one discussed by Mr. Woozley seek to subvert, knowingly or not, the basic principles of our public lands policies. These lands are managed by the Federal Government in the interest of the entire Nation—rather than for their exploitation by a few. Public lands are just that—they belong to the public and are to be used in the best interests of the public.

When a publication encourages the public to seek desirable sites solely for vacation retreats or a weekend paradise, it becomes a party to encouraging disregard for Federal law. The publication of this type of article reflects a complete lack of regard for principles. It is shoddy journalism.

Our public lands belong to the public and I for one shall do whatever I can to make sure they are handled for the benefit of the public. The public land laws have been tightened before because of disregard for the law. If is becomes necessary to tighten them still further I feel sure that will be accomplished.

Mr. Woozley's letter follows:

FROM A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF MAN'S ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE FROM THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON D. C., APRIL 4, 1958

In the May 1958 issue of Man's Illustrated you published an article, "Uncle Sam's Great Land Giveaway," by Stuart James. Though it is not our general practice to comment on articles published by private individuals and firms, this article is such a flagrant collection of misinformation and distortion that I am compelled to write you. As I am sure you would not intentionally publish articles deliberately designed to mislead the public, I am confident you will welcome these remarks. From the large number of people who have written us about this article, it is obvious that many people have been badly misinformed by it. We are, of course, obligated to tell these people the facts.

First, I should tell you that articles such as this—which propose to inform the public of ways to obtain free land from the Federal Government—are not new. All of them follow much the same pattern. The Bureau of Land Management welcomes writers and publishers who work to inform the public about their rights and privileges under the public land laws. However, we cannot condone articles which so clearly seek to distort and subvert the intent of law.

The fundamental idea behind this article—that Uncle Sam gives away land—is false. There are no free lands available from the Federal Government—not for any purpose. The author's own statement that it is necessary to perform $100 assessment work per year on mining claims refutes this notion. The minimum costs of obtaining fee simple ownership to a mining claim include (1) $500 in improvement work, plus (2) a $10 filing fee, plus (3) either $2.50 (placer claim) or $5 (lode claim) per acre, plus (4) other expenses varying from $100 to $1,500 per claim. These are minimum amounts and do not include larger investments in mining equipment and operations which miners may make.

There are also several other major issues raised by this article on which I must comment.

It is illegal for anyone to stake a mining claim on public lands of the United States for the sole and deliberate purpose of acquiring lands for a summer home or "weekend paradise." Mining claims may be staked on public lands only for the purpose of making an actual discovery of valuable minerals. If the Government determined that the person who staked the claim had not made a valid discovery of valuable minerals the claim would be canceled and he would then stand to lose all improvements (cabins, buildings, fences, roads, and so forth) that he had placed upon his "weekend paradise." In addition, anyone who stakes or occupies a mining claim for the recreational purposes mentioned by the author of this article is violating the United States mining laws and would be subject to legal action for trespass, and payment for unauthorized use or occupancy of the land.

The "department of natural resources," to which the author refers on several occasions, does not exist. The United States mining laws are administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the United States Department of the Interior.

There is no such thing as "Federal mining land," as described by the author of this article. The United States mining laws apply to much of the vacant and unappropriated public domain lands and to certain areas within existing withdrawals and reservations. These lands are never described as "Federal mining land," since no such category of Federal land exists.

Though part of the author's information on the procedures for staking and holding a mining claim is correct, he has failed to explain that it is not legal for anyone to hold or patent a mining claim that is tacitly occupied for nonmining purposes. The prime requirement for holding a mining claim is that an actual discovery of valuable mineral must be made. The mere fact that someone else had earlier staked the same claim is not proof that the claim is now valid. In fact, if a former claim had been abandoned, there may be strong evidence to suggest that it did not contain valuable minerals. Legitimate miners are not likely to abandon valuable ore deposits. Furthermore, it would not be legally possible for anyone to obtain patent to a mining claim unless there had been an actual valid discovery of valuable mineral in such quantity and quality to justify a prudent man to go to the expense of developing a paying mine. In short, the purpose of the mining laws is to encourage and facilitate mining.

Contrary to the statements of the author of this article, the Bureau of Land Management cannot and will not issue patent to a mining claim simply on the grounds that assessment work has been done and the lands have been surveyed. At the time patent is aplied for the Bureau makes a thorough mineral examination of the claim. Patent is only issued if there is clear evidence of actual valid discovery of valuable mineral. Such proof can hardly exist on claims established for the sole purpose of acquiring a cabin or cottage site.

Though there are many other points which could be raised about this article, it should not be necessary to recite them here. The most disturbing point is that it encourages other people to deliberately violate the law by staking or occupying mining claims on public lands for nonmining purposes. To do so is illegal, and does material disservice to programs for the proper use and development of the Nation's public lands and resources.

Of course, it is possible for legitimate miners and prospectors to stake and hold mining claims on public lands. But to use the mining laws as a means of acquiring and occupying public lands for nonmining purposes is a gross prostitution of the intent of Congress and of Federal land management agencies who are working for the conservation, wise use, and development of public lands and resources.

People who want to obtain small tracts of public land for recreation and residential purposes have an opportunity to do so under a law known as the Small Tract Act. This law authorizes the Government to sell or lease small tracts of vacant public land up to five acres for residential, recreation, and business purposes. This law does not apply to reserved lands, such as national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges. In recent years the Federal Government has leased or sold many such tracts to people who want to "get away from it all." This law is one of the means whereby people may do this; the mining laws are not.

The Small Tract Act was specifically designed to meet the needs of our Nation's growing population and furnish them a means for acquiring desirable sites for summer homes and other purposes. But these lands are not available everywhere and are not "free." Small tracts that are sold are generally sold through competitive bidding and cannot under any circumstance be sold at less than the appraised fair market value. Sometimes these lands are not expensive, but often they sell for many hundreds of dollars. In all cases, however, it is necessary for the Bureau of Land Management to classify the lands as best suited to that specific type of development. Many thousands of American citizens have acquired sites under the Small Tract Act. In all likelihood a citizen could obtain land under the Small Tract Act at less total expense than would be necessary to find and develop a mining claim.

I hope from this discussion you will understand the reasons for our concern about the content of this article. When people write us about acquiring "Federal mining land" as a "weekend paradise complete with trout stream" and so forth, we must reply to them with the same facts as are in this letter. I am sure that you will be pleased to have this information also.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD WOOZLEY, *Director.*

"E" for Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the Harney Electric Cooperative, in Harney County, Oreg., has been waging a fight to secure a power source from the Bonneville Power Administration. The cooperative has been beset with a great many problems in this endeavor, not the least of which has been a quite obvious lack of enthusiasm on the part of the BPA.

When one remembers the importance of power in the development of a sparsely settled region it is not difficult to understand how important this fight is for the Harney County area. As I have pointed out in a number of letters to Dr. William Pearl, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, I am most concerned over the continued failure of the BPA to approve the proposed powerline.

Recently an editorial was printed in the Daily Journal of Commerce, Portland, Oreg., concerning the excellent work being carried on by the Harney Electric Cooperative. I think it will be of interest to my colleagues and to all who are concerned over the failure of the president administration to provide low-cost power for rural America.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial as follows:

"E" FOR EFFORT

The Harney Electric Cooperative has made formal application to the Bonneville Power Administration for a powerline to be built from Redmond to Harney County.

A study has been completed by Robert Welty, consulting engineer, and the Harney Cooperative hopes this study will prove the feasibility of building the line.

The BPA can build the line only if it is proved to be justified. Yet one cannot help but feel sympathetic toward those persons in Harney County who have worked for many years in order to develop the high desert and marshlands which lie south of Burns.

This area south of Burns is surrounded by mountains or high hills and forms a pocket into which water drains, forming a reservoir. Most of the reservoir is underground, although at places it comes to the surface and forms marshes and lakes. Considerable work has been done to provide power into that area so that electricity can be used to pump water from deep wells tapping this underground reservoir, and use that water for irrigation.

Power, that ingredient which the Pacific Northwest relies upon so heavily, presents the problem. At present the co-op buys power from the Idaho Power Co. for about 9.6 mills per kilowatt, which makes irrigation very costly. In order to develop the basin it is felt Bonneville power, which would cost about 3.5 mills, must be obtained. To get this power the co-op must turn to the West.

Efforts to provide irrigation to develop this high basin have met with many difficulties. There have been doubts cast as to the value of the land, even with water. However, residents in Harney County do not share those doubts. They envision Harney County as a productive, green basin if power can be obtained at a cost which makes pumping feasible. Thus far they have made a determined effort to develop the area, and it is an effort which shows no sign of diminishing in spite of the difficulties encountered.

Oroville Mercury Questions Profits of Sacramento Municipal Utility District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in a concise editorial of February 22 entitled "City Making Money Wants More From United States," the Oroville Mercury takes a look at the annual report of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. SMUD's net revenues last year came to $4,748,000, by no means a peanut sum of money.

Yet, as the Mercury notes:

These are the people who are willing to see the Trinity powerplant operated by the Government at a loss if only Sacramento can be assured of ample cheap power.

For as the recent hearings on Trinity partnership legislation revealed, Federal Trinity power would cost the Government at least 7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour to produce, and the bulk of this power would be sold to SMUD at 4 mills. The Government would stand to lose millions under this kind of arrangement, millions which taxpayers throughout the country would have to make up.

As the Oroville Mercury adds in another Trinity partnership editorial of February 19:

Now no one can blame Sacramento for making a big try to get that cheap power, if it can, at the cost of the rest of us. But no one can blame us if we resist Sacramento's effort.

Another major group resisting the preference customer claims at Trinity is the California Farm Bureau, representing the largest group of organized farmers. Naturally, the farmer wants the Government to get maximum revenues from Trinity power to cut down his water costs. And traditionally, revenues from hydroelectric power have been used to help defray the expense of getting the water to our farmers. The partnership plan will bring in over $320 million in direct public benefits—$320 million in surplus revenues over any all-Federal operation. Nor does this include the $60 million in capital savings to the Government through private building of Trinity powerplants. Which power arrangement is really working for the farmer and water user?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the Oroville Mercury editorial of February 22, referred to above:

[From the Oroville (Calif.) Mercury of February 22, 1958]

CITY MAKING MONEY WANTS MORE FROM UNITED STATES

Now comes the annual report of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) with the word that during the past year it had a net revenue (profit) of $4,748,000. That was a little larger than in 1956 when it was $4,461,232.

These are the people who are willing to see the Trinity powerplant operated by the Government at a loss if only Sacramento can be assured of ample cheap power. On the other side are the farmers who want the powerplant operated efficiently by private enterprise with the assurance that the Government will receive many millions from it that can be used to reduce the price of irrigation water.

There is no mandate on the Government that it shall keep Sacramento in cheap power. The $4 million cushion annually should be sufficient assurance that the people of the capital city will not suffer deprivation.

Oakland Tribune Calls for Action on Trinity Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased with the House action authorizing emergency funds for the Trinity

River project. The supplementary $10 million will assure continued progress on the Trinity Dam construction, which came so close to complete shutdown when project operating funds were running out.

Our quick move on this appropriation bill was prudent. Let us hope the same good sense is shown in the earliest possible enactment of the Trinity partnership legislation. As the Oakland Tribune states in an editorial of February 27, Trinity River Funds:

The next thing the House could do that makes sense would be to override those who are trying permanently to block the plan to let private enterprise share a large measure of the cost of the power features (through partnership).

In the original legislation of 1937 authorizing the Central Valley project, Congress specifically acknowledged that the generation and sale of electric energy was to be a "means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings." Through partnership, power would more than pay its way at Trinity. An all-Federal power operation would seriously undermine our reclamation goals. One hundred and forty-five million dollars in extra tax payments to Federal, State, and local governments; $175,524,000 in surplus revenues for Trinity; $60 million in capital savings to the Federal Government—the all-Federal power supporters would have us scrap these funds and savings for their own uneconomic venture. Yet how would they justify this fund sacrifice when California faces a $12-billion water plan and other costly Central Valley additions?

It does not take an economics specialist to figure out which plan for the development of Trinity power brings the most benefits for the greatest number of people. And in a period when we are compelled to think economy on local, State, and Federal levels, it would be interesting to see how our Appropriations Committees would handle the partnership case.

At this point I request that excerpts from the Oakland Tribune's February 27 editorial be included herewith in the RECORD:

TRINITY RIVER FUNDS

The House of Representatives must have been in a rare mood when it overrode its own Appropriations Committeee and voted funds which permit operations on the Trinity River project to continue. It is not often that committee recommendations are upset. But that was the case this time.

Although the dispute over whether private enterprise and the Government will be allowed to go into a partnership in development af the hydroelectric phase of the Trinity project is still not settled, it is good news. Construction of the main feature will go on without delay and without having to depend upon allocation of funds from other projects as decreed by the committee.

As it now stands, new funds are on the way and that means uninterrupted operations.

The next thing the House could do that makes sense would be to override those who are trying permanently to block the plan to let private enterprise share a large measure of the cost of the power features. They want the taxpayer to carry the whole load by squeezing out interests which would not only shoulder some of the building cost but which would be paying taxes of its own later.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. stands ready to meet almost all of the demands raised by the opposition with respect to future reappraisals of its contributions. The administration is prepared to go ahead with its share. But the forces of bureaucracy and public spending stand in the way. Congress is going to have to make a decision before long. We hope it is one in favor of private enterprise against raids on the Public Treasury.

American Farm Bureau Federation Fights for Partnership at Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the Oroville Mercury's lead editorial of February 18 is most appropriately titled "Is Trinity for the Farmer or Sacramento?" One begins to wonder, as we listen to the all-Federal power supporters attack the Trinity partnership legislation, and champion all-Federal development of Trinity—a plan which would bring superficially cheap electric rates to a few "preference" customers, principally the city of Sacramento.

In recent testimony before House Interior Committee, Mr. Louis A. Rozzoni, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, stated:

We believe that the benefits from joint development to farmers as water users in California and as taxpayers throughout the Nation far outweigh the subsidy that would be enjoyed chiefly by the residents of one city in California.

Mr. Rozzoni adds:

The interest of water users is to obtain from Trinity the maximum contribution to the Central Valley project that the marketability of the power will warrant, and that this objective will be furthered by private development.

These opinions come from an organization that is 100 percent dependent on a sufficient water supply. Of all groups, the California Farm Bureau ought to know which plan for Trinity power development is best for the farmers and reclamation. To listen to the all-Federal power advocates, one would almost forget that the real purpose of the whole Trinity River project is to bring more water to thirsty acres in the Central Valley. Water, not power is California's problem. We have all the power we want. What we are in desperate need for is a better distribution of our total water supply. The maximum in water distribution and reclamation benefits would accrue from adoption of Trinity partnership.

And what would an all-Federal power arrangement provide? Nothing but bargain power rates for a few preference clients serving less than 7 percent of the northern California population. As the Oroville Mercury notes in its February 18 editorial:

Something the representatives of the farmers did not bring out is that a few city people in their demand for Government-subsidized, cheap power appear to be chiseling in on a project primarily designed for the farmers. Obviously, if Congress refuses to accept the partnership plan it not only will be turning down this opportunity for cheaper water in a semiarid State, but will be asking farmers to help pay for the power features at Trinity at a project loss.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the full analysis of this question "Is Trinity for the farmer or Sacramento?" Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial from the Oroville Mercury:

[From the Oroville (Calif.) Mercury of February 18, 1958]

IS TRINITY FOR THE FARMER OR SACRAMENTO?

When a hearing is held as far away as Washington, D. C., naturally the service via the press wires is inadequate. Thus we are just beginning to get some of the Trinity testimony that the wires didn't carry, but that is as important as the more headline-earning factors that made up the stories promptly received.

No one will deny that the attitude of the farmers—the water users—is of commanding importance in the matter of the Trinity project. The project is being built primarily to provide water for reclamation and irrigation purposes. The power of the project is secondary, naturally and according to law. Yet the testimony given by the farmers was ignored by the wire services, as far as we can ascertain.

Through the Western Water News, of which an Oroville man, Bert Smith, is editor, we learn that the American Farm Bureau Federation played an important part in the hearing. A statement was presented by A. L. Anderson of Colorado, and Louis A. Rozzoni, both directors of the AFBF, in which the farmers were rather convincing in their claim that the partnership plan favored by the Federal Department of Interior, would be best for the farmers. (Rozzoni also is president of the California Farm Bureau Federation.)

Electric power that resulted from the Trinity job was to be used, according to the Federal statute, "as a means of financially aiding and assisting" irrigation and other objectives of the project. They went on to demonstrate that under the plan offered by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. its purchase of the falling water for $4,600,000 per year would be equal to more than $5 per acre-foot for the water used in power generation.

They pointed out that this water is not consumed in the generating process, but remains available for irrigation purposes, and that Central Valley project power is sold to farmers way down in the San Joaquin Valley for only $3.50 per acre-foot. Thus the Government gets $1.50 more per acre-foot at the powerhouse from the power company than it sells it after transporting it several hundred miles.

This looks like a good deal to practical farmers as, indeed, it is.

Their statement calls attention to the fact, as stated by Interior Secretary Seaton, that Trinity power facilities, if built by the Federal Government, would "require substantial assistance from other project revenues in order to meet repayment requirements." The farm bureau asked the question: "Why should the users of water on the various units of the Central Valley project be required to pay or help to pay for the Federal Trinity powerplants? We believe this would defeat the purpose as declared by Congress."

The statement reviewed the benefits of the partnership plan: taxpayments by the company of $83 million to the Federal Government, $62.6 million to State and local governments, and said that considering these

and the increased revenue to the project, joint development of power "would provide additional total revenues of $310 million."

It added that under certain assumptions "the preference customers, most of whom are located in one city (Sacramento) would be required to pay more for electric power" and added that the benefit to the majority "far outweighs the subsidy that would be enjoyed chiefly by the residents of one city in California."

So there we have the opinion of the people for whom the Bureau of Reclamation, as its name indicates, is building the Trinity project. It would be ridiculous to build a project for one main purpose then let a side purpose govern the policy.

Something the representatives of the farmers did not bring out is that city people in their demand for Government-subsidized, cheap power appear to be chiseling in on a project primarily designed for the farmers. If the Government can get $5 per acre-foot at the powerhouse, it certainly can, in time, reduce the cost of water for irrigation. Obviously, if Congress refuses to accept the partnership plan it not only will be turning down this opportunity for cheaper water in a semi-arid state, but will, as the farmers say, be asking the farmers to help pay for the power features at Trinity, for it will be subsidizing power to Sacramento at a project loss—a loss to be financed by the irrigation features of the project.

Law Day, U. S. A.: Emphasizing the Supremacy of Law in the United States of America—A Speech Given by Charles S. Rhyne, President of the American Bar Association at the Atlanta, Ga., Regional Meeting of the American Bar Association, February 20, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of what appears clearly to be a very timely discussion by the very distinguished president of the American Bar Association on an always pertinent subject: to wit, the place of law in the structure of constitutional government in the United States of America.

Therefore, Mr. Rhyne's discussion, as appearing in the American Bar Journal for April 1958, volume 44, page 313, in which he announces and discusses "Law Day, U. S. A.," will be of interest and recognized as of importance to all who read it.

President Charles S. Rhyne is a resident and active member of the Washington, D. C., bar. I know he enjoys personal acquaintance with many Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. As result of his leadership of the American Bar Association in the matter of the proclamation by the President of the United States recommending to the American people that May 1, 1958 be observed as "Law Day, U. S. A.," another timely occasion is offered to strengthen the sinews of our constitutional government.

LAW DAY, U. S. A., EMPHASIZING THE SUPREMACY OF LAW

(By Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association)

President Eisenhower has proclaimed May 1, 1958, as Law Day, U. S. A. This official proclamation is a call for action in recognition of the law and what it has meant to our country and imposes a duty and responsibility upon lawyers to apprise the people of America of the great privilege it is to live under the rule of law. We must do our part on Law Day, U. S. A., to bring home to our people the tremendously important role of the law in our daily lives as well as the increasingly important role that law must play in relations between nations.

Because of our daily contacts with our Nation's legal structure and our ceaseless battle to insure equal justice to all of its inhabitants, we lawyers are perhaps a little more appreciative of our life under the rule of law than the average man. But lawyers and laymen alike should pause and recognize the tremendous contribution which law has made to our way of life, both as a promoter of our progress and as an insurer of the rights which made that progress possible.

The selection of May 1 as Law Day, U. S. A. has great significance. May 1 is also the day on which international communism celebrates its past victories and looks forward to its future conquests. There could be no better date for us to recall the basic moral and philosophical principles upon which our society is based, and to contrast them with the cynical, immoral, and atheistic philosophy which underlies the international Communist conspiracy.

In the context of current history we are going through an inventorying process as we gird ourselves to fight the Communist menace, which operates by economic, psychological, and subversive means as well as by threat of armed force. It seems well that we tie to our strengths and shore up our weaknesses. In any such inventory one must concede that the idea of individual freedom under law is the great ideal we offer to the world. Respect for and adherence to law is ingrained in all Americans. So it has been since the birth of our Nation. While the average individual is not learned in the law, there is an intense sense of justice which burns within him. There is an almost instantaneous adverse reaction to any unlawful or illegal action. We believe in, and we live under, the law. We are a lawful people.

It seems well therefore that we pause to pay tribute to the law and what it has meant to us. The space age has brought a need for new concepts as new frontiers and new horizons have been opened to the human race. But there is also a need to reaffirm old traditional concepts whose validity and fundamental importance cannot be shaken by any scientific or technological achievement. The rule of law is such an unshakeable concept.

Among all the contending ideas which have fought for the minds of men since the dawn of history, the concept of individual human freedom has been outstanding. On this concept, which embodies the natural law, which was the heart and core of Magna Carta, which is the spirit and guiding light of our Bill of Rights, we can build with every confidence that it is a foundation not of sand but of everlasting rock.

Individual freedom and justice, under law, is the great principle that distinguishes our form of government and our way of life from the Communist system. It is the keystone of our moral leadership in the world. This unique national observance of Law Day, U. S. A., affords a dramatic opportunity for the American people to reaffirm their dedication to the rule of law and to demonstrate to the world that their faith in it is unshakeable.

As our Declaration of Independence affirms, the true purpose of government is the protection of the fundamental rights of man. Any denial of this purpose necessarily results in absolutism. Dean Roscoe Pound has said that the strongest bulwark of any nation against absolutism is the law. But, as totalitarianism has illustrated, this bulwark is real only when the concept of the law includes also the concept of natural rights. It is by the denial of this basic principle that totalitarianism is able within the framework of so-called law to subvert the primary purpose of the law. Basically, the true advantage of the rule of law in a democracy is the affirmation of the dignity and individuality of the human being. It is the affirmation of the purpose of the state to protect and safeguard this dignity. It is the recognition that the state exists for man, and not man for the state. Only within such a philosophy can a government of law and not of men be assured. Without such a philosophy, government by rule of law becomes impossible, and arbitrary rule must necessarily be substituted for it.

From its inception to the present zenith of its power, ours has been a government of law rather than of men. Colonial and frontier courts applied as law that innate wisdom of the centuries which had come down to them through the crystallized public opinion of what is fair as recorded by Aristotle, and Montesquieu, and Coke. And while our whole system of law was bottomed firmly upon the great principles and precedents of the English common law, we also created law of our own fitted to the needs of the New World. A good example of this is the famous jury charge of Judge Andrew Jackson, who presided over thousands of trials in the frontier country of western North Carolina and the new State of Tennessee. He instructed juries to "Do what is right between these parties. That is what the law always means."

Law is the intangible force that makes freedom and progress possible. It is law that brings order into the affairs of men—that enables them to lift their sights above mere survival, to accumulate possessions, to develop the arts, to pursue knowledge, and to enjoy life among their fellows. Law gives the individual security that they could obtain in no other way; it protects the family and other groups organized for the advancement of common interests; it permits the growth of great cities and the development of vast enterprises. In other words, it is the cement that holds our free society together.

And what is law?

Definitions by great men down through history have been many:

Samuel Johnson called the law "the last result of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the benefit of the public."

Cicero said: "Law is the highest reason, implanted in nature, which prescribes those things which ought to be done and forbids the contrary."

Grotius said: "Law is a rule of moral action obliging to do that which is right."

Blackstone's definition of law is probably the one most quoted in law schools. He said: "Law is a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

Charles Evans Hughes said:

"The fundamental conception which we especially cherish as our heritage is the right to law itself, not as the edict of arbitarary power but as the law of a free people spring-

ing from custom, responsive to their sense of justice, modified and enlarged by their full will to meet conscious needs and restrained by authority which is itself subject to law—the law of the land."

We tend to regard too narrowly and too shallowly the law and its functions and purposes. When we regard the law as a servant of our free enterprise system, we see the truth, but only part of the truth. When we see the law as the great resolver of differences, when we see the law as the one viable substitute for brute force in human society, when we see the law as the guardian of our rights and the protector of our freedoms, we see clearly, but always in part only. The law is all these things and more.

Law is in a sense codified history; but not merely this. It is also medicine, accounting, engineering, and science—for all professions in the ultimate depend upon law as the basic foundation for their existence and operation and service. They are licensed, protected, and governed by law.

Law is made up of the accumulated wisdom of the people, plus the power to pass decisive judgment in accordance with that wisdom, plus the various procedures, formulas, and facilities involved in legal process. But the power to pass decisive judgment is not law in and of itself, any more than legal forms and formulas and all the panoply of process, taken alone, are law. Nor is the accumulated wisdom of the people law without the power to pass decisive judgment and all the machinery necessary for handling particular cases. But when these three—wisdom, power, and machinery—are combined, when the power of government is used to apply the accumulated wisdom of the people to individual cases through a system of legal machinery which is available to every individual, then we have a true rule of law.

One of our most priceless blessings as citizens of the United States of America is our rich heritage of ordered freedom under law.

Our Nation was created and nourished on due process of law. The liberties found in our Bill of Rights are the essence of America.

Law reigns supreme in our Nation at the municipal level, the State level, and the National level, and is the one common thread which runs through the wide variety of mechanisms used by local, State, and Federal governments to achieve governmental objectives. From the adoption of the Constitution down to the present day, law has been the cement which has held together our complicated local, State, and Federal governmental structure. Supremacy of the law is the concept which has controlled at all levels of government. In every instance the aim is to put law above the whims of man. We as a people believe in, and have lived by, William Pitt's famous saying, "Where law ends, tyranny begins."

Civil law aims at orderly and peaceful adjustment of all reasonable claims. Criminal law aims at protection of the public, punishment of the offender, and deterrence of commission or repetition of the offense.

Law is concomitant with good government.

We need to make the distinction between a government under law and a government under laws. This is important. You cannot have a government without laws, for even the spoken whim of an absolute monarch is a law for his subjects. Government under law means much more than just having laws. Government under law connotes stability, permanence, almost timelessness. Government under law connotes rightness, righteousness, in the sense of conformity with the natural law, and justice. Law connotes order and certainty.

In a government under law, it is recognized that basic individual rights are only formulated by laws, but do not depend for their existence upon such laws. In a government under law, there is no arbitrary power to punish any man except for a distinct breach of the law established in an ordinary legal manner before the courts. And in a government under law, every man is equal before the bar of justice, without any distinction based on class, whether of race, or creed, or wealth, or color, or any other.

Equal protection of the law is a cornerstone of our governmental system. Equal justice under law to the poor and to the rich, to the weak and powerful alike.

Law is rooted in justice. Justice is both its foundation and its objective.

We speak of our ideal as a government of law and not of men; but we cannot have a system of functioning law without men. It takes men—wise men and trained men—to preserve the accumulated wisdom of the people, to understand it and to apply it to particular cases. It takes men—dedicated men, selfless men—to exercise properly the power of decisive judgment. It takes men—skilled men, diligent men—to operate smoothly the machinery which we call legal process. All these are among the functions of lawyers. Here is the justification for the legal profession. The greatness of our Nation is due to the liberty under law that exists here—a liberty which lawyers have created and fought to maintain all through our history. We lawyers can be proud that our profession has lived up to its duties and responsibilities.

Government under law is impossible without lawyers. Every new invention or scientific discovery, every new business practice, every new activity in which the Government itself engages, poses new problems which lawyers must solve. In both form and content, almost all the institutions of government are the work of lawyers. But lawyers are seldom fully appreciated, and the extent of our national need for lawyers is neither felt nor recognized except in times of great stress or emergency, when the services of lawyers become priceless and indispensable.

Time was when development of the law by a slow evolutionary process was sufficient to keep it abreast of normal political, scientific and industrial transformation. But today, if the evolution of the law is too slow to keep pace with racing scientific and military technology of our space age, we shall almost surely face disaster. The hope of civilization is establishment of the rule of law on an international basis to govern relations between nations, not only on the planet earth but in outer space as well, before some unwise application of force sends the four horsemen of war, pestilence, famine and death on what may be their last ride across the face of the earth. The struggle for a world ruled by law must go on with increased intensity. We must prove that the genius of man in the field of science and technology has not so far outstripped his inventiveness in the sphere of human relations as to make catastrophe inevitable. If man can conquer space he can also solve the need for legal machinery to insure universal use of space for peaceful purposes only. With the Kremlin now only 30 seconds via missile from Washington, the absolute necessity of such machinery requires no further emphasis.

Self-government by law is an inherent right of free people.

The Pilgrims who came to Plymouth Rock and our first permanent settlers at Jamestown sought escape from the arbitrary power of an English king who ruled without the law's restraining influence. These ancestors of modern-day Americans carried in their minds a dream of reestablishing the individual liberty under law which King John had promised more than 300 years previous when he affixed his seal to Magna Carta at Runnymede.

Today, after 350 years, the greatest strength of America lies in this concept of individual liberty under law. Other systems of government have produced great scientists, great musicians, and other outstanding achievements. But no system has produced the individual freedom which exists in America. And the reason for this achievement is that our system is founded upon and governed by the rule of law.

The more one reads and studies history the more he becomes impressed with the amazing wisdom of the draftsmen of our Constitution. One explanation for their wisdom may be that they were more experienced than we in the abuses of governmental power. They lived in times of monarchy, feudalism, military dictatorship, colonialism, revolution and, yes, even anarchy. They were able to create our Constitution, which provides all the powers necessary to govern and yet leaves the basic reservoir of power in the hands of the governed. Our Government is one of checks and balances. The three branches of Government, and the checks which each of these branches has on the others, constitute our best insurance that the absolute power necessary to form a tyranny will never vest in any one branch.

Our Constitution—the greatest statement of the basic wisdom of the centuries ever put together for the government of man—was not created out of thin air. Its draftsmen drew upon the great lawgivers of all centuries. They used those principles which the test of experience had proved. That is why it has endured and met the new and novel needs of each new generation.

Supremacy of the law, which transferred sovereignty from ruler to the ruled, has guaranteed our individual freedom. Law Day, U. S. A. must underscore and emphasize in the mind of every American this concept of legal supremacy—not the supremacy of law over ruler, alone, but the supremacy of law over force in a world which through space conquest has become too dangerous to live in without law replacing weapons as the ultimate decision mechanism to resolve disputes between nations.

There are only two alternatives to law, and they are on the one hand, terror—on the other, chaos. In a society without rules there would be no freedoms, no property rights, no protection for the weak, no basis for commerce or business or industry. Under a tyranny which knew as rules only the current whims of the tyrant, black terror would stalk and lurk, thrive and grow. The only possible counter to force would be force, and freedom and justice would have no place. The foundation and matrix of our free society, the protection of individual security, the basis for our accumulation of personal possessions, our development of our talents, our pursuit of knowledge, and our right to enjoy life, are the law.

We tend to take too much for granted the great principles which underlie our system of government. We have a legal system which, in spite of the size of our country and the necessary complexities of its organization, assures for the average citizen more vigorous protection for life and person, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more effective protection for individual rights, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property, and greater personal freedom, than any other system yet developed in all the history of mankind. What more meaningful proof is there that life under the rule of laws assures the best existence yet devised by man?

In this era when dictators have supplanted law with force in captive nation after captive nation, preservation of the ideals of individual human rights and equal justice under law will require much of us who now enjoy it. We shall have to love liberty as passionately, cling to our ideas as stubbornly, respect law as deeply, and place our

faith in divine guidance just as firmly as did our inspired pioneer forefathers who founded a Nation in freedom.

It is upon leadership that our future depends. And leadership of the mind is all-important in this era of dramatic change and progress. Leadership in instilling in our own people such an appreciation of what life under the rule of law means that they will help us lawyers in selling the rule of law to the peoples of the whole world as mankind's best hope for survival in the space age. Our offer of leadership to the world must be more than bigger and better weapons or missiles—we must tell the people of the whole world that we who glorify the rule of law at home will step out on the path of progress and lead toward a "law-ful" and peaceful existence for the world community, and for the unknown and unexplored frontiers of space as well.

Let us pledge each other, here and now, to rededicate ourselves to our most solemn responsibility, the responsibility of preserving and passing on to the generations which will follow us as citizens of the United States of America the heritage of individual human freedom and equal justice under law which has been ours and which rightfully must be theirs. And let us pledge ourselves to meet the challenge to the rule of law which our shrunken world and the space age encompass. Such a rededication and such a pledge must be the meaning to the legal profession of Law Day, U. S. A.

Let us be ever aware that the seat of the law is a throne of purest justice and her crowning glory is a wreath of truth. In the words of Daniel Webster: "The law: it has honored us, may we honor it."

Revolt on Automobile Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following cleverly written satire which may be overdramatized, but it has considerable value. This was reprinted in the Deseret News from the Virginia City Territorial Enterprise once edited by Mark Twain:

REVOLT ON AUTOMOBILE ROW

Alarm and despondency, to use a fine old British phrase, are the dominant characteristics today in Detroit and other centers of the automobile industry.

Sales are way off; gloom prevails and even the gauleiters of the United Auto Workers have paused in their business of pillaging their slave membership to tell President Eisenhower that there are nearly a million cars unsold in the warehouses.

Most of the viewers with alarm attribute this to an incapacity on the part of the auto buying public to purchase new cars.

There is, however, good reason to believe this simply is not the case. The sales of big cars for family use are indeed in lamentable decline. The sales of small cars, both American and foreign made, and the more expensive foreign cars as well, are booming.

Ramblers are in bonanza. Jaguars, MGs, and other sports cars are rolling in chips.

Rolls Royce last year sold more cars than ever before in the United States. Mercedes Benz, another luxury car in a quiet good taste is doing fine.

It's only the block long explosions of chromium vulgarity with enough appliances to be driven by a quadruple amputee that are lagging. Americans have taken a powder on useless monstrosities of battleship dimensions and are, for once, combining taste and prudence in their automobile purchases.

Detroit is loud in its protestations that huge cars of 360 horsepower ornamented like a calliope and with an acre or 2 of space for the family are what carbuyers want.

When were American car buyers ever in any way consulted about their preferences?

Was there ever a poll on the use of chromium by the square yard and 6 tail lamps where 1 would do?

Was there ever a popular mandate commanding wrap-around windscreens, automatic gear shift and motor activated windows? Detroit has always unloaded as much junk as the traffic would bear with no least or slightest consultation of what car buyers wanted, and that is still the philosophy of the major manufacturers.

Meanwhile, the revolt is on. Americans are buying strictly nonfamily cars by the hundreds of thousands in a determined effort to be well shut of the wife and kiddies for a few hours now and then.

In the face of 40-cent gasoline they are not as intent as they once were on owning a private replica of the Queen Elizabeth.

Cars without a smidge of chromium are in requisition, and phony spare tire assemblies are strictly for the hot-rod trade.

When the designers at Detroit return to turning out the beautiful, useful and characteristic cars they outshopped 30 years ago and content themselves with 1 set of headlights where now there are 5, there will be no limit to the market potential.

In the interim Americans will continue to pay premium prices and import taxes on foreign cars simply to avoid riding in the circus wagons that have been the Detroit obsession.

The United Nations: Challenge of a New Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on the 24th of March the Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs visited New Hampshire. While in the State he spoke at a joint Kiwanis-Rotary-Lions-Jaycees luncheon in Concord, N. H., participated with me in a radio broadcast, and appeared on television.

On Monday evening, March 24, he addressed the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs at the Carpenter Hotel in Manchester, N. H. Secretary Wilcox is one of our ablest public officials. His presentations in New Hampshire were masterful and eloquent. His speeches while in the Granite State were some of the ablest I have heard on the United Nations and related problems.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein excerpts from the address which Assistant Secretary of State Wilcox delivered to the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs in Manchester.

THE UNITED NATIONS: CHALLENGES OF A NEW AGE

(Address by the Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs at the Carpenter Hotel, Manchester, N. H., Monday, March 24, 1958)

THE NEW AGE

Today, we live in a world which is in every sense on the threshold of a new age—the space age. It is an era which holds implications and challenges for man far greater than those of the 15th and 16th century age of discovery and exploratiton. We all recognize today what a significant age that was although very few people at the time were aware of it.

In sharp contrast, millions of people throughout the world today are keenly aware of the fact that we are on the eve of a new age in history. This was particularly evident to me during a trip abroad from which I have just returned. Everywhere I traveled—to the Near East, southeast Asia, and elsewhere in the Far East—people appeared to recognize that recent scientific and technological advancements of the new age demand, to use the words of President Eisenhower, that a way be found "by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

I would like to discuss with you some of the major challenges which confront both the United States and the United Nations in this new era. There is no doubt that the United Nations today is man's best hope for meeting many of these challenges. The United States regards the United Nations as a cornerstone in its development of a sound and imaginative foreign policy to cope with the impact of these challenges.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

In the technological field, man is on the verge of conquering outer space. At this moment, as you know, three artificial satellies—sputnik, Explorer, and Vanguard—are circling the earth. Men put them there. These, together with the ICBM, and other missiles are only the beginning of a new era of scientific and technological advances which until recently have been relegated to the realm of the Sunday supplements and comic books. Developments in the field of outer space will inevitably shrink the universe of which we here on earth are but an infinitesimal part. The mysteries of other planets will gradually be unfolded.

In addition, man soon will become the master of matter and energy. Research on the atom already has opened up new limitless vistas in many areas of human endeavor. Progress in atomic energy will affect almost every facet of our daily lives—the power which runs our factories, the wares which they produce, the homes we live in, even the food we eat. A promising start is underway in the international development and control of this fabulous resource through the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

These technological and scientific developments serve to reemphasize the increasing interdependence of man, his institutions and his international organizations. They bring into sharper relief than ever before the absolute necessity for a common international approach to meet common problems.

POLITICAL CHALLENGES

This new age, along with its technological and scientific developments, has produced equally far-reaching political challenges. They are not as apparent nor as sectacular, but they are certainly as real and as urgent.

Unfortunately, we are accustomed to thinking of the world as being divided into power blocs. As a result we have tended to

overlook a fact of vital importance. While it is true that the wold is divided into power blocs, militarily, it is at the same time developing politically into a multinational society with new challenges and new problems which demand the same common approach by the nations of the world as do those in the scientific and technological field.

These challenges stem from the steadily increasing number of newly independent countries; they consist of the many new issues which arise from conflicting aspirations of these nations. We have only to look around us to see daily evidence of the disputes associated with the crumbling of ancient empires and the vigorous nationalism and intense anticolonialism of newly emerging states. Nor is the new nationalism the only seed bed for new issues in the political field.

In many new nations the population in one generation has been undergoing almost overnight a social and economic transformation which required centuries in Western Europe. Africa is a case in point. In this vast territory peoples are eagerly seeking recognition of their national identities. You can be certain that what happens in Africa in the next decade will influence profoundly the future course of events of this world in which we live.

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

Finally, there is an even more formidable challenge of constant and increasing concern to all free men. I refer, of course, to the increased power of the Soviet Union as it crosses the threshold of the new age.

This new Soviet power confronts us with many far-reaching problems. Sputniks I and II have provided a striking demonstration of the Soviet Union's capabilities in the scientific and technological fields. But these capabilities, according to our best scientific information, have been accompanied by the development of certain types of missiles, notably the ICBM. The Soviets have given top priority to training more scientists and more engineers in their schools and universities. Their efforts in this respect, when compared with our own, are a source of serious concern. Certainly our own free democratic society is far better equipped to explore scientific truth and thus provide the necessary capabilities for the advancement of mankind. Yet the Soviet Union—dictatorship that it is—has demonstrated to the world that it can mobilize both its manpower and resources for the education of highly qualified scientists and engineers and encourage their scientific and technological achievements, although it may be at the expense of a broad education for all the people.

The Soviets are posing a serious challenge on still another front through the misuse for imperialistic purposes of their rapidly growing economy. In four decades, and at great sacrifice to the material well-being of its people, the Soviet Union has developed an industrial base that is second only to that of the United States. And today, it is still expanding. * * *

Now, of course, the Soviet Union is fully aware of the aspirations of newly developing nations for economic and social progress. With this in mind it has utilized its economic strength and has embarked on a campaign of economic penetration and political subversion of these countries particularly in the Near East and Asia. In the past 2½ years, according to Department of State estimates, the Sino-Soviet bloc has committed the equivalent of $1,900,000,000 in economic and military assistance to these new states. Energetic efforts by the Communist bloc to negotiate trade and payments agreements have more than doubled its trade with these countries since 1954. * * *

This Communist economic offensive has made American trade and assistance programs more important than ever before. The Mutual Security and Trade Agreements Acts which President Eisenhower called the iron imperatives of peace, and which are now under study by Congress, provide potent weapons in meeting this new economic threat.

I know that some of our people vigorously attack our foreign aid program. They have condemned it as a giveaway program and they have deplored the fact that we continue, over a period of years, to send our aid abroad.

This is to seriously miscalculate the nature of the challenge we face. We must never underestimate the determination of the Soviet Union to convert the uncommitted nations to the Communist system. Without an adequate foreign aid program we would be faced with an impossible task in our attempt to help keep the free world free.

My point is that the Soviet Union is moving into the new age aggressively on all fronts. Backed with enhanced power, it has injected into its foreign policy, on the one hand a new demanding and threatening tone, and on the other hand, blandishments of good will and peaceful intent. This requires bold initiative on our part as well as swift countermoves. Otherwise, the free world will be faced with the grim prospect of a very serious reversal in the balance of power.

THE U. N. AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

The implications of man's ultimate mastery of the atom and conquest of outer space are awesome in magnitude. There is no doubt the United Nations provides the most effective instrument to insure that these conquests will be devoted to peaceful purposes. The peaceful uses of outer space must be assured, and its use for military purposes must be prevented. Immediate exploratory work is necessary to establish the competence of the United Nations in this field.

Secretary of the State Dulles, in advocating that outer space should be dedicated to peace, has said that "* * * there is an opportunity here which is almost staggering in its possible implications—its implications if we do it, and its tragic implications if we do not do it."

In this connection, you will recall our efforts which began over a decade ago to insure the peaceful uses of atomic energy when we had a monopoly on atomic weapons. As early as 1946, when the atomic age was in its infancy, the United States took the unprecedented step of offering to relinquish that monopoly and vest it in an international authority with complete control over the manufacture and use of dangerous atomic-energy materials. As you know, the Soviets turned that offer down. Consequently, it is now impossible, owing to the passage of time and the refinement of scientific techniques, to account for past production of fissionable materials. Thus, a great humanitarian opportunity slipped by. The world cannot afford to let a mistake like that happen again.

Once again, we have made a new proposal, this time relating to cooperation in the use of outer space. President Eisenhower in his lettter of January 12 to Soviet Premier Bulganin stated the United States position when he declared: "Should not outer space be dedicated to the peaceful uses of mankind and denied to the purposes of war? That is my proposal." Once again the choice lies with the Soviets.

It is my firm conviction that, given assurance of peaceful uses of outer-space development, the possibilities for the advancement of mankind are enormous. It is, of course, impossible at present, to assess the full impact on our lives of the exploration and exploitation of outer space. But there are a number of significant possibilities which already are becoming apparent and, in fact, in certain instances are predicted as certainties by our scientists.

We are told, for example, that artificial satellites, reporting back to earth, will enable us to study the mysteries of the universe for the first time unimpeded by the distortions of the earth's atmosphere. New knowledge of the behavior of the sun and of radiations which interfere with radio communications will be acquired. This will mean eventual improvements in means of communication, with satellites being used as radio relay points. For the first time reliable radio communication, unhampered by disturbances in the atmosphere and ionosphere, may be possible between the most distant points on earth. A worldwide system of television will be feasible. Navigational and air-safety aids beyond anything now conceived will become realities. Weather forecasting will be immeasurably improved through the study of cloud patterns on a planetary scale. Even weather control through the use of space platforms may be a possibility.

We are also told that the impact of new knowledge gained from studies conducted from such vantage points may have a revolutionary effect on medicine, nutrition, agriculture, food preservation, and other fields intimately connected with man's welfare.

These are but a few of the breathtaking prospects which this age may open up. Do they not represent a prize worth attaining—for all mankind? This prize is within the reach of man, provided international agreement can be achieved on the peaceful exploitation of outer space as proposed by the President and Secretary Dulles. The question now is how best to achieve such agreement. Naturally, a prime requisite is Soviet willingness to cooperate.

* * * * *

Unfortunately sovereign states cannot always be counted upon to do the logical thing. It would seem logical, however, to try to agree upon certain fundamentals now while our activities in outer space are just beginning. Once the great powers have moved further into outer space their positions may become hardened, and it may be far more difficult to secure agreement. We can see the danger ahead; now is the time to avert it.

One thing we will need to do is to develop some simple rules of conduct for the use of outer space. We have such rules for the use of the high seas and for the air space above us.

But the creation of rules for the use of outer space is a far more complex matter. One has only to consider the terrific speed by which a satellite circles about the earth passing over many countries in its flight. What rights do the states launching such missiles have to use outer space? And what rights, if any, do the states have over which the satellites pass? Is it feasible to claim jurisdiction over space that never stands still over any nation? One has only to raise these questions to realize their complexity.

It would be tragic indeed if outer space were used in such a way as to intensify the arms race and magnify even further the danger that could come to mankind from the uncontrolled use of missiles and nuclear weapons in outer space.

Achievement of the possibilities inherent in the conquering of outer space would have a tremendous effect on the relations between nations. The scientific and material advantages would benefit all mankind. The demonstration of good faith and good will provided by cooperation on both sides of the Iron Curtain would materially assist in the relaxation of tensions which now grip the world.

THE CHALLENGE OF DISARMAMENT

In this connection, one logically thinks of the problem of disarmament. The quest for agreement on this most complex of man's problems becomes increasingly a race be-

tween time and catastrophe—and time may be running out. The United States record in this quest is one of earnest endeavor. The record spreads over more than a decade and has been punctuated by such United States initiatives as the offer we made in 1946 to internationalize atomic energy, and President Eisenhower's "Open Skies" proposal made at the Geneva Summit Conference in 1955. This same record consists of months, in fact years, of patient negotiation in the United Nations to arrive at some reasonable accommodation which will provide an effective system of limitation and control of all types of armaments, conventional as well as nuclear.

* * * * *

The Soviet Union has sought to make considerable propaganda of its easy slogan of "ban the bomb." We, however, are not interested in slogans. We seek an effective disarmament program. To us this means control, and control means inspection. To us, the manufacture of nuclear weapons—not merely the cessation of nuclear tests—is the heart of the problem.

However, in spite of Soviet intransigence, we shall persist in concert with our NATO allies and other members of the United Nations, in our efforts to arrive at a reasonable solution which will give to man everywhere freedom from anxiety and an opportunity to pursue the arts of peace. We hope to persuade even the Soviets that this would be in their own interests as well. For that, in the last analysis, is what we seek—security for all.

The immediate problem is to get serious disarmament talks under way once again. This is our objective. With this in mind, the United States earlier this month, and after consultations with other United Nations members, suggested informally to the Soviet representatives at the United Nations steps which could lead to an early resumption of the discussions and also insure the continuing responsibility of the United Nations in this field.

We suggested to the U. S. S. R. that the enlarged Disarmament Commission hold discussions in line with the resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Assembly in 1957. We believe that the Disarmament Commission should meet in spite of the Soviet Government's announced intention to boycott such a meeting.

In addition, the United States also proposed to the U. S. S. R. that, if the Disarmament Commission discussions were unproductive, a procedural meeting of the Security Council should be convened in order to insure a proper link between the United Nations and any disarmament negotiations which might be held later.

* * * * *

The opposition of the Soviet Union to the resumption of discussions in the Disarmament Commission, constitutes a continued defiance of the General Assembly's resolution. The U. S. S. R. in refusing to consider disarmament, even on a procedural basis, appears to no longer regard the United Nations as the responsible channel for dealing with the problem. We, for our part, are not willing to abandon the United Nations in its quest to find means to resume the disarmament talks.

THE SUMMIT MEETING

The Soviet Government ostensibly desires a heads of government meeting for a discussion of a number of pressing international issues including the disarmament question. I can assure you that the United States is ready to take part in such a meeting if advance preparations provide evidence that high-level talks would lead to agreement. The agreements we seek are those which would actually resolve issues, lessen international tensions, and respond to the hopes of men everywhere.

I do not need to point out that recent Soviet declarations relating to the disarmament problem are hardly calculated to attain these goals. However, I can assure you that the United States will continue its efforts by every reasonable means to bring about a resumption of serious disarmament discussions.

One can, of course, understand the basic reasons Soviet leaders are so attached to the idea of a summit meeting. Mr. Khrushchev, in particular, has persistently sought to identify himself with the world's quest for peace. A summit meeting would provide him with the most solemn and influential forum for him to repeat his pronouncements about world peace. Even if no agreement were reached this exercise would be of considerable value to the Soviet cause.

We and our allies, on our part, recognize the dangers as well as the possible advantages that might flow from holding a summit conference. We do not want such a meeting to increase tensions rather than reduce them. We do not want it to spread disillusionment and misunderstanding. We have made it unmistakably clear, therefore, that we would be willing to participate in a summit conference provided there is good evidence that fruitful results can be obtained.

It would seem to me that there are at least two prerequisites for such a meeting: First of all there must, of course, be some agreement upon the items to be discussed. Secondly, there should be sufficient exploration of these items in advance of the conference to indicate that positive results can be achieved.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND POLITICAL CHALLENGES

If it is true that the United Nations is essential in meeting the technological challenges of the new age, it is more vital than ever as a forum in which political challenges can be placed in their proper perspective and adjusted on the basis of reasonable compromise.

The society of nations, as I said earlier, is still characterized by the existence of sovereign, independent states—the principal new factor being that there are more of them. More than 20 new nations have achieved their sovereignty in the past decade. * * * Accordingly, the political problems arising from the conflicts of national interests of these new sovereign states have increased proportionately. The United Nations has played a fundamental role in dealing with these new issues.

Consider for example, how the United Nations has been dealing with the Tunisian crisis. Here is a really serious situation containing all the political characteristics of the new era in which we live—nationalism, anticolonialism, and Soviet imperialism seeking fertile ground to extend its harmful influence. Tensions were running extremely high. The incident which touched off the crisis occurred on February 8. The Security Council met on February 18. The conflict was channelized into the United Nations, and quiet and effective diplomacy persuaded Tunisia and France to accept the good offices of the United States and the United Kingdom to assist the parties to resume peaceful negotiations.

* * * * *

The vital role of the Security Council also was clearly demonstrated in the case of the Egyptian-Sudanese border dispute. While the elements of this issue were quite obscure and were different from those in the Tunisian crisis, the fact is that the Security Council dealt effectively with a dangerous situation threatening the peace in the area.

Here was a complicated border dispute which suddenly erupted between a newly sovereign nation and an old one. On January 29 Egypt requested that the Sudan Government hand over certain border territories. The Arab Union plebiscite was to take place on February 20 and the Sudan parliamentary elections were to take place on February 28. Acrimonious charges involving alleged troop movements and seizures were leveled from both sides. Tension rose. On February 20, the Sudanese representative at the United Nations lodged a complaint with the Secretary General. The Security Council met on February 21, only 24 hours later.

In the meantime, the Egyptian Government had indicated that it did not intend to conduct the plebiscite in the disputed area. Moreover, after a short debate in the Council, the Egyptian representative announced Egypt's willingness to negotiate with the Sudan in the spirit of article 33 after the Sudanese elections. Council action, therefore, had a moderating influence and peaceful conditions prevail at the moment.

These two recent issues demonstrate the versatility of the United Nations machinery in dealing quickly and effectively with the political stresses and strains inherent in the new age. In both instances passion gave way to moderation and potential violence to peaceful discussion. Opportunity for reasonable accommodation was afforded in the one case through use of good offices and in the other through negotiation between the parties themselves. The existence of the United Nations and its machinery had a significant influence on the situation. What is even more important is the fact that in both cases the Security Council still remains seized of the question and can bring further useful influence to bear, if need be, for peaceful settlement.

I am convinced that the versatility of the United Nations demonstrated in these two crises can be exploited further and the utility of the United Nations proportionately increased provided there is a willingness among its members to resort to its machinery instead of to the trust of force.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

If the machinery of the United Nations is to be fully utilized, we first must recognize that it has changed in responding to new political conditions. In this way we can better assess how it may be adapted to fulfill its purpose, namely "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

As you may recall, the role of the United Nations, as originally envisaged, was enforcement of the peace. The Security Council was designed as the action arm of the United Nations for this purpose. However, the cleavages between the Soviet orbit and the free world over a 10-year period and an endless use of the veto by the U. S. S. R. seriously crippled the effectiveness of the Security Council. The Assembly gradually assumed greater importance in this field, particularly in view of its increased membership.

For example, it was the General Assembly which created the United Nations Emergency Force which has been so effective as an influence for peace in the Gaza strip and Sharm-el-Sheikh area. The charter wisely provided that the General Assembly could "discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present charter * * *." This has enabled the Assembly, backed up by its increased membership, to assume a role far more potent than that originally foreseen. This development is an example of the vitality and adaptability of the United Nations in responding to the changing political facts of life.

But the increased importance of the Assembly need not detract from the continued need to revitalize the Security Council. This prompted President Eisenhower in his letter of January 12 to Premier Bulganin to propose that "* * * we should make it the policy of our two governments at least not to use veto power to prevent the Security Council from proposing methods for the pacific settlement of disputes pursuant to chapter VI." By such action the United Nations would be strengthened and would become, as

the President suggested, "the effective instrument of peace and justice that was the original design."

In this connection, I might recall that the United States as early as 1948 submitted to the Interim Committee of the General Assembly concrete and detailed proposals designed to improve the functioning of the Security Council. Unfortunately, however, the Soviets were unwilling to consider any categories of questions on which they would agree not to use the veto. We hope that in the months ahead the Soviets will see the wisdom of strengthening the United Nations by agreeing to a restriction of the veto with respect to the peaceful settlement of disputes. The cause of world peace would profit immensely if the Soviet Union would permit the Security Council to play the effective role which the framers of the charter intended.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

It is clear to me that the United Nations has served the interests of the United States and world peace. As an instrument of collective security, it repelled Communist aggression successfully in Korea. In the field of pacific settlement it has alleviated many disputes containing the seeds of war. It has provided us with a powerful forum to present our viewpoint and refute Soviet propaganda. It has channeled national aspirations toward independent or self-government through evolutionary processes. It has made modest but constructive attacks on the root causes of war—economic, social, and cultural—through the Economic and Social Council, the Human Rights Commission, and the specialized agencies and the technical assistance program.

It is equally clear that the United Nations has shown a remarkable capacity to adjust to rapidly changing political and economic conditions.

It has demonstrated that it is a flexible organization that can be adapted to the new age that is upon us. It is not too much to say that it can—with intelligent leadership—do a great deal to help give shape and order to the political landscape of this new era upon which we are entering.

But the United Nations is, after all, an organization of sovereign states. It can do no more than its member states are willing to have it do.

We must, therefore, look ahead with the wisdom and the imagination which the times require. We must give to the United Nations the vitality it needs to nurture and encourage peace in a world in which change is both frequent and profound.

In this respect we would do well to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln in another era of great challenge: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

The United Nations, with all its imperfections, remains the best hope of earth for the achievement of world peace. It is up to us, and the other members of the United Nations, to bring that hope to its full fruition.

Experiments by Teen-Age Rocketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth and final in a series of articles by George Allen, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on experiments by teen-age rocketeers. It was published on April 18, 1958.

FIRST ARMY'S PROJECT: GUIDED MISSILEMEN

(By George N. Allen)

Capt. Bertrand R. Brinley, in charge of the First Army's program for amateur rocketeers, is viewed by many of the stripling spacemen as the only adult who currently is offering to help them avoid blasting themselves and their neighbors off the planet.

CHANCE TO FIRE

Through his efforts, the First Army is the only organization that has concrete knowledge of the number of junior space scientists in the New York area, their activities and the danger they present to themselves and the rest of the population. Army questionnaires revealed that about 3,000 boys in this area are active rocketeers, with many regularly handling explosive fuels.

The Army's program, worked out by Captain Brinley, differs from those offered by the American Rocket Society in that it offers the serious, advanced boys a chance to fire their rockets. Other programs stick to theory and design. Many public and private agencies have condemned the handling of live rockets under any conditions.

Lt. Gen. B. M. Bryan, commanding general of the First Army, told this newspaper today that the exploratory phase of the program had ended with the acceptance of proposals submitted by Captain Brinley. The First Army, he said, is now moving ahead with some parts of the program. Other parts are still under study.

FIRST SYMPOSIUM

First item approved by General Bryan was distribution of an official army safety pamphlet written specifically for junior rocketeers. It will be mailed to them next week.

Captain Brinley also has scheduled the first official symposium for stripling spacemen at which they can exhibit their hardware and can question experts. It will be held at Charles Evans Hughes High School, 351 W. 18th St., on May 3, from 1 to 5 p. m. Featured will be scientists, engineers, safety and fuels experts, films, demonstrations and exhibits.

"There has been an easy assumption that the junior rocketeer is a new form of juvenile delinquent and that amateur rocketry is merely a sputnik-era fad," Captain Brinley told the World-Telegram and Sun. "This is not true. Amateur rocketry is a serious business. It is here to stay. Many of the young men engaged in it are seriously intent on pursuing careers in science and rerated technical fields.

"Many are building marvellously intricate professional caliber rockets and research instruments. They are semipros rather than amateurs. Programs that deal only in theory and the building of safe model rockets that are little more than toys have nothing to offer such boys."

AGAINST SUPPRESSION

Referring to the increasing number of tragic accidents caused by exploding rockets, Captain Brinley said:

"Strict enforcement of laws against explosives and fireworks is the least desirable approach in seeking an intelligent solution which will both ensure the public safety and preserve the enormous potential of scientific and technological skill which these boys have.

"Suppression of these boys," he added, "is certain to create a new group of juvenile delinquents that will include some of the most talented young people in America today. Even worse, it would tend to drive underground the serious-minded young scientist who, denied public approval and adequate facilities for his work, would seek to continue his experiments under darker and more dangerous circumstances. This would be tragic."

Main points of the combined military-industry school-community program worked out by Captain Brinley are:

Establishment of an organization that would provide supervision, safety information and advice by scientific, military, industrial, and education experts.

Requesting members to surrender the explosive fuels they now have.

Setting up launching sites away from metropolitan areas and static test areas in cities.

Starting a publication for the boys and setting up a library of technical and safety films.

Running a rocket-model contest and a launching contest.

Columbus Day: A Spiritual Symbol of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H. R. 387 which seeks to declare October 12 a legal holiday, I am pleased to submit the following report issued by the officers of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day for printing in the RECORD.

I want to commend the officers of this committee for the fine work which is being done in bringing to the attention of all Americans the significance of the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by Christopher Columbus, an Italian who sailed under the coffers of Spain, with a crew of Portuguese sailors.

The discovery of this hemisphere was certainly the result of international cooperation. Here was the Italian Columbus equipped with scientific knowledge, an abiding faith in God, and a serene confidence in his ability to penetrate the unknown. Here were the coffers of Spain willing to back him in this daring adventure. Here was the Portuguese sailors with the skills and courage to man the ships on uncharted seas.

The theme of this 1957 report is: Americans all. Regardless of nationality, race, culture, or religious belief, the people who live on the American Continent are bound together by their belief in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Furthermore, we in the Western Hemisphere believe in freedom of the spirit based on individual responsibility and mutual respect. We seem unable to get this idea across to other people. Perhaps this is because we have not given the kind of help which develops freedom and independence of spirit. Only through determined advancement of moral and spiritual values can we of this hemisphere prove to the world the value and effectiveness of our western system.

The American continent should be the symbol of a new way of life—of freedom—of opportunity—for people the world over. The Charter of the Organization of American States, the eldest, the strongest, and most influential

regional organization in the world, proclaims that the historic mission of America is to offer man a land of liberty.

It is therefore heartening to see the magnificent fashion in which people and organizations from all sections of the United States—North, South, East, and West—have rallied to the call to make Columbus Day an occasion for a spiritual rededication to the ideals of a free America based on the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Even more heartening is the committee's proposal to create a Columbus Foundation to sponsor scholarships for youngsters of ability and limited means. In this space and atomic age, talented young people need aid and encouragement if they are to face the future with the same bold daring, and same quiet courage, the same dauntless faith that brought Columbus across the seas nearly 500 years ago.

We of the Western Hemisphere have a leadership responsibility that transcends anything man has heretofore faced. We must meet that responsibility with the faith of Columbus and we must do our part to the end that the dream of a new path to the east, the west, the north, and south can become a reality.

It is now my pleasure to tell a few things about what the National Citizens Committee has done during the past year to dramatize this great historical date, October 12.

Under the leadership of the President of the United States, 40 State governors issued 1957 Columbus Day proclamations calling for observances on October 12 to create greater inter-American friendship and understanding under the theme: Americans All. In addition, a majority of these governors appointed State Columbus Day chairmen, to stimulate statewide observances and to coordinate the activities in the various communities.

It is particularly pleasing to me to report that my own State of New Jersey had a most outstanding statewide observance under the leadership of Governor Meyner and State Chairman Ovid J. Colalillo of Orange, N. J. Pennsylvania also had an outstanding State program under the leadership of Governor Leader and the State chairman, the Honorable Mary A. Varallo, State senator from Philadelphia.

In addition to this outstanding leadership given by the governors, hundreds of mayors of cities throughout the United States issued Columbus Day proclamations and appointed local chairmen and local committees to stimulate communitywide observances and advance the goal of increased inter-American understanding under the theme of Americans All.

Also noteworthy is the fact that these spectacular accomplishments were, attained by private citizens who joined forces to create good citizenship projects across the Nation. There was not 1 cent expended by the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day for salaries or paid staff. All these skilled services were contributed and donated by the officers and executive committee as their contribution to better inter-American friendship and international understanding in general.

I am pleased to serve as an honorary sponsor of this program and to join with 70 distinguished colleagues in the Congress of the United States who sponsored the 1957 observance, in saying to the national committee: Well done. Keep up your good work.

The National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day plans to stimulate even more impressive observances throughout the land during 1958.

The committee plans a continued and expanded program of inter-American friendship and understanding through the establishment of a Columbus foundation to promote scholarship funds for able and gifted students.

Mr. SANTANGELO of New York, Mr. LIBONATI of Illinois, Mr. BOYLE of Illinois, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, and Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania would like to join with me in congratulating the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day for a splendid contribution to an improved inter-American understanding and in wishing the committee even greater success in 1958 and future years.

The report follows:

COLUMBUS DAY: A SPIRITUAL SYMBOL OF THE AMERICAS—THEME: AMERICANS ALL

(A report on the 1957 Columbus Day observances in the United States issued by the officers of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day, Washington, D. C.)

For 3 years, the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day has sponsored a nationwide Columbus Day Observance. The first observance—1953—was a local District of Columbia affair. In 1955, 1956, and 1957, the national committee extended its activities to schools and colleges, organizations, churches, and State and community committees across the Nation.

Columbus Day activities have been carried on by public-spirited citizens, throughout the United States, with a two-fold purpose.

1. To commemorate October 12 as the day which the people in the 21 American Republics have in common.

2. To develop stronger bonds of brotherhood among the people of the Americas.

The response across the country has proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the people of the United States want such a movement and will give it their enthusiastic support.

In 1958 the national committee therefore proposes to:

1. Stimulate even more impressive observances throughout the United States and to widen citizen participation.

2. Establish a Columbus Foundation to provide scholarship funds for able and gifted students.

1957 COLUMBUS DAY OFFICERS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

The National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day is a voluntary, nonpartisan nonprofit citizens committee, giving their time and money without a paid staff. It is composed of business, political, civic, educational, and religious leaders who believe that it is essential to develop stronger bonds of friendship and understanding between the United States and the Latin American countries. Furthermore, they believe the way to do this is to interest United States citizens through such established channels as schools and colleges, national and community organizations.

The 1957 Columbus Day officers were:

National chairman: Mr. John I. Bott: Active member; World trade committee, Washington, D. C., Board of Trade; Christmas Pageant of Peace, Inc.; International Christian Leadership, Inc.; Religious Heritage of America, Inc.

Executive vice chairman: Mr. John T. O'Brien, public relations; recipient of numerous awards and commendations for public service and public relations programs.

Secretary-treasurer: Mr. Edward R. Carr, Washington home-builder, past president National Association of Home Builders and Washington Board of Trade, and president, Christmas Pageant of Peace, Washington, D. C.

Director of publicity: Dr. Alejandro Orfila, chief of public relations, organizations of American States, Pan American Union.

Community observances chairman: The Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia; member, United States Conference of Mayors and American Municipal Association.

Education committee cochairman: Sister Mary Janet, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., and Dr. John D. Ludington, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Program committee cochairmen: Mr. Richard E. Kellogg: Active member: World trade committee, Washington, D. C., Board of Trade; Christmas Pageant of Peace, Inc.; Propeller Club; Mr. Barnee Breeskin: Public relations for Inter-Continental Hotels and Pan American World Air Ways. The 1957 Columbus Day Planning Committee was composed of citizens of the United States, Spain, Italy, and the 20 Latin American Republics.

These leaders planned and organized the 1957 Columbus Day observances. It was this committee which helped to distribute the 2,000 copies of the 1957 Columbus Day leaders' guide so ably prepared under the direction of Dr. John R. Ludington of the United States Office of Education and Sister Mary Janet, D. C. Catholic University of America.

Dr. Paul E. Smith distributed 750 guides through the International Relations Committee of the National Education Association. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt distributed 600 to the Catholic schools. Dr. William E. Dunn of the American Council on Education sent materials to the 300-odd American-sponsored schools in the Latin American countries. The Latin American representatives carried the Columbus Day story to their ambassadors who in turn informed their governments of United States activities.

1957 COLUMBUS DAY BUSINESS SPONSORS

Contributions from the following industrialists enabled the National Citizens Committee to prepare and distribute the 1957 Columbus Day leaders' guide and Columbus Day poster to schools, colleges, organizations, State and community Columbus Day committees:

Edgar R. Baker, managing director, Time-Life International; H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president, American and Foreign Power Co., Inc.; William W. Faw, president, Friendly Faw Hotels; Walter Harnischfeger, president, Harnischfeger Corp.; Carl N. Jacobs, president, Hardware Mutual Casualty Co.; Charles A. Meyer, vice president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; W. M. Miller, vice president, Singer Sewing Machine Co.; John D. J. Moore, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co.; Howard M. Packard, executive vice president, S. C. Johnson & Sons, Inc.; Andrew B. Shea, president, Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc.; Malcolm C. Stewart, treasurer, The Gillette Co.; Arthur K. Watson, president, IBM World Trade Corporation; Wm. S. Youngman, Jr., director, The Starr Foundation.

HONORARY SPONSORS OF THE 1957 COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATIONS

From the Congress of the United States came honorary sponsorship from Members

of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In spite of their heavy political duties, many of these eminent leaders gave direction and guidance to the Columbus Day programs and made Columbus Day addresses to their constituents.

From the United States Senate: The Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire; the Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH, Connecticut; the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, Kansas; the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, New Mexico; the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania; the Honorable RALPH E. FLANDERS, Vermont; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota; the Honorable IRVING M. IVES, New York; the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee; the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts; the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California; the Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California; the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, Pennsylvania; the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, Oregon; the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota; the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island; the Honorable FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Maine; the Honorable CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan; the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Virginia; the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts; the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey; the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri; the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota; the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin; the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware; the Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota.

From the United States House of Representatives: The Honorable E. ROSS ADAIR, Indiana; the Honorable HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; the Honorable THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, Ohio; the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Michigan; the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; the Honorable FRANK T. BOW, Ohio; the Honorable HAMER H. BUDGE, Idaho; the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; the Honorable CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Michigan; the Honorable PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania; the Honorable JAMES J. DELANEY, New York; the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; the Honorable IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania; the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; the Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania; the Honorable J. VAUGHN GARY, Virginia; the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Michigan; the Honorable JAMES C. HEALEY, New York; the Honorable LESTER HOLTZMAN, New York; the Honorable DONALD L. JACKSON, California; the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; the Honorable CARROLL D. KEARNS, Pennsylvania; the Honorable DON MAGNUSON, Washington; the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, Texas; the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota; the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Massachusetts; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts; the Honorable EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland; the Honorable ALBERT P. MORANO, Connecticut; the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; the Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York; the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; the Honorable ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey; the Honorable HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, Texas; the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, New Jersey; the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin.

The Honorable John C. Dreier, United States representative to the Organization of American States.

HONORARY RELIGIOUS SPONSORS

Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, S. T. D., LL. D., minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.; the Most Rev. Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Washington, D. C.; Rabbi David H. Panitz, Congregation Adas Israel, Washington, D. C.

These three distinguished clergymen represented the desire of their churches to help improve inter-American relations.

From the Latin American countries came splendid cooperation and honorary sponsorship from the Ambassadors to the United States and the Organization of American States.

The national committee is indebted to many officials of the Organization of American States for their splendid cooperation in helping to make the 1958 Columbus Day observances a success: Dr. José A. Mora, Secretary General; Dr. Alejandro Orfila, Chief of Public Relations and his assistant, Mr. Carl Migdail for their outstanding press, radio, and TV coverage; and Mr. Paul W. Murphy, Chief of Protocol, for his assistance in the national celebration.

In 1957, 40 governors and the District of Columbia Commissioners issued Columbus Day proclamations. Many appointed chairman for statewide observances.

EXAMPLES OF STATE COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATIONS

The State of Pennsylvania

In Pennsylvania, Gov. George M. Leader appointed as Columbus Day State chairman the Honorable Mary A. Varallo, dean of the womem members of the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives. Representative Varallo attended the National Columbus Day celebration at the Pan American Union as the guest of the National Columbus Day Committee. Because of her excellent work, the national committee presents excerpts from chairman Varallo's report of Pennsylvania's Columbus Day activities:

"Spurred by the outstanding interest of our Governor, George M. Leader, as his Excellency issued his statewide proclamation urging the people of Pennsylvania to observe Columbus Day, my work began * * * to induce many more communities in the State to conduct celebrations.

"Every mayor in the State of Pennsylvania received a letter under the theme 'Americans All,' urging them to commemorate the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by issuing a Columbus Day proclamation, and enclosed therein a copy of the proclamation that was issued by our Governor.

"I followed this request to the mayors by enclosing the statement issued by our Governor, in connection with the statewide observance of Columbus Day, suggesting it as a sample, and asking them to urge the citizens in their respective communities to display the flag of our country during the Columbus Day observance at their homes and all public buildings, and so forth. In addition, to some of the more important communities, I furnished a Leader's guide.

"The details of these activities were given to every radio station, every TV station, and they responded wonderfully by repeatedly broadcasting the promotional material that was furnished them.

"Every newspaper publication, including all foreign newspapers, both large and small, received the promotional material and also cooperated 100 percent.

"It was most encouraging when replies came to me from mayors of many communities who declared that they would issue the proclamation and follow it with the statement.

"Under the enthusiastic leadership of our Governor, who placed at my disposal every facility or help that the State could offer, we in the State of Pennsylvania had one of the most publicized and most commemorative days ever celebrated, with activities that have remained most impressive upon the citizens throughout this great Commonwealth. Our Governor participated in all the activities of the day, being the principal speaker at the banquet held in the city of Philadelphia and the following day leading the greatest parade ever held in Pennsylvania lasting well over 3 hours with nearly 10,000 people participating in the line of march.

"Aside from the fact that our large cities have permanent Columbus Day committees, I was greatly inspired by the widespread acceptances that were received from so many mayors and burgesses who expressed their willingness to have something organized to honor the great discoverer."

The State of New Jersey

For 3 years, Mr. Ovid J. Colalillo of Orange, N. J., has served as State Columbus Day Chairman. Chairman Colalillo's splendid 1957 report shows the growth of the Columbus Day idea in New Jersey.

"Since assuming the position as State Chairman of Columbus Day celebrations for the State of New Jersey in 1955, I wish to report that I am especially pleased with the widespread cooperation I received throughout the State this year. Americans of Italian descent are naturally enthusiastic about these celebrations, but the reports I have received from various sections of the State, indicate this year that the theme, Americans All, is now felt and is rapidly becoming a reality.

"As in past years, I have received the wholehearted and unstinted cooperation of our Governor, the Honorable Robert B. Meyner. Governor Meyner accepted the post of honorary chairman and issued a State-wide proclamation, inviting all the people of the State to observe Columbus Day with appropriate ceremonies in their homes, houses of worship, and other suitable places. He also directed that the flag of the United States be displayed on all State buildings and requested school authorities and civic leaders to hold appropriate exercises for the commemoration of this day. The facilities of his office were given to me to assist in communicating with various leaders throughout the State and heads of interested organizations. In addition to this, Governor Meyner attended as many celebrations as was possible on Columbia Day.

"Because of the success achieved in past years, I again sent letters to the mayors of the several hundred cities, towns, and hamlets of the State of New Jersey, numbering about 566. Contained in said letter was a suggested plan for the observance of this day and an appeal to appoint municipal committees to arrange such programs and to have a municipal proclamation issued by the said mayors. We also placed at the disposal of the said mayors a sample proclamation for their use.

"In addition to the above, we communicated with many of the civic organizations of the State, namely the Knights of Columbus Council, Unico Clubs, Sons of Italy lodges, and various federations of Italian-American societies.

"As a result of the above program, I can report that Columbus Day in 1957 was more enthusiastically celebrated than in past years. The responses to our appeal were many and widespread. I can report that practically every large city in our State observed Columbus Day by having some form of activity, in addition to issuing a municipal proclamation. A percentage of the mayors reported to me that permanent Columbus Day committees were established.

"In many of the large cities, in addition to having parades, banquets, and speakers, programs were initiated in the school systems.

"I would like very much to publicly thank Governor Meyner, the several congressmen of the State and the many mayors and their committees for making this observance a successful one."

COLUMBUS DAY COMMUNITY OBSERVANCES

Columbus Day community observances were widely stimulated in 1957 through the

cooperation of the Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Serving as chairman of the National Columbus Day's Committee on Community Observances, Commissioner McLaughlin worked with members of both the United States Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association.

Reports from mayors and State Columbus Day chairmen reveal participation by around 500 mayors, the majority of whom appointed community chairmen and had community observances.

Every State had mayor and community participation.

Mayors' Columbus Day proclamations urged churches, clubs, and schools to pay tribute to the importance of inter-American friendship while honoring the great discoverer, the hero of the American continent.

EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY COLUMBUS DAY OBSERVANCES

The reports of community Columbus Day observances reveal the finest community-wide cooperation among religious groups, civic organizations, and business groups. Members of the Italian-American and Spanish-Americans communities gave excellent leadership to Columbus Day celebrations everywhere. Here are some examples of outstanding community Columbus Day observances:

Miami, Fla.

The Miami Citizens' Committee, Inter-American Observance, honoring Christopher Columbus was the outcome of the work of a great many civic leaders. The leader of the group from year to year has been Dr. J. M. DeGaetani, the Italian Consular representative in Miami.

In 1953 Miami unveiled in Bayfront Park a statue of Columbus executed by Count Vittoria de Colbertaldo. The statue stands on an ancient marble column, a gift from the Italian people, the first such relic released to a foreign nation. Dr. DeGaetani was greatly responsible for the erection of the monument, and it was he who negotiated with the Italian Government for the column.

On September 27, Mr. José Ferre was selected as general chairman. The late start was due to the illness of both last year's chairman, James R. Ranni, and Dr. DeGaetani.

Mr. Ferre's interest in the future of Columbus Day, and young people's part in this, led him to request the president of the Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce to assist in preparing the public program. Mr. Eddie Swan, assistant State attorney and jaycee president, arranged and M. C.'d the ceremonies at the Columbus statue. This celebration was covered by local newspaper and TV reporters. Approximately five hundred people witnessed the ceremony on October 12.

A cocktail party for the consular corps was held at Mr. Ferre's home on Thursday, October 10. The Governor of Florida, Leroy Collins, and the mayors of Miami and Miami Beach attended, in addition to the diplomatic representatives. Publishers and editors of several local papers were also present.

At the cocktail party, Miss Barbara Knight was introduced as the committee's Queen Isabella. Miss Knight was selected because of her interest in inter-American affairs, rather than as a beauty queen. Mr. Ferre and the general committee agreed that every attempt should be made to surround the title of Queen Isabella with dignity and respect rather than to capitalize on the cheesecake appeal of a pretty girl.

The speaker at the monument ceremonies was a well known local attorney, prominent in civic work, Mr. E. R. P. Brigham. Dr. J Wayne Reitz, president of the University of Florida, was the speaker at the dinner dance.

The annual racing regatta, famous in yachting circles, was chairmaned by Mr. Timothy J. Sullivan. The regatta is traditionally part of the Columbus Day activities and is international in scope as it draws participants from all over the Carribean area.

The overall intent of the committee this year was to perpetuate the memory of the spiritual significance of the great navigator.

In his Columbus Day proclamation, Miami Mayor Randall N. Christmas stressed the fact that the city of Miami is the Gateway of the Americas and its citizens are most conversant with the peoples of Latin American countries.

The Miami Herald, October 12, pointed out on its editorial page that "Florida will always carry the distinction of being the first territory settled in the United States as a direct result of Columbus sighting land on October 12, 1492."

Furthermore said the editorial: "Columbus Day might well serve as the occasion for renewed patriotic determination to lend our every effort—individually as well as nationally—to safeguard this heritage of ours, whose beginnings were started in the dawn of October 12, 1492, in the Bahamas."

Philadelphia, Pa.

Nearly 10,000 persons participated in Philadelphia's second annal Columbus Day parade. The parade, which began at 1:30 p. m., was led by Genevieve Bene, 18, of 2641 Snyder Avenue, who was chosen from 10 finalists by the Sons of Italy as queen of Columbus Day. In the line of march were the police and firemen's band, units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, scores of floats entered by service organizations and community groups, several string bands and bugle and drum corps, and a host of veterans' organizations, parochial school and city playground groups and Boy and Girl Scouts.

At the national shrine, further exercises to honor the discoverer of America was held. The speakers included Gov. George M. Leader, Mayor Richardson Dilworth, Council President James H. J. Tate and Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni, president of the Philadelphia Columbus Day Committee, who will soon receive the Medal of Merit from Italy's President Giovanni Gronchi.

Under the chairmanship of the Honorable Eugene Aliessandroni, judge of common pleas court in Philadelphia, a formidable celebration got underway, beginning with Friday, October 11.

October 11: Field sports for children of all ages.

October 12: At Columbus Square: 8 a. m., flag raising exercises; 9 a. m., bocce contest; afternoon card contest; 6 p. m., award of prizes.

10:30 a. m., an impressive motorcade left for exercises at the Columbus Monument in Fairmount Park; 7 p. m., banquet at the Bellevue Stratford Hotel; over 1,000 attended. Governor Leader was the principal speaker.

At Columbus Square: 7:30 p. m., band concert and fireworks.

October 13: 11 a. m., memorial mass at St. Rita Church (the Archdiocese participating); 1 p. m., parade with well over 10,000 marchers in line; 4:30 p. m., the parade concluded at the national shrine, Independence Hall, where exercises were held. The principal speakers were: His Excellency George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania; Mayor Richardson Dilworth; Committee Chairman Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni; City Councilman Paul D'Ortona.

Many other preday activities were inaugurated; such as, offering valuable prizes for contests in essays in the schools; scholarships; sending out numerous speakers versed in the history of Columbus to school assemblies and many organizations requesting help.

Kansas City, Mo.

The Kansas City, Mo., Columbus Day celebration was headed by the distinguished surgeon, Dr. James A. DiRenna, who was appointed Columbus Day chairman by the Honorable H. Roe Bartle, mayor of Kansas City.

For the first time in the history of Kansas City, Columbus Day was celebrated by a program of great magnitude because a group of people were organized in the cause of really celebrating Columbus Day.

Starting with Kansas City's newly organized Italian Social Club, Dr. DiRenna brought in representatives from the civic, social, educational, business, and political life of Kansas City. Over 1,300 persons expressed their appreciation of Columbus at a dinner dance held at Hotel Muehlebach. Eddie Clark, program director of radio station WHB, acted as toastmaster and Boy Scout Troop 70 of Holy Rosary Catholic Church served as the color guard, posting the American and Italian flags.

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, United States Senator from Missouri, was the keynote speaker. Two Missouri Congressmen, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING and the Honorable WILLIAM R. HULL, JR., were also honored guests. Dr. Roberto de Cardona, consular general for Italy in Missouri, presented the Order of Merit to the Honorable Fred G. Manusco from the Republic of Italy.

In his Columbus Day proclamation, Mayor H. Roe Bartle urged that the citizens of Kansas City make "these observances an occasion for the expression of the brotherhood and goodwill which the people of Kansas City hold for our neighbors in the Latin American countries."

Dr. DiRenna in a radio broadcast said: "We certainly hope that our Latin American neighbors will use their Columbus Day celebrations as an opportunity to strengthen their bonds with us in the United States."

Dr. DiRenna attended the national Columbus Day celebration held at the Pan American Union, on Friday evening, October 11, as the guest of the National Citizens Committee.

Oakland, Calif.

Under the leadership of Mr. Felix F. Chialvo, Columbus Day chairman, the city of Oakland and the County of Alameda enjoyed a 3-day celebration. The Italian-American Federation of the East Bay composed of 20 member organizations supported the efforts of Mr. Chialvo to make the 1957 Columbus Day celebrations the best in the 33 years of the federation's history.

On October 11, the coronation of the Columbus Day queen and court and the presentation of Puccini's opera, Madame Butterfly opened the 3-day celebration. These two events were open to the public without charge.

Miss Carmen Pago was selected as the festival queen and was crowned at 8 p. m. at the Oakland Auditorium Theater. Queen Carmen, senior at Berkeley's St. Joseph High School, plans to be a doctor.

Following the coronation, the audience of over 2,000 enjoyed listening to the opera Madame Butterfly with well-known artists taking the lead and music furnished by the cooperation of local No. 6 of the American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, as a public service.

The grand ball and banquet held at the Leamington Hotel on October 12 was attended by 350 persons with State, county, and city officials as guests and Mr. Chialvo as master of ceremonies.

Highlight of this occasion was the presentation of citizenship awards—$100 Government bonds—to Ronald Foglia, 17, Oakland Technical High School senior; Joanne Raffaelli, 15, and Michaele Botella, 15, both students at Holy Name Central High School.

On October 13, Lake Meirith was the scene of the marathon, walkathon and bicycle races. A concluding and unusual feature of the 1957 celebration was to have been the pageant of the Landing of Columbus, at Jack

London Square. Inclement weather knocked out this feature, but it will be included in the 1958 pageant says Attorney Raymond Mellana, pageant chairman, who worked for 3 months to arrange this colorful affair.

District of Columbia

The Knights of Columbus, under the leadership of Mr. Carmine Garofalo and Mr. Henry G. Catucci sponsored two outstanding events in the District of Columbia. On October 12, the parade and wreath laying at the Columbus Monument were highlighted by addresses by the Spanish Ambassador, His Excellency Don José M. de Areilza and Dr. Vincenzo de Benedictis, counselor, of the Italian Embassy. Music was furnished by the United States Army Band and the Sea Chanters (U. S. Navy).

The Columbus Monument was cleaned, the fountains turned on, and the monument lighted for 3 nights through the courtesy of the National Capital Parks.

On the evening of October 13, the Knights held their Columbus Day banquet at the Mayflower Hotel with Mr. Gilbert A. Cuneo as toastmaster and Mr. William H. Collins as general chairman. The Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop and chancellor, Archdiocese of Washington; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James A. Magner, procurator, Catholic University; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John K. Cartwright, rector, St. Matthews Cathedral; and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward H. Roach, rector, Shrine of the Blessed Sacrament, participated in the impressive ceremonies.

THE 1957 NATIONAL COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATION PAN AMERICAN UNION—HALL OF THE AMERICAS

On Friday evening, October 11, the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day held a reception, dinner, and dance in the Hall of the Americas, Pan American Union. The Pan American Union function was sponsored by Washington's leading industrialists, businessmen, civic, religious, and educational leaders interested in United States-Latin American relations. Around 350 attended this distinguished celebration.

Six prominent Americans received Columbus Day awards for their contributions to inter-American friendship and understanding.

Recipients of the 1957 Columbus Day citations were Gov. Luiz Munoz Marin of Puerto Rico; former president of Ecuador, Galo Plaza Lasso; John T. O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News and now president of the Inter-American Press Association; Congressman JAMES GROVE FULTON, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; John W. White, author of "Argentina: The Life Story of a Nation" and "Our Good Neighbor Hurdle"; and industrialist L. A. Astley-Bell, president of the Shell Caribbean Petroleum Co.

Following are excerpts from the Columbus Day citations delivered by Dr. Jose A. Mora, Secretary General, Organization of American States:

1. Governor Marin: "Played a leading role in achieving for Puerto Rico a free, voluntary, association with the United States under a Commonwealth status."

"Munoz Marin has strengthened democracy in the Caribbean area and has pointed the way in which our free society can be made truly free and truly representative. He established a stable government, increased the standard of living of his people, provided health facilities, improved the health and well-being of the Puerto Ricans. He uprooted the Communist beachhead in the island and launched a constructive, industrialization program which got his country away from a one-crop dependence on sugar cane."

2. Galo Plaza: "In a geographic area characterized by deliberately incited civil disorder, Galo Plaza was the first Ecuadorian president in many years who served out his full term despite the fact that as president he lived as a servant of the people, not as their military master."

"As a football player in his own country and in the United States he early learned the principles of team play and of sportsmanship based on mutual respect; principles which he carried into his adult life and which were contributing factors to his success in advancing the cause of representative government in the Americas."

3. O'Rourke: "Has worked strenuously for more than a decade to make North Americans and North American newspapers more conscious of events in Latin America.

"Mr. O'Rourke's great contribution has been his unceasing struggle to widen and deepen the channels of communication among the nations of the Americas and thus create a setting in which representative government can grow and flourish. He has been and continues to be an implacable enemy of press control and thought control in the Americas."

4. Congressman FULTON: "Senior Republican on the Subcommittee for Foreign Economic Policy of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he is a stalwart champion of a bipartisan good-neighbor policy.

"He is a strong advocate of expanded business activity by United States firms in Latin America with Government assistance.

"As an observer for the House Foreign Affairs Committee at the Rio economic conference in 1954. Congressman FULTON had the vision and the courage to recommend an expansion of the Export-Import Bank loan through a $1 billion revolving fund to implement the United States role of leadership in Latin American development."

5. White: "For 28 years he lived and traveled in Latin America as a close observer of its political life.

"He was one of the founders of the Inter-American Committee for Columbus Day in 1933 and of its successor, the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day.

"In 25 years south of the Rio Grande he has learned to know the Latin Americans as they are. He has respected their culture and learned their language. He has learned to see through their eyes, which is the first step in being a good neighbor. In his excellent books, Argentina: The Life Story of a Nation, and Our Good Neighbor Hurdle, he has sought to bring home to his fellow countrymen in the United States some understanding of our responsibility as good neighbors to respect people who may be different from us rather than to shape them to our mold before we accept them."

6. Astley-Bell: "His contributions consist of efforts to strengthen the ties between the Americas through the medium of education. His organization is presently supervising the welfare of 75 Venezuelan students attending United States colleges on scholarships granted by the Shell Companies of Venezuela. These scholarships cover 4 years' living expenses and tuition. They are awarded annually to about 20 qualified students, who are free to choose their own school and course of study.

"Another investment in mutual understanding is made by the contribution of the Shell Cos. to the Inter-American Law Institute which annually provides the opportunity for promising Latin American lawyers to take a 1-year graduate course in American law at New York University. This specialized training develops mature individuals capable of assuming responsible positions in government or business."

Columbus Day citations in 1956 were awarded to Henry F. Holland, former United States Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs; Dr. Jose A. Mora, Secretary General, Organization of American States; Msgr. Joaquin Salcedo, Secretary General of Accion Cultural Popular, of Bogotá, Colombia; Dr. Horacio Aguirre, editor of Diario Las Americas, Miami, Fla.; and the late Rudolf S. Hecht, onetime Chairman of the International Trade Mart of New Orleans.

The Honorable George D. Neilson, Chairman, Western Hemisphere committee of the world trade committee of the Washington, D. C., Board of Trade, was master of ceremonies for the national celebration. The Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Washington, D. C., and the Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, were other active participants.

The Defense of America: A Special Debate on the Reorganization of the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast entitled "The Defense of America: A Special Debate on the Reorganization of the Defense Department," as broadcast over the CBS television network, April 20, 1958. Guests, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator, Republican, of Massachusetts; the Honorable William C. Foster, Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1951–1953, member of the Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Defense To Study the Reorganization Plan, the Honorable F. Edward Hébert, United States House of Representatives, Democrat, of Louisiana; the Honorable John T. Koehler, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1949 to 1951. Moderator, George Herman, CBS News. Producer, Nancy Hanschman.

The broadcast follows:

Mr. HERMAN. I am George Herman. I am substituting for Eric Sevareid, who is unable to be here.

Gentlemen, President Eisenhower wants a major reorganization of the Defense Department involving the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Do you agree, Senator SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am sympathetic with his objectives.

Mr. HERMAN. Congressman HÉBERT?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am opposed to the President's proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. The plan demonstrates the President's leadership in the field in which he is preeminent.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler?

Mr. KOEHLER. I am opposed to any proposal which results in merger of the armed services.

ANNOUNCER. From Washington, the CBS Television Network brings you The Defense of America: A Special Debate on the Reorganization of the Defense Department.

Participating in the debate are Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, top Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee; William C. Foster, former Deputy Secretary of Defense; Representative EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, one of the top Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee; and John T. Koehler, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The moderator is George Herman, CBS News Washington Correspondent.

Mr. HERMAN. Gentlemen, I think you all know that President Eisenhower told Congress last January that he was going to give them his plans for defense reorganization before long, and on the 3d of April he sent Congress a message which proposed a much broader and deeper reorganization than anyone had apparently expected.

On April 16, he sent a draft of legislation to bring about that reorganization, and a bill was promptly introduced in Congress, and the following day he delivered a strong and dramatic appeal for support in a speech before a gathering of news editors here in Washington.

Secretary of Defense McElroy has also spoken in defense of the plan, which very strongly bears his own imprint.

With the Department of Defense under Mr. McElroy, which drew up the main points of the plan after conferring with past and present Chiefs of Staff and with the five-man committee of which Mr. Foster was a member, the President's legislative leaders will now have the main burden of carrying forward this plan in Congress, and in particular that means Senator SALTONSTALL.

So, Senator, would you start off by telling us what you feel about the President's reorganization plan?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Herman, I am glad to. First, let me say I am happy to be on this program with these 3 other gentlemen and yourself, because I have worked with all 4 of you, on Capitol Hill, on the subject, at one time or another.

Now, today what we all want is security and a great opportunity for peace in the world. What we need for our security is strong defense of a quick retaliatory effort, quick and very massive in the retaliatory effort. To get that quick retaliatory effort, we have got to have efficiency, and to be efficient we have got to today use as little money as we can, because of the tremendous expense that goes into our defensive effort.

Mr. HERMAN. And for that reason you plan to support the——

Senator SALTONSTALL. As I said, I am sympathetic with the objectives of the President. I think we have got to work out some of the details in the Congress that aren't perhaps entirely clear in his message or in the bill that he has submitted.

Mr. HERMAN. Thank you, Senator SALTONSTALL.

Congressman HÉBERT?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Herman, I am surprised at Senator SALTONSTALL's statement, pleasantly so, because I can't be in disagreement with it.

Mr. HERMAN. Try.

Mr. HÉBERT. We aren't at all in disagreement on the objectives. We are all for mother and country and against sin, but the thing that strikes me most in the President's most recent proposition to reorganize the Department is the similarity of all previous reorganization attempts. I think it would be well to trace the history of these reorganization movements.

The original one began in 1947, at which time we had the original intent, and of course it was for efficiency and economy, the same words used today. At that time it was indicated that if we adopted the original Unification Act, everything would be solved and we would be on our way to efficiency and economy.

Admiral Forrest Sherman at that time then envisaged what the Defense Department would be, and his words were: there would be 1 Secretary, 4 deputies, 100 people, and a concentrated office, with a decentralization of power.

That Secretary and 4 deputies and 100 people has now grown to 33 individuals in the Department of Defense who can be called Mr. Secretary, and the hundred people have grown to 3,500 people.

Now, the next time: we also heard of the reorganization as soon as we got a new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson. He came to the Hill in 1949, I think it was.

He said, "We want efficiency and we want economy. Now, if you will just give us this added power, it is going to solve everything."

So he marched up the hill.

Then we had another Secretary of Defense come up, Mr. Charles Wilson, and he came to the Hill.

He said, "We want efficiency and we want economy. If you change this and give me more power, we are going to accomplish this and give us more Secretaries."

So we promptly gave him that.

And now, several years later, we have another new Secretary. He marched up the hill again and we hear again efficiency and economy.

Now, these statements I am making in general and I am quoting the individuals in general, but for the benefit of my friend, Senator SALTONSTALL, and Mr. Foster, I have the records stacked here and here which can be found the accurate quotes, and I am sure you will accept my paraphrasing.

But I think there is one thing I want to leave, before I go on now, and that is this: The President has said that the present law causes waste and ineffectiveness, but I wonder who wrote the present law, except the President himself. The Congress had absolutely nothing to do with it. They accepted a blank check from him, and we couldn't change a comma or a semicolon.

Mr. HERMAN. I just want to ask you as you conclude that statement, Mr. Hébert, whether by this you mean that you do not think we need further efficiency, and you do not propose to support the President's——

Mr. HÉBERT. We need further efficiency and economy, but we could do it with what we have in hand and could have done it under the first act.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Foster, I am sure you will have a reaction to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do. Of course, I think we all agree in the objectievs. I think we all accept the Congressman's paraphrase, although he may have conceivably taken it a little bit black where it was gray instead of white.

You are quite right. There have been each time over these years a hope that the latest plan would meet the change and conditions a little bit better, and I think we must all realize that conditions have substantially changed since 1947.

I think the onrush of technology, to use the President's phrase, has been something that none of us could have foreseen. I think the substantial progress which our major enemy has made none of us could have foreseen.

I think it is quite clear today that we need a more direct command channel between the President as Commander in Chief through his deputy, the Secretary of Defense, to the operating commands, which are the cutting edges of our defense, and I think that each of these plans to which you refer has actually made an improvement.

True we have never reached perfection; we never will. I am sure that this plan will require amendment sometime in the future. But I do believe that this does meet the major things which we have to do; namely, to clarify command channels, to put research and technology at a high level where it can be developed and be available to the Chiefs of Staff to meet the kind of conditions which we face from here in.

And while I agree perhaps it could have been done better each time, Mr. Congressman, it has improved down through the years, but I believe we need this to make it better and good enough to meet today's challenge.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Foster, you were 1 of the 5 men on the committee which advised Secretary McElroy on the building of this plan. Let me ask you this: Were the past plans considered as evolutionary steps? Was that built upon the past, the changes of the past plans?

Mr. FOSTER. This is cetainly evolutionary, and I would not say I was a member of the committee. I was 1 of the group of 5 consultants and we consulted, questioned, advised, in that sense, but the plan is the President's and the Secretary's, using, to the extent that he could, since he had not been there long, as you know, the experience which a number of us had had.

And you will recall the group, the three Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Mr. Rockefeller who has been active in administrative recommendations through the whole Government, and myself, and I think that as a group of consultants we were very effective in challenging major suggestions, and I think that what has come out as evolutionary is not destructive to what has gone on in the past, but will be an improvement over it.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler, you were in the Pentagon from 1949 to 1951, I believe, as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. You were there during the last reorganization. How does this one strike you?

Mr. KOEHLER. Well, I wasn't there during the last reorganization. I was there during the first two. I wasn't there in 1953.

As Congressman HÉBERT has said, this is No. 4.

Now, I would like to take a slightly different tack from that taken by the other three gentlemen. I agree, of course, with the objectives, that we must have the most efficient and the most capable military forces that our circumstances and our finances permit. But in view of some disagreements at very high level, and being a lawyer, I think that I can best perform my part of this task this afternoon to the language of the proposals.

The Congress has consistently repulsed attempts (1) to merge our armed services; (2) to create a single Chief of Staff; and (3) to authorize someone other than Congress to prescribe the roles and missions of the services, which authority is vested solely in the Congress by article 1, section A, clauses 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution.

The President has said as recently as last Thursday that the proposed changes will not result in merger, nor the creation of a general staff system, and that the bill does not undermine the constitutional power of the Congress in this respect.

On the other hand, Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, has reached the opposite conclusion on each of those three points. It goes without saying that both statements are entitled to highest consideration and the highest respect. I believe, therefore, that we should, to the extent possible, address ourselves to the language of the bill and in considering the language, consider just as carefully the language that would be deleted from the present legislation.

Mr. HERMAN. Gentlemen, in listening to all four of you, one thing strikes me right away. We all talk about whether we call it chains of command, whether we call it efficiency, whether it gets called as it was called in the previous reorganization, "more bang for a buck," we all talk about improving the status of our Armed Forces and we all talk about getting more firepower, more defense power for our dollar.

What I would like to ask of you at this point is how bad are things? How urgently do we need reorganization? Are things in a devil of a mess, and how quickly must we move on this? Senator SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would just say this, Mr. Herman, and you bring up a very good point. Things aren't in a mess. Things are going forward well. They can go forward better. But we have always got to remember today is the speed of attack. To-

day or in a year or so the Russians presumably can send a missile over here that will come over in 30 minutes.

Now that is quite different from World War I or World War II or 1947, Mr. HÉBERT. It can come over very quickly. Therefore, we have got to organize our defense very quickly and very efficiently, and that has got to mean a quicker chain of command and a quicker action, and that action has got to be devastating if we are going to be secure, because if it is devastating we won't be attacked.

Mr. HÉBERT. Senator, show me one thing in the present law which the President himself wrote with a blank check which would prevent immediate action if we were attacked?

Senator SALTONSTALL. The one thing is the time that it takes to get a command, we will say, from the Secretary of Defense or from the Joint Chiefs of Staff down through to the command post for action.

Mr. HÉBERT. Where is that prevented in the present law?

Senator SALTONSTALL. There is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course there is not.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Except that the people that it has to go through. What we want to do is to have it go through as few people as possible, and yet keep a civilian head at the final command.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am thoroughly in accord, but I suggest there is not a thing in the present law that prevents immediate action. There is not one thing, and I would like to have it pointed out if there is one thing.

Keep in mind again, Senator, that the President himself in 1953—what has been so different from 1953 to 1958—the President himself wrote the present law under which they exist in the Defense Department, you will agree with me on that I am sure, because it was a reorganization act, not a statutory act, and the President wrote it and we couldn't change a comma. In this book back here which I won't have time to bring out, he says now is the time to perfect the Department, "and I am perfecting it now with this plan."

Mr. HERMAN. Congressman HÉBERT, before you come out with any more of your secret weapons from the table back there, let me ask you this:

Do you believe that things have not changed so radically from the production of missiles and from the shrinking of warning times, that things do not require a different frame now from the frame they required 5–10 years ago?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir. Our lack is lack of a decision or, if not lack of decision, of an immediate decision. The stumbling block in the Defense Department has been in the area of the Comptroller who controls the money in which Mr. Eisenhower is so interested. We could have put up a satellite a year and a half ago if the decision had been made in the Defense Department, and it was not made.

Mr. FOSTER. May I go back to this question of command, and the President's former reorganization act, because I think this is extremely important. It is true it was written as a reorganization plan, by the President when he first came in. Five years have passed. We do have a strong security setup in our Armed Forces, but in 5 years we have learned, as Senator SALTONSTALL said, that the command lines are not as clear as we would like to have them.

The executive agent process is not as effective under these terms and times which we are up against today. Then when that was written we thought in terms of a manned air force attacking us. This is a matter of hours. We had sufficient tactical warning. We could get our deterrent forces, our retaliatory forces in the air. Today, as Senator SALTONSTALL says, this is a matter of 30 minutes. In addition to that, in any passage of command down, the executive agent does introduce what have been determined to be unnecessary additional layers to go through.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember in history, sir, and I appeared before you several times when I was there, you were very concerned about layers of command at that time. We were talking about cataloging, you will recall, and you felt there were too many. This is simply a movement toward the elimination of obstructive layers.

Mr. HÉBERT. I don't want to monopolize the time, Mr. Foster, but you injected something in there. I want to ask you a question.

You mentioned the cataloging situation. That was the one act that to unify and make uniform purchases, make a catalog with a single number, isn't that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it didn't unify purchases.

Mr. HÉBERT. But it was direction for unification, wasn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. It was an attempt to get a common name for each and every item.

Mr. HÉBERT. And that is what is being done today at a savings of some $5 billion, I think, estimated by the Hoover Commission, isn't that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. This is correct, and you and I both worked toward this end.

Mr. HÉBERT. You did? Wait just one second please, sir. I have the record here in which you opposed that bill and said you had enough laws; that you didn't need any more laws. Now where do you stand today?

Mr. FOSTER. We would have done it without the law and we do not feel that the Congress in that kind of a thing should get in and do the executive actions which you, sir, as a legislator write the policies and the executive branch carries out.

Mr. HÉBERT. I have proved my point.

Mr. HERMAN. Between the legislator and the administrator here, I think a lawyer wanted to get a word in.

Mr. KOEHLER. I wanted to get back to the discussion that Senator SALTONSTALL started; namely, that because of technological improvements and the fact that the new world, the new look is so different, we must be able to act very very speedily.

I agree, but it strikes me as more than a happenstance that this desire for speed in reaction has come about very recently. Now the missile program is not new. The missile program is not a matter of the last 6 months. And it seems very interesting that during the years 1953 through 1957 the organization of the Department of Defense was deemed apply capable of taking care of technological improvements under the present Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But the Rockefeller report has come out within the last few months; and the Rockefeller report, which I think in my humble way is the basis of this proposal; is replete with very sweeping statements——

Mr. FOSTER. May I interrupt there, because it is not the basis of this proposal, Mr. Koehler.

Mr. KOEHLER. Shall I say was taken into consideration then in preparing——

Mr. FOSTER. It was along with the advice and counsel of dozens, twenties of other people, all of whom were also experienced and competent.

Mr. KOEHLER. I stand corrected. Shall I say it had a bearing on the subject. But the Rockefeller report—and I, of course, have not had access to other reports—is complete with sweeping conclusions and generalizations; and, so far as I am concerned, it is very much like a brief without citation of authority.

I do not feel that the present Joint Chiefs of Staff have failed to make proper position for the protection of this country in the event of some international disaster. It may be that their present system could be improved, because any system can be improved, but I am astonished that in a period of a few months a reorganization as sweeping as this is should be necessary, in view of what I consider to be the tremendous advances we have made in the last 10 years in unification.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I, Mr. Koehler, go into one part of that, and that is this: The position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We put in there our most experienced military man, a man with a hard personality and a man in whom the country has confidence.

We have had General Bradley, Admiral Radford, and now General Twining. Those are the three.

Now what we really in a way do is to downgrade him when we put him in there. We do not give him authority. Now that bothered me in 1947. It bothered me again in 1949, and I was on both those conference committees that worked out the technical language of those acts.

Now what the President is trying to do is not to downgrade the Chief of Staff, but to take advantage of his experience and to give him a true responsibility in working out our strategy, as I see it. And that is one very important part of this act. I do not think anybody will—well, I will not say anybody, but I do not think that that should be too much opposed.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me ask you four gentlemen this. At this point in our history, with the missile war apparently approaching the tilt, do you then think that we can respond to these future fast happening wars with our present setup, or some kind of a reorganization, whether it be a basic reorganization or a plan of this kind, or whether it would simply be a reorganization decided upon by the Chiefs of Staff, that some such reorganization is needed, or are we all right for a missile war now.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think the reorganization is needed in the other direction. Cut out all of these secretaries and all of these needless people. Let the Joint Chiefs of Staff have some authority right directly under the Secretary of Defense himself, and revert back to the original plan as it was drawn and as the testimony of General Eisenhower at that time and Forest Sherman, Bob Patterson, everybody that appeared said would settle it.

However, there is one thing, and Senator SALTONSTALL has put his finger on it. There is one thing that worries me greatly about this military thing, and that is a military man on horseback. That is the idea, of course, it has been thrown up as a screen, Senator.

I know they say even the President, and I may say here parenthetically something that I am deeply concerned about, and that is the language of the President in his speech the other day, as an example, before the national editors association in which he just tossed off with a wave of the hand and said of the people who criticized him: it was sheer nonsense. Does he mean to say that he can wave off a man like CARL VINSON, whom he undoubtedly was criticising, 44 years of experience in military affairs in this country? Every man who wears a star on the uniform today was a lieutenant when he came to Congress, and that includes General Eisenhower. Whom General Eisenhower calls Uncle CARL. Is that nonsense when he gives forth? I don't think so.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. HÉBERT, we all have great respect for Uncle CARL. I have dealt with him across the table a good many times, and I know he is a man who has a great deal of knowledge on this subject. But that doesn't mean that the President necessarily was criticizing him.

What I think the President wants to do is to give a greater responsibility to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to give duties to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The

Chairman, under this bill of the President's, isn't going to be a one man on horseback.

Mr. HÉBERT. Not at this time, but in the future.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Nor ever, I hope.

Mr. HÉBERT. You hope.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You are looking pessimistically at the future. I wouldn't agree with making him one man, but he has got the Joint Chiefs to work with. The Joint Chiefs are kept as operational heads, but at the same time they are allowed to delegate certain of their operational duties so as to have more time for strategic planning and for the overall operation. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is given certain managerial duties. He appoints the director. The director will be responsible to him, the Director of the Joint Staff Organization. And the Joint Staff Organization is built up to be the overall strategic command.

Mr. HÉBERT. And, mind you, this new bill or proposal of the President puts an unlimited number of people on the Joint Chiefs, where it was previously limited.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me go to the far end of the table now and ask first Mr. Foster——

Mr. FOSTER. As an engineer, may I get a word in with all these lawyers?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. FOSTER. I assumed you were a lawyer, but if not, I will get in anyway.

I would like to get back to Mr. Koehler's statement first about all this has developed in the last few months, and why didn't we know it before, since we have known about missiles for some time.

We have known about missiles for some time. They did not give evidence of becoming operational in the immediate future until the last several months. But there had been much study given to what we did about missiles over the last 4 or 5 years, and the military men who were concerned with this were those same three distinguished Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs that you speak of, General Eisenhower, and General Gruenther, each of whom believe at this point in history in order to meet these new threats that there should be a clarification of these lines of command in order to do it more rapidly.

Now, going to Mr. HÉBERT'S statement about CARL VINSON, I think everyone in the Defense Department, everyone in the military services, has great respect for his experience and his ability. But I think in this he has perhaps felt, as you say, that there could be the man on horseback, but I wonder if that is realistic.

May I just finish one sentence. The President is the Commander in Chief of the military forces by that same Constitution to which we refer. He is charged with that responsibility and he must discharge it. It is a terrific responsibility. He must have under him a man who can pass those commands as clearly and quickly through as it is possible to do it.

And I think that this setup does exactly that. There can be no man on horseback with our system of government, because, you know, every single military man is under the direction of a civilian, and every civilian is under the direction and under the control of you gentlemen as Congress who will appropriate, and there are numerous other groups and controls within the Government that make it impossible to ever achieve the man on horseback under this or any other similar democratic plan of organization.

Mr. HERMAN. I would like to hear the lawyers' reaction to that.

Mr. KOEHLER. I think it is just about my turn to say something. Bill, I clearly would have no way of passing any informed comment on the extent to which or the manner in which the chain of command over military operations should be clarified. I am a civilian. I just don't know. To the extent that it can be done properly, it should be done.

What concerns me, as I said before, is the necessity, the apparent necessity, of a sweeping reorganization of the entire Department of Defense. Now, I warned you originally that I was going to get to the law, and I think what is important is not only what is in the new proposal but what has been stricken out.

I now read the present law:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act"—this is existing law—"the combatant functions assigned to the military services by section"—so and so and so and so—"shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished or consolidated. Military personnel shall not be so detailed or assigned as to impair such combatant functions. The Secretary of Defense shall not direct the use and expenditure of funds of the Department of Defense in such manner as to affect the result prohibited by paragraphs 1 and 2."

And substituted therefor, the proposed law is a provision that the Secretary of Defense shall have authority to establish unified or specified commands and assign forces of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, to those commands.

When you add to that the provision that the requirement of law that the three Departments shall be separately administered is to be stricken out, and then when you add to that this provision, I mean by striking—this is in the present law which I am now about to read, and which is to be stricken:

"No provision of this act shall be so construed as to prevent a Secretary of a Military Department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress on his own initiative, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation related to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper."

So the Congress, gentlemen, is forbidden to receive the very information it should have in order that it may judge more capabilities of the service.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Koehler, would you yield there?

Mr. KOEHLER. Certainly. I am finished.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I don't think the unified command violates any question or involves any question of merger of forces. We did it in the war. We are doing it now.

Mr. KOEHLER. I couldn't agree with you more.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So far as individual members of the Defense Department coming up to the Congress, I personally do not believe that the Congress will change that provision. Now, the President himself has said——

Mr. KOEHLER. I am pleased to hear you say that.

Senator SALTONSTALL. The President himself has said that he did not feel that a man, when he is asked questions, or at least McElroy said that, and I think the President has said it, that when a man is asked questions he should answer truthfully. And we have had a great deal of experience in that in the last 18 months, in the so-called Symington preparedness committee and in the Johnson preparedness committee. We have had other freedom of discussion with a man holding up his hand and taking an oath and speaking truthfully. So I wouldn't worry about that.

Now, I think so far as the merging of the services are concerned, we can't connect that with unified command.

Mr. KOEHLER. No.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That is another problem that has got to be argued out by itself. And there again the President has said emphatically he did not wish to merge the services.

Mr. KOEHLER. I know that. The difficulty is, Senator, that I find it extremely difficult to square the language of the proposal as written. Now, when we come—section 2 is the declaration of intent of the statute, and section 2 says it shall be the intent of this legislation not to merge the armed services. Well and good.

Now, if we turn to the section of the statute which implements that section of intent, within the policy enunciated in section 2, that is the intent not to merge: "The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate steps" and so forth "to provide for more effective" and so forth "eliminate duplication."

Now, "No function which has been or hereafter authorized by law to be performed by the Department of Defense or any officer or agency thereof shall be substantially transferred, reassigned, abolished or consolidated until 30 days after a report in regard to all pertinent details shall have been made by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees of the Armed Services of the Congress."

Now, he makes that report. He waits 30 days, and if Congress acts within the 30-day period, Congress can prevent the transfer of those functions. But if Congress does not act within the 30-day period, those functions are effective, as I read the law.

That seems to me that if he should do it during that period when Congress was in recess——

Senator SALTONSTALL. That has got to be clarified.

Mr. KOEHLER. I am reading the law as it is written.

Mr. HÉBERT. Senator, I am glad to hear you say that. I agree with what you said. I don't believe the Congress is going to buy this bill at all, and that is what we are discussing right now.

We are going to have some type of reorganization, but the question is, Are we going to take what the President has spoonfed us? and I don't think—I don't think the President's bill will get out of the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Congressman, you are entitled to your own opinion, and we will leave that go.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I think it will.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to get back to the legal brief here, because it seems to me that this whole question of separate administration is one of the key things in this whole argument.

Mr. KOEHLER. I agree with you.

Mr. FOSTER. You set up a law and I am not a lawyer, but you set up a law in which you allegedly give direction, control and authority and the complete responsibility for the security of the United States to the Secretary of Defense.

Then you go down four lines and say, but you can't do this, you can't do that, and you can't do the other things.

You say he can come up and he can make these changes. He gives the Congress notice and if the Congress says "no," he may not do it.

It seems to me with the unification of sea, air, and land forces which we must have in order to fight the kind of battles and wars we have today, you have got to give equal authority to the man to whom you have given responsibility, and this set of proposals is so designed to give that authority to the man on whom you have placed this terrific responsibility.

Mr. KOEHLER. Bill, I couldn't agree more with everything you have said. My only argument was this: I am dealing with the legislation that has been submitted to the Congress. I am not doing anything else, but interpreting that legislation.

On the basis of this legislation, the President has said merger will not result. Chairman VINSON has said merger will result.

As I read this legislation, and I am not taking a position personally for or against

merger, as I read this legislation a future unknown Secretary of Defense will have the authority if he chooses to exercise it to merge the services.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, perhaps that is so. The writers of the Constitution did not know the future people who were going to operate under it.

I do not think you can write a piece of law, and you legislators can advise me on this, that is only for this particular man. I think this is good sound legislation to meet the difficult problems we have, and I think that unless we do this kind of thing, we may be too little, too late, and too slow.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Foster, as I understood it, you complain now that the Secretary is responsible and then the authority is taken away from him.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is right. Now, in the bill which you subscribe to and which you like, if you will read the act in section 4, it gives the direction to the Secretary of the Navy, "the Chief of Operations shall exercise command and supervision over such of the forces of the Navy and the Marine Corps as the Secretary of the Navy determines."

That is an affirmative declaration that the Secretary and the Chief of Naval Operations has control, is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. Now we come to the "but": "Other than the forces assigned by the Secretary of Defense to unified or special commands."

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. In other words, by the wave of his hand he could have Mr. Arleigh Burke up there with no forces under him at all.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. Why subscribe in one instance and complain in another?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no, this is not true at all. What we are saying is that in order to fight modern wars, you must have the ability to have in command forces as your cutting edge sea, land, and air forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. One assignment to a unified joint or specified command. The commander of that force by direction of the President through the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff is charged with the responsibility of operating that force.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. At that point the Chief of Naval Operations or the Secretary of the Navy does not have this command over those forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. Isn't that in existence today?

Mr. FOSTER. But he must support them. It is in existence today.

Mr. HÉBERT. Then why do you need another law before——

Mr. FOSTER. I thought you meant——

Mr. HÉBERT. Admiral Stump commands the Pacific and he commands everybody in the Pacific.

Mr. KOEHLER. Mr. Herman, could I swing to something else again?

Mr. HERMAN. I was going to suggest at this particular point we had been discussing particularly the provisions of the Secretary of Defense to handle forces.

Now, another major point arises at this time, and I think is unalterably connected with it, and that is ability to handle funds and to transfer them from one force to another and I haven't heard that discussed.

Mr. KOEHLER. Maybe I could lead off on that and really divert a little from that.

Mr. HERMAN. Very well, sir.

Mr. KOEHLER. I am a veteran of two Pentagon reorganizations, the 1947 one and the 1949 one.

I recall distinctly when the first plan went into effect in 1947. Secretary Forrestal, in whom there was no abler public servant that I ever knew, Secretary Forrestal took the position that the Department of Defense could work successfully only if it had a very few number of people in the Secretary of Defense's organization. Some say 50, some say 100. That is unimportant.

In the 1949 act, specification was made for 3 Assistant Secretaries of Defense, and later in the 1953 act, 6 more were added.

Now, it seems to me, although I wasn't too much subjected to the intervening layer of Assistant Secretaries of Defense, it seems to me that the appointment of every additional Assistant Secretary of Defense downgrades to a certain extent a service secretary, because he must be taking some of the secretary's functions, and also adds another burden to the already intolerable burden of the Secretary of Defense, because there is one more person who has to report to him.

Now, I believe that it would make very much sense if we are going to keep the services at all, to eliminate the greater part of that intervening layer.

Let the service secretaries relieve the Secretary of Defense of a tremendous burden administrative and otherwise, and let the Secretary of Defense devote more of his time to his fundamental job, which is working with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

That is the heart of his job.

Mr. HERMAN. Go ahead, Senator SALTONSTALL.

Mr. FOSTER. I do want to get in on that one.

Senator SALTONSTALL. As one that was on that conference committee, and worked out this act and who worked very closely with Mr. Forrestal at that time, I know something of what he was thinking.

Now the words that were finally put in, as you will recall, are "authority" and "control."

Mr. KOEHLER. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But the Department shall be separately administered.

Mr. KOEHLER. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That was done to work out this compromise, if you will, that could carry through. That has been interpreted since that time to give the Secretary of Defense the authority over the services.

On the other hand, it is clear that they should be separately administered.

Mr. KOEHLER. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. One of the purposes of this act, as I understand it, at the present time, is to clarify that.

Mr. KOEHLER. One purpose is to wipe up separate administration.

Senator SALTONSTALL. The words "separately administered" are wiped out as such, but the various services are not merged. The Secretary of the Navy, for instance, will continue to——

Mr. KOEHLER. Senator, could I ask you just one question?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Certainly. I don't know if I can answer it, but I shall try.

Mr. KOEHLER. If the services cease to be administered separately, and if they are taken out of the chain of command, the service Secretaries, which may be proper, as Mr. Foster said, I am not qualified, what then is left of the individual services? Are they organizational entities at all?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, they are, and there is absolutely no thought of eliminating the services as such.

The elimination of the separately administered is to give the Secretary of Defense the authority which he needs to truly direct and coordinate these groups, and this story of 100 people to do this job, I have heard that a good many times, and you know, Jack, as well as I, that Jim very rapidly changed his feeling about that way of running the Department.

Mr. HÉBERT. Just a moment. It is in here if you want to read it, Admiral Sherman——

Mr. FOSTER. I don't care whose testimony it was that is contrary to this.

Mr. HÉBERT. It was never sold to the Congress other than what he said. Mr. Forrestal never told the Congress anything different.

Mr. FOSTER. He never went back for a hundred in the reorganization at all, and I can assure you to run a business—and I think perhaps you gentlemen are overlooking the magnitude of this operation that has to be done by the Secretary of Defense. On this I can speak with some authority. I am not a lawyer, but on this one I can speak with some authority.

You are running a $40 billion or $50 billion business. You have $120 billion worth of plant and installations. You are complaining about seven vice presidents.

I think this is a very small number of vice presidents. I think the Office of the Secretary of Defense is one of the most efficient business operations that I know in terms of numbers, 1,500 civilians, 700 military people.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me get a question in here, please. I just want to say that as a former Deputy Secretary of Defense, yourself, perhaps you would want to comment on this question of how the Secretary of Defense's Office operates and also you might want to add at this point the question of the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Research.

Mr. FOSTER. His title will not be that, although he will be somewhat similar to that. Of course, research and technology is so obviously such a terrificly important part of our whole military activity now that unless we give to that the position of authority and prestige which it deserves, we may well be unable to attract the kind of real brains and real forward progress that we have to have in order to keep up in this terrific race.

I think that this plan, a Director of Defense Research and Engineer, provides that kind of authority. It gives to that man the prestige of authority in precedence, fifth in precedence behind the Secretary, the three Secretaries, and the Deputy Secretary. And it gives to him a control over, as well as an ability to advise, the Secretary of Defense on the highest research and technology level, and we need it. We must have it.

We have lost in this regard over these last few years. We know this, all of us. And unless we are able to give this kind of a job and get the kind of brains and support and direction that I believe can get through this device, we may really be in a desperate state.

Mr. HÉBERT. There is nothing in the law that prevents you from accomplishing everything you have said.

Mr. FOSTER. This I question.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. HÉBERT, may I just say this. This I personally know. Take for instance today, the solid fuel as opposed to the liquid fuel in the propulsion of a missile.

Today there are three separate investigations going on in solid fuel, in each one of the services. Now this was brought to my attention by a man who is involved in it. He says there simply isn't manpower enough to do it. I just give you that as one example.

I dont think there will be much debate over this one centralization of research, do you?

Mr. HÉBERT. Senator, I think we could take a cue from that on the Hill, too, the overlapping investigations we have got.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me ask all four of you gentlemen to turn your attention to that question, the question of inefficiency, needless duplication of which so much has been made and also of the funds involved here.

Is there so much inefficiency and needless duplication now going on in the Pentagon?

Mr. HÉBERT. May I address myself to the money question? That is very interesting.

When the President first came out with this very revolutionary plan, the straw man was put up as the moneyman.

The Secretary of Defense would control all this money. He knew the Congress never

would buy anything like that. So he abandoned it and then in his statement he said he didn't really need that right now.

We will set that aside until a later date because he has the power now.

Whether he has the power now is debatable, but he exercised the power now because he is exercising a line item veto which the Congress has refused to give him by the conduct in the Comptroller's Office in the Department of Defense and in the Bureau of the Budget. And in the hearings of recent vintage by the House Armed Services Committee, when all of the services were there, every individual that testified, every Secretary, every general had one comment to make: that the reason for the tardiness and delay in our missile program and all hindrance rested in the Comptroller of the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget where the money is being controlled. So he has got it now and he says nothing about it, and that is where the delay is. This is—no, I won't use the word he used, "nonsense."

I think it is tragic that this matter has been placed out of focus and the word "nonsense" used, and every time the President speaks, he says, "I'm the man that knows. I'm the great military man."

Does the 44 years of Mr. VINSON, 22 years of Mr. BROOKS, the 22 years of Mr. ARENDS, the 22 years of Mr. KILDAY, 18 years of Mr. RIVERS mean anything—we are not children.

Mr. FOSTER. Administration or writing of the policy? I think that there is a good deal to be said for what really I believe was the President's thought on this, namely, to give some flexibility for transfers within the overall appropriations. You know, Mr. HÉBERT and Senator SALTONSTALL and Mr. Koehler, that the budgets are made up 3 years almost before they actually get to the point where they are being spent. With all the due wisdom that is accumulated in both the Congress and in the Department of Defense and in the Budget Bureau, it is impossible to foresee the changes that will take place in this rapidly changing world, and all that is being requested is, number one, that the budget be that of the overall Department of Defense, the overall plan of how to support, maintain and further these defense forces, and when the time comes to the actual expenditure, the right to move within line items and within the services some amount—Mr. McElroy said less than 10 percent.

Some other figure was mentioned as 5 percent. Say it is between 5 and 10 percent. I think that if you get the kind of problems we have today, this flexibility can save us a great deal of money, and will allow us to proceed with the new things that develop at the point the money is available.

Senator SALTONSTALL. We have a certain amount of flexibility today. The Defense Secretary in the last budget had, I think, $100 million which is a comparatively small amount of $40 billion that he had complete control over. He had also certain powers of transfer: As I remember it, not over 10 percent change in any one appropriation item, any one line item, and not over 5 percent could come from any other line item. Of course, that had to be within the services. That couldn't be shifted from one service to another.

Now we also have the power of transfer of funds for construction purposes. That has been done historically. And that comes down and goes through if it gets the approval of the Appropriations Committees in the House and in the Senate.

Now, how far Congress will go with allowing that transfer to be made between services is a problem that we have got to argue out and argue out very carefully.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct and that is the crux. Again, the Secretary has the power which the President is asking, but he wants just a little bit more, and I understand he is going to have $500 million in that emergency fund.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not have it as between services.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think he was more fearful——

Mr. FOSTER. He wants flexibility in order to meet changes.

Mr. KOEHLER. I think that problem is one that lends itself admirably to resolution between the Congress and the Department, as Senator SALTONSTALL has said.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You have been down there many times.

Mr. KOEHLER. Many times. I would like to get back to this question and I trust, Bill, you would bear with me on this one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense versus the Secretaries in the military departments.

As I told you and as you know, my experience there terminated late in 1951. But even then, I found difficulty as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy in carrying out what to me where the orders assigned to me by the Secretary. I found a rather diffuse situation at the Assistant Secretary of Defense level because it seemed to me that there you didn't have authority running hand in hand with responsibility.

You had authority, but the responsibility was down the line. Now, I think today—and I think it is a very sad thing—I think today the Secretaries of the military departments are of much lower stature than they were 10 years ago, and without question, if this proposed bill becomes law, the Secretaries of the military departments, for my money, will not amount to very much at all.

I would like to reverse the trend so that the carrying out of the tremendous administrative functions of the Department of Defense could be done under the aegis of the service Secretaries rather than under the aegis of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Mr. HERMAN. I'd like to take this away from the officials at this point and ask the Members of Congress, Congressman HÉBERT and Senator SALTONSTALL, how they feel on that particular argument?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, I think that the Secretaries of the various services should have a very substantial authority. Now, I think that in these days of quick decisions and quick actions and strong actions, there has got to be a greater centralization of authority.

Therefore, I would make it perfectly clear in the law that the authority is in the Secretary of Defense under the President through the Joint Chiefs of Staff for action in these unified commands, for instance, and then the details of how to carry out a lot of that business have got to be left and given to the secretaries of the services rather than assistant secretaries in the Defense Department.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may interrupt for 1 minute, it will just take a second, that the secretaries of the services will continue to have tremendously important delegated authority under the authority of the Secretary of Defense. They have got to support the whole military——

Mr. HERMAN. I think we have come to the point where we are running out of time and our agreements and disagreements are pretty well lined up, so I'd like to ask you to reflect back over your arguments here and offer you one last moment for rebuttal and restatement of your positions, starting as we started before with Senator SALTONSTALL.

How do you now feel that you should state your position?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Herman, I am very glad to have been on this discussion because I think it has been very helpful, I hope, to people who have listened and certainly to me who have taken part.

I reiterate what I said before. In these days of missiles and supersonic airplanes and all that goes with speed, we need speed of decision, we need speed of action. We are never going to be an attacker. We are going to be attacked. We may be attacked. We hope we won't be. We are more liable not to be attacked if any possible enemy knows that we have got a speedy retaliatory effort that is going to be a very destructive and devastating effort.

Now to accomplish that, we have got to, because of the speed of action, we have got to have more authority in one person, more authority most essentially in a civilian. That is the Secretary of Defense.

We have got to give him the strategic powers of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we do that, and that is all the President wants to do, we will be able to give that massive retaliatory effort.

Mr. HERMAN. Very well, Congressman HÉBERT.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think after listening to the discussion today that I am more convinced than ever that those of us who oppose this extraordinary bill of the President's are thinking along the right lines.

There has been nothing developed today that has indicated in any manner, shape or form, that this speed that is desirable of which Senator SALTONSTALL has just spoken could not be accomplished.

You can write all the laws in the world, but you can't change human nature, and if the Secretary of Defense is not a man of action and speed, the added power which could well be misplaced, will not help him one iota. I believe it most important that we do reorganize the Department, but organize it downward instead of upward by giving more central authority to fewer people and drawing a definite line so we will know exactly where we stand and keep each service in its true autonomy, its true identity. And I hope that we can get the proper testimony on the Hill and I was very interested in Senator SALTONSTALL talking about the people who appeared, but the echoes of names like Denfeld, Gavin, and Putt ring in my mind.

Mr. HERMAN. Could I ask you just in a very brief word whether you propose to start some kind of reorganization downward?

Mr. HÉBERT. Oh, yes. There is a bill before the committee, positively. We have that bill. We have no negative approach. Mr. VINSON has a bill in with Mr. KILDAY. That is the bill that I support.

Mr. HERMAN. Thank you. And Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I couldn't disagree more, of course, with the Congressman, and I think that it is a completely negative bill to which he refers. I am sure we are all aiming at the same objectives. We all want to have the most efficient, the most adaptable, the most decisive forces that we can get, and I think we have to ask ourselves these questions: Will this organization give us better coordination and direction of the Armed Forces? Will it give a better place in the scheme of things to research and technology? Will it make it possible for us to react more rapidly to the almost instantaneous attacks to which we may be subject? And will this in essence provide for us the kind of defense effort which will allow us to survive at a time in history when we are truly threatened with destruction almost overnight if the enemy makes that choice?

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler, will it?

Mr. FOSTER. I say it will.

Mr. KOEHLER. I would just like to say this: That this is the first conference of this type in which I have participated in which there has been so much light and so little heat on a subject that is bound to raise so many different points of view. I would like to revert to a few remarks I made in my opening statement.

And regardless of my personal views, I would like to say that it may well be, for reasons that Mr. Foster knows much better than I, that our national security requires fundamental changes in our present defense structure. If the President and the Congress so

determine and if those required changes include merger of the Armed Forces and the creation of a single Chief of Staff, that would, of course, be a definitive answer.

My concern, as I said earlier, lies not with the expressed intent of the proposed legislation, but with the conclusions I have drawn from a study of its language. We are a government of laws and not of men, and with that in mind, I am forced to conclude that this bill, if passed, would authorize some presently unknown and future Secretary of Defense to merge the armed services as we now know them and would also authorize, if not create, a command structure.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler, I think we have just about run out of time. I want to thank all you gentlemen for joining with us today in this discussion of the defense of America.

The Grand Strategy of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the erroneous role of Government in spending huge sums of the taxpayers' money can one day spell the downfall of this great Nation, as I see it. While we have called our spending New Deal, Fair Deal, planned economy, war effort, general welfare, modern Republicanism, or other terms, it is akin to, if not fullblooded, socialism. And a rose by any other name is still a rose.

Big Federal spending as we now know it, is not traditional constitutional government, and it is not compatible with free enterprise. Something must go—either free enterprise and a free society or spendthrift government with huge taxes and debt. It is in this spirit of grave concern, therefore, that I present this excellent study by former Congressman Sam Pettingill, a Spotlight article distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Is freedom jeopardized by huge Government spending and taxes and Government business operations or is it not?

THE GRAND STRATEGY OF FREEDOM

(By the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, former Congressman from Indiana)

Socialism's secret weapon is money. Governments formerly gained power by the sword and swelled their coffers by conquest and tribute. That method is still used, but chiefly against foreigners. Modern governments obtain power over their own people in a more subtle fashion. They tax away the earnings of their people, and then dole some of it back to them in subsidies, gifts, grants-in-aid, and the award of huge government contracts. By this process they become the masters of men, and cease to be their servants. The historic relationship is reversed. Instead of government coming to the people for its support, the people come to the government for their support. Hitler put all groups in Germany in pawn to him via the money route. In the face of the granting or withholding of public money, opposition died away. People began to keep their mouths shut—businessmen first—but, finally, editors, educators, and ministers. He thus united both conservatives and radicals behind him. This is a very important point.

In this country, governors of States, mayors of cities and members of business organizations—chambers of commerce—including those most opposed to socialism in the abstract, become beggars at Washington for a return of some of the money collected from them in their own communities—less the political brokerage. As beggars, they fawn and smirk. Big government breeds little men. The great power of the purse, with which the representatives of the taxpayers once held the executive branch in check, is rapidly passing into the hands of a political Santa Claus.

Not one of the extensions of socialism could be put into effect without money. Cut off the money supply—and the power to borrow—and you stop them in their tracks. As Jefferson said, "We must make our selection between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

Harry Hopkins gave the formula for socialism—tax, spend and elect. Yet because they fail to grasp the grand strategy of freedom, various groups exhaust themselves on scattered tactical skirmishes—good in themselves, but futile in the face of this overpowering flood of money.

Justice Holmes used to say, "We must strike for the jugular and let the rest go." I would urge no one to abandon the fight for his own group, but the No. 1 plank in all platforms must be the exact reverse of the Hopkins formula: "Reduce taxes and spending, especially at the Federal level. Keep government poor and remain free."

Make that the No. 1 plank in all platforms for freedom. The doctors can then fight socialized medicine; owners of real estate can fight public housing; others can fight Federal control of education; business can fight government competition; others can fight to relieve privately created wealth of some of the tax burden. With reduced Federal spending and sharply reduced taxes as the No. 1 plank of all groups, they can then fight with some chance of success. As it is, with each group fighting some single phase of socialism in which the others are not particularly interested, they are picked off like sitting ducks.

The Socialist planners lull the unthinking with the trick question, "What freedom have you lost?" That's easy to answer. It is my freedom to keep what I earn and spend it as I please. That's the vital distinction between European socialism and American individualism. "To have and to hold," written into millions of title deeds, tells the story of the individual incentives and rewards that have produced America's magnificent achievement.

A grand strategy for freedom is imperative. We must unite on one point, easily understood, which touches the pocketbook nerve of millions of voters. Intellectual arguments are not enough. You must appeal to the self-interest of millions. We must find the common denominator of mass resistance to socialism. The common denominator is the pocketbook. On that concept and that alone can we mobilize an army sufficient in numbers to wage successful war.

We must show millions of voters how they are being hurt—how their security for old age is melting away.

There are 78 million life insurance policyholders. As money becomes cheap, their security vanishes. A $10,000 policy paid up in 1940 has lost $4,800 or more in terms of what it will buy today.

A life insurance president has just told us of the disastrous effect of the cheap money policies of the past 20 years on life insurance security. The insurance companies are forced to earn less on their investments. Therefore, they must charge higher premiums for the same protection. Then when the policy is paid, the money received is taxed more, and buys less. To cover all these losses, a typical life insurance holder needs to take out 90 percent more insurance to provide the same purchasing power and protection as in 1939.

Most of the beneficiaries of life insurance are women. Tell them what taxes and debt and rotting money are doing to the security their husbands have worked so hard to provide. "Old age and want—thou ill-matched pair."

Then there are other millions who own Government bonds. A bond bought 10 years ago for $75 can be cashed today for $100. But the $100 will buy you less than the $60 did when you turned it over to the Government. And you are 10 years older.

Then you have 50 to 60 million people who have been compelled to buy what are called social security cards. Their hoped-for security melts away as dollars become cheap. To make up the loss, bills are in Congress to pay them more of these rotting dollars, adding to the tax burden to be carried by all industry, forcing prices still higher, and the music goes round and round.

The guaranties of Government are writ on water and carved in sand. Something for nothing is the moral cancer of a free society. Once begun, there is no stopping its deadly course except to find the lowest common denominator of the mass resistance of millions of voters—the pocketbook and the fear of poverty in old age. This is the grand strategy of freedom.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1957).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Trend of Economic and Political Affairs in Non-Red World Stirs Rising Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article, by the distinguished correspondent for the New York Times, James Reston, summarizing some of the basic forces that are troubling the free world today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 23, 1958]

DECLINE IN THE WEST—TREND OF ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN NON-RED WORLD STIRS RISING CONCERN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The United States and the Soviet Union are dominating the news with their endless bickering, but the really important news is happening in other countries.

It is not the stalemate between the United States and the Soviet Union on summit talks that is worrying most diplomats here but the trend of economic and political affairs elsewhere in the non-Communist world. Among these disturbing developments are the following:

In the Western Hemisphere, economic troubles are plaguing not only the United States but other principal nations as well, from Canada, where 590,000 persons—about one-tenth of the labor force—are unemployed, to Chile, where the copper-marketing problem has become critical. Brazil, Colombia, and the other countries that rely primarily on coffee for their foreign exchange are also facing an economic crisis.

In Britain, the political trend is running with the Laborites, who have been increasingly critical of the United States policy toward the Soviet Union.

In France, the search goes on for the 26th Cabinet since World War II. The political instability is not only threatening France's position in North Africa but weakening the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's defense position in France itself.

In the Middle East, the situation is not without some promise. However, the rising force centers on the antiwestern policies of President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic and the trend is toward Arab union under the domination of Nasserism.

In Southeast Asia, Communist influence is making steady progress in Indonesia. In India there is evidence of rising Communist influence and of disintegrating forces within Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's Congress Party. Even the Pakistani Government has been threatening to break with the West and seek aid from the Communists.

In Nationalist China and South Korea, the Governments are merely waiting and hoping for the best. Japan, eager for new markets to maintain her rising population, is also feeling the increasing weight and influence of Communist China.

DIPLOMATS DISTURBED

These are the things that are disturbing thoughtful men here, even though these events are on the periphery of the main news.

Compared with the trend of events in Indonesia alone, the tiresome argument over the procedural steps to the summit and all the other issues over the reorganization of the Pentagon and the training flights of the United States Air Command seem to experienced diplomats to be of secondary importance.

Indonesia seems a long way from the United States, but it is very close to Australia. This is why Australian officials are spending so much time at the State Department these days.

Australia has 8 million people on a sparsely settled continent as large as the United States, and the thought of a possible Communist Indonesia of 80 million people close by naturally causes the greatest apprehension there.

It is only now that the repercussions of the United States recession are beginning to take effect overseas. Some regions have not yet been affected, even though United States imports fell off steeply in February.

BRITISH POSITION IMPROVED

For example, the British have made a remarkable financial recovery in the last year and their dollar reserve position is good. But elsewhere there is evidence of increasing economic difficulty.

This is particularly true in the countries of this hemisphere that depend on a single crop, the prices of which have fallen steadily. In Europe the fear of a prolonged United States recession is beginning to encourage great caution in capital investment. The Communists, of course, are proclaiming the economic instability of the capitalistic countries all over the world.

Particularly in Asia, they are asserting that the United States recession, and the United States trade and tariff policies are clear evidence of the dangers of relying on support from Washington.

And this, in turn, is why State Department officials, more than the officials of other departments, are tending to urge the President to take bolder measures to shore up the economy and fight the Trade Agreements Act through Congress.

The news is centering on summit talks and other procedural and organizational questions partly because so many of the questions outlined above are intractible, and partly because the Soviet leaders apparently want to keep attention on the summit conference.

NO MAJOR CONCESSIONS MADE

They are making no important concessions to get a summit meeting, apparently because they believe the economic and political difficulties in the non-Communist world are working to their advantage and forcing the West to seek agreement with the Soviet Union on disadvantageous terms.

Preoccupation with the summit, too, is keeping the western powers busy and diverting them from the few questions that might yield to concentrated action.

For example, there are some officials here who believe that it might be possible now to do business with President Nasser and even to detach him from Moscow. But Secretary of State Dulles has been devoting most of his time to questions thrown at him by Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and finding little opportunity to concentrate on anything else.

It is, in short, a depressing picture. The news makes the cold war seem to be in stalemate, but the fact is that there are serious signs of slippage all over the non-Communist world.

Unemployed Men, Sacred Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the New York Post on April 4 carried an editorial about the sacred myth that there is an immutable economic law which decrees times of prosperity and times of depression, calling for implementation of the Full Employment Act of 1946.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEMPLOYED MEN, SACRED MYTHS

Congress is about to disperse for a 10-day Easter holiday; the unemployed can wait. No broad, sweeping attack on the recession has come from either the White House or the Democratic leadership; despite much big Democratic talk, a highway appropriation is the only major move so far. It is palpably not enough. It is also depressing that roads should take such precedence over schools in both the legislative and the executive mind.

More serious, however, than the record of inertia is the evidence that a "wait-and-see" mood is beginning to paralyze both parties. The predicted upturn has not occurred but the downturn has allegedly been slowed; we are increasingly being told to let well enough alone until "economic law" reasserts itself. So say the sages.

By summer, fall or winter things may well right themselves; no man really knows. The profound question confronting the country is whether we must forever remain prey to the unpredictable cruelty of economic cycles. The question is a human one; in a world in which we are competing with the Communist mystique, it may also be an issue of democratic survival.

Let us face it; neither the New Deal nor the Fair Deal conquered the disease of unemployment. Enactment of the Full Employment Act in 1946 was the first formal proclamation of free society's total war on economic insecurity. But we have done little to implement that act.

Once again we hear talk of the inevitability of periodic decline; some men even whisper that unemployment produces its own compensations by stabilizing the labor market. Hungry men don't quibble about wages, it is said.

No matter what the ultimate course of this recession, democracy has to find better answers. "Economic law" is not divine law; the blight of unemployment is manmade; the solutions lie in men's hands. But we shall not find them until we are prepared to seek more original remedies than either party has so far proposed, and to recognize that, in an economy as vast and complicated as ours, large-scale Government planning is a continuous imperative.

The conservatives (of both parties) say Government must not do too much lest it make things worse. This is the doctrine of despair; it tells us we cannot truly regulate our affairs; it is like saying we must not try to control floods because anything we do will aggravate the gods. In economic affairs we are the victims of a mythology as pessimistic and irrational as the mumbo-jumbo by which the most primitive tribesmen lived and died.

Many Gold Star Mothers in Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have received from a Gold Star Mother living in Dallas, Tex., a copy of a resolution passed some 2½ years ago by the Dallas Chapter of Gold Star Mothers.

In sending me this resolution, the Dallas Gold Star Mother wrote me as follows:

I am making a request of you as a Gold Star Mother and friend to look into the matter of this resolution. I would like to request that this resolution be looked into by you with regard to the many Gold Star Mothers, of which I am one, that do not have any income besides insurance and compensation and that are still having to rent their homes. Many of these mothers have reached the age of 75 and I myself am 76.

At this high cost of living I am now barely able to get along on my present income. Would humbly appreciate anything that you might do in regard to this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DALLAS CHAPTER, AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

"Whereas many Gold Star Mothers (1) are widowed and have no income except the pension paid them by our Government for the loss of their child in the service of our country; (2) are unable to work by reason of age and condition of health; (3) have no other children who can help support them; (4) have living husbands who are unable to work by reason of age and condition of health, and who have no income except the pension paid them for the loss of their child in the service of our country; (5) who do not own their own homes and must rent their living quarters; (6) are often ill and must have medical services and at times must be hospitalized; and

"Whereas the pension now paid to Gold Star Mothers for the loss of their child, or children, in the service of our country, of $75 per month is greatly appreciated by the Gold Star Mothers, but is wholly inadequate to sustain them by reason of the high cost of rent, groceries, clothing, medical services, hospitalization, and all other necessities of life; and

"Whereas by reason thereof, many of such Gold Star Mothers are denied necessary medical care and attention, proper diet, and other necessities of life, and are in dire need and circumtances: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*—

"1. That the pension to Gold Star Mothers, and all other mothers entitled to the same or similar pension, be increased to $100 per month.

"2. That copies of this resolution, accompanied by an appropriate letter, be sent to Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON and Hon. PRICE DANIEL, Senators from Texas, and to each Congressman from Texas, imploring and urging them to initiate and support legislation necessary to increase such pensions to $100 per month; and

"3. That a copy of this resolution, accompanied by an appropriate letter, be sent to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives."

We certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by unanimous vote at our regularly stated meeting held in Dallas, Tex., on the 6th day of September 1955.

MRS. ROY V. SMITH,
President, Dallas Chapter.
MRS. L. E. CASEY,
Secretary, Dallas Chapter.

The Late Senator W. Kerr Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in due course the Senate will have the opportunity formally to pay tribute to the memory of our colleague, Kerr Scott. But I have been deeply moved by an editorial eulogy which was published last Friday in the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News. The essence of the man as I had come to know and love him in my too brief acquaintance with him is, in this piece so well captured that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro Daily News of Friday, April 18, 1958]

KERR SCOTT: ESSE QUAM VIDERI

Even after a heart attack hospitalized him last week, it was hard to visualize Kerr Scott stricken with anything. And it is harder yet to visualize him dead today at his beloved Hawfields Presbyterian Church in Alamance, where his meteoric career began in a major way a little more than 10 years ago.

The big, bushy-browed, tobacco-chewing farmer appeared on the Tar Heel political scene in 1948, as if summoned by some deep, inner folk need. He came, unpretentious and fixed in his views. The mud of Haw River still clung to his shoes. He came to prove again that North Carolina is suspicious of a sure thing.

Already in 1948 the Tar Heel political hierarchy had laid an apostolic hand on the successor to Gregg Cherry in the governorship. The arrangers had everything arranged. Then Kerr Scott strode into the fracas; he tossed Haw River witticisms left and right and nailed his major opponent, Charlie Johnson, to the cross of lazy money in the State's counting house.

TWO MEN OF INDEPENDENCE

Like another plucky man of Independence, Kerr Scott wrought a political revolution in 1948. He spoke of his victory as "the bottom layer overturning the top." But the secret of his success lay in something more than the red-neck stereotype of southern politics. His family background was above the level of the South's wool-hat tradition. It was part and parcel of that independent ruralism which sets North Carolina apart. It was chittlins and cornbread, but it was also light and enlightenment.

At times Kerr Scott seemed to hover dangerously near the edge of demagoguery—pitting class against class—but always an innate sense of the North Carolina spirit stayed his hand. With his stupendous political intuition, the Squire of Haw River combined a genuine understanding of the needs of a struggling agricultural State. He saw his regime as an instrument for redressing the balance between lawyers and farmers—between the moneyed interest and the boys at the head of the creek.

He used his 4-year regime to recharge the batteries of farmers in the mud, schoolchildren in double-shift classrooms and branchhead boys without electricity. He was blunt. He was candid. At a ceremony unveiling a new powerplant he threw a bolt of lightning at the power company. At an august dinner of businessmen he called their magazine We the People Against the People.

With that single-minded determination born in a man of action, Kerr Scott persuaded the general assembly and the people to spend $200 million for building rural roads. Some of his advisers told him it would never pass. But he knew North Carolina better than they did. As a county farm agent he had traveled the back roads for decades, observing agricultural conditions, formulating his program. When he reached the governor's office he knew what he intended to do, and he did it.

THE NEW FUSION

Ironically the fact that the State highway commission refused to pave the road by Scott's house inspired his gubernatorial career. He turned his crusade for roads into a kind of sermon for general uplift in North Carolina. He viewed it as a campaign for getting schoolchildren and rural church patrons out of the mud. The scholars, philosophers, and press agents suddenly saw his revolution as a plea for accessible isolation, for a Lewis Mumford-like dream of tension-free, dispersed living—1 foot in the soil, 1 foot in the factory. Scott's appeal began to transcend the purely hayseed and political gimmick level. It definitely moved into a genuine fusion of the intellectual and the rural when Scott casually announced the appointment of Frank Porter Graham to the United States Senate at a dinner meeting in Chapel Hill.

That appointment led to a fiery political campaign unmatched in decades. Scott's candidate could not keep the branchhead boys and the intellectuals in line. Faced by a second primary bitter in racial demagoguery and bombast Frank Graham went down to defeat at the hands of Willis Smith. Graham's defeat and the later rejection of Scott's candidate for governor, Hubert Olive, set a pattern. Kerr Scott could generate a huge following for himself; but he could not pass it along to his chosen successor. Thus Scott never built much of a political ma-

chine in North Carolina, despite fearful speculation of his enemies. He seemed to become undefeatable on his own—proved in his spirited 1954 campaign against Governor Umstead's appointee to the United States Senate, ALTON LENNON.

In the United States Senate Kerr Scott again confounded his critics. Many had expected a continuation of the unconventional antics which often marked his regime in the Governor's office. Scott again demonstrated his political wisdom. He was a quiet freshman, listening and learning. He assembled an astute staff and laid low. Little by little in the last 2 years he had begun to raise his voice in the august Romanesque Hall of the Senate. On every hand he was consolidating his position; his principal interests lay in the fields of agriculture and resource development.

THE SHADOW GROWS

How large will Kerr Scott's bulky cigar-attached figure loom in the history of North Carolina?

Like Harry Truman's his shadow grows larger every day. For Scott and Truman were alike: Their hearts were in the right place, and they were sound on many large and memorable issues; they were sometimes wrong, and petty, on small ones.

The span of years will see Scott's gubernatorial administration as a time of spirited moving forward. He recognized the predominantly rural problems of a predominantly rural State as no governor has in this century; he sought to combine rural, down-home living with modern industrial society in an interesting blueprint still applicable today. He made some poor appointments and some good ones, among the latter the first woman member of the North Carolina Superior Court and the first Negro to the State board of education. Scott's prediction that water is the largest unmet challenge will haunt North Carolina again and again in the future—just as the research triangle area learned recently when a nuclear-reactor project went to the shores of the Yadkin near Rockingham and not to the Raleigh-Durham area.

A COMMON MOTTO

Kerr Scott had a mind open to new ideas. He was a bulldozer, not a diplomat, a doer not a philosopher. He never plowed under false colors. He plugged for roads, schools, rural electricity, telephones—all tangible things the people of North Carolina understood. He said he would let in some fresh air and he did. If he is standing close by St. Peter this morning, we suspect he is advising him to rip out all that gold facade and repave it with black macadam.

When they bury Kerr Scott's body at Hawfields Church this afternoon, North Carolina will lose a unique political leader. He is a variation in the lawyer-governor tradition, proving the strength of North Carolina's independent spirit. He is as near a symbol of a plain-spoken State's motto—"To be rather than to seem"—as we have had in this century.

That was Kerr Scott's motto, too.

The Spirit of Patrick Henry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the people of the State of New Hampshire and the Members of the United States Senate recognize the ability of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The people of the State of New Hampshire, and particularly the women, as well as the Members of this body, also recognize the ability and talent of Mrs. Bridges. Her analytical mind and forthright utterances have made her a speaker in great demand among organizations in the State.

Mrs. Bridges recently delivered a speech before a luncheon of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington. The Manchester Union Leader for Monday, April 21, 1958, comments upon Mrs. Bridges' speech, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPIRIT OF PATRICK HENRY

Mrs. Styles Bridges has not forgotten Patrick Henry's famous utterance: "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

In a recent speech in Washington before the Daughters of the American Revolution Mrs. Bridges said: "For my part, I would rather die than be a slave to communism."

Mrs. Bridges was referring, with proper horror, to a number of people who have been saying recently that to avoid destruction by bombs the world might have to be conquered and controlled by the Communists for a time, possibly a few generations.

Just what being controlled by the Communists means can be best gathered from the recent testimony of the Commander in Chief of the United Nations Forces in the Far East, Adm. Felix Stump, who told the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee, in heavily censored testimony, that the Communists have murdered 18 million Chinese since taking control of China in 1949. Stump said the report is based on carefully evaluated information given by Europeans and Chinese who have been inside China during that period.

For Mrs. Bridges to say: "For my part, I would rather die than be a slave to communism" is not a mere empty thought. Death would indeed be preferred to Communist slavery because the Communists do not treat the conquered nations as we have treated Germany and Japan. They grind under their heel not only the body but the mind, the spirit, and the soul of the conquered.

Communism in control of the United States would stamp out everything from Christmas to Easter, to kindness to each other, all those things which distinguish life in the United States from the life of the brute in the jungle.

Congratulations to Mrs. Bridges for having the courage to speak out against appeasement.

Every American should turn against the appeasers and the cowards in our midst, whose whining words encourage our enemies.

Progress of the Russian Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, many people around the world were amazed when Russia put the first satellite into outer space. We are uniformed about the progress of the Russians scientifically or there would have been no such surprise. Indeed, if the American people had known the situation their pressure on our laggard administration might have prevented this Russian cold war victory.

Today, the Russians are boasting that their economy is progressing while the United States economy declines. The ability of the Russians to make such boasts, with some degree of veracity, is one of the very serious aspects of the present economic decline. It is one of the reasons that at least some of us feel that it is a tragic mistake to temporize and delay about recovery measures. We do not want Russian economic "sputniks" to inflict another serious cold war defeat on us while the Eisenhower administration waits for the August, September or 1959 figures on unemployment.

In the interest of general information about how the Russians are capitalizing on our present economic situation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a recent editorial in the Russian newspaper, Pravda, entitled "Socialist Industry in New Upsurge."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALIST INDUSTRY IN A NEW UPSURGE

The socialist industry of the U. S. S. R. is progressing along the path of a new powerful upsurge. This is shown eloquently by data of the report of the Central Statistical Administration of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers on results of fulfillment of the state plan of U. S. S. R. industry in the first quarter of 1958, published a few days ago.

Analysis of data on fulfillment of the state plan brings us to a number of important conclusions:

First. Our industry has been developing in the first quarter of 1958 at a rapid pace. Compared with the first quarter of 1957, industrial output increased 11 percent.

Second. Our heavy industry, which represents the basis of the entire national economy, of the growth of the well-being of the working people, and of the defense capacity of the country, has been developing successfully as before. Compared with the first quarter of 1957, the gross output of ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy represented 109 percent in the first quarter of 1958.

Third. Following heavy industry on the basis of the data, there is a rapid development of the light and food industries. Compared with the first quarter of 1957, the gross output of light industry in the first quarter of 1958 was 108 percent, and of the foodstuffs industry, also 108 percent. Considerable quantities of the following goods were produced in excess of plan: cotton, woolen, linen, and silk fabrics; artificial fibers; leather footwear; paper; sugar; canned foods; vegetable oil; macaroni goods; radio sets; soap; and other consumer goods.

Fourth. Ever more visible results are being achieved in fulfillment of the main task of socialist production—an increase in the productivity of labor. The plan for increasing labor productivity of industrial workers in the first quarter of 1958 was fulfilled 102 percent. Compared with the first quarter of 1957, labor productivity in industry increased 7 percent.

Fifth. The state plan is being fulfilled in the country as a whole and in all republics. All union republics have fulfilled the quarterly plan of gross output and output of the most important items. The industry of local Soviets has been developing successfully,

together with the industry of the Sovnarkhozes. Its first quarter plan was fulfilled 102 percent.

Such are the main results of development of our industry in the last few months. Such are the conclusions to be drawn from these results. The current year has been started well by Soviet builders. The plan of building and assembly work in the first quarter of 1958 was fulfilled 101 percent. Building organizations of the Sovnarkhozes fulfilled the plan 103 percent. The volume of building and assembly work in the country increased 11 percent compared with the first quarter of 1957.

The rapid growth of the industrial might of our country exerts an increasing influence on the development of socialist agriculture. This determines the rise of the material well-being of the Soviet people. The report of the Central Statistical Administration of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers on fulfillment of the state plan of retail goods turnover in the first quarter of 1958, published April 17, shows that the continuously growing requirements of the population are being met ever more fully in our country.

The powerful upsurge of the economy of the U. S. S. R., as of other socialist countries, is taking place at a moment when the economy of a number of capitalist countries has entered a period of progressing depression. Even the biggest representatives of imperialist circles and inveterate troubadours of capitalism cannot conceal that an economic recession has begun and is continuing to develop in the United States—the main country of capitalism. This recession leads to a destruction of the production forces and to the greatest calamities.

The greater is the pride felt for their socialist country, for its successes, by the Soviet people, who were the first to pave the way to socialism.

Texas Electric Cooperative Calls for Adequate REA Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution calling for adequate funds at present interest rates for the rural electrification program, as passed by directors of the Jackson Electric Cooperative, Edna, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This Texas cooperative serves rural consumers in Jackson, Matagorda, Calhoun, Brazoria, and Lavaca Counties.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF JACKSON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., AT BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING, APRIL 15, 1958

Whereas the continued progress and service of the rural electric cooperatives is contingent upon the availability of sufficient funds at present interest rates being made available each year by the Congress; and

Whereas it has been determined that $350 million will be required for rural electrification and $9,500,000 for administrative expenses in order to carry on an effective program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the Jackson Electric Cooperative, Inc., representing more than 5,000 members in Jackson, Matagorda, Calhoun, Brazoria, and Lavaca Counties, Tex., respectfully request the Congress to consider and act favorably on this resolution.

Respectfully submitted.

JACKSON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
E. S. YOAS, *President*.

Attest:

W. M. SELLS,
Secretary.

Address by John S. Gleason, National Commander of the American Legion, Before South Carolina Legionnaires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on March 29 the Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, came to my State to address the spring rally of South Carolina Legionnaires at Columbia.

He took the occasion to speak on the subject of national defense. He delivered an able and extremely illuminating address.

The American Legion, one of our finest veterans' organizations, has always been vitally interested in our military posture. At a time like this, when we are faced with the immense and complex problems of molding our military organization to fit changing concepts of strategy, it is not surprising that the national commander of the American Legion speaks with the authority and background knowledge that was displayed in his address at Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that this able address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY JOHN S. GLEASON, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, AT DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA SPRING RALLY, COLUMBIA, S. C., MARCH 29, 1958

It is a real pleasure and a privilege being with you South Carolina Legionnaires and auxiliary members tonight. I am grateful for the opportunity you have given me to participate in this great spring rally.

For the American Legion here in the Palmetto State, spring is really busting out all over. Your enthusiasm for our organization and your dedication to our programs of service for God and country have been overwhelmingly in evidence at this rally. I am confident that this interest and effort will be continued and will carry you to new heights of service and membership this year.

At a meeting of this kind it is necessary and proper that you should examine carefully each of our major programs to insure that needy and disabled veterans in this State are receiving all of the help which the American Legion Department of South Carolina can give them to make certain that no child wants for food, clothes, shelter, medical care, or the other necessities which you can provide, to know that the young citizens of this great State are benefiting from such positive, constructive Americanism programs of the American Legion as Boys' State, junior baseball, oratorical contests, Boy Scouts, and other citizenship training activities.

We must, I submit, look carefully at each of these programs and determine that they will always be carried out as effectively, extensively, and vigorously as possible. But beyond this, the American Legion, here in South Carolina and in every State, must continue to lead the fight for adequate national security.

All of the hard-won benefits for America's veterans, their dependents and survivors, all of the worthwhile programs for our Nation's needy children, and all of our efforts to build better citizens and better communities in America will be lost if we do not win the fight for our Nation's security and survival.

I feel confident that the subject of national security is especially meaningful to you South Carolina legionnaires. This State is rich in military heritage and history. Within your borders are a number of our Nation's most important military, naval, and air installations. Just a few miles from where we are meeting tonight lies Fort Jackson. Shaw Air Force Base, the great Charleston Navy Yard, the Citadel, these and other names tell of South Carolina's intimate identification with the military security of America. Throughout your State active military installations and historic battlefields such as Cowpens and Sumter serve to emphasize the vital role which the citizens of South Carolina have played in winning our independence and keeping us a free nation under God.

Now fate has once again thrust upon you the opportunity for leadership in the field of national security.

When an Air Force jet bomber accidentally hurled a loaded but untriggered A-bomb into a farm yard outside Florence, S. C., a few days ago, there was ample opportunity for anger, fear, and a public outcry against arming our planes with these bombs on stateside flights.

In London, 3,000 miles away, there was instant and widespread editorial alarm. Even Russia was upset. But here in South Carolina, among the citizens most directly concerned, there was calm. In fact, to quote one news account: "interest (here) seemed to center more on the technical workings of the bomb, as revealed by the explosions of a TNT trigger device and on the built-in safety precautions."

Your reaction is truly commendable. More than that, it should serve as an inspiration and example to all of our citizens, in every State.

We have to accept the possibility of infrequent accidents as part of the price of national security. We have to realize that, despite the most extensive and effective safety precautions possible, an untriggered A-bomb can drop accidentally from a plane, cannon shells can be fired accidentally over populated areas. And even in a cold war the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of our Armed Forces literally must risk their lives at times in our defense.

Their task will be made easier, their service more effective and their sacrifice more meaningful with public understanding and support.

It is up to organizations like the American Legion to create this essential climate of public understanding. It is up to us to instill in our fellow-citizens an awareness and appreciation of the sacrifices we must make, the inconveniences we must accept and the rare dangers we must face in the peacetime defense of our country.

Beyond this, the American Legion, here in South Carolina and in every State, must

voice the concern of those citizens, veteran, and nonveteran alike, who believe with us that America is not now prepared to counter Russia's massive military might in a so-called limited or conventional war.

There are many sincere Americans who believe that it is unrealistic to concern ourselves with the problem of fighting a conventional war when our security and survival depend primarily on missiles and control of interplanetary space. The American Legion realizes the imperative need for America to win the race for space. But we submit that we cannot afford to concentrate all of our efforts, all of our resources and all of our time and talent on missiles and other weapons of the space age.

In the first place, the era of pushbutton warfare, if it ever arrives, is still years away. Second, we must recognize the possibility of a nuclear-missile stalemate, a condition in which the retaliatory capabilities of both the United States and Russia are so complete that missiles and nuclear weapons of vast destructive power and range will not be used.

If this seems like wishful thinking, just remember for a moment that neither side used gas in World War II because of the retaliatory capability which both possessed.

Thus we are confronted immediately with the need to maintain and increase the strength of our existing Armed Forces to counter Russia's vast and growing superiority in the area of conventional military power. And we face the distinct possibility of a missile-nuclear stalemate in the event of a future war.

And what is our Government's reaction? Cut back the strength of the Regular Army, reduce the existing or authorized strength of the National Guard and Reserve forces, maintain presently inadequate production schedules for jet bombers, submarines, and other vitally needed weapons of today.

The American Legion is confident that the Congress will not approve a proposed reduction of 1 division and 30,000 men in the strength of the Army in the next fiscal year. We believe that such informed and dedicated statesmen as your own distinguished Senator, STROM THURMOND, will agree with the American Legion and with the House Armed Services Committee that the National Guard should not be cut back from 404,000 to 360,000 men in the next fiscal year. We know that his own extensive experience and brilliant service in the Reserve forces of the Army will make Senator THURMOND an effective ally and leader in our fight to prevent the reduction of the Army Reserve from 300,000 to 270,000 men in the next fiscal year.

The American Legion is not fighting for obsolete concepts. We are not seeking to maintain an archaic kind of military force. We are seeking only to give America a measure of security in an area in which we are now so vulnerable and so weak compared to Russia.

I am not exaggerating. Here are the facts. By the end of this June, the Army's strength will be down to 870,000 men in only 14 divisions and 6 regimental combat teams. The strength of the Red Army alone, not counting Red China or any of the other Communist satellite countries, is estimated at approximately 2½ million men, organized into some 175 divisions, of which 105 are infantry, 45 are mechanized, 20 are armored and 6 are airborne.

Further, the Soviet Army today has a completely new postwar arsenal of weapons, in being, in the hands of trained troops, capable of fighting either a nuclear or nonnuclear war, big or small, in any kind of climate or terrain.

In other words, the situation we face today is simply this. The Russian Army, with its 175 active divisions and an estimated 300 divisions in reserve can match us in a global war, but we can't match Russia in another conventional, limited war such as Korea.

On balance, we still enjoy naval superiority over Russia. But hidden under the sea is a force that threatens not only the strength and fighting effectiveness of our Navy but America's lifeline as well. Right now Russia could surface off the Charleston Navy Yard a submarine fleet many times greater than that with which Hitler started World War II and still have ample submarine strength to deploy to other waters.

Hitler began World War II with only 57 submarines. And he came closer than many of us will ever realize to winning his gamble for control of the seas.

Today Russia has approximately 600 submarines in its fleet and, according to reliable estimates, is adding 3 submarines every 2 weeks to this strength.

We don't have to be Navy veterans to understand the importance of control of the ocean highways which link 85 percent of the world's land masses. These highways must be kept open in time of war to insure the safe delivery to our shores of the many strategic raw materials which we must import from abroad. Further, without control of the sea all of the overseas bases which we have built up over the years at such great expense and effort will be lost to us.

If we lose control of the seas we will be cut off from those raw materials needed for our defense industries. And we will be cut off from our allies and left standing alone with our backs to the wall as Russia chooses the time and place for a final, all-out assault on America, freedom's last bastion of defense.

These are the frightening realities which compel the American Legion's constant and continuing effort to build up the strength of our Army and Reserve Forces, to insure the Navy's ability to maintain control of the seas, and to maintain at maximum strength and efficiency America's greatest retaliatory and deterrent force, the United States Air Force and its Strategic Air Command.

With the interest and dedication of such Legionnaires as you members of the great department of South Carolina, the American Legion can and will win the fight for complete national security.

We will forge that shield of defense needed to keep us free now and in the years ahead as we seek to conquer space, to reach other planets, and to attain lasting peace.

Thank you for the privilege of being with you tonight.

South Gate, Calif., Kiwanis Club Holds Noon Meeting Poll on Knowledge of Club Members as to Who Their Elected Public Officials Are, and Other Related Public Matters

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to advise you of a very significant educational program by the South Gate, Calif., Kiwanis Club, it being one of the Kiwanis Clubs in the great 23d district which I represent this my 12th year in this Congress.

In speaking with Mr. Paul S. Chance, a prominent educator in California, and a member of said South Gate Kiwanis Club, and chairman of their committee in this matter, he explained to me that the reason he and his committee had developed these questions to submit to all of the 89 members of the club at a club meeting was that it was recognized as of strategic and utmost importance that all Kiwanis Club members in the 23d Congressional District know the answers to said questions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, following are the questions and the answers thereto as written on the ballot by the club members present at their luncheon meeting. This educational program dealing with their own congressional district, their State assembly districts, and their own State senators, and their own United States Senators, and their own supervisorial districts, and other important items as set forth in the 24 questions is certainly worth adaptation and copying by any club of American citizens. I do not have the percentagewise of these successful answers.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and all the other Members of this Congress join me in congratulating the South Gate, Calif., Kiwanis Club on this very worthy educational program. Of the 89 members present, I am informed by the chairman that 51 of the members present turned in their ballots and thus participated in the objective work of the educational committee of said club.

The questionnaire follows:

SOUTH GATE KIWANIS CLUB, SOUTH GATE, CALIF., 23D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

1. The Governor of California is (Goodwin J. Knight).

2. California's 23d Congressional District has nearly 100,000 (200,000), 300,000, 400,000 registered voters.

3. California Congressional District 23 has a population of about 325,000, 425,000 (575,000), 625,000.

4. Los Angeles County has how many State assemblymen? (31.)

5. Los Angeles County has how many United States Congressmen? (12.) (In the House of Representatives.)

6. Mayor of city of South Gate is (Earl Hutchinson).

7. The present United States Congressman from 23d District is (CLYDE DOYLE).

8. The 23d Congressional District comprises how many assembly districts (3), 52, 55, 69.

9. Number of Members in United States House of Representatives (435).

10. Number of United States Senators in United States Senate (96).

11. United States Senators from California are (1, THOMAS KUCHEL; 2, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND).

12. Number of California Representatives in United States Congress (30).

13. Number of California State senators (40).

14. How many California States assemblymen? (80.)

15. Number of members of county board of supervisors (5).

16. Veterans' Day is (November 11).

17. Flag Day is (June 14).

18. Los Angeles first supervisorial district has (.3 million), 2.3 million, 3.3 million population,

19. The four congressional actions are (bill, joint resolution, concurrent resolution, simple resolution).

Identify the source:

20. "In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten." (Mayflower Compact.)

21. "Article 1. The stile of this Confederacy shall be * * * 'The United States of America.'" (Articles of Confederation.)

22. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal." (Declaration of Independence.)

23. "* * * with a firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence we mutually pledge" (Declaration of Independence.)

24. "Done in convention by unanimous consent of the states present the seventeenth day of September." (United States Constitution.)

Fifty-one members turned in papers. There were 89 present.

Statement by Former President Harry S. Truman, Before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, April 14, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD former President Truman's statement before the House committee when he appeared to give his views on the present economic recession and the means of reversing it. We are all indebted to him for the contribution he made to our thinking on the matter.

I was particularly interested in one part of his testimony in which he referred to the causes of the current inflation. He observed that, contrary to inflationary periods in the recent past when demand greatly exceeded the available goods and services, this recession is characterized by high and rising prices at the same time that there are unused plant capacities and increased unemployment.

His observations further buttress my own conviction that much of the credit for the present inflationary spiral can be laid at the feet of those who administer the prices of some of our most vital commodities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HARRY S. TRUMAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, APRIL 14, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is an honor for me to have an opportunity to appear before this committee.

I am especially delighted, Mr. Chairman, to see that you are here working with the same diligence and vigor that you have shown through the years in behalf of our country and its people. You are doing a great job just as you have always done.

I appreciate very much this opportunity to tell you my views about some of the problems before the country. I don't know why you would be interested in the views of a retired Missouri farmer on these subjects, but since you were good enough to invite me to come, I am glad to express them.

I understand that these hearings relate to a number of bills pending before this committe and also to the general problem of economic distress and unemployment. I shall refer specifically to some of these bills later in my statement, but I wish to speak about the general economic problem.

First, I wish to say that I think the present recession is very serious. It is serious not only in terms of hardship and suffering for millions of our people who are unemployed, it is even more serious because it weakens our ability to meet the dangers and challenges which threaten us from abroad.

I know that in spite of our present difficulties, this is still the strongest Nation in the world, with the greatest productive power and the highest standard of living. However, we cannot ignore the fact that Russia is catching up with us very rapidly. Her economy has been growing at an annual rate of about 7 percent during recent years and is continuing to grow at an even faster rate. At the same time, the growth of our own economy during the past few years has averaged less than one-third the Russian rate, and for more than a year now we have been actually shrinking and not growing at all. It is almost impossible to overemphasize the great danger in this situation.

Secondly, we ought not to underestimate the nature of the job that must be done or the magnitude of the measures that will be required to do it. It is necessary not only that we stop the recession, but we must also restores the growth of our economy. This is necessary not only to meet the needs of a growing population, but also to meet the needs for greater and greater economic strength which is a stark necessity for continued national survival in the competitive situation that exists in the world today.

I think the root of the difficulty is that we have departed from the philosophy of maximum employment, production and purchasing power set forth in the Employment Act of 1946. In place of this philosophy, there seems to be some strange notion abroad in the land that prosperity today would be dangerous for tomorrow, a strange notion that if we had full employment and full production that somehow this would cause an explosion that would blow the economy apart and end up in a depression that would curl your hair. I do not understand this. I do not see why our economy cannot grow and continue to grow, and without inflation. I see no need for periodic downturns when people are put through the wringer, and I see no reason why our plans and policies ought not to be directed toward a constantly expanding economy and toward the prevention of recessions altogether. We might not be altogether successful in preventing economic downturns, but at least we can make that our goal and not try to brush recessions aside by pretending that they are a good thing.

During my administration we were not entirely successful in dealing with this problem, and we had an economic recession in 1949. But there are several reasons why I will not go into this in detail now. In the first place, that recession in 1949 was nowhere near as prolonged, as deep and as serious as the one we are in now. I do not need to attempt to prove this because practically every business analyst and expert has been telling us over and over again that we are now in by far the most serious and dangerous economic recession since World War II.

In the second place, the economic recession of 1949 did not have back of it a number of years of rising economic difficulties, such as we have had since 1953, and consequently the powerful sources of strength within the economy which enabled us to have a sharp upturn well before the Korean war are not present now. For example, American agriculture in 1949, at the base of our economy, had not been weakened as it has been weakened now.

In the third place, and most important of all, we should be dealing with serious economic problems and not with politics, and there is nothing that we can do now to change what happened a decade ago, but we have great responsibilities to deal with the current situation. If the critics of how things happened in 1949 learned any constructive lesson which they now want to apply, I am ready to go along with them 100 percent. My own view is that the one thing we learned was that perhaps we should have acted in this 1949 recession even more vigorously than we did, and this is doubly true now in view of the whole international situation.

Due to population growth, our labor force expands by more than 1 percent a year. Under favorable conditions, our productivity or output per man-hour, grows by more than 3 percent a year. Therefore, our total national product needs to expand by about 4½ percent a year in order for the economy to stay healthy. Otherwise, we will have rising unemployment and idle productive facilities. From 1947 to 1953, the rate of growth for our economy as a whole was slightly more than 4½ percent a year. In the years from 1953 to 1957, the rate of growth declined to 2.3 percent. In the last year of this period, the rate of growth was only 1 percent. During the past year, the total output of the economy has actually declined about 6 percent. All of these figures are adjusted for price changes. Thus, over the past 5 years as a whole our economy has been moving consistently and increasingly away from maximum employment and maximum production.

One of the most distressing features of this, of course, is the increase in unemployment. Not only are millions of men and women out of work, but millions are working part time. They are only partially employed. This partial unemployment is just as much a loss to the country as full time unemployment. Figuring the full time equivalent of this partial unemployment, and adding it to existing full time unemployment, the true level of unemployment has risen from about 2.8 million in 1953 to over 6 million at the present time. For these people and their families, this is a real depression.

You know the difference between a recession and a depression is that if your neighbor loses his job, that is a recession; if you lose your job, that's a depression.

This growth in unemployment has meant, in the years 1953 through 1957, about 8½ million man-years of unemployment in excess of the minimum frictional amount we would have had in a full employment economy. This tremendous waste of manpower has been accompanied by a tremendous waste of machines and other productive facilities. The steel industry, for example is now operating about 50 percent of capacity. Many other industries are in almost as bad shape.

This tremendous waste of manpower and productive facilities which represents failures to achieve maximum production and maximum employment has meant, during the years 1953 through 1957, a loss of more than $55 billion in wages and salaries, a loss of almost $25 billion in farm income, a loss of more than $12 billion in corporate profits, and a loss of some $5 billion in unincorporated business and professional income. It is harder to measure what it has cost us in lost ground in the struggle to maintain freedom in the world, but surely that loss is tragic beyond words.

Basically, the growing failure to utilize manpower and other productive resources springs from insufficient demand to call forth maximum production and maximum employment. Demand is of three main kinds: First, the demand represented by private purchases of consumers; second, the

demand represented by private investment for business purposes; and, third, the demand represented by public expenditures for goods and services. The total of these three types of demand represents, generally speaking, the actual level of total production.

During these recent years, private and public consumption expenditures have lagged behind private investment for business purposes. This is the chief explanation for the vast unused plant capacities of today. To regain our economic health, it will be necessary to restore the balance in our economy by achieving an increase in the combined expenditures for public and private consumption in proportion to the levels achieved in recent years for private investment.

I do not think it is true that the deficiency in private consumption is due to the reluctance of consumers to spend available income. I think instead that it is due to a shortage of funds and bad distribution. What the average American consumer actually lacks is not confidence but income after taxes. During the whole period since 1953, the growth in consumer income after taxes has been even slower than the inadequate growth rate of private consumer expenditures. This has been increasingly the case in the latter part of the period. Between the second and third quarters of 1957, for example, consumer expenditures increased at an average annual rate of 2.4 percent, while consumer income after taxes was going down at an annual rate of 0.5 percent. In the following quarter, both consumer income after taxes and consumer expenditures were down at an annual rate of about 3 percent. We cannot go on forever with consumers borrowing too much because their incomes are too low.

Since the current recession is the outgrowth of a train of events which has been gathering momentum for the past 5 years, it has deeper roots and is more serious than previous recessions since World War II. This means that the measures required to reverse the downward trend are more substantial than those needed to reverse earlier recessions since World War II. Even more important, the corrective measures should not confine themselves merely to arresting the absolute decline in production and employment. Instead, they should be designed to restore maximum employment and maximum production as rapidly as feasible.

To put the measures needed in proper perspective, we must first grasp the magnitude of the task. It is sometimes hard for us older people to adjust our thinking to keep pace with the march of events. It is hard for us to comprehend the magnitude of the sums of money involved in the operation of our national economy, but we simply must make the necessary adjustments in our thinking. We must look at things as they are today and not as they were in 1900 or, for that matter, as they were in 1945 or 1950.

The restoration of our economy is a man-sized job, and this is certainly a case where it would be a mistake to send a boy to do a man's job.

In order to make reasonable progress toward maximum production and employment, we should lift the total national product for the calendar year 1959 to about $40 billion above the level for 1957, and for a satisfactory rate of sustained economic growth, we will need to continue to add about $20 billion a year to our total national production. Increases in economic activity of this magnitude will not be achieved by feeble or fainthearted measures, or by simply waiting for nature to take its course.

I wish to commend the Congress for the actions it has already taken to combat the recession. These actions have been substantial and important. They certainly were moves in the right direction, and I know that additional steps are planned.

These actions by the Congress are all the more notable and praiseworthy because of the conspicuous lack of encouragement they have received from other quarters. But I hope you will not be discouraged or become weary of well doing.

In my judgment, the measures already taken are only the beginning of what is necessary and wise. I believe that bold and vigorous action is necessary; and in considering this matter, I would never forget for a moment that the Russians are looking over our shoulders with an economy—their economy, that is—which is growing at a rate of 7 to 10 percent a year, while ours is standing still.

I am not in favor of inflation, and I will have more to say about that later. However, I would not sit in the midst of a pool of economic stagnation while the Russians are overhauling us because of some fear—whether it be real or fanciful—of inflation somewhere down the road in the future.

The first major weapon now available for use by the Federal Government toward arresting the depression and restoring our economy is an expansion of public outlays. I believe that public expenditures should be increased to the extent required to fulfill necessary and vital public programs. This is not merely for the purpose of increasing current economic activity. It is in the first instance a matter of providing an adequate national defense and meeting other national needs. Secondly, the expansion of Federal outlays and the adoption of the programs which go with them will be a means of assuring economic growth in future years.

The Congress has already authorized some increased Federal expenditures, as in the case of the housing and highway bills, and I approve of these measures. I think there should be additional increases in some other lines, which I shall mention. We should plan these increased public outlays for a long period of time, in accordance with the growing needs of the economy. This would be a wise thing to do, because in recent years we have been starving the economy by holding up or blocking public expenditures for domestic needs. We have been holding back on such things as dams and schools and buildings that we need, and this has been bad for the Nation.

I think, therefore, that we should plan our public outlays not just for the next fiscal year, but for the next 5 years. This will show that we mean business about an expanding economy, and assure a rate of public spending that can be counted on.

I would suggest increases somewhat along the following lines:

1. In the area of national defense, increase outlays for fiscal 1959 by about $3 billion above the level originally proposed in the President's budget, and plan to increase them by another $5 billion or more annually by fiscal 1964. These amounts are in accord with the recommendations made in recent studies by competent experts. If they don't give us an adequate national defense, then they should be increased.

2. In the overseas field, increase outlays for technical assistance and economic development from the $972 million recommended by the President to $1.5 billion in fiscal 1959, and plan to increase them to $2.5 billion by 1964. I think this is essential if we are to keep ahead of the Russians in the area of foreign economic development.

3. In the area of the domestic economy and its needs, I would make increases totaling about $1.7 billion for the fiscal year 1959. The bulk of this expansion would be for education, public health, and public assistance.

In succeeding years, I would keep enlarging the spending in the domestic area, so that by fiscal 1964 we would be spending a total of around $12 billion for education, health and public assistance, a total of about $2.5 billion for natural resources development, and a total of $2.2 billion for housing, including low rent housing, aid for middle income housing, and urban redevelopment.

These increases for fiscal 1959 and for later years would be consistent with a resumption of our normal rate of economic growth. By 1964, if we progress as we should, our total national output should be about $600 billion, instead of the $434 billion of 1957, and a Federal budget much larger than the one for 1959 would still be a smaller fraction of our total production.

You may note that I say nothing about increases in agricultural outlays by the Federal Government. This is not because the farmer needs no help. Indeed, he has suffered longer from this recession than anyone else. However, I believe that the current rate of expenditures for the agricultural program would be sufficient if the program were properly administered. The farmers' income could be increased without additional Government expenditures.

With these programs in mind, the next question is what ought to be done about taxes. I am strongly in favor of a long-range tax program designed to balance the Federal budget, but we all know that we do not have that now. Despite the President's claims that his fiscal 1959 budget is going to show a surplus of $466 million, practically every informed expert expects a deficit estimated at between $4 and $8 billion. So we do not have any prospect of a balanced Federal budget if things are left as they are.

This prospective deficit in the Federal budget is due in large part to the current recession. And the recession in turn is primarily due to the inability of consumers to buy the products which our factories and farms can turn out. Our present tax structure has serious inequities which contribute to this lack of consumer purchasing power. Therefore, the same tax policies which can help to improve the tax structure can also help to cure the economic recession and bring us more quickly to a balanced budget.

The first element in this improvement in the tax structure is to take the special privilege benefits out of the tax laws and use the added revenues to put more spending power immediately into the hands of average American families who do not now have enough spending power. The obvious and quickest way to do this is to revise the tax structure so as to reduce by about $5 billion the amount of taxes imposed on middle- and low-income families. There are various detailed ways of doing this which would reach an equitable result. However, the Congress should be careful not to pass out tax benefits to investors and well-to-do people who, if they are suffering at all, are suffering only because average American families do not have enough purchasing power. This adjustment in the tax structure by helping to restore maximum employment and production can help to lift our total national production, which is our tax base, to a level $40 billion higher in calendar year 1959 than in calendar year 1957. This is the surest and safest way toward a balanced Federal budget.

We can lighten the tax burdens on the low-income groups in this way without running the danger of a large temporary drop in revenue. The reduction for low-income groups should be accompanied by tax changes which will increase revenues from other sectors of the economy and help to balance the budget. Most important is to close up the most glaring tax loopholes. This should bring in about $2 billion more in tax revenues.

We can increase tax revenues by another $1 billion or so by getting rid of some of the inequitable benefits to privileged groups in the tax reductions of 1954.

In addition, by reversing the high interest policies which have already added about $1.2 billion to the Federal budget annually in the form of carrying charges on the national debt, and which will be adding $2 billion

shortly if new financing continues under this high interest policy, we can save about another $2 billion a year which is now being wasted from the viewpoint of the Federal budget and which is doing almost irreparable damage to our whole economy.

These measures, in combination, would transfer $5 billion of purchasing power to places where it belongs both on considerations of equity and because that is where it would do the most good for the economy.

There are other measures which should be taken to meet the problems of the recession. One of the most important of these is to extend Federal aid to the State unemployment insurance systems to lengthen the period for the payment of insurance benefits. Also, as a long-range measure, unemployment insurance coverage should be extended and Federal standards should be established to bring about a greater degree of uniformity in the various laws.

I also hope very much that the Congress at this session will increase social-security benefits. This is needed on social grounds; we can afford it economically, and certainly it is one of the most desirable methods of expanding purchasing power.

I want to say a bit more on the whole subject of inflation. My record as an opponent of inflation is perfectly clear. If the measures which I proposed to combat inflation during the war and reconversion years of my Presidency had been adopted, we would have had far less inflation. There was never a year in my 8 years of the Presidency when I did not propose a more effective and complete anti-inflationary program than in fact was adopted.

I want to use what influence I may still have to help protect the American people from the ravages of inflation to the greatest possible extent.

But in order to do this we need to understand the causes of the recent inflation. This recent inflation has been entirely different from that which occurred during wartime, when total demand exceeded the total productive capabilities. It is entirely different from the inflation which occurred during periods of reconversion when pent-up savings and backlogs of demand caused spending to exceed our total productive capabilities. This recent inflation, unlike any other that we can recall, occurred during 1956 and 1957 at a time when our economic growth rate was too low rather than too high, and when we were already witnessing unused plant capacities and rising unemployment. Still more striking, this inflation has continued even in the face of the economic recession.

This new kind of inflation, therefore, has not been due to too much employment or too much production or too rapid an economic growth. Indeed, there is strong evidence that this new inflation, sometimes called administered price inflation, has been due to the pressure of some strong groups to make up for an inadequate level of production and sales by raising their prices excessively. How else can we explain the striking price increases in some of our key industries even when they are operating at 70 percent or less of capacity?

We have not solved entirely the problem of how to deal with this new kind of inflation. But there is certainly every reason to know that we cannot deal with it by the surrender of prosperity and the acceptance of recessions which could lead to depressions. In fact, the evidence strongly suggests that the restoration of maximum employment and production and purchasing power would in itself tend to remove many of the causes which have been responsible for the recent price inflation. If we find other causes of price inflation even after this first vital remedial action is taken, we may have to devise still additional remedies.

But most of all, it is nonsense to argue—as so many seem to be doing now—that we dare not take the steps necessary because to do so would be inflationary. To say that is to contend that we must be cursed with either inflation or recession. I reject that conclusion as defeatism of the worst order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak particularly in support of some of the bills pending before this committee which I understand are included within the scope of this hearing. These bills fit into the pattern of the actions which should be taken to strengthen our economy.

First, there is the community facilities bill which will make available a $2 billion loan fund for loans to the States and local communities for needed public works projects such as roads and streets, water works, sewer systems, hospitals and the like. Loans of the type provided by this bill will serve the twofold purpose of creating badly needed public facilities and also creating jobs and incomes to help restore our economy and keep it healthy. I hope the bill will be favorably considered.

Next, I wish to refer to the area redevelopment bill, the purpose of which is to help create new jobs in areas of chronic unemployment. Legislation for this purpose was reported out by this committee 2 years ago. It passed the Senate in that same year, but was not taken up on the floor of the House because of the rush in the final days before adjournment. Legislation for this purpose has been endorsed in the platforms of both major political parties and has been recommended by the present administration. It was badly needed even before the current recession became so severe. Now it is needed even worse.

This legislation might possibly be combined with the community facilities bill as there is some similarity in the purposes of the two. However, special provisions ought to be made for the chronically depressed areas because they have distinct problems which require special treatment. Remember this: Depression in any part of our economy tends to depress the rest of it; and correcting the trouble spots where the worst problems exist will improve conditions everywhere.

Finally, I understand that you have before you legislation to provide additional equity capital for small business. This is most important. The tight money policy and other restrictive fiscal policies of recent years have not been particularly hard on the big corporations. However, they have made it much harder for small-business concerns to get money. The small concerns were having a hard time in 1950 when I recommended legislation for this purpose. They are having a harder time now and the legislation is needed even more than it was in 1950. I hope that you will give it your blessing.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that concludes my statement, and I wish to thank you very much.

Need for Increased Appropriations for Work on Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I am concerned by administration proposals to curtail drastically expenditures for needed work in our parks and forests and certain other public lands. It is my sincere hope that Congress will appropriate sufficient money for fulfillment of the mission 66 program, for adequate fire protection on our public lands and for reforestation.

In his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee Mr. Stewart M. Brandborg, Assistant Conservation Director of the National Wildlife Federation, states the case for these increased appropriations.

I would call particular attention to his point that millions of acres of timber and game range were destroyed in Alaska last year, because of the inadequacy of fire control measures.

Some of the richest timber and wildlife areas on the continent are among the 225 million acres of Federal land in Alaska under jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. Yet the understaffed BLM personnel had less than 100 men—and insufficient modern equipment—to spot and fight fires. One hundred men to fight fires on 225 million acres means that each fire fighter—pilot, radio technician, or guard—had more than 2 million acres to protect from fire. In national and State forests here in the United States frequently more than 100 men are assigned to the job which 1 fire fighter tries to do in Alaska.

This policy of saving pennies on fire prevention is costing dollars in fire losses. Last summer, as Mr. Brandborg points out, uncontrolled forest fires swept over 5 million acres of Alaskan forest and tundra, an area as large as the whole State of Massachusetts, destroying timber, game range and waterfowl habitat.

I wish to add, parenthetically, that if the Congress would finally grant Alaska the statehood it deserves there would be additional voices here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives suggesting, as I am now, that Congress appropriate an additional $1 million for the BLM's Alaskan fire protection program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print Mr. Brandborg's testimony in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY STEWART M. BRANDBORG, ASSISTANT CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 7, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I am Stewart M. Brandborg, assistant conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation.

The National Wildlife Federation is a private, nonprofit conservation organization, representing a membership of State affiliate groups which are composed of local conservation sportsmen, and other civic clubs. The federation and its members are broadly concerned with the protection of our outdoor recreational resources, particularly those scenic and natural places where people can still enjoy some of the refreshment that is found in living in the out of doors. We are dedicated through our policies to the conservation of fish and wildlife as well as our basic soil, water, timber, and mineral resources.

We feel that the protection of our lands and their many uses which serve man's needs are as vital to our Nation as are our pro-

grams of national defense and security. It is these lands that have produced the wealth that makes possible the growth of our Nation and people. Our soils have given us the foods and fibers that have made us the greatest national producer of farm and forest crops. Our mineral and water resources have made possible an unequaled growth of our industries. In many ways we have demonstrated man's control over his environment, but we still have not come to realize our total dependence upon these life-giving resources. We are in the process of killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

Many of us have associated the wasteful depletion of our natural resources with the periods of exploration and settlement of our country. And while much irreparable damage was done to our lands during this period when frontiers were pushed westward, it has not been until the present century that we have demonstrated our full potential for changing the landscape and completely ravaging a large and vital part of those resources which have contributed so much to the abundance of our living.

Our State and Federal conservation agencies have made remarkable progress in carrying out needed research and in developing long-range programs for managing our forests, wildlife, farmlands, and waters; they have given us many fine standards for measuring our successes and shortcomings in learning to live with the land in such a way as not to destroy its future productiveness. They have shown us the methods to care for our resources; if we will practice them wherever we are putting land to work.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chairman, I would like today to discuss a phase of public land management which is in critical need of review by this committee. This problem has been brought to our attention by our affiliate in the Territory of Alaska, the Alaska Sportsmen's Council. It involves over 225 million acres of Federal land in the Territory of Alaska which is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. Included in this vast holding are some of the richest timber and wildlife areas remaining on the North American Continent. These represent the last, but very large, remnant of our American frontier.

I would like to call your attention to the mistreatment that we are giving this vast, undeveloped public estate. In many respects it is not dissimilar to the abuse that our forest and farm lands suffered at the hands of our grandfathers when our country was first settled. But they had an excuse—they didn't know any better. They lacked know-how to care for our lands so that they could continue to meet the needs of the people. We cannot use the same excuse today.

Last summer uncontrolled forest fires swept over 5 million acres of Alaskan forest and tundra. That's more land than there is in the whole State of Massachusetts. Timber and game ranges were scorched and ravaged. The ranges of huge herds of big game and flocks of waterfowl were destroyed.

At a time when publicity and public education experts have focused so much public attention on the serious threat of uncontrolled forest fires and the public has responded by becoming more careful in handling fires in forested areas, we are inclined to ask how such shocking losses can be permitted. The answer lies in the study of the money, manpower, equipment, and facilities which are available for this job.

Last summer the Alaskan field force of the Bureau of Land Management experienced the worst fire season in history. A crew of less than 100 men was charged with the protection of 225 million acres of forest and tundra lands. This means that each man—if pilots, radio technicians, temporary and seasonal fire guards are included—had over 2 million acres to protect from fire. This is an area larger than most of our National parks and National and State forests where sizable crews, sometimes numbering more than the entire 100-man fire staff of BLM in Alaska, are assigned to fire-protection work.

The airplanes and other equipment that the fire fighters in the Bureau are using are obsolete and unsafe. Much of it is Army surplus from World War II.

Under pressure of extreme fire-hazard conditions, such as were experienced last summer, both men and equipment are taxed to the limit. Human lives are subject to serious hazards under conditions which drive men and dilapidated aircraft beyond their limitations. And for what? With such overwhelming odds, it is totally impossible for the small crews, even with emergency fire-fighting funds and help from cooperating agencies, to control more than a small part of the hundreds of fires that burned last summer. Many of them were not even visited.

Alaska is a big and inaccessible country. Lightning causes most of the bad fires in inaccessible interior areas where airplanes and helicopters provide the only practical means of access. The fire-protection job calls for fully staffed, well-equipped planes and helicopter crews that can get to the fires while they are small and before they require large investments of time and money to be brought under control. Emergency fire funds, which are made available to the Bureau after the fires are started, do not provide for staffing with trained forestry personnel who can come into action before fire fighting becomes a crash operation.

To do an adequate job, the BLM needs a regular yearly appropriation of $600,000 for its Alaskan fire-protection program. In addition to this, there is a critical need for an additional $1 million for equipment—helicopters, smoke-jumping gear, airplanes, raidos, pumps, trucks, and adequate buildings and guard stations. It is urged that this reequipping job be initiated with an appropriation of $500,000 for the next year.

In Alaska today we are sacrificing valuable resources to forest fires just as we did 50 years ago here in the United States. The main difference is that today, with our swelling populations, we can see that within a few years we will place heavy demands upon these lands. Yet we have done nothing to stop this waste.

RANGE MANAGEMENT ON LANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BLM

Bureau range managers and technicians work to conserve water and other resources in the management of western rangelands so as to provide food and cover for wildlife and forage for livestock. Because the public range is an integral part of many livestock operations in the West, the management of Federal grazing areas is an important element in the national production of meat, wool, and leather. With nearly 9 million head of cattle, sheep, and horses receiving at least one-third of their annual requirement for forage from public ranges, the stability of the western livestock industry is, to a large extent, dependent upon these lands.

More than a million big-game animals, which are enjoyed by hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts, live on these grazing lands during at least part of each year. Many upland animals—sage grouse, prairie chickens, rabbits, coyotes, as well as migratory waterfowl—make heavy use of these western ranges, the area of which, exclusive of Alaska, is approximately 178 million acres. Practically all of them lie in the 11 Western States.

One of the greatest handicaps to the production of BLM rangelands is the constant shortage of personnel to manage these. Right now, there is about one trained conservationist for every half-million acres under the Agency's administration. No private landowner would ever consider operating under such a manpower shortage. The public cannot expect the Bureau to take better care of the lands it manages unless more generous appropriations allow for increased staffing with trained conservationists. An increase of $750,000 is recommended for 1959 to begin a program of personnel expansion for this purpose.

BLM FORESTRY PROGRAMS

BLM administers more than 161 million acres of forest and woodlands in the continental United States and Alaska, all outside of the national forests. Two and one-half million acres of these are the so-called Oregon and California grant lands in Oregon. This places about 46 million acres of commercial forest lands and 115 million acres on noncommercial woodlands under Bureau jurisdiction.

A program of sustained yield forest management maintains a reasonable balance between the volume of tree cutting and tree growth to insure a continuing supply of forest products. Sale of mature timber; scientific cutting and protection against fire, disease, and insects; reforestation and construction of access roads are all part of the Bureau of Land Management's timber management program.

Here again, as in the case of the BLM range management program, appropriations for the sustained yield forest program are so limited that severe shortages of personnel and equipment hamper the work that can be done. Fire is taking a heavy toll of BLM-administered forest lands.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

Obligations incurred for BLM operations and all phases of management and administration during fiscal year 1957 amounted to almost $24 million. Over the 15-year period from 1943 to 1957 receipts from BLM-administered lands ranged from $10 million to $239 million. During the same 15 years the annual appropriations for management of these lands averaged $9.4 million and never exceeded $24 million. This demonstrates that we are putting but a small amount into these public lands compared to the rich benefits we take from them. The question now is whether they can continue to produce at this level if we are unwilling to invest more in their care.

We urge, Mr. Chairman, that the committee give the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management program its careful consideration. We feel confident that once you become aware of the sacrifices to these public lands which result from fund shortages, the committee will take the necessary steps to remedy needless waste.

The National Wildlife Federation wishes to make additional recommendations pertaining to funds for conservation agencies and programs in H. R. 10746.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

We respectfully urge this subcommittee, the full Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress to increase the direct appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service to a level not less than that provided for fiscal year 1958.

The reorganized Fish and Wildlife Service has additional responsibilities given it by the Congress and its programs must expand if the resources entrusted to its care are to be conserved and properly managed in this day of expanding human populations and increased demands upon those resources.

We are hopeful that the problem of securing funds for stepping up the acquisition of wetlands in order to assure the future of waterfowl resources and the great sport of wildfowling will be in large measure solved by enactment in this session of Congress of legislation increasing the duck stamp to $3 and allocating the receipts therefrom for wetlands acquisition.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

As proposed in the Federal budget, the House of Representatives approved a drastic

cut in 1959 funds for the mission 66 program in the national parks. The cut recommended by the Budget Bureau was justified, at least in part, on the basis of Park Service construction moneys held in budgetary reserve during the current year. It is our understanding the administration has now ordered release of these funds and a speedup of construction projects in the parks as a step in combating the business recession.

Completely apart from the Nation's business or economic needs, however, mission 66 must go forward on schedule if the national parks and monuments are to be rehabilitated, protected, and made ready for future public-use demands.

Therefore, we urge 1959 appropriations for the Park Service items of construction and acquisition, and for construction of parkways, roads, and trails, at least equal to the amounts voted by Congress last year for fiscal year 1958.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

Operation Outdoors is the same kind of program in the national forests as mission 66 in the national parks. The need and the urgency are at least as great. Therefore, we urge that the Forest Service item for recreational areas and public-use facilities, budgeted and approved by the House at $8,020,000, be increased to $10 million for the next fiscal year.

We have long worked for and urged an increase in the totally inadequate Forest Service item for wildlife habitat management and improvements. This figure is now set at $510,000. It is our understanding, however, that the Department of Agriculture intends soon to present to Congress part II of Operation Outdoors, proposing therein an expanded program of wildlife improvements on the national forests and in cooperation with the States. We hope this new program may be favorably considered in a supplementary appropriation bill.

We urge restoration of the cut made by the House of the Clarke-McNary program of cooperation with the States in tree planting. The House voted only $258,000 for this item compared to $1,308,000 last year. We also recommend continuation of the program of assistance to the States in tree planting as authorized in the Agricultural Act of 1956. We also recommend the restoration of the $300,000 budgeted for acquisition of lands within Superior National Forest.

We thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity of presenting our views.

Justice Frankfurter Lectures the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 18 there appeared in the Greenville News of Greenville, S. C., an editorial entitled "Justice Frankfurter Lectures the Court," in which attention was called to a recent dissenting opinion by Justice Frankfurter. Justices Burton, Clark, and Harlan joined in this dissent, in which the Court was warned that it must be on guard against encroaching beyond its proper bounds and into the areas of Government which the Constitution reserved for Congress, the executive branch, and the States.

I ask unanimous consent that this enlightening editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FRANKFURTER LECTURES THE COURT

There have been increasing signs during the past year and more that the position of the South with respect to the anti-segregation decision handed down by the United States Supreme Court in 1954 is being better understood.

Feeling about segregation itself probably delayed and may now be inhibiting expressions of such sentiment, but it exists nonetheless.

Among laymen in other regions, now themselves more and more beset by racial problems, there is arising sympathy for the South in its refusal to integrate. National publications, and even some liberal writers, are beginning to understand what southern leaders mean when they say that integration is impractical now and in the foreseeable future.

More important ,however, is the growing realization among men learned in the law that the Supreme Court went outside the law and the evidence in ruling as it did on the school cases; that it undertook to rewrite the Constitution; that it sought to make national policy; that it seriously invaded the powers, functions and duties of both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal, State, and local governments.

Able lawyers and judges are beginning to speak out. In a series of university lectures, since incorporated in a book, Judge Learned Hand, one of the most distinguished and brilliant of the Federal judges, criticized the Supreme Court on much the same grounds. Judge Hand sees grave danger in the Court's attempting to legislate and to establish public policy by reading into the law meanings it was not intended to have when it was written.

In a recent Supreme Court case, Justice Frankfurter filed a dissent which came closer than any judicial pronouncement since 1954 to stating the case of the South against the school decision.

On March 31, a majority of 5 of the 9 members of the Court, led by Chief Justice Warren, held that the trial court was wrong in revoking the citizenship of a soldier who was convicted of desertion. Desertion is punishable by death in wartime, but Warren held that taking the man's citizenship was cruel and unusual punishment, which is forbidden by the Constitution.

By way of background, that provision was written into the Constitution to prevent such ancient and barbarous forms of punishment as the cutting off of an ear, hand, or finger, or subjecting the convict to vicious degradation, torture, or fear.

As is his wont, Mr. Warren, and those who agreed with him, went far beyond the accepted interpretations of the law to give it new meaning; in so doing they struck down an act of Congress.

Justice Frankfurter said this:

"All power is, in Madison's phrase, 'of an encroaching nature.' Judicial power is not immune against this human weakness. It also must be on guard against encroaching beyond its proper bounds, and not the less so since the only restraint upon it is self-restraint.

"Rigorous observance of the difference between limits of power and wise exercise of power—between questions of authority and questions of prudence—requires the most alert appreciation of this decisive but subtle relationship of two concepts that too easily coalesce. No less does it require a disciplined will to adhere to the difference. It is not easy to stand aloof and allow want of wisdom to prevail, to disregard one's own strongly held view of what is wise in the conduct of affairs. But it is not the business of this Court to pronounce policy. It must observe a fastidious regard for limitations on its own power, and this precludes the Court's giving effect to its own notions of what is wise or politic. That self-restraint is of the essence in the observance of the judicial oath, for the Constitution has not authorized the judges to sit in judgment on the wisdom of what Congress and the executive branch do."

Justices Burton, Clark, and Harlan joined in this expression. This was almost as amazing as the fact that the 1954 decision was unanimous, 1 of the few times in many years that all 9 justices have concurred in a single opinion.

It may be significant, for the men of the Court are intelligent enough to perceive that in that decision they violated every principle enunciated in Frankfurter's dissent.

The Court did, indeed, abandon self-restraint. It did pronounce policy in a matter which should have been left to Congress and the State legislatures. It did write into the law their own notions of what is wise or politic, and it did sit in judgment on the wisdom of what the Congress and the States agreed to in adopting the 14th amendment and in passing the 2 civil rights acts, 1 preceding it and the other following it.

It is, of course, too much to hope that the Court may one day reverse itself; but it may be that, at least, qualms of conscience within the Court over the trend it has established will lead to its modification of the 1954 decision and the 1955 decrees in disposing of later cases, of which there are bound to be many.

Testimonial of Confidence in Secretary of Agriculture Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief testimonial to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson from the residents of Franklin County, Idaho, his birthplace.

Mr. Benson visited Franklin County April 9, and addressed a gathering of Farm Bureau and county area residents at the Preston High School. His talk was courageous and thought provoking, an outline of the problems which agriculture must face, and a progress report on what has been done.

After this meeting, the following statement was spontaneously written and signed by farmers, city officials, businessmen—a cross-section of the people of Franklin County, Idaho.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PLEDGE OF CONFIDENCE

Realizing that the strength of a nation lies in the quality of the individual citizens and the ability of the citizens to work together to solve the problems of a democracy, we hereby resolve that our distinguished United States Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, a native son, an experienced farmer, a student of the science of agriculture, an astute business man, a sympathetic friend to all men, and a Christian gentleman, be given a vote of confidence by the people of Franklin County, Idaho.

We express our faith in him as a leader working with the agricultural groups of the Nation to develop a program for agriculture

that will be fair to all people and especially beneficial to the farmers of the Nation. We pledge our full support in solving the agricultural problems of our Nation.

Frank J. Gilbert, Franklin County Farm Bureau, county president; Demar Merrill, Preston Chamber of Commerce; William W. Poole, Franklin County commissioner; O. Shenim Webb, mayor, Preston City; Charles M. Crabtree, Lions Club; A. Lee Bugginnst, Preston Kiwanis; Homer E. Johnson, Preston Rotary Club; Phenoi H. Edgley, board of education; W. H. Simmons, superintendent of schools; K. H. Brimhall, superintendent of schools; Woodrow Rasmussen; Kermit Shumway, first vice president; Von O. Noyes, second vice president; Ralph Esplin, county organization; Burnell H. Baird, county director; J. Barlow Gilbert, first vice local; Morris H. Poole, chairman Whitney local; Dean R. Bingham, county director; Rodney N. Jenser, chairman Mink Creek local; Floyd E. Erickson, vice chairman; Harold Baird, vice chairman; Don E. Dalley, insurance special agent.

Preston Rotary: Ralph Miller, Harley Greerees, A. N. Vendell, Philip L. Wist, Clifford Warr, Royce F. Fuhromian, E. P. Runyhan, A. Gordon Merrill, Richard W. Hendricks, Daniel Roberts, Homer E. Skown, W. S. Giddec, W. Paul Merrill, G. Mahone, David E. Davis, A. L. Bambrough, Lloyd J. Hogge, Angus Condie, W. P. Shompsay, Wayne S. Esme, E. L. Cox, Keith P. Larson.

Lion's Club: Charles M. Crabtree, president; Max L. Ninten, first vice president; Nat Edwards, Jr., second vice president; George S. Price, third vice president; Robert N. Aroch, secretary-treasurer; Glen Petterborg; Don Greave; R. B. Gibson; Maut Hammond; Glen Olemman; Palmer; Wayne Brown, tail twister.

Farm Bureau: Lois Nielsen, chairman; Margaret Nelson, chairman; Carol B. Gilbert; A. Carlson Singer; Raymond R. Hobbs, chairman, Weston service; Elmo C. Petersen, Farm Bureau insurance agent; Mrs. Vera Atkinson, county director; Mrs. Beatrice Hyde, local chairman; Mrs. Mabel Rawlings, first vice local; Mrs. Ada Bailey, first vice local; Mrs. Pearl Jessop, director; Ethel S. Mockil, local chairman; Mrs. Elmyra Baird, county first vice chairman; Mrs. Verla Baird, second vice chairman, local; Mrs. Virginia Jensen, local chairman; Mrs. Margaret Woodward, local chairman, Franklin; Mrs. Nephi B. Chase, secretary; Marion H. Bennett, first vice chairman of Preston community; Marvin D. Greggensen, second vice chairman, local; Ruth P. Smith, chairman, local; Mrs. Jessie Erickson, vice chairman, Mink Creek; Russell A. Koller; Heber M. Jorgensen; Clyde Nielsen, first vice chairman, Weston Linrose; Orsen Nelson, vice chairman; Boyd Woodward; Matilda B. Gilbert; Leon Torsgren, county chairman; Percy W. Larsen; Horace Hawkes, district chairman; Stanton M. Hawkes, county director; C. Wallace Chatterton, vice chairman; E. Aiken Larson, chairman, Preston local.

Preston Chamber of Commerce: Demar Merrill, president; Ralph Millar, vice president; Fraser, board member; Royce F. Fuhrimian, board member; Robert N. Arode, board member; Richard W. Hendricks, board member; Starks W. Smedley, board member; Rulon Dunn, secretary-manager.

Preston Kiwanis Club: A. Lee Bergquist, president; O. Keith Nielsen, secretary; M. R. Millward, vice president; A. B. Condie; A. C. Honson; W. Burton; Elmo C. Petersen; Roy A. Ware; Guy Stenberg; Sturton W. Smedley; Rulon A. Dunn; J. A. Kjar; Danal C. Moser; L. W. Longhurst; J. L. McKnight.

Franklin ASC County committee and office personnel: Von R. Atkinson, Hesy A. Seckstead, Eldon B. Bingham, Eldon R. Johnston, Klis H. Davis, Retta Scott, Therrall L. Campbell, Cleo Hulet, Doris K. Carter.

Franklin County fur farmers, Franklin Village: Dennis C. Lowe, fur farmer, mayor; Harley C. Lowe, fur farmer, councilman; Orgell L. Bennett, fur farmer, councilman; J. Hoyt Whitehead, fur farmer, fur club president; W. Reed Jamison, fur farmer, fur club secretary; Victor L. Dunkley, fur farmer; Joseph D. Morrison, farmer and fur farmer; Lester D. Lowe, Franklin, Idaho, fur farmer; William L. Hobbs, fur farmer; Fern W. McFarland, fur farmer; Floyd C. Robinson, fur farmer; Harold S. Bradford, fur farmer; Adell M. Viehweg, housewife; Hilda Hensen, housewife.

The Board of County Commissioners of Franklin County, State of Idaho: William W. Poole, chairman; Roy C. Andreasen, commissioner; Albert E. Moser, commissioner; C. L. Swenson, clerk.

Educational Project of League of United Latin American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, council No. 132 of the League of United Latin American Citizens in El Paso, Tex., is engaged in a worthy project which deserves the support and encouragement of all Americans.

The El Paso Council of the Lulacs' Citizenship Committee has established classes in American citizenship for immigrants from Mexico.

The League of United Latin American Citizens is an organization which, throughout its history, has held dear the principles of Americanism and has labored to insure equality of opportunity for all citizens. The Lulacs realize that with freedom goes responsibility. And they are constantly striving to establish projects which will give to the people the understanding of American history and government which they need in order to be better American citizens. The work of Lulac Council 132 in El Paso, Tex., is an example of the splendid job that Lulac councils are doing throughout the State of Texas and the country.

Recently the El Paso Herald-Post printed a study by one of its very able reporters, Trini Acosta, which tells of the splendid efforts of Lulac Council 132 in El Paso. The El Paso Herald-Post, under the leadership of its vigorous and independent editor, Ed Pooley, is an outstanding Texas newspaper.

I think there is no doubt that it is the most fearlessly edited newspaper in a major city in Texas. I do not know of a more fearless editorial column in any newspaper in any major city in America than that of the El Paso Herald-Post, edited by Ed Pooley.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Immigrants Study Three R's of United States Citizenship," published in the April 16, 1958, edition of the El Paso Herald-Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRANTS STUDY THREE R'S OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

(By Trini Acosta)

"Quien es el presidente de los Estados Unidos?" "Que son las leyes del estado?" "Que son los derechos civiles?"

This is a sample of what you hear in citizenship classes sponsored by the League of United Latin American Citizens Council No. 132. (The questions translated into English are: "Who is the President of the United States?" "What are the State laws?" "What are civil rights?"

In each class there is an earnest group of immigrants, most over 50 years old, and some who have been in the United States for most of their lives, who are learning how to become American citizens.

What does it mean to be a citizen of the United States?

Many persons, perhaps, take it for granted. But what about the thousands of immigrants who are learning or want to learn the privileges and duties of American citizenship?

QUESTION ANSWERED

This question is now being answered by people who have received their United States citizenship. Most of these immigrants do not speak English. Yet, they work hard to become American citizens. And are they proud?" Just ask any person who has recently received his citizenship.

Mrs. Maria Rodriguez came here from Mexico City when she was a young girl. She is now 72 years old. She left for San Francisco 8 years ago and came back when she heard of the classes Lulac Council No. 132 was conducting. She decided not to return to San Francisco until she had received citizenship.

Now she can return to San Francisco and proudly show her papers to her sons. She also has three daughters.

"My boys are very proud of being in the service," Mrs. Rodrigues said. "I kind of feel an obligation to become a citizen. I could never learn English and now that I was able to take my tests in Spanish, I just had to become a citizen. I didn't want to be the only noncitizen in the family."

GET PAPERS TOGETHER

Mr. and Mrs. Francisco Gutierrez, of 7364 Bassett Loop, received their citizenship papers together. Mrs. Gutierrez is 61 and Mr. Gutierrez is 67. Both are from the State of Chihuahua and have been here for 26 years.

"The Lulacs are doing a wonderful thing in helping people who don't speak English to take their naturalization tests in Spanish," Mrs. Gutierrez said.

Under the Walter-McCarran Act, immigrants over 56 years old, who speak no English, can take citizenship examinations in their native tongues if they fulfill all the requirements.

Generally, an alien who arrived in the United States on or after June 30, 1906, may not file a petition for naturalization until a record has been found that he was lawfully admitted for permanent residence. An applicant who alleges entry into the United States prior to June 30, 1906, and is able to establish that fact by satisfactory evidence may file a petition for naturalization even though a record of his entry cannot be found.

BOTH LANGUAGES

Classes are conducted in both English and Spanish.

One of the Lulac's instructors, Francisco Sandoval, encourages people in his class to learn English. "I teach them both in English and Spanish," he said. "I teach in English hoping they will pick up the language and I teach in Spanish to be sure they learn the essentials of the American form of gov-

ernment, on which they will be tested when they apply for naturalization."

Citizenship classes are conducted every Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Saturday from 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday's classes are at the San Juan Civic Center at 400 North Glenwood Drive. Leopoldo Calanche and Alfonso Perez divide their classes in to 2 groups, 1 English and 1 Spanish. This class was started 2 months ago.

On Wednesday classes are held at the El Paso Boys Club at 801 South Florence. Frank Ortega and Cecilio Duarte are the instructors.

On Thursday classes are held at the Sherman Hall at 431 Jaffe Street. Francisco Sandoval, Rodolfo Carvajal, and Enrique Vasconcelos are the instructors. These classes were originated 4 years ago.

Saturday's classes are held in Smeltertown at 2733 Doniphan Drive. PTA Members Josefina Villa and Ramon Roman are the instructors. All the other instructors are Lulac members of Council No. 132 with the exception of Miss Villa and Mr. Roman.

Each student attending the citizenship classes is given a DAR Manual for Citizenship, which is given to the Lulacs through the courtesy of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

This manual has a welcoming address by President Eisenhower and its contents contain the Growth of Freedom; the Flag of the United States; the Government of the United States; the Bill of Rights; the Oath of Citizenship; the American's Creed; the Responsibilities of Citizenship; How To Become a Citizen of the United States; Text of the Declaration of Independence; and Text of the Constitution of the United States of America.

The book is published in both English and Spanish.

"Time and patience are rewarded when we see the expression on the faces of those persons who receive their citizenship papers," Mr. Sandoval said.

"The Lulacs try to teach Americanism," Mr. Vasconcelos said. "Our council feels that our job will never be complete until there aren't any immigrants left that have wanted to become citizens. We of Lulac Council No. 132 ask all persons interested to contact either Mr. Sandoval at KE 2-2885 or myself at KE 3-2255 or to drop in at any of our classes. They are more than welcome."

Forty persons who attended the Lulac's classes received their citizenship papers Monday. A reception is held after each class graduates.

Nonpartisan Selection of Judges in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in Maryland we are proud of the fact that we elect our judges on a nonpartisan basis. When we find well-qualified men for our judgeships, the leaders in both the major political parties get behind those men with full support.

A case in point is the current candidacy for full, 15-year elective terms on the supreme bench of two sitting judges, serving under appointment by the Governor of Maryland, Judges Joseph Allen and Anselm Sodaro. Unqualified recommendation of these two judges for the elective terms have been made by the Bar Association of Baltimore City, the Junior Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association. I concur fully with these recommendations and with an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Sunday, March 16, 1958. The two judges have won the confidence and respect of their colleagues and the members of the bar, as well as the general public of whatever party affiliation, for their judicial temperament and impartiality and for their industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial to which I referred, and copies of the recommendations of the several bar associations.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO GOOD JUDGES

The Bar Association of Baltimore has lost no time in throwing its full support behind the candidacies of Judges Joseph Allen and Anselm Sodaro for full, 15-year elective terms on the supreme bench. This is as it should be. The two judges have already served more than a year under appointments by Governor McKeldin and have proven through this service that their election would be in the public interest.

In giving its support to Judges Allen and Sodaro the association, through its judiciary committee, noted that the two candidates have won the confidence and respect of their colleagues, as well as of the members of the bar, for their industry, impartiality, and judicial temperament.

Each of the two judges has filed for both the Democratic and Republican nominations. This means that if both are successful in the major party primaries May 20, their election in November would be assured unless an independent candidate were to pop up under the petition procedure in the meantime.

Judges Allen and Sodaro will have opposition May 20. There is one other candidate. But there should be no trouble here—if the independent voters back the two qualified judges and the political leaders of both parties work with determination to avoid the political shenanigans that defeated a highly qualified judge in the primaries 2 years ago.

The executive committee of the junior bar association has unanimously voted to endorse Judge Joseph Allen and Judge Anselm Sodaro for election to full 15-year terms on the supreme bench of Baltimore City. In the opinion of the junior bar association, both Judge Allen and Judge Sodaro have displayed qualifications in keeping with the highest traditions of the bench and we feel that they deserve the vote of all citizens interested in keeping a qualified and competent judiciary.

JUNIOR BAR ASSOCIATION
OF BALTIMORE CITY.
WILBUR D. PRESTON, JR.,
President.

THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF
BALTIMORE CITY,
March 12, 1958.

FRANCIS A. MICHEL,
President, the Bar Association of Baltimore City, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: In November 1956, due to the untimely deaths of Judges Moser and Nice, 2 vacancies were created on the supreme bench of Baltimore. The Bar Association of Baltimore City at that time submitted to Governor McKeldin a list of lawyers who were recommended as possessing the qualifications necessary for appointment to the bench. The Governor appointed Judge Joseph Allen and Judge Anselm Sodaro from that list.

Under the law, these judges have to stand for election at least 1 year after the occurrence of the vacancy at the next congressional election. The reason for this trial period, as is well known, is to afford the bar and the community at large an opportunity to observe the new appointee in the performance of his duties, and to judge, on the basis of this experience, his fitness to be continued in that position.

Judge Allen and Judge Sodaro each has now served on the supreme bench for more than a year. In that period, they have both won the confidence and respect of their colleagues, as well as of the members of the bar, for their industry, impartiality, and judicial temperament. During this trial period required by the Constitution of Maryland, Judges Allen and Sodaro have fully justified the action of this association in submitting their names to the Governor and in recommending them for appointment. They have distinguished themselves for integrity, wisdom, and sound legal knowledge, and are endowed with characteristics requisite for service on the bench.

The committee has fully considered the qualifications of every person who has entered the primary election, and we unanimously state it to be our opinion that Judge Anselm Sodaro and Judge Joseph Allen, through their demonstrated ability and experience, have proved that they are the best qualified of the candidates for the high office of judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City. Their election will be in the public interest and will enable the supreme bench of Baltimore City to continue to maintain its high standard of judicial administration.

Yours very truly,
CARROLL F. FITZSIMMONS,
SAUL A. HARRIS,
JOSEPH S. KANPP, JR.,
DANIEL B. LEONARD,
MORTON E. ROME,
DONALD N. ROTHMAN,
KARL F. STEINMANN,
Chairmen.

STATEMENT OF ELI BAER, ESQ., PRESIDENT OF FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION FOR MARYLAND

Attached hereto is a copy of report which I received as president of the Federal Bar Association for Maryland, from its judiciary committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable Bernard J. Flynn. The said report advises that the judiciary committee, consisting of seven members, considered the question of electing judges to the supreme bench of Baltimore in the forthcoming election, and unanimously decided to recommend that the present sitting judges, the Honorable Joseph Allen and the Honorable Anselm Sodaro, be supported, they having demonstrated that they are eminently qualified to carry on the work required of them as members of the supreme bench.

The judiciary committee met in the realization that although membership in the Federal Bar Association is restricted to lawyers who have been or are now in the Government service, all of its members are qualified and entitled to practice before the courts of this State. The committee took full cognizance of the provision in the national constitution of this association which requires the membership to deport themselves in accordance with the highest ethics of the legal profession, and requires of them a pledge to take an active interest in the administration of justice by urging the selection of judges of the highest competence, in the realization that the sacred functions and the grave responsibilities imposed upon judges constitute them the conservators of

our political institutions and the bulwark of constitutional liberty:

"The judiciary committee of the Federal Bar Association, consisting of Wilfred T. McQuaid, James B. Murphy, Morris Fedder, Calhoun Bond, Charles A. Trageser, Charles W. Wilkerson, and Bernard J. Flynn, has considered the question of the election of the judges to the supreme bench of Baltimore City and they have unanimously decided that they would recommend to the Federal Bar Association that the association support the election of the present sitting judges, the Honorable Joseph Allen and the Honorable Anselm Sodaro, at the coming election.

"Both Judge Allen and Judge Sodaro during the period that they have served under appointment of His Excellency, the Governor, have demonstrated that they are eminently qualified to carry on the work required of them as members of the supreme bench of Baltimore City.

"BERNARD J. FLYNN,
"Chairman."

United States Rochambeau Commission Observes Fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Alexandria Gazette, Alexandria, Va., on April 17, 1958, an interesting article concerning the observance of the fifth anniversary of the Rochambeau Commission of the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the complete text of the article, which is as follows:

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of Thursday, April 17, 1958]

UNITED STATES ROCHAMBEAU COMMISSION OBSERVES FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

Charles Parmer of Hunting Terrace is receiving congratulations on the success of the Rochambeau Commission of the United States.

This is the national organization he founded 5 years ago April 16 when—in answer to his call—the governors of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia sent representatives to Mount Vernon.

Where Mr. Parmer asked their support in a project to honor the people of France whose ancestors had come to Gen. George Washington's aid in his darkest hour—and whose armies had helped the Continentals establish the United States of America.

Mr. Parmer's original suggestion was that the almost unknown route over which the French General Rochambeau led King Louis XVI's legions from Rhode Island to Washington's side at Yorktown should be uniformly marked the Rochambeau Victory Route, an idea he had conceived when a student at the University of Toulouse, in France.

Already Virginia's General Assembly had adopted Mr. Parmer's suggestion: empowering the governor to appoint a commission to arrange this with the other States—a body which had unanimously chosen Mr. Parmer chairman.

GREETINGS FROM IKE

During that momentous Mount Vernon meeting, President Eisenhower wired his congratulations to Mr. Parmer, saying in part:

"In planning the uniform marking of their victory route, you are once again acknowledging the important role which France played in securing the independence of our Nation. I join you in this tribute to the people of France—our allies in 1781, our friends today." And Senator BYRD stated the route marking was an action of honor long overdue to the people of France, our first allies.

France's then Foreign Minister, Georges Bidault, cabled his greetings, saying in part:

"It was a thoughtful initiative indeed when you decided to uniformly mark the route which Rochambeau and his soldiers took in 1781. In so doing, you are stressing upon your countrymen the fact that France is the oldest friend and ally of the United States * * * today as in 1781, in 1917 and in 1944, our 2 countries stand united for the defense of liberty."

Fired by Mr. Parmer's enthusiasm, and sparked by his initiative, the no-called Rochambeau States began a series of national celebrations: Connecticut—later that year—staged a great 2-day Rochambeau Festival; the next year—1954—Mr. Parmer inaugurated the yearly commemoration over the graves of the unknown French dead at Yorktown—the Marine, General Shepherd, dedicating the first Rochambeau plaque, marking the end, there, of the Rochambeau route.

In 1955 Rhode Island staged its reenactment of the arrival of Rochambeau—Navy Secretary Thomas addressing the throng which gathered to welcome the arriving French battleship, *Jean Bart*, the same year the Rochambeau Commissions of New York State—and in Pennsylvania—began yearly commemorations, marking the stay of the French Army within their borders. In 1955, Mr. Parmer inaugurated the second national Rochambeau event:

OTHER EVENTS NOTED

The birthday honors at the Rochambeau statue in Lafayette Park, opposite the White House, each July 1: the first year Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth laid a wreath in honor of her father, who had dedicated the statue 50 years before; the next year Mrs. Woodrow Wilson was guest of honor in memory of America's wartime President who went to France's aid in 1918; and in 1957 congressional ladies—led by the wife of Senator PURTELL, of Connecticut, placed flowers of friendship on the statue, while America's wartime Ambassador to France in World War II, Fleet Admiral Leahy, stood at attention with French Ambassador Alphand.

Last fall, under Mr. Parmer's guidance, historical groups dedicated General Rochambeau's headquarters in New York State at Yorktown Heights; Mr. Parmer flying there with Maj. Gen. Henry R. Paige, United States Marine Corps, and French Minister Robert Valeur to unveil the market. General Paige spoke on behalf of America, and Mr. Valeur represented France.

Mr. Parmer conceived the idea of naming the new East 14th Street Potomac River highway bridge as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge—his researches revealing that General Rochambeau crossed the Potomac thereabouts September 10, 1781, en route to Mount Vernon; and thence with Washington to Yorktown. This, he said, should be a Keystone arch to the marking of the Rochambeau Victory Route.

Virginia's statesman, Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, introduced, at Mr. Parmer's request, S. 768, to so name the bridge; and Mr. Parmer secured 29 other Senators as cosponsors with Senator BYRD. The measure passed the Senate unanimously; and then, shepherded by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, (who made a powerful floor speech in its behalf), it unanimously passed the House. President Eisenhower signed it into law on Rochambeau's last birthday, July 1, 1957.

The members of the Rochambeau Commission serve without pay. The expense entailed in promoting the bridge naming was borne entirely by Mr. Parmer. Supporting him in his activities are some of the Nation's foremost citizens: historians, statesmen, church leaders, generals, admirals, business and professional stars, and outstanding gentlewomen.

STANCHLY SUPPORTED

Virginia's first families stanchly support the cause he inaugurated. Mrs. Granville Gray Valentine, of Richmond, long the directing genius of Colonial Dames, State of Virginia, was the first organization doyen to come to his side. Colonel Catesby ap Catesby Jones, president general of the Society of the Cincinnati (of which Washington and Rochambeau were the first leaders) gives powerful support. And Mrs. J. Powell Wardlaw, regent, the Commonwealth Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Richmond, placed her organization with the commission.

The late Mrs. Rebecca Ramsay Reese, direct descendant of Alexandria's Lord Mayor, gave her powerful endorsement; as have Miss Esther Green, Mrs. Dabney Halsey Little, Miss Ellen Coolidge Burke, Mrs. Joseph Crockett, Dr. H. A. Latane, Armistead Boothe, Marshall J. Beverley, Henry Fowler; Mrs. E. Stuart James and Mrs. Charles Marbury Seaman, representing the Children of the American Revolution; while Col. Robert P. Waters stands for the Sons of the American Revolution in the commission's ranks.

Colonel Casey of Casey's Corner brought his famed Irish War Veterans into the commission. Count Henry Harrison de Frise and Dr. Samuel White Patterson and Mrs. Logan Billingsley, of New York, Col. James R. Case, of Connecticut, Claiborne deB. Pell, of Rhode Island, Miles L. Frederick, of Delaware, Judge John Raymond Fletcher, of Maryland, have been with the movement from its inception.

Among the clergy are the Reverend B. B. Comer Lile, rector of Christ (George Washington's) Church, Alexandria; Dr. Joseph F. Thorning; the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward L. Stephens; the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate; and Rabbi Emmett Frank.

Virginia's political leaders, headed by Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, and three governors, Congressmen, and general assembly members have advanced the Rochambeau Commission's achievements.

Winder R. Harris is a leader of one strong supporting group, among whom are David Bacon, Frederick Coleman Rosenberger, Warren D. Quenstedt, Paul Eckman, Leroy Bendheim, Thomas J. Broyhill, Irving Diener, John A. K. Donovan, Patrick Hayes. The military chairman is Maj. Gen. Charles R. Landon, United States Air Force (retired). Though it was Senator BYRD's bridge bill that passed the Congress unanimously, Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL introduced a similar measure in the House.

The Mount Vernon Guards, under the direction of Comdr. John Harris are an integral part of the Commission. Mr. Parmer states that in the next Rochambeau commemoration—which will be an international one—the Mount Vernon Guards will be given a post of highest honor.

Sister Cities in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this week is one of special significance to Texans—a week steeped with the history of our State and the great battle which made possible its independence from Mexico, its existence as a republic, and finally, its admission to the Union. For on April 21, 1936, Gen. Sam Houston, who later became the first United States Senator from Texas, triumphed over the forces of Santa Anna on the battlefield of San Jacinto. Santa Anna's surrender at San Jacinto battleground was to Texas independence what Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown was to American independence.

There are no communities in Texas more intertwined with the history of Texas, as a republic and as a State, than are East Columbia and West Columbia in Brazoria County, Tex. Jim Mousner, a staff writer for the Houston Post, writing in the April 20, 1958, issue of that newspaper, stated it very succinctly when he said:

> East and West Columbia live easily with history. There are families here, three generations of which span more than a century of Texas history from the raw, turbulent prerevolutionary years to the present.

There are families in East and West Columbia like the Underwoods, a pioneer merchant family in Texas—transplanted from Lowell, Mass., in 1834. There are families here like the Weems, whose ancestors came from Virginia in 1831. Grandfather Weems was one of the few physicians who came to Texas in the prerevolutionary era. His sons and daughters, still bearing the proud name of Weems, have lived in West Columbia ever since, and although they are no longer physicians, they have been stanch fighters in the many recent battles to remove the germs of corruption and inaction which have plagued Texas' body politic in this generation.

Miss Ima Hogg, generous daughter of one of Texas' alltime great governors and champion of the people, Jim Hogg, recently gave the beautiful and historic Varner-Hogg home in the area to the State of Texas, and it has been made into a State park. Several weeks ago, West Columbia won second place in a nationwide community beautification contest.

Jim Mousner closed his story in the Houston Post with these beautiful words:

> So here beside the Brazos, an old and growing town considers its future and the preservation of its past, and an old and fading town lives comfortably with yesterday as it gazes out over the muddy river flowing endlessly to the sea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the feature entitled "Brazos' Sister Cities," by Jim Mousner, which appeared in the Houston Now magazine section of the Houston Post of Sunday, April 20, 1958.

I believe that this article is worthy of the study of all who are interested in American history, and particularly the history of the westward movement of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAZOS' SISTER CITIES

(By Jim Mousner)

You may hardly notice the little village of East Columbia as you cross the narrow Brazos River bridge on State Highway 35 between West Columbia and Angleton, the Brazoria county seat.

Perched there overlooking a sweeping curve in the dun-colored Brazos, it contrasts sharply with West Columbia 2 miles away.

At East Columbia (population 200) a handful of the ante-bellum homes framed by magnolias and Spanish-moss line a winding drive beside the river. A few decaying store buildings and some residences of more recent vintage are scattered along either side of the highway.

West Columbia (population 3,500) is a busy town of modern stores, homes, schools, and churches, material manifestations of an economy made secure by oil and agriculture.

There is little to indicate that 50 years ago these two communities, whose histories date back to the second decade of the last century, presented entirely different faces to the world.

At the turn of the century and for more than 50 years before, East Columbia was the prospering town, waxing rich as the key river port in the cotton- and sugar-producing Brazos Valley.

West Columbia, sight of the Texas Republic's first capital for a brief period, was a little more than a suburb of its sister community.

Park your car beside the bridge at East Columbia and give your imagination free reign. You may be able to make out the steamboat *Yellowstone* rounding a bend in the river on its way to old Columbia to carry the body of Stephen F. Austin to nearby Peach Point for burial. The father of Texas died at the home of Judge G. B. McKinistry near West Columbia on December 27, 1836.

Take another look at East Columbia and visualize a bustling port of mercantile stores, inns, and taverns, its warehouses bulging with the produce of great plantations—places with magic names like Osceola, Chanango, Willow Glen, and Orozimbo.

Now, drive into West Columbia and stop at the stone marker on Brazos Street where the building that housed the Texas Republic's first senate once stood.

Perhaps, with a little concentration, you can hear Gen. Sam Houston's voice drifting back over the years as he takes the oath of office as the new republic's first president.

Look down the street where the giant Capitol Oaks, now long gone, once spread their branches over the enigmatic Santa Anna after his capture at San Jacinto.

East and West Columbia live easily with history. There are families here, three generations of which span more than a century of Texas history from the raw turbulent pre-Revolutionary years to the present.

Take, for instance, Miss Laura Underwood who lives in one of those venerable homes beside the Brazos in East Columbia—a home built in 1836 and first occupied by her great-grandmother, Mrs. William Carson who, with her husband, was one of the original 300 members of the Austin Colony.

A small, gray-haired woman with a charm and graciousness that reflects a past era when such virtues more highly prized, Miss Underwood remembers well her grandfather, Ammon Underwood, one of Texas' first merchants.

Underwood came to Columbia from Lowell, Mass., in 1834, just 10 years after Josiah Bell laid off the town of West Columbia and established the river port of Marion on the grant of land given him by Stephen F. Austin. The settlers called "Old Squire Bell's" river port Bell's landing. It was later renamed Columbia.

Fortunately for historians the young New Englander was a faithful dairy keeper during the years from 1834 to 1838. In prose that sometimes rose to a lyrical pitch, he chronicled the ominous rumblings of the coming revolution, the expedition against San Antonio, in which he participated, prior to the battle of the Alamo, the Runaway Scrape, and the hurried return to Columbia after the victory at San Jacinto "for fear that whatever goods or merchandise has been left by the Mexicans would be plundered by the Americans."

On the records of Underwood's mercantile business in an unpaid debt of $10 incurred by Dr. Anson Jones, the Texas Republic's last president, who once made his home at Columbia.

The house in which Miss Underwood lives has been moved twice since its construction to prevent its collapse into the ever-meandering Brazos, which has shifted several hundred yards to the west over the years.

Miss Laura recalls the great floods of 1899 and 1913 when "some people climbed to the second stories, some moved to higher ground, and others just left the country."

"In one deluge," she says, "you could go all the way from West Columbia to Angleton by boat."

Across the street from Miss Underwood live S. S. Weems and his wife. Weems is a retired merchant but his father and grandfather were physicians. Grandfather Weems, a Virginian, came to Texas in 1831.

Weems worked at Columbia and Velasco during the early 1890's, a period oldtimers call the "Velasco boom," when land promoters were trying to develop the old town at the mouth of the Brazos as a port.

"It was a circus," grins Weems. "People by the hundreds would come down from Houston on the old Columbia Tap (a county subsidized railroad built in 1859). Here they would get on steamboats with brass bands playing and whistles blowing and head for Velasco."

T. M. Smith, whose father operated a fleet of river boats, agrees that it was quite a sight. Smith lives two doors up from Weems in a house built by the Dance brothers, George and David, who made small arms for the Confederacy.

The home is believed to date from about 1855. Nothing is left of the gunshop, which once stood across the street from the house, and the Dance pistol is a collector's item.

The Smith boats, like the Dance gunshop, are also just a memory. Proud stern-wheeler steamboats like the *Hiawatha* and the *Alice Blair* no longer head for the coast, loaded with cotton destined for Galveston, or their decks crowded with people bound for a gay weekend at Quintana Beach near Velasco. They lay on the bottom of the Brazos side by side at East Columbia.

But old Columbia didn't become the East Columbia of today by any single stroke of ill fortune. A town that helped spawn the Texas revolution, reigned over a plantation empire, withstood a Civil War blockade, and survived the Reconstruction wasn't going to die easily.

Most oldtimers think the decline began during the 3 years around the turn of the century when a trio of natural disasters swept the area. These were the great Brazos flood of 1899, 1900 storm, and the appearance of the boll weevil in Brazoria County cotton-fields in 1901.

In the meantime West Columbia had dwindled from a fairly prosperous community to a couple of stores, a post office, and a one-room school.

Then, one January day in 1918 an oil-drilling rig operating on the Varner-Hogg Plantation 2 miles north of town changed everything.

The Tyndall-Hogg No. 2 came in at 600 barrels a day heralding the discovery of a prolific new sand.

The village of West Columbia became a boisterous, brawling boomtown. Its population mushroomed. Rude buildings appeared overnight on previously bald prairie. Some East Columbia merchants moved their businesses to West Columbia or established new ones. At one time the town had two banks.

Nothing slowed the urgent quest for oil, not even the wet weather of the coast country. Mules and oxen, 20 to the team, dragged heavy oil field machinery through seas of mud to the West Columbia field.

Businessman T. M. Smith recalls the time a mule drowned on the town's main street in front of where the First Capitol State Bank now stands.

As the boom days waned in the early 1920's, West Columbia looked around to find itself cast in its sister community's old role. It has played the part so successfully that in the past 5 years alone it has almost doubled its population.

A $400,000 bond issue voted a few years ago financed such improvements as a sewage disposal plant, water and sewer extensions, a new city warehouse.

A few weeks ago West Columbia won second place for towns within its population class in a national community beautification contest. Earlier it had been voted first place winner of a similar countywide contest.

Stimulated by Miss Ima Hogg's gift of the Varner-Hogg plantation home and a 53-acre site to the Texas State Parks Board recently, a group of West Columbians are considering the restoration of at least 1 of the old capitol buildings which were destroyed in the 1900 storm.

So here beside the Brazos an old and growing town considers its future and the preservation of its past, and an old and fading town lives comfortably with yesterday as it gazes out over the muddy river flowing endlessly to the sea.

The Case for States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why States Rights?" from the April 17, 1958, issue of the Indianapolis Star. The editorial deals with a book entitled "States' Rights—The Law of the Land," which is one of the most masterful presentations on this subject ever written. The author of the book is one of Georgia's foremost legal scholars, Hon. Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY STATES RIGHTS?

Under the impetus first of the Soviet sputniks and now of economic uncertainty, advocates of big government in Congress and out are devising new or increased invasions into fields where the Federal Government has no right to be. A Federal highway bill uses Federal tax money to influence State legislation on billboards. An administration proposal urges greater Federal participation in State unemployment benefits. All along the line the encroachment continues. It works through Congress, through the United States Supreme Court and through weak-spined local failure to resist.

Increasing federalization of American life is due partly to ignorance. States' rights has become a phrase which seldom evokes in the minds of its hearers any real conception of its meaning. Too many are inclined to think of it as merely a political slogan instead of as the vital constitutional doctrine it actually represents. For this reason we recommend to any American who wants to understand the framework of his own Government a book recently published by the Harrison Co. of Atlanta, Ga. It is States' Rights, the Law of the Land, by Charles J. Bloch, a Macon attorney.

Bloch has done in his book what so few technical legal writers ever do, making his material understandable to anyone who can read high school English. While his prime target is the trend of the United States Supreme Court in recent years toward focusing all power in Federal hands, a discerning reader will find equal application to Congress and the functioning of State legislatures in many of the book's passages. Despite an unfortunate tendency to place too much stress on racial issues, and notwithstanding the fact that in some few instances Bloch is open to strong rebuttal on legal points, his book by wide circulation would do much to increase America's understanding of what States' rights is all about.

Without what the authors of the Constitution believed to be firm guarantees of widely inclusive States' rights, there would never have been a Constitution. Even Alexander Hamilton, the great Federalist, recognized and subscribed to the doctrine that "whatever is not expressly given to the Federal head is reserved to the members (the States)." He added, "The truth of this principle must strike every intelligent mind." He was in these words paying heed to the universal demand of his time that the Constitution place strong barriers against Federal expansion of power. The original States demanded these barriers before they agreed to ratify the Constitution.

From the time when Patrick Henry, George Mason, James Monroe, and others fought against ratifying the Constitution unless the Bill of Rights was agreed to as a set of specific injunctions against Federal authority, the right of the States to manage most of the affairs of government was never in serious question until comparatively modern times. Even the War Between the States did not involve this issue, as has been generally thought. It was not the right of States to govern which was at issue there, but their proposal to breach a contract of federation, the Constitution. The war was fought to keep them from leaving the Union, not to subject them to greater Federal control.

Bloch's research has turned up a tremendous store of Supreme Court opinions bearing on States rights, issued in the days before the Court felt itself licensed to change the Constitution by a 5 to 4 vote. Touching every imaginable governmental problem, these seems gradually to have established a clear, unmistakable picture of the law of the land as set forth in the Constitution. It is that the Federal Government has no rights of government which are not specifically listed in that document.

The law as it has been throughout most of American history is admirably summed up in Bloch's quotation of an opinion written 50 years ago by the first Justice Harlan: "The preservation of the dignity and sovereignty of the States, within the limits of their constitutional powers, is of the last importance, and vital to the preservation of our system of government. * * * The country should never be allowed to think that the Constitution can, in any case, be evaded or amended by mere judicial interpretation, or that its behests may be nullified by an ingenious construction of its provisions."

Congress and the States themselves, as well as the Supreme Court, need a refresher course to take States rights out of the realm of slogans and put them back into practice. Bloch's book is a good beginning.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, we are now considering proposed legislation relating to education. Education is one of the most important subjects confronting the people of the United States.

Mr. John C. O'Brien, senior representative of the Philadelphia Inquirer in Washington, makes some very able comments on the subject of why students drop out of college, in an article published in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. O'Brien comes to the conclusion that money is the third reason if students drop out of college. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY RANKS ONLY THIRD IF STUDENTS DROP OUT

(By John O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—One of the assumptions underlying the demand for more money for education is that not as many of our talented youth are going to college as should be doing so.

A recent study by the United States Office of Education showed that only half of the students graduating from high school in the upper half of their classes went on to college or university. Less than one-third of all high school graduates became full-time college students in the fall following their graduation.

It is commonly supposed that the chief reason why so many bright high school seniors fail to go to college is that the colleges do not have room for them or the students do not have the money to pay for their education. Hence, the clamor in the hearing rooms of Congress for a large Federal appropriation to aid colleges expand and to help needy students through scholarships. It is true, no doubt, that a certain percentage of talented youths is deterred from pursuing higher studies because of lack of financial means, but the number who have to forego college or university for this reason may be smaller than most people think.

Financial difficulties, according to the Office of Education study, are not the principal reason why students drop out of college after once being admitted. One out of 4 students who enter college, so the study

showed, drop out by the end of the first year, and about 1 out of 4 of those who start the second year do not graduate.

The higher percentage of dropouts in the first year suggests that the method of selecting students for entrance into college is highly ineffective. But apparently this is not the explanation of the high washout rate, for among those who quit in the first year 1 out of 5 was in the top 20 percent of his high-school graduating class.

This waste of talent has been described by Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, as distressing, particularly at a time when the number of 18-year-olds in our population is very low.

Students taking scientific courses in technoligical institutions have the best record for tenacity of purpose, yet only 42 percent of the male freshmen in such schools are graduated 4 years later, according to the Office of Education study.

Aside from military service, the reason for leaving college most often cited by the male students was lack of interest in studies. Women reported marriage and the taking of full-time jobs as the chief reason why they did not wish to complete their college courses. Financial difficulties ranked as the third most important reason for the dropouts.

The Office of Education report also showed that scholarship money was being used to pay the expenses of some students of marginal ability while students of demonstrated ability were allowed to quit college because of finance difficulties.

United States Aid Program Called "Scandalous"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Hon. Brent Breedin, editor and publisher of the South Carolinian magazine, has recently returned from Pakistan, where he was resident manager for the Hunt International Petroleum Co.

In the April 16 issue of the South Carolinian magazine, Mr. Breedin has presented some first-hand observations of the United States foreign aid program, and I think these observations will be of interest to every citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "United States Aid Program Called 'Scandalous'" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AID PROGRAM CALLED SCANDALOUS

(By Brent Breedin)

"If the average person back home knew how much of his money was being wasted over here, there'd be a national scandal bigger than any we've ever had."

In substance, this statement was made to me by several United States Government officials working in Pakistan during 1956 and 1957.

When I asked one of the observers why he didn't report this to his superiors, he laughed and said, "What do you want me to do? Lose my job?"

And so aid to the sixth most populated—estimated 85 million—nation in the world is provided in an inefficient manner and, instead of winning friends for the United States, it is losing many.

This is a real shame, for the Pakistanis are a fine people and deserve better. Their heritage is among the world's oldest, and their friendliness to the United States and England alike is genuine. There are few Pakistani leaders who have not visited one or both of these English-speaking nations, and English is the language in which most business and government matters are handled.

My experiences in setting up and managing the Hunt International Petroleum Co.'s interests in Pakistan convinced me that private capital, not Government handouts, are the answer to Pakistan's problems, and what holds true in Pakistan would likely be true in many other nations now overrun by United States Government employees. Private capital will not tolerate inefficiency for long periods; the result is more work accomplished in lesser periods of time and good examples set for the Pakistani employees and observers to follow.

United States aid is needed in Pakistan, but handouts in themselves and the sending of hundreds of mediocre individuals to administer them is not the solution. Private capital, working with the Pakistani Government direct, but receiving solid support from a streamlined United States State Department, is my idea of the answer.

Israel Confronts Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon on the subject Israel Confronts Tomorrow, which was delivered on April 19 by Rabbi Philip Bernstein, chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, who delivered the prayer at the commencement of today's session of the Senate.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL CONFRONTS TOMORROW, TEXT OF A SERMON DELIVERED ON APRIL 19, 1958, BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN OF TEMPLE BRITH KODESH, ROCHESTER, N. Y., IN OBSERVANCE OF ISRAEL'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

The 10th anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel is a source of the profoundest gratification to the Jewish people, as well as for me personally. I became a Zionist when as a young boy in Rochester, I joined the first Young Judea Club here. From that day to this I have been deeply involved in the problems, needs, hopes and aspirations of the Jewish people. I winced with every manifestation of antisemitism. I suffered personal agonies with every cruelty of nazism. The Zionist answer to the Jewish problem always seemed logical, democratic and necessary. I still hold to that view. To me, zionism is a word of honor, not of disparagement as some antisemites, including Jewish antisemites, have attempted to make it. It was the zionist who steadfastly clung to the idea of rebuilding a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, over every conceivable opposition. They saw it through, they fought it through. They sustained the morale of the world Jewish community both against antisemitism and against assimilation. They brought about the renascence of the Hebrew language. They built Jewish pride and world respect. My zionism, therefore, has always been and continues to be a badge of honor.

And as I suffered with the sufferings of my people, I have rejoiced in their joys. The establishment of the State of Israel 10 years ago gave me a sense of personal exaltation and fulfillment. I knew the people who were going there, as I knew the people who were the leaders there.

Out of this background of personal experience and deep personal feeling I speak to you tonight about the meaning of the 10th anniversary and I call my message Israel Confronts Tomorrow. I intend to draw a balance sheet of assets and liabilities, of strengths and weaknesses, as the 10-year-old Jewish state faces the future. This will be my philosophy, and also my program.

Let me begin, in the category of assets, with the religious impulse. A miracle has been achieved. This broken decimated people, staggering under the lethal assaults of nazism, rose to its feet, established a state, defended itself against murderous attacks, and made it strong, democratic, free and viable. There is nothing like it in history. And I say to you tonight that it would not have been possible on a pragmatic basis. Certainly, the establishment of a state solved the individual problems of innumerable Jews who were not wanted where they were and were unwanted elsewhere. But there would not have been this unflagging devotion, this fierce determination, this sacrificial valor without the religious impulse at its heart and center. The most precious associations in judaism and in Jewish history were with that little strip of land along the Mediterranean. It was promised to the descendants of Abraham. It brought about the emancipation of Egypt and the return to Canaan. It drove David to build Jerusalem and his son to construct the Holy Temple. It was the goal of prophetic thought, the enduring basis for Hebrew prophecy. It was the dream of the exiles who said that their hands would lose their cunning and their tongues cleave to the roofs of their mouths if they forgot Jerusalem. It was the final hope of the Messianic dream for building God's kingdom, not in heaven, but here on earth in Zion, from which would come forth the law, and the word of God from Jerusalem, to teach men to beat their swords into ploughshares and learn war no more.

A second asset is what the Israelis call the philosophy of no alternative. And, of course, they are right. It sounded pretty for some American Jews to proclaim that our persecuted brethren should stay where they were and fight the battle for democracy. It wasn't so hard to say this from the fleshpots of New York or Philadelphia or Rochester. But this made no sense to Jews of Poland who saw their loved ones done to death by pogromists, nor to Jews in Germany, the stones of whose streets cried out with the blood of their slaughtered parents and children. This had little meaning to the Jews of Morocco who had been oppressed for centuries and saw, under even a more enlightened regime, no basic change in their position or any real hope for a better future.

This is not a matter of the past. Khrushchev recently restated his antisemitism. I view with profound misgiving the future of those Jews who remain under his domination. There was a very serious trial in Germany during the past week of a high-school teacher who said publicly and taught in his classes that Hitler did not kill enough Jews, and who was cheered by the men and kissed by the women even when convicted of violating German law. In the United States there has been the bombing of synagogues and no one can predict the impact on group

relations of a deepening recession, which might become a depression.

This does not mean that in every case where Jews are problems they must think immediately of fleeing to Israel. In the United States I believe in light and when necessary, fight, rather than flight. Education can serve and does serve a very useful purpose here. Flagrant antisemitism should be resisted. But we are in a singularly fortunate position. Tonight, if I were in Morocco, or even Tunis, or Germany, or Poland, or Russia I wouldn't hesitate a minute about getting out if I could. And for those who would get out Israel remains, as it has been for the past 10 years, the one sure answer.

Thus when an Israeli is confronted with the problem he really has no alternative. When a man knows that he must either resist Nasser or be thrown into the sea, that he must work on the land and the roads or perish, that he must tighten his belt or starve, he has a very powerful motive for working and building and defending himself. And this motive becomes a very important asset.

Another of the major assets is the Jews. I am aware of Jewish faults. One who lives in Jewish life all his life knows when a human group this is with all its failings and imperfections, but as Dr. Weizmann ounce said, I love them. Jews are bright and eager and independent. They have more intellectual curiosity, a greater critical faculty, more freedom of the mind per square inch than any group I know. They are sensitive to suffering and injustice. They are capable of combining the purest idealism with the crassest materialism. They produce more violinists, more chess geniuses, more top level physicists than any other group. They can drive you crazy but I love them.

And this is the people that is settling the Jewish state and building it. I have heard Israelis express the wish that God had led Moses in another direction toward a more fertile land, and I have heard Israeli leaders express the wish that God had given them an easier people to deal with, but all these qualities of which I have spoken and many more are now simmering and seething in the pressure cooker that is Israel. To use another simile it's as if suddenly the lid were taken off a boiling pot. All that has been suppressed and repressed in Jews for centuries is now bursting out. Nowhere in the world is there such intense vitality, tremendous creativity as one encounters on every level in Israel. This is a people in a hurry. A sand dune today, a new city tomorrow. A wilderness this month, the next, an oasis. And newspapers and orchestras, physicists and chemistry, the fastest commercial airlines in the world. Some of the quickest and best trained jet pilots. The human factor, the Jewish factor, is a tremendous asset in Israel.

This, I must add, is one of their problems. The whole Middle East has been somnolent and backward. Suddenly, into its midst from without has been projected a dynamic western community. It is understandable that this should be regarded with suspicion and with resentment and with envy as both a challenge and a threat.

Even within Israel this constitutes something of a problem. There the 20th and 10th centuries meet, and there have been many tensions in this juxtaposition. But I have the feeling that this too will prove to be an asset. There is cross-fertilization, and all sorts of new and interesting developments are coming out of it. This is another source of vitality and creativity.

The frontier is a hazard turned into an asset. All Israel is a frontier and that is a situation hard to live with. It means that at any moment an enemy can dart across the border, or shoot across the border and kill. You can never relax. I must add immediately that the atmosphere in Israel is not tense. Even during the Sinai campaign, I am told people went about their ordinary business in the ordinary way. But they have had to remain strong and prepared, always ready to defend themselves and to shoot back, if necessary.

On the other hand this very frontier characteristic is a source of strength. Frederick Jackson Turner promulgated a famous theory in which he stated that the frontier was the greatest single influence in shaping American character and history. If true, it also applies in large measure to Israel. The people live a hard, austere life. It keeps them vigorous, alert, vital. Their boys and girls are not softened by luxury as ours are here. They are able to take care of themselves in the emergencies which they take for granted.

This is also true in the economic frontier. In an older society there is a kind of hardening of the arteries. Less experimentation, more acceptance of limitations. But in a new society, the fact that something hasn't been done before is a challenge rather than a handicap. It's a little like the competition between business, those long-established in families for generations with plenty of deadwood, and a new business being built by a family, perhaps new to the community, in which everybody works his head off and everybody has to produce. Consequently, Israel is producing everything. From copper to phosphates, from transistors to concrete pipes, from fruit to nuts, from the last word in fashions to the newest idea in furniture.

This has been helpful to Israel in its relations with new states. Israel actually has a point 4 program for countries like Burma and Ghana. It is helping them to bring backward countries forward. It is sharing its advances in scientific technology. It is introducing new methods of production and distribution. And this is not only helpful to them but promising for Israel because it is developing friends and trade with the great continents of Asia and Africa, which probably hold the key to the future.

On the subject of economic assets, one must mention German reparations, and having something to do with initiating this program, I take personal satisfaction in its results. In a period of 10 years over $800 million will go into Israel from Germany, chiefly in the form of efficient German products—housing, machinery, motors, ships, buses, etc. This can never compensate for the slaughtered 6 million Jews nor will it ever free Germany from its moral guilt before the bar of history, but at least it means that the survivors will be aided by these former Jewish assets rather than the murderers.

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion in his 10th anniversary message points up another asset. He reminds us that when all nations and the United Nations failed to come to Israel's aid when the Arabs invaded the new state established by the United Nations, the Israelis had one ally and that was the Jews of the world. They sent money and arms and fighters. The Jewish defenders included people who had come from 60 different countries of the world to help the infant state survive. The United Jewish Appeal has represented the most generous giving of any known philanthropy. This does not mean that all giving is generous. There are many Jews who ought to have bad consciences, but the United Jewish Appeal is commonly accepted as a sacred responsibility of the American Jewish community and there is, in many quarters, perhaps most, really sacrificial giving.

The bond drive has proved to be a tremendous asset. The United Jewish Appeal provides for human needs but every penny must be spent on resettlement, medical care, social welfare, etc. How shall the Israeli economy sustain this growing population. This can be done only through large scale economic projects, the deepening of harbors and rivers, hydroelectrification, heavy industry, large housing projects, and this is accomplished through investment in Israel bonds. I urge you, this year particularly, to buy bonds as you have never bought before. That is one way of showing you appreciate the meaning of the 10th anniversary.

Thus far the assets have been essentially Jewish in character. But they go beyond Jewish sources of strength and help. The United States has played a very important, yes, even a crucial role. Every American President since Woodrow Wilson, some before him, displayed sympathy toward Zionist aspirations. United States Congressmen, governors and State legislators, the press and clergy, the rank and file of the American people have displayed good will toward this undertaking of Jews to rehabilitate themselves and to establish through their own efforts a democratic state. President Truman, with whom I will be participating in the 10th anniversary ceremony in Philadelphia at Independence Hall on Thursday, gave recognition to the State of Israel within minutes of its formation. For this he will always be honored by Jewish history and, I believe, by the human conscience. The United States has been generous with its aid through the years and this year the economic aid and loans will surpass any year since 1949.

America and Israel have much in common. Both were formed by pioneers. Both welcomed peoples from many lands. Both have been democratic, freedom loving, emphasizing individual liberty and dignity. This kinship has reflected itself on the one hand in American sympathy and aid and on the other in Israel's commitment to the West, as the only trustworthy bastion of democracy in that part of the world.

Finally, let me speak of the United Nations as an asset. It was the United Nations which created the State of Israel, that might not otherwise have come into existence. World opinion agreed to the formation of a third Jewish commonwealth. The United Nations brought together Russian and American support of the establishment of the Jewish state. The United Nations has officially acted on the assumption that it is committed to the preservation of this state. It has at least taken an official position against aggression toward Israel. It helped bring about the truce in the violence that erupted along Israel's borders. Its troops now keep peace in Gaza and Aqaba and enable the Israeli settlers to relax their vigilance.

The final asset implicit in much of what has already been said, and the result perhaps of all other assets, is Israeli strength. A handful, they successfully resisted the invasion of the armies of 6 Arab countries with a total population of over 40 millions. Through 10 years of unremitting hostility they have steadily built and defended what they built. When it became clear that Nasser with the aid of Russian arms was in the process of attempting to destroy them, they struck, swiftly and successfully and as a result the Fedayeen raids stopped, there was quiet along the borders, the Gulf of Aqaba is open to Israeli shipping, and the Arab states know they will get badly hurt if they really try to make trouble.

I for one, and I know there are many like me, both in Israel and in the United States, do not exult in this kind of armed strength. I do not want to see any building up of militarism which is a real danger in this situation if the present condition continues for many years. I would like to see Israel concentrate on its peaceful objectives and not have to devote so much of its energy and means to defense. But, ringed round by Arab steel

supplied by Russia, they now have no alternative. They must be strong in order to survive, and they are strong. And I must say that I do take real satisfaction from the knowledge that Jews can no longer be killed with impunity. It was 15 years ago tomorrow that that tiny band of pathetic survivors provided the world with an heroic but pathetic example of resistance in the Warsaw ghetto, and what they did was more noteworthy because it was so exceptional. Most Jews went like sheep to the slaughter. It was only 10 years ago that British troops were bashing in the heads of Jews with no other place to go, who were trying to get into Palestine. It was hardly 10 years ago that the Arabs announced that they would drive the Jews into the sea and promised the Arabs living among Jews that if they would join them in the war against the Jews soon they would have their own property and get that of the Jews as well. So without exalting militarism, I, for one, am grateful and proud that Jews in our generation, after all their humiliation and degradation, have shown again they are capable of Maccabean courage and have said to the world, "We, too, must be treated with dignity and respect."

Would that one could end this address on this note. But a balance sheet requires that we look at the other side of the picture. Once again, we have learned that nothing worth while comes easy. Neither men nor nations achieve emancipation without sacrifice, usually through blood, sweat, and tears.

The major problem continually confronting Israel is Arab hostility. No one really knows how deep rooted nor widespread this is. In the vast illiteracy of the deserts of Saudi Arabia or the upper Nile peasantry of Egypt, perhaps they have never even heard of Israel. The ordinary impoverished Arab probably is much more concerned with his daily bread than with Zionism. But the articulate Arab leadership remains violently hostile. By a strange paradox the spoken hostility is more violent among so-called United States friends in the area than with its problem children. Perhaps just because they feel they may be accused of pro-West and pro-Zionist sympathies, the leaders in Iraq and Jordan have said uglier things about Israel than has Nasser. After one makes due allowance both for Arab hyperboles of speech and for Arab politicians' necessity for saying things in order to survive, the fact still remains that there is no known break in the wall of Arab hostility. What shall be done?

The Huleh drainage issue indicates one problem. Israel has an abundance of water in the north and no water in the south. Therefore, it drains swamps in the north to make land cultivable, and channels the waters to the south that it may become fertile. This does not harm anyone and brings benefits to all. But the Syrians don't like it. They can't use these waters; they don't need them, but they don't want Israel to progress. So they make difficulties and shoot from across the frontiers which are nearby. Israel doesn't want trouble. It needs a period of tranquillity, but it cannot permanently hold up progress because of ongoing Arab opposition.

Nasser has become the leader and the symbol of rising Arab nationalism to most of the Arab world. * * * Regardless of credit or blame the fact is that Nasser emerged from this crisis with greater prestige and strength than before. He confiscated the assets of the Suez Canal and holds on to them. He gets Russian aid and uses it for bargaining power with the West. He has taken over Syria and Yemen. His cohorts and supporters are powerful and dangerous in every Arab country.

And now there is a rising sentiment in the West for some rapprochement with Egypt's dictator. He is no trustworthy friend of the West. At the very moment he is negotiating for United States aid, his controlled press and radio have denounced United States leaders as criminals. If we strengthen Nasser we are building up Soviet influence and power in the Middle East. Let him learn the hard way, that Russia does not keep all its promises, that he cannot repudiate his commitments and defy the West and expect it to rescue him from his difficulties.

If we give him this type of aid we will alienate our own tested friends in the Middle East and North Africa, Bourguiba in Tunisia, Chamoun in Lebanon, the majority in Sudan and other Arabs like King Hussein of Jordan, who don't wish to come under his domination or the Russians. In effect we will be saying to them that they made a mistake in trusting us, that they will profit more by resisting us than by joining with us. United States policy should be clear and firm. We should give economic aid for the peoples of the area, not arms. We should be helping our friends, not our enemies. We should commit ourselves to resist aggression. Beyond this both Israel and the United States should do all in their power to reach through to the masses in the Arab countries, to show them the way to emancipation and to seek out progressive forces, the potential democratic forces in each land. We should not ally ourselves with decadent, backward feudalism, destined to disintegrate and disappear.

The second major problem that confronts Israel is economic. This need not be so. If the Israelis were to close their borders, they could probably soon be self-sustaining. But they have already taken in over 1 million Jews and many more are yet to come. No one knows when the doors in north Africa will open and close. No one knows when the satellite countries will permit or stop Jewish immigration. No one knows whether or when Russia will allow some of her Jews to depart. But what we do know is that we must be ready and this means preserving and strengthening the institutions of American Jewry such as the United Jewish Appeal and the bond organization, and on the local levels, the welfare fund. It means the ongoing readiness for generous aid. It means substantially increased investments in Israel. It means the increased use of American technology, and Americans ready to contribute their know-how.

The third problem is spiritual. I refer in the first place to the unresolved church-state problem in Israel. * * * Israel did not come into existence to become another Balkan State. Harassed by enemies, it had no alterative but to become strong and to defend itself. But the ultimate purpose of the Jewish commonwealth is spiritual. Israel is intended to be the fulfillment of Hebrew prophecy. It has already redeemed over a million Jews, and that is a heroic achievement, not only of the Jews but of the human spirit. It should lift the hearts of oppressed man everywhere. But we dare hope also for the redemption of their souls. We dare hope for a return to the Torah as the guiding principle of their lives, freely given and accepted, not under compulsion. We dare to hope for new Torah. The Jewish soul has not had its last insight, nor has the Jewish voice spoken its last immemorial word. I hope for light and healing from that sacred soil and I dare hope that Israel may become a bridge between East and West.

This is not a light task, nor for small-minded men. I dare hope that this generation of Jews, aided by friends outside their own group, will have the vision and the courage and the determination and the statesmanship to rise to the challenge, not of this hour but of the centuries.

Radioactive Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished head of the physiology department at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, has recently made an important contribution to the current debate on radioactive fallout.

In a letter to the editor of the Minneapolis Star, Dr. Visscher attempts to clarify some of the current public confusion on the fallout peril. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Visscher's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS, SCIENCE ALL MIXED UP

TO THE EDITOR: As I listen to and in a minor way participate in the controversy over the present or future danger to mankind from the radioactive fallout associated with bomb-testing, I am becoming more and more sympathetic with the nonscientists in our society who must be getting more and more confused by the day. I am therefore encouraged to try to clarify the situation for the nonscientist.

There are as I see it three main reasons for the confusion. The first is that literally no one really knows what damage to the human race can be expected from low levels of radiation from the radioactive elements produced in bombing.

We know a great deal about high-level radioactivity damage. We can extrapolate from information on lower animals such as mice and flies at various levels of radiation and deduce that as to genetic damage there is a linear relation between radiation dose and damaging effect. This would mean that any additional radiation would mean additional damage.

Very few persons seriously challenge the validity of this extrapolation. Those who do only point out that the magnitude of the damage at present levels of radiation due to bomb testing would be very small. They argue further that even if it did produce an additional 15,000 defectives per generation per bomb, it would be worth the cost to society as a whole.

But the fact that the magnitude of the damage is just an educated guess is the first great difficulty. The real effect may easily be only one-tenth or it might be 10 times as great. No one actually knows.

The same is true in an even more extreme way in connection with the cancer-producing effects of radioactive elements. We think, but do not really know, that strontium 90 is the main hazard as far as cancer is concerned with low-level radioactivity from fallout. Furthermore, we do not really know how little strontium 90 will produce cancer.

The public should know that it will be absolutely impossible to know how dangerous this element is for at least 20 years, which is the time we have found it takes for similar radioactive substances to produce cancer. The public should know that we scientists have no actual data on the carcinogenic (cancer-producing) activity of low levels of strontium 90.

We are simply making educated guesses again as to what it will probably do.

These gueses or extrapolations are based on comparisons with radium, about which we do know something because of unfortunate industrial accidents which led to many deaths in the luminous-dial industry. The guesses are probably correct within a tenfold range, up or down, but no scientist would dare say that he positively knows what the lower limit of damaging effect is.

In other words, here again we are dealing with a substance which we know is damaging to the point of lethality and we are guessing that it will not do much or any harm below a certain dose level.

The second reason for our confusion is secrecy. Right now the most extensive data on strontium 90 in milk in the United States are in the hands of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. On March 6, 1958, I was shown these data which are marked "For Official Use" and I am therefore now not privileged to disclose the facts they contain.

There is one point about this situation that disturbs me greatly. It is that the top administrative officials do not have confidence in the intelligence of the American people. They act as though they did not really believe in the democratic system.

The facts in question have no conceivable military significance. They are important only as background information for policy decisions. To withhold them from the public means 1 of 2 things, either that our Washington administrators do not trust our intelligence, or that they hope to control opinion by monopolizing information.

Either conclusion would be distressing to me as one who believes in the democratic process, because it would mean that we are imitating the practices of authoritarianism, which I abhor.

The third reason for confusion is, I believe, the fact that scientists who talk and write about this problem mix up science and public policy.

We should all be more careful to point out exactly what is fact, what is guess and what is opinion as to public policy. I firmly believe that this is the only way in which scientists can be really useful to society in public policy questions.

Scientists have some special competence regarding knowledge of facts, and even in being able to make the most probable guesses about situations in which specific facts are not available. But they have no special competence in arriving at policy judgments.

Policy in a democracy must be based on informed public judgment and therefore clear distinctions between fact, guess, and policy judgment must be made. I hope that in the future this will be done by every scientist who undertakes to deal with this or other questions of public policy depending on scientific information.

PROFESSOR MAURICE B. VISSCHER,
Head, Physiology Department,
University of Minnesota.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, secrecy in government is like a slow paralysis that can be combated successfully only by continuous exercise and exertion. That is why I rise at every opportunity to speak for the right of the people to know what their government does. That is why I pay tribue to every man and every group that joins in the fight for freedom of information and wins a victory, large or small.

One of the most aggressive champions of freedom of information is the American press. That is to be expected; it is the lifeblood of their enterprise. One of the most respected members of the press is the Christian Science Monitor, which proves in its daily conduct that freedom and responsibility go hand in hand. Therefore the editorial "A Right to Know," which appeared in the April 21 issue of the Monitor, is worth wide distribution and reading.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Monitor editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 21, 1958]

A RIGHT TO KNOW

Americans properly feel that totalitarian governments are treating their people badly when they prevent them from receiving honest information about the rest of the world. But Americans have some reason also to be concerned about limitations on the freedom of information—the right to know—in the operation of their own Government.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS told the American Society of Newspaper Editors last week that, although some gains have been made, the fight against censorship in Federal Government departments is far from having been won. The House of Representatives has just passed a bill to amend a law of 1789 so as to prevent department officials from withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records. Certain necessary exceptions, of course, are made. It is to be hoped that the Senate also will enact this bill.

No one wishes national security endangered, or confidential FBI files thrown open, or trade secrets exposed, but a great deal of information has been denied to the press and public under circumstances which suggest that its release would have been politically awkward or embarrassing rather than a detriment to defense or an injustice to individuals.

A law would help establish the right of information where executive departments are concerned, but Congress itself is sometimes an offender on the issue of excessive secrecy about public business. The Congressional Quarterly has made a survey of congressional committee meetings which indicates that these sessions, including hearings, have been closed to the public one-third of the time so far this year.

Many such meetings unavoidably are closed because secret military information is discussed. Some lawmakers believe less time is lost to grandstand speeches when no audience is present. Nevertheless, many occasions occur when it could pertinently be asked, "Is this secrecy necessary?"

Probably as much or more should be said about public access to information in State and local government as on the national level. A survey by a legislative research council in Massachusetts disclosed that 187 town and school councils, boards, and committees customarily conducted the public's business in secrecy, with press and public barred. Most of these refused public inspection of their minutes and some kept no minutes. Surveys in Maine and Wisconsin showed similar conditions.

On such findings the Sigma Delta Chi journalistic fraternity has urged adoption of State laws requiring open government records and open government meetings. Twenty-nine States now have such laws as to records and 19 as to meetings. California enacted 66 statutes, 1 for each State board. Thirteen States whose legislatures are meeting this year have no law requiring open government meetings; 8 of these lack also a requirement of open government records.

The right to information about public business is not merely a concern of the press for news as a commodity. Far more importantly it is a concern of the whole people to have the facts on which the conduct of public affairs should be based.

Job-Producing Measures Too Slow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely and most sensible editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on April 21, 1958:

JOB-PRODUCING MEASURES TOO SLOW

Democrats in Washington have finally taken the bull by the horns and drafted a new unemployment relief bill calling for outright Federal grants to provide 16 weeks of emergency Federal unemployment benefits to jobless workers. Cost of the plan, which would be financed wholly by the Federal Government, is estimated at about $1 billion.

At least one half million persons thrown out of work in the recession have run out of unemployment benefits since the first of the year. Unless business takes a sharp turn for the better it is estimated that the number in this particular fix may grow to more than 2 million by the end of 1958. Jobless benefits are paid for a maximum of 26 weeks in more than half the States, including Massachusetts.

At last count, the jobless in Massachusetts totaled close to 170,000. Of these more than 50,000 already have used up their unemployment compensation rights. And the present claim exhaustion rate continues at 7,400 each month.

A somewhat similar situation exists in various other sections of the Nation. In some States it is worse than in others. It is a matter that needs attention, whether it is at National or a State level.

With so many people losing not only job income but also jobless income, it is gratifying that some Members of Congress should return from their Easter recess prepared to do something about the situation.

Substantial opposition has arisen to any action by Congress to alter the unemployment insurance system, temporarily or permanently. A good many people think it's up to the individual States to make any necessary changes. They condemn plans for emergency extension of benefit periods, financed by Federal loans or grants, as improper use of an insurance system to distribute relief.

What is needed, persons of this mind say, is not a dole but action to make more jobs. But most job-producing measures are slow-working.

Congress should not feel it can ignore the plight of a rapidly growing group of unemployed workers while waiting for general

antirecession legislation to take effect. The quicker it provides help for this group, the better.

Taxes and Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the April 19 edition of the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat there appears a guest editorial by Lyle R. Mercer, president of the Iowa Taxpayers Association. His remarks, Taxes and the Individual, are more apropos when applied to today's situation. In his six questions, by which he measures the necessity for any Government spending proposal, he provides us with a yardstick which we should apply when such proposals come before us.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial as follows:

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat of April 19, 1958]

TAXES AND INDIVIDUALS

(By Lyle R. Mercer, president, Iowa Taxpayers Association)

When Thomas Jefferson said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy," did he foresee the situation toward which we appear headed today?

The level of taxation is higher than during any other time in our history. While the Federal Government still gets the biggest share of the total tax take (73 percent), State and local spending has risen 201 percent in 10 years, compared with a 19-percent increase in Federal spending.

Continuation of this trend at State and local levels with no offsetting reductions in Federal spending means an increasing share of the national wealth will continue to be taken by governments. Perhaps this is what Jefferson had in mind, for such a trend carries grave risk of stagnating enterprise and eroding personal liberty.

Until recently, there was little indication that people had taken Jefferson's warning seriously. Most of us show concern about Government spending only by complaining about taxes, particularly at this time of the year when our burden is so apparent. This accomplishes nothing; nor is any useful purpose served by the unreasoning opposition offered by some toward all public expenditures, regardless of need or merit.

The Nation's growing population has created additional service demands at all levels of government, particularly State and local. Since 1946, for example, about half the 30-million increase in population has been in the school age and retirement age groups. This, in part, accounts for increasing expenditures for education and welfare programs.

The number of automobiles has increased during this same period from 34 million to 53 million with resulting demands for more and better roads. These and other instances have caused legitimate increases in Government spending.

These increased demands make even more acute the need for individuals, singly or through organized groups, to take a serious and continued interest in the spending of public funds. Worthwhile existing programs should be supported, but inauguration of new spending activities should receive close scrutiny.

Expansion of existing programs whose purposes are to provide services that properly belong to private initiative should meet with citizen opposition at every turn. And wasteful practices in Government should be opposed with all the force at our command.

Next time you are wondering if you should or should not support a Government spending proposal, ask yourself these questions:

1. Is it necessary? Or is it something already being provided by a private or public group?

2. Can we afford it? There is no limit to what we would like; only to what we can afford.

3. What will it cost ultimately? Many proposals are like icebergs—only a small fraction of the total cost is apparent on the surface.

4. Is it in the balanced best interest to all?

5. Does it place too much power in the hands of one individual or group and thereby lessen effective citizen control?

6. Is its appeal based on emotional propaganda or facts?

Often, individuals feel it is useless to attempt to do anything to control Government spending.

This feeling prevails first because many of us believe our opinions receive little, if any, attention; and secondly, because we are not skilled to assemble the necessary data for effective argument.

However, there is ample indication that Government representatives do pay close attention to the expressions of their constituents. And where research is necessary to acquire statistical and other data necessary to effectively question Government spending, individuals can employ help to perform this service by banding together through local or State taxpayers groups.

Providing this type of service at the local and State levels is one of the prime functions of the Iowa Taxpayers Association.

The Significance of the Federal Milk Marketing System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the systems utilized for distribution of the Nation's milk supply is the system of Federal milk marketing orders.

Under these orders around one-third of all the milk sold by the farmers of our country is marketed.

Naturally, to America's dairyland, the State which is the greatest single supplier of milk, Wisconsin, these orders are of particular significance.

In order to help illuminate what is otherwise a not sufficiently understood subject, I send to the desk an article from the current April 19 issue of the magazine Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer.

The article will go a long way toward clarifying the purpose and background of these orders.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDERS

Currently about one-third of the milk sold by United States farmers is marketed under the terms of 68 Federal milk marketing orders. Furthermore, the prices of most of the rest of the fluid milk in this country are strongly influenced by Federal order prices. Thus Federal milk marketing orders either directly or indirectly go a long way toward determining the prices that farmers in this country receive for milk for fluid purposes.

The demand for Federal milk marketing orders dates back to the late 1920's and early 1930's when milk prices were very unstable, retail prices were rampant and milk strikes were fairly commonplace occurrences. Farmers felt that they could not individually or collectively protect themselves against disastrous price declines in farm milk prices. Federal milk orders resulted.

The number of Federal milk marketing orders, and the volume of milk regulated under orders has been continuously expanding in recent years. It therefore appears that these orders are here to stay.

ORDER SETS MINIMUM PRICE

A Federal milk order is issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and requires that farmers regularly supplying the market be paid no less than a certain price for milk used for various purposes. A minimum price may be set for milk used in the bottle, another minimum price for milk used in manufacturing products, and some other minimum price for milk used in ice cream, cottage cheese and products of that type. The point here is that, regardless of what happens at the retail level, the farmer is still assured of a minimum price for his milk used in various classes. Thus, retail price wars can't hurt the farmer.

However, Federal milk orders do not set minimum average prices to producers. The average or blend prices to producers are determined by the so-called "class" prices mentioned above, and the amount of milk disposed of in each "class." Also a Federal milk order does not set retail prices. Some State milk orders do.

Federal milk orders also assure farmers of accurate weighing, classification, and accounting of milk. The market administrator has the authority to audit the records of all the dairy plants and make sure that the minimum prices set up under an order are paid to farmers.

PRODUCERS MUST APPROVE

Normally only grade A milk is priced under Federal milk orders. Thus cheese factories, creameries, and others buying grade B milk are not regulated. Federal milk orders have no relationship to the dairy price support program.

Orders are generally petitioned for by farmers or by their organizations. The order itself is issued by the Secretary of Agriculture only after a public hearing is held, and consumers, dairy plants and farmers alike have had a chance to be heard. The order itself has to be approved by the milk producers before it can become effective.

The Government cannot impose a Federal milk marketing order on any market unless it has the producer support. Furthermore, if more than half of the farmers vote to get rid of an order, it will be removed. So farmers make the final decision as to whether an order will become effective in a market, and whether it will stay.

Only the dairy plants are regulated. Thus, if a farmer does not wish to be under a Federal milk order, he can withdraw by stopping his sales to a plant which is regulated under an order. So a Federal order does not tell a farmer whether or not he has to be regulated.

The dairy plants do not have such an option: They will be regulated whether they want to be or not. However, the order will not tell the dairy plants whom they must

buy from, whom they must sell to, or how much they must charge when they are selling their products. All the order does is to tell the plants what they must pay farmers for milk used in various purposes.

MARKETING AREA IS DETERMINES

The marketing area determines which plants will be regulated and hence which farmers will be affected by the order. All plants selling milk in the marketing area who meet the requirements set up under the order will be regulated. All farmers selling to these plants will therefore have their milk priced under the Federal order.

It is important to point out here that the plants and farmers do not need to be located in the marketing area in order to come under regulation, but merely that the plants sell milk in the marketing area.

A recent development has been the emergence of so-called superpools, or farm milk prices over and above the Federal milk order price. These are negotiated between producers and plants and are not part of the Federal milk order. Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, and others have such superpools.

From the pattern of development it appears that these so-called superpools will be with us until such times as an increase in farm milk prices are authorized under Federal orders. Dairy plants apparently are not adverse to increases in farm milk prices so long as they can be successfully passed on to consumers, and so long as all of their competitors also increase prices.

It also appears that the Government is not going to suspend or eliminate Federal orders which have superpools. Evidence thus far does not indicate that the superpools have substantially reduced the per capita sales of milk.

MILKMEN WANT CONSOLIDATION

Pressure is developing among farmers and dairy plants for consolidating Federal milk marketing orders. The reason is that competition between orders has often resulted in unsettled conditions and disorderly marketing. Thus in the future instead of orders for individual cities, one order may serve a 2 or 3 State area. This recently happened in the New York area.

Wisconsin now has milk directly regulated under at least seven different orders. They are: Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth-Superior, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Rockford-Freeport, Quad Cities, and Dubuque. Another order is being proposed for 22 counties in northeastern Wisconsin. The consolidation of at least some of these orders will probably command a great deal of attention in the future.

H. R. 968 Permits Homeowners to Deduct for Income Tax Purposes Expenses of Home Repairs Up to $500 Annually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, if the leaders of Government are looking for a method of tax relief to bolster the Nation's economy and at the same time make a contribution toward the betterment of community, State, and Nation, they would do well to consider seriously the merits of my bill, H. R. 968, which I introduced January 3, 1957.

H. R. 968 is a bill to permit a homeowner to deduct for income-tax purposes up to the amount of $500 for money spent on ordinary and necessary repairs to his home. All that would be necessary would be for the homeowner to submit with his income-tax return an itemized account of home repairs, which would include painting, papering, repairing porches, roofs, spouting, and so forth. As you know, the owner of a rented dwelling under existing law is entitled to deduct such expenses, and my bill merely extends the privilege to the homeowner's dwelling used as his own residence.

Mr. Speaker, for a moment stop and think of the effect this type of legislation will have on the economy of the Nation, because it will promote employment and at the same time increase the sale of paint, hardware, lumber, wallpaper, and numerous other items of building material used to make home improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I originally introduced this bill in the 84th Congress, and at that time the Treasury Department submitted an adverse report to the House Committee on Ways and Means. However the economic conditions of the country have changed considerably since the adverse report was rendered in 1955.

President Eisenhower has proposed that people start buying the things they need, and in this connection I can think of no better stimulant to our free enterprise system than to encourage the homeowners of America to fix up and paint up their homes.

Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the April 11 issue of the Muscatine (Iowa) Journal, has much food for thought for all of us. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial as follows:

[From the Muscatine (Iowa) Journal of April 11, 1958]

POINT OF VIEW

It all depends upon the point of view.

Some folks see the doughnut; others see the hole in it.

Different individuals would see a pint of milk in a quart jar with varying viewpoints; to one it would be a jar half empty; to others, a jar half full.

Take the most recent figures on employment in the United States, for example, for the month of March.

The number of unemployed has been estimated at 5,198,000, the most jobless since August, 1941.

That's one way of looking at the picture.

On the other hand, only twice since employment figures have been available, have more people been employed in the month of March. That was in 1956 and 1957.

That's the other side of the picture.

It shows that a whole lot of people are still working regularly.

And even in March of 1956 and March of 1957, when record numbers were working there were nearly 3 million in the ranks of the jobless.

What Would Henry W. Grady Say About a Southern Funeral Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Anderson, S. C., Independent, entitled "What Would Henry W. Grady Say About a Southern Funeral Today?"

WHAT WOULD HENRY W. GRADY SAY ABOUT A SOUTHERN FUNERAL TODAY?

Seventy years ago that great spokesman for the South, Henry W. Grady, of Georgia, made a speech in Boston, Mass., at the Bay State Club.

His oration on that occasion dealt in part with a funeral Grady said he had attended in Georgia. That speech became a classic.

"This funeral was particularly sad," he said. "It was for a poor one-gallus fellow, whose breeches struck him under the armpits and hit him at the other end about the knee. They buried him in the midst of a marble quarry; they cut through solid marble to make his grave, and yet a little tombstone they put above him was from Vermont. They buried him in the heart of a pine forest, yet the pine coffin was imported from Cincinnati. They buried him within touch of an iron mine, yet the nails in his coffin and the shovel that dug his grave were from Pittsburgh.

"They buried him by the side of the best sheep-grazing country on the earth, and yet the wool in the coffin bands and the coffin bands themselves were brought from the North.

"They buried him in a New York coat and a Boston pair of shoes and a pair of breeches from Chicago and a shirt from Cincinnati.

"The South didn't furnish anything for that funeral, but the corpse and a hole in the ground."

Writing in the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, Paul Flowers wondered the other day what Henry W. Grady would say today if that poor, unfortunate one-gallus fellow could be brought back and reburied. Here, says Flowers, is what Grady could now say:

"The cow's milk that nourished him all through his childhood and helped him keep his health came from fine Jersey and Guernsey cows well grazed on lespedeza on southern hillsides; the diapers and clothing he wore came from Dixie's King Cotton, carded, spun, woven, cut out and sewed in Dixie factories; the toys and sporting goods he used in his youth came from southern materials and plants, fabricated by southern workmen; the books he read were bound in the South; the piano to whose chords he sang Glory to God in his church was made in Dixie; the pews and pulpit were a golden oak raised on a neighboring hillside, and processed by his kinsmen near home.

"When he married, his bride wore man-made silk created in a southern mill; the meat they ate came from white-face cows that had turned green grass into red meat on Dixie's gentle slopes; the wool of his 'longies' in wintertime came from Ba-Ba Black Sheep that shoved King Cotton off a Mississippi Delta plantation.

"The muffler and tailpipes and tires on his two-toned hardtop convertible were made near his southern home; many of the electronic devices in his radio, record player, and television were fabricated almost within a stone's throw of his birthplace.

"And now he has gone to his fathers, but in a well-built coffin as native to this soil as he was; his winding sheet was grown, spun and woven near home; even the embalming fluid which protects his mortal remains was made and packaged in an adjoining county.

"His widow and orphans will get their regular monthly checks from an insurance company whose home office is in the capital city of his own beloved State, and the bronze plaque that proclaims his name and character was designed and cast just over the next hill.

"All these came to enrich his life and to ease his pains of death, without taking away one fragment of trade or commerce from any other place on the planet.

"All this in 70 years, one man's lifetime."

How right the man is.

And how fortunate are we, who live in this region embracing western South Carolina and northeast Georgia, that the historic fact in our lives today is diversification—in both industry and agriculture.

This Would Help Protect You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill (S. C.) Herald of April 19, 1958:

THIS WOULD HELP PROTECT YOU

In Washington, Government secrecy is a newsman's worst enemy.

Under a security order issued by President Eisenhower, the heads of 17 big Federal agencies can censor information if they believe security is involved. The power is often abused in order to hide information that might be embarrassing.

Executive agencies of the Federal Government have twisted the meaning of a 1789 housekeeping law in order to withhold information from the public.

And under a policy laid down by Eisenhower, the executive branch can hide anything but final decisions on Government business on the grounds that it's "confidential executive business." By the time the final decision is announced, of course, it might be too late to change course.

Against this background, the United States House of Representatives this week passed and sent to the Senate a bill to curb censorship. The bill says simply that the old housekeeping law can't be used as a basis for withholding information from the public.

The housekeeping law charges agencies with the responsibility for keeping Government records in a safe place, and assuring they will be handled in such a way that they won't be destroyed. It has often been used to hide information.

The House action is a good start on the important job of making sure that the people of this country know what's going on in Washington. We hope the Senate will give speedy approval.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Milwaukee Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in any roll of the Nation's great newspapers, the Milwaukee Journal must be given an honored place. So must the Christian Science Monitor. Both of these outstanding newspapers are models of accurate reporting and responsible editorial policy.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to me, therefore, to place in the RECORD a tribute from the Christian Science Monitor, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary, to the Milwaukee Journal, which is observing its 75th.

As a Member of the Senate from Wisconsin, I have reason to know and take pride in the record of independence and fearless reporting of the Milwaukee Journal. The Journal is more than just a newspaper in Wisconsin. It is a force—a moral force for better government and community responsibility. I am glad to take advantage of the opportunity afforded me by the Monitor's fine editorial to acknowledge my debt, and the debt of the people of Wisconsin, to a newspaper without which the State would be infinitely poorer in moral and intellectual resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Salute to a Senior" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for April 21, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 21, 1958]

SALUTE TO A SENIOR

This newspaper, as its readers know, is celebrating its 50th anniversary. The Milwaukee Journal has just completed celebration of its 75th. As the junior we salute an esteemed senior contemporary!

A newspaper, like other institutions, can often be measured by something which symbolizes the ideals which have guided its growth. In the case of the Journal, the symbol can be found in the Nieman Fellowships. These were established at Harvard University in 1937, shortly after the passing of Lucius W. Nieman, the paper's founder, by his widow, Mrs. Agnes Wahl Nieman.

These fellowships are awarded on merit to working newspapermen and women to afford them, without loss of income, a year in which to enrich the background of knowledge and understanding out of which they write. The roster of the 229 who thus far have been Nieman Fellows presents a representative cross section of enlightened journalism. And this newspaper is proud to have had four of its staff numbered among them.

The Journal, from its early days, has remained courageously nonpartisan and independent. During World War I it battled pro-Germanism in a community of overwhelmingly German heritage; after World War II it aggressively fought the threat to American civil liberties implicit in McCarthyism, and in Senator McCarthy's home State.

Here is the "fourth estate" functioning as it should.

Economic Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on March 25, 1958, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] discussed in the Senate, in one of the thoughtful and well-documented foreign policy statements which are characteristic of him, the great need for assisting India in her efforts at economic development. He explained the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 74, which he has introduced along with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who used to be our Ambassador to India, which would endorse American action toward assisting these efforts of the largest non-Communist nation in the world to meet its pressing economic needs in the context of democratic means and political institutions. The New York Times, on March 27, 1958, carried an editorial praising the initiative taken by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kentucky, and supporting their statements concerning the importance of assistance to India from this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of March 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO THOUGHTFUL CITIZEN

In urging full American support for India's economic development program Senator KENNEDY observed that "no thoughtful citizen can fail to see our stake in the survival of free government in India." The point that he and the cosponsor of his resolution, Senator COOPER, were making on the floor of the Senate is painfully obvious. Yet the alarming thing about it is that blind congressional resistance to aid to India and other neutralist nations—not to mention to such Communist deviators from Russia hegemony as Yugoslavia—is strong and may even be growing.

Though India's foreign policy is not always to our liking, "no thoughtful citizen"—to repeat Senator KENNEDY'S words—could fail to recognize that India is a great and vital hope of democracy in Asia. And to succeed in the ways of political freedom India is in a desperate race with the demands of economic necessity. She must be able to show to the hundreds of millions of impoverished peoples in underdeveloped areas throughout the world—in Africa and even South America as well as in Asia—that there is a way to a better future through democratic means and free institutions, and that there is a happier and more effective and

more satisfying alternative to the way the Russian and Chinese Communists have chosen.

India is in desperate economic straits and has already had to scrap all but the core of its ambitious 5-year plan. The new American loan of $225 million is helpful, but it will not be enough. What will really be needed is a far more imaginative and ambitious program to assist India than anything the administration has yet proposed; but it is hard to believe that Congress could be so unresponsive to American interests as to fail to grant what little the administration has been asking. Help to India without any political strings whatsoever may serve so to strengthen the economic foundation of democracy in that subcontinent that it will remain a bulwark of the free world. No one can be sure of this, but everyone can be sure that if there should be an economic collapse or even a lasting discrepancy in China's favor between India's rate of progress and that of China, it is the entire free world that will be the loser.

In the case of Yugoslavia and, for that matter, Poland, the situation is of course entirely different. These are Communist states; but it is so clearly in freedom's interest to help them as much as possible in their attempts to establish themselves as independent entities that again one can only wonder at congressional resistance to the administration's efforts in this direction. American military aid to Yugoslavia is, in fact, ending; but American economic assistance to any country of Eastern Europe that will accept it creates an invaluable link with the democratic world. And the cultural exchanges already established and now gradually increasing may be of even greater importance.

The Late Honorable Anton J. Johnson

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my good friend and neighbor, Hon. Anton J. Johnson.

Before the redistricting of Illinois he represented part of the district which I now have the honor to represent, and I had the privilege to know him well during the 10 years we served together. We worked in close cooperation on matters of mutual interest to the State of Illinois. We helped each other in our campaigns. I always admired him for his ability and have been grateful for his friendship.

Anton was known as an outstanding authority on farming and dairy products, and was an able member of the House Agriculture Committee. Many of his colleagues leaned heavily upon him for advice in this field.

Anton was a sincere man, a hard worker devoted to his service and to his country. After he retired from Congress he continued to serve his people as mayor of Macomb. Personally, I have lost a warm friend, one for whom I had great regard and affection. I join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to his devoted wife.

The Tornado and the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 15, a tornado struck for the first time in Fort Pierce, Fla., which is in my congressional district. It struck when the community was overcoming the results of a long, hard winter which had destroyed many vegetable crops and had affected businesses and industries. The tornado struck with violence and ruthlessness and did severe damage to many homes and businesses, and injured numbers of residents. Local and State officials immediately took action to aid in the disaster, and the Red Cross responded in its usual tradition. I was glad to be of assistance at this time by enlisting the immediate aid of Federal agencies.

The way the community responded after the disaster is a fine example of the way our people in America respond to crises and disasters. The community rather than panic and bemoan its fate, responded in a most remarkable way and all of its citizens joined together in a fine spirit of cooperation to overcome the disaster which had struck.

The community's spirit and action are pointed up in a very fine editorial which appeared in the Fort Pierce News-Tribune of April 20. The News-Tribune is one of our leading newspapers in Florida and is published by Mr. H. T. Enns, who has had an outstanding career in the newspaper field.

The editorial follows:

THE TORNADO AND THE COMMUNITY

Things have been pretty much on the rugged side here in Fort Pierce and St. Lucie County since about 1 o'clock last Tuesday afternoon. If there was anything which we didn't need, after the worst winter weather in history, it was that tornado we had tossed at us.

Why did it have to happen here? Who knows. That question is as impossible to answer as it is to give a reason for the vicious twister taking the unpredictable path which it did. Striking with the violence and ruthlessness which mark such storms, it seems almost a miracle there were no fatalities—for that, at least, we can be thankful.

Damage was heavy. The full total of the losses suffered probably will never be known. It will be possible to add up the losses paid by insurance companies. Local insurance agents really went all out to check losses and to get adjusters on the ground to process claims. But such losses do not always cover full replacement cost; other losses were not covered by insurance; and how would it be possible to arrive at a total represented by such things as personal injuries? Nor can one estimate in dollars the wholesale destruction of trees, shrubs, and plants.

Our community has suffered severe blows before. We recovered from them just as we will from the results of this tornado. In fact, the tornado was hardly over before the cleanup had started; and in most areas right now, outside of some boarded-up windows and some piles of debris in the streets, the average visitor would hardly realize a tornado had struck.

Maybe it takes such an ordeal as the recent tornado to bring out the real character of a community. All of us have heard many times about how a person must go through a certain amount of suffering before they actually grow up, just as steel must be tempered. From this idea came such phrases as "through adversity to the stars" and "sweet are the uses of adversity." There is much truth in them, although there surely must be easier ways to find such truth than suffering through the savagery of a tornado.

But we did have a tornado, and the community did measure up. There was little talk—and even less wailing and bemoaning. There was work to be done and the universal reaction was simple and direct, let's get at it. Those in positions of responsibility stuck to their posts—the needs of the community transcended personal well-being.

The various departments of the city responded magnificently. The entire police force went on duty—and stayed on duty until the emergency was over. Every county law-enforcement official was on the job until the end. So was the highway patrol. And bouquets to the National Guard for its immediate response and fine conduct. The efficiency and cooperation of these various law-enforcement bodies was amazing. Despite blocked and debris-littered roads—and sightseers who should have stayed at home—traffic was handled unbelievably well. And, with all the havoc and open stores in the business districts, not the first attempt at pilfering or looting occurred.

As for the utilities, the power went off, of course. Lines were down all over town. But with line crews and the fire department working round the clock, accidents and fires were kept to a minimum, how as much service was restored as quickly as it was we'll never know. And maybe—just maybe—the telephone company some day will figure out how, with so many lines out, it handled a record number of both local and long-distance calls. Nor should it be forgotten how the city crews tackled, and licked, the tremendous task of clearing streets blocked with trees, wires, and storm debris of all kinds.

City and county forces couldn't do it all alone. They didn't have to. Doctors, nurses, and the entire personnel of Memorial Hospital responded to care for the heavy list of injured. The Red Cross was on the job, as usual.

All of these things done by all of these people were essential. But, alone, all they did could not get the wheels of the community turning again. For the amazingly quick return to what is close to normal business in many lines credit must go to all the builders, contractors, electricians and other outfits who call their crews together, put them on round-the-clock schedules, and got things done.

Under pressure—and let all be assured that the visitation and the aftermath of a tornado is pressure—people have been known to fall to pieces. That didn't happen here—to the contrary the people did better than they knew they could do in getting to work to put the pieces back together.

And, as a community, in such a time of emergency you don't only find out about yourself, you also find out about your friends, thank goodness, we have friends. The folks from Vero Beach, Stuart, and Okeechobee, were not only ready to help, they did help. They did not wait to be asked, they got on the job, sending men, and materials, and needed supplies. Even from as far aways as Orlando and Sebring came offers of help and aid. Should the need ever arise—and Heaven forbid that it does—may we, in turn, prove as good friends.

The outer scars of the tornado have mostly been erased. It will take more time to care for all the inner scars. But that will be done. The tornado did not destroy—it only tempered to a keener edge—the spirit of the community which knows only one way to go, ahead.

America Must Not Be Made Sitting Duck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "America Must Not Be Made Sitting Duck," which was published in the Salt Lake Tribune on April 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of April 20, 1958]

AMERICA MUST NOT BE MADE SITTING DUCK

Foreign Minister Gromyko, of Russia, has accused the United States of being provocative, because American planes armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs have flown over the Arctic in the direction of the borders of the Soviet Union.

Russia demands that these flights be stopped.

In effect this is a demand that the United States cease being on the alert to counter a surprise Russian attack, while the Soviet Union remains free to prepare just such an attack.

Of course, this country is not going to let itself be talked into becoming a sitting duck target for Communist warmakers.

Now the Communists insist they are not warmakers. The cry of "peace, peace" echoes constantly from all the propaganda mouthpieces of Red nations. Mr. Gromyko sounded the same old cry in his attacks on the United States Strategic Air Command flights. He assailed those who have tried to frighten the American people into believing there was danger of a Communist-made war.

But nobody has to frighten the American people into such a belief.

Americans know the record of Communist warmaking all too well. They know about the rape of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. They remember the unprovoked attack on little Finland. They recall the plot with Hitler to divide up Poland. They know about the Communist attack on South Korea. They know about Communist-fomented conflicts in China, in Malaya, and in Indochina.

The truth is Communists cannot be trusted. Their own actions, as well as their well-documented policies of deception and faithlessness, prove that.

America must be prepared to strike back unfailingly against a Russian surprise attack. And such preparedness requires nuclear-armed planes in the air, as well as ships at sea. Planes at their bases and ships at their docks are sitting ducks for sudden attack, as this Nation well learned at Pearl Harbor.

That must not happen again.

Now admittedly this constant readiness to attack Russia is a danger. Nuclear war might conceivably be triggered by accident. A more immediate danger is that a plane may crash or drop an armed bomb through some error.

The accidental dropping of an unarmed nuclear device over a South Carolina town last month brought that peril home.

The danger of accidental nuclear war is real. It must be recognized. It must be guarded against with every possible mechanical and human precaution.

But this Nation dare not substitute a real and present threat of American destruction for a potential but not certain threat of accidental nuclear bombing.

In the present state of world affairs America must remain prepared to counter surprise Soviet attack.

The United States is ready, however, to talk with Russia and other nations about the threat of accidental or deliberate nuclear warfare. And one cannot be discussed without the other. For it is the danger of surprise attack that is responsible for the danger of accidental nuclear bombing.

If the Soviet Union is really concerned about the accidental war danger, let it come to the United Nations Security Council meeting Monday prepared to offer some effective guaranties against a Soviet attack.

Russia's very protest emphasizes the need for such guaranties.

Russia likely knows what American defense forces are doing. But we know little about what Russian forces are doing.

We cannot know when a deadly strike might come. Therefore we must be ever on our guard.

Three years ago President Eisenhower offered his "open sky" inspection plan. As a protection against surprise attack it might have lessened the need for America being ever on its guard.

But the Soviet Union has scoffed at the plan—and offered no satisfactory alternative inspection plan of its own.

Perhaps the Security Council airing of this Russian protest about American bomber flights will bring the real issue of peace clearly to world attention. Perhaps it will even force Russia to face up realistically and honestly to inspection and disarmament problems.

And if that should develop, that long-debated conference might really be worth holding.

Time To Hone the Blade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill (S. C.) Herald of April 18, 1958:

TIME TO HONE THE BLADE?

Now that President Eisenhower is showing more vigor about the Defense Department mess, we wish he would take a look at the State Department—which is in an even worse mess.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles runs the show, and he makes sure that it's a one-man show.

The State Department has an array of experts and career diplomats who are highly qualified to analyze the political situation in any part of the globe. Does Dulles lean on the recommendations of these men? Does he take advantage of the brainpower and experience of the people who run the many divisions of the State Department? Far from it.

The situation has become so bad, in fact, that the heads of State Department divisions sit on the back row at Dulles' press conferences in order to learn what his policies are.

Perhaps the pressure of running a one-man show and trotting all over the world, briefcase in hand, has made Mr. Dulles testy. That seemed to be the case Tuesday when he exploded at a Washington news conference and charged the Russians with prostituting diplomacy for propaganda purposes. His personal blast gave no indication that Mr. Dulles is interested in diplomacy.

The Secretary of State has lost the play to the Russians and has slipped into the feeble position of reacting indignantly to everything the Soviets propose. In the delicate, razor sharp world of diplomacy, John Foster Dulles is getting a bit dull.

Why Iowans Chase Cosmic Rays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent United Press article, Dr. James Van Allen of the State University of Iowa, one of America's leading scientists in the development and successful launching of our Explorer satellites, explained why so much time and money is being spent in studying cosmic rays. Because of the part this study will play in our conquest of outer space, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHY IOWANS CHASE COSMIC RAYS

(By Dr. James Van Allen)

IOWA CITY.—Like early experimenters in other fields, the upper air and space scientists don't know now what practical applications their findings will have.

Such predicting would be something like Benjamin Franklin offering the world the telegraph and telephone immediately after his explorations of lightning.

Michael Faraday, British pioneeer in the physics of electricity, had an answer for a member of parliament who came to his laboratory to find out what was practical about his work.

"I can't tell you what it will be good for," Faraday said. "But I'll tell you this. One of these days you'll be taxing it."

In 1831, Faraday discovered how to generate electricity by rotating a coil of wire within the field of a magnet. His discovery became practical 40 years later with the development of the arc-light dynamo, and machines to convert mechanical energy into electrical energy became major investments of taxable enterprises.

RAY RESEARCH IN INFANCY

It wasn't long ago that many people wondered why physicists were spending so much time and energy trying to split up those tiny atoms, things too small even to be seen in a microscope. Now, of course, atom-splitting is one of our major businesses, for peace as well as for war.

Cosmic ray and other upper atmospheric and space research is now in its infancy, like electromagnetism in Faraday's days of the 1830's and nuclear physics in the 1930's. We are now "crash programing" our efforts to grow in knowledge through several International Geophysical Year projects, using balloons, rockets and the Explorer satellites.

Cosmic rays possess enormous energy. They speed toward the earth with much more

zip than man has been able to generate in his most powerful cyclotron.

Cosmic rays, spawned both in the sun and in interstellar space, are natural "atom smashers," shattering both themselves and atoms of nitrogen and oxygen when they crash into the earth's atmosphere.

Because of their energy, cosmic rays have already taught physical scientists things which they could have learned in no other way. Some atomic particles, mesons, for instance, first identified about 20 years ago, were discovered when cosmic rays blasted them out of atmospheric atoms.

SATELLITES BROAD SWEEP

Cosmic rays at full strength can pierce several feet of lead or a hundred feet of water. But their energy is largely dissipated when they hit the atmosphere.

Therefore, we must send our detecting and measuring instruments up high enough to meet them before they are broken down from primary into secondary rays. Rocket flights are useful for quick vertical studies of these particles, but satellites provide a broad sweep of information over a long period of time.

In its cosmic ray experiments, the University of Iowa physics department is interested mostly now in charting how the intensities of cosmic rays vary from hour to hour, from month to month, and from year to year in the solar cycle.

Just as meteorologists have charted temperatures, wind speeds and other weather information at every possible latitude, longitude, and altitude, and at every hour and season, we hope to fill in some of the many gaps in mapping cosmic rays throughout the earth's immediate environment.

This detailed chartering of cosmic rays should lead to detailed plotting of the effects of the earth's magnetic field on outer space and to further correlations.

McElroy's Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney (S. C.) Ledger of April 19, 1958:

MCELROY'S POWERS

The illogical way we go about running our Defense Establishment is typified by the mystery on Capitol Hill about the broad new powers being proposed for Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy. This is the reorganization plan promised the American people by President Eisenhower in January—when the public in this country was thoroughly alarmed over our lag in the rockets and missiles race.

Now the new plan is being proposed in Congress—a plan which was partly formulated by the new Defense Secretary himself. Knowing that he helped create the plan, one would hardly think his powers of office were to be lessened.

In addition to that, there is the unreal element involved as a result of McElroy's newness in his all-important job. Granting the fact that he was a good soap industry executive, it must be admitted that he has not been Secretary of Defense long enough to show what he can or can't do.

Yet we are ready to turn over the greatest department in the Government to this relatively untried business executive. It is difficult to believe that Congress will resolve concern over our defense program by going along with the administration's plan to enlarge the powers of the Defense Secretary who is a newcomer on the scene, so to speak.

What we really need is unification—something Congress tried to provide 10 years ago, and which has never yet been accomplished. There is still that jealous schoolgirl mentality in every one of the armed services, and the old-timers are more guilty than the youngsters, in most cases. The result is waste, overlapping and inefficiency. The waste is worst of all and staggering in scope.

Health and Welfare Trust Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, we of the State of Washington are proud that not one hint of scandal has arisen in connection with the administration of health and welfare funds in our State.

The Journal of Accountancy recently saw fit, in its January 1958 issue, to feature an article by Mr. Percy A. Lockitch, a certified public accountant practicing in Seattle, reporting on health and welfare programs generally and in the State of Washington in particular. Mr. Lockitch is a graduate of the University of Washington and has practiced as a CPA in that State for more than 20 years. His article contains excellent advice on the administration and auditing of these plans, and makes timely reading for the Congress at a time when new legislation in the labor field is before us.

I should particularly like to emphasize that portion of Mr. Lockitch's article which deals with how the Washington State Federation of Labor, headed by Mr. Evan M. Weston, spearheaded the State law requiring the filing of an annual report with the State Insurance Commissioner and an audit by the insurance commissioner's office at least once every 5 years.

Mr. Weston, incidentally, now serves as president of the merged AFL–CIO Washington State Labor Council.

This is dramatic evidence that responsible union leadership is eager to see that health and welfare plans are administered properly, and I am proud that union leadership in my State has led the way. The final paragraph of Mr. Lockitch's article also deserves special emphasis. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUDIT AND TAX PROBLEMS OF HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

(By Percy A. Lockitch)

Union-employer health and welfare trust funds have been very much in the news these past few months. It is the intent of this article to discuss the mechanics of these trusts, the accounting and the audit problems involved, and the tax situation confronting these trusts.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act, requires in effect that a welfare trust fund contributed to by an employer as a result of collective bargaining shall be administered jointly by management and labor. This same section of the Taft-Hartley Act (302) contains the provision that an annual audit of the trust is required and shall be made available to interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund. No particular audit problem presents itself with single employer welfare funds managed by the employer. This article concerns itself with those health and welfare trust funds jointly administered by labor and management.

This is not to be construed as though management-administered funds should not be audited. Indeed, all health and welfare funds should be audited, since mismanagement and abuses can be found at any level, whether union, management or jointly administered. The challenge to an auditor in the main lies in multiemployer health and welfare trusts jointly managed by labor and industry.

These health and welfare trust funds were established through the medium of collective bargaining. In most instances labor had the opportunity of either accepting 7½ cents to 10 cents per hour for wage increases, or that amount for a health and welfare trust fund. So far as take-home pay is concerned the health and welfare trust fund proved to be the better bargain, since the trust can be tax exempt under code section 501 (c) (9). The employer's contributions are deductible by him under code section 162 (a)—necessary business expenses. The employer's contributions are not includable in the employee's gross income under code section 106, which section provides with reference to accident and health insurance that gross income to the employee does not include contributions by the employer to accident and health plans for compensation to his employees for injury, sickness, etc. This provision of the code also applies to hospitalization, medical, and surgical insurance for the families and dependents of employees.

Most of these jointly administered health and welfare trust funds are set up on an area craft basis. That is, each craft in a defined area will set up a separate trust for that area. An example would be a carpenters trust embracing all the carpenters in the San Francisco-Oakland area. All signatories to the labor contracts with the carpenter unions in that area would make contributions for their employees to that particular trust. It can be seen that in a metropolitan area there could be several thousand employer contributors making contributions coverings tens of thousands of employees.

Based on the latest membership figures this writer has seen on the various craft unions such as the construction crafts, machinists, and teamster trades, etc., a conservative estimate would be that several million employees are covered in health and welfare trust funds that are jointly administered by labor and management. A further conservative estimate would be that hundreds of millions of dollars a year are paid into these funds by managements for the benefit of their employees.

As of the date of this writing there are no compulsory reporting laws on the Federal statute books. It is possible that the next session of Congress may see compulsory reporting laws at the Federal level enacted.

The State of Washington has a compulsory financial reporting law in its statutes, enacted in 1955, which requires the filing of an annual report with the State insurance commissioner and an audit by the insurance commissioner's office at least once every 5 years.

It may be stated that a labor organization—the Washington State Federation of Labor—was instrumental in drawing up this piece of legislation and successfully guiding it through the legislature. It is the writer's understanding that the State of New York has enacted similar legislation recently, and that Connecticut and California are considering legislation along these lines.

ROLE OF THE TRUSTEE

When a jointly administered trust fund is established, trustees are first selected, an equal number from management and labor. It is unfortunate that some of the trustees either forgot, never knew, or did not attempt to find out what the definition of "trustee" is. These trustees take on the same degree of responsibility as do any other trustees of an organization such as a mutual life insurance company, and the responsibility follows on through the insurance broker, insurance consultant, and insurance carrier. This is occasioned by the fact that the trustees themselves are usually not versed in insurance matters and must of necessity rely heavily on the advice and counsel of brokers and carriers.

Since personal liability can attach to the trustees, it would be prudent for trustees to review their position as such and decide for themselves whether, through nonattention to trust matters or disinterest in the trust, they may have left themselves wide open for damage suits. It could also be an opportunity for trustees to mend their ways if mending is needed.

The trustees at an early date should, with the guidance of competent legal counsel, have a trust agreement drawn up. It is important that competent advice be obtained on the insurance, administrative and income tax details that the trust will encounter.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

The rules of eligibility should then be drawn up, but only after a careful study of the amount of funds that will be available, the ages of the employees, the proportion of male and female employees, the insurance coverage desired and the cost thereof, and the reserve that must be maintained. This reserve becomes of increasing importance where an hour bank is maintained. The rules of eligibility may provide for coverage based on hours worked in a month, quarter, or on a semiannual or annual basis. * * *

It is apparent then that the trustees should periodically review the liability for future premiums, and compare it with the reserves that have been accumulated. It may become necessary to revise the rules of eligibility, increase the employer's contributions or reduce the coverage, in order to match the future liability with the reserve. It is better to do this timely than to make the attempt after the trust is in financial difficulty.

Among the early duties of the trustees is the selection of a depository for trust funds and the selection of an administrator. The administrator can be a management representative, a union representative or an independent agency. The writer's preference is the independent agency not beholden to either labor or management. Recently trust departments of commercial banks have set up facilities for administering these funds, in connection with the pension trusts they also administer.

Among the duties of an administrator are the establishment and maintenance of the complete financial and accounting records for the trust. * * *

SUGGESTED AUDIT PROGRAM

Since there has been a great deal of criticism leveled at health and welfare trust funds, it is the writer's belief that an audit for such trusts must be more detailed in scope and positive in confirmation of all balance-sheet items than audits for commercial and industrial enterprises. The following audit program could reassure the trustees, the trust members, and the employer contributors that the fund is being properly maintained:

1. There should be direct positive confirmation with all employer contributors. This should be in the form of a letter stating the total amount of the employers' contributions during the year under review, and either an adding machine tape showing the monthly contributions or a tabulating machine listing of these contributions attached to it. The letter should leave space for a contributor to state his objections to the amount listed if it is incorrect. A self-addressed stamped envelope should be included with every confirmation. All confirmations returned which are not in accord with the records should be investigated. This procedure is valuable for two reasons:

(a) Since there has been criticism leveled at these funds, every contributor should be apprised of the fact that all his contributions are properly accounted for.

(b) Many employers, particularly in the construction crafts, make payments to as many as 12 different trusts. Through the medium of positive confirmation it has been the writer's experience that payments have been made to the wrong trust by the bookkeeping staff of the employer. It is thus possible that bona fide employees do not earn eligibility in either fund for which payments have been made for them, while in reality they are entitled to coverage had an error not been made. As stated, positive confirmation of employers' contributions remedies in part these errors.

2. There should be direct confirmation with all depositories that all bank accounts owned by the trust are in accord with the records.

3. There should be physical inspection of all securities owned by the trust, and cost values should be checked as of the date of purchase, to assure that the proper price has been paid for these securities.

4. All interest from savings accounts should be proved, and it should be ascertained that all dividends and interest from securities have been received and properly accounted for.

5. There should be direct confirmation with insurance carriers to account first for the amount of premiums paid to the carrier, second the extent of participation by insurance brokers or agents in commissions paid by the carrier as a result of trust business, and third the amount and computation of the experience rating dividend, if any, received by the trust. If possible a fee schedule of the carrier should be obtained and should be included in the audit report, so that the trustees know exactly the basis for commissions paid to the broker or agent.

6. There should be direct confirmation with all brokers to ascertain that no fee-splitting has been resorted to or inside deals made.

On the surface, points 5 and 6 may appear somewhat difficult to obtain. In many audits performed by the writer only one broker balked at giving the information requested. He complied when it was pointed out that his reply would be made part of the audit report and would be accompanied by a request to the trustees to probe the matter. In the main, both brokers and carriers welcome the opportunity to divulge brokerage arrangements. It is possible that they may not confirm truthfully, but at least the auditor will have done all he possibly can to determine the facts in these important facets of a health and welfare plan.

7. If there is a change in carriers during the year the auditor should investigate the reason for the change, since first-year commissions are usually higher than subsequent years.

8. The auditor should thoroughly check at least 3 months' eligibility records to ascertain that premiums had been paid only on those trust members entitled to insurance coverage.

9. All administration fees paid during the year should be proved.

10. The bank accounts should be reconciled for all months for the entire year. Canceled checks should be scrutinized to make sure that they are being signed by authorized persons. Usually one employer and one employee trustee are entrusted with the signing of checks. Endorsement of checks should also be examined.

11. There should be examination of all expense vouchers and authorizations for payment to determine that these expenses were actually trust expenses.

12. The usual checking, reconciling and verification that would develop during the course of any audit should be performed.

13. The trust agreement should be read or reread in the case of subsequent audits. The trustees' minutes should be read in their entirety to ascertain that the trust business is actually carried on in accord with the trust agreement and the minutes of trustees' meetings.

14. The adequacy of all fidelity bonds covering the administrator and the trustees should be checked.

15. Form 990—Annual Return of Organization Exempt From Tax—should then be prepared if the organization has been granted exemption, or Form 1041—Fiduciary Income Tax Return—if the trust has been denied exemption. The auditor should then prepare financial statements and an audit report for the period under review. * * *

AUDIT REPORT

The auditor should use a long-form audit report and apprise the trustees of the work he has performed and his findings. The statements should include a balance sheet, an analysis of the net worth or surplus account, and a statement of receipts and disbursements for the period under review. It has been found helpful to the trustees to include also a statement of receipts and disbursements for all years the fund has operated up to 10 years. It may also be helpful if a statement showing the liability for unpaid premiums to be paid based on eligibility of members on the audit date, is provided. This can be obtained through sampling (possibly 10 percent) of the employees' eligibility accounts. There should be notes to financial statements that are prepared on a cash basis of accounting, similar to the following:

1. All administration fees due and unpaid as at the audit date should be mentioned.

2. A statement regarding the delinquency of employers' payments, if any, and that liability for premiums might possibly attach to these delinquencies.

3. A statement to the effect that since the policy year does not correspond with the accounting year (if such be the case) it is not possible to determine whether an experience rating dividend for favorable experience will be forthcoming from the carrier.

4. A statement that there is a substantial liability for premiums to be paid subsequent to the date of audit, but which will be based on trust members' eligibility which had been paid for before the audit date.

5. A statement to the effect that securities are carried for balance-sheet purposes at cost, and that in the case of certain government securities, notably series K bonds, the bonds are redeemable at a price less than cost if they are redeemed before maturity.

Summing up the audit procedure, it can be seen that the receipts have been verified in their entirety, and all disbursements have been properly accounted for. The report will tell the trustees in detail about the financial status of the trust.

TAX PROBLEMS

After a health and welfare trust has been in operation for a full year it is possible to obtain exemption from income tax by filing an application (Form 1026) with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue at Washington, D. C. Accompanying the application there must be an executed copy of the trust agreement, an audit report for the first full year of operation, and a schedule of benefits that the members of the trust enjoy. If exemption is granted under code section 501 (c) (9) the trust will file annually on Form 990. If exemption is denied the trust will file Form 1041, Fiduciary Return.

Most trust agreements provide for coverage of associate employees, which term undoubtedly includes salaried personnel. Many trusts' agreements contain the following clause describing associate employees: "The term 'associate employee' shall mean (a) individual proprietors, partners, or corporate officers of individual employer contributors who are actively engaged in the affairs of the business of the individual employer and for whom the contributions as provided by this trust agreement are made for the purpose of providing such persons with the benefits set forth in this trust agreement." Section 501 (c) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides that a health and welfare fund, in order to obtain exemption, must meet three basic tests, namely:

1. It must be a voluntary association of employees organized for the purpose of providing for the payment of life, sickness, accident, or other benefits for its members and their dependents.

2. No part of its net earnings may inure to any private shareholder or individual, other than through the payments of the prescribed benefits.

3. At least 85 percent of its income must be derived from amounts collected from members and amounts contributed by their employers, and not more than 15 percent of its income can be derived from other sources.

Practically all trusts which had a provision in their trust instruments containing the above clause, and who filed for exemption before 1955, were granted this exemption. Practically all trusts whose agreements contained this clause regarding associate employees who filed for exemption subsequent to 1954 were denied exemption on the basis that individual proprietors or partners cannot belong to a voluntary association of employees, for the reason that they are not employees. The following quotation from a denial of tax exemption issued by the Treasury Department will illustrate: "The Internal Revenue Service takes the position that a strict interpretation of the law which relates to the exemption from Federal income-tax organizations described in section 501 (c) (9) of the code of 1954 is mandatory. It follows, therefore, that the inclusion of employers as members of a voluntary employees' beneficiary association would preclude exemption for the reason that they would not meet the first of the three basic tests" (outlined above). In every instance where tax exemption has been denied the Treasury Department offers two suggested courses of action, namely:

1. The trust agreement can be amended by eliminating individual proprietors and partners as participants, or

2. Filing a protest which can be heard only in the national office at Washington, D. C.

The smaller trusts with very few individual employers or partners have successfully eliminated this class through amendment of the trust agreement and have thus obtained tax exemption. In many of the larger trusts this has proved not feasible or possible. * * *

To the writer's knowledge no protests have as yet been heard, and no hearings have been held toward an issuance of regulations governing section 501 (c) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Note that the exemption denials have been made in a strict interpretation of the law, and it is possible that a more liberal interpretation could rule that self-employed individuals or partners could contribute to such a fund on the same basis and for the same reasons that self-employed individuals cover themselves under the social-security laws.

This income-tax exemption denial brings up several problems in connection with trusts which have already been granted exemption and whose trust instruments contain substantially the same wording as those for which income-tax exemption was denied, namely:

1. Will the Treasury Department revoke the exemption granted upon a rereading of the trust agreement?

2. Will the Treasury Department revoke the exemption if the trust innocently accepts contributions from an individual proprietor or partner?

3. Will revocation of tax exemption follow if an unemployed member of the trust pays into the trust a sufficient amount to keep his coverage alive while he is unemployed?

These questions have been asked but have not been answered by the Treasury Department. For those trusts that have had tax exemption denied a further problem presents itself in the question as to what constitutes taxable income, and what deductions may be taken from this taxable income. At the very worst it can be held that all receipts from employers' contributions and all experience rating dividends from the health care contractor, coupled with investment income, constitute taxable income. At the very best taxable income could be investment income only, with a deduction for those expenses applicable to that income, such as investment counselor's fees and accrued interest purchased.

In a ruling dated April 10, 1957 the Director of the Tax Rulings Division helped solve this problem. He stated that "the contributions required to be made pursuant to a labor contract by the employers to a trust (reference is to health and welfare trusts) of this nature are regarded as contributions of corpus to the trust and would be excluded from gross income of the trust.

"Receipt of so-called dividend payments by the trust from the insurance companies as a result of favorable loss experience by the companies is considered a receipt in the nature of a refund or rebate of excess premiums paid by the trust, and not of gross income, provided the expenditures to acquire the insurance did not result in a tax benefit to the trust by reason of an allowance of a deduction therefor."

It follows that since the experience rating dividend and the employers' contributions are not considered taxable income the only remaining source of income would be investment income. The extent to which trust expenses may be deducted from this income is still a problem.

EXPERIENCE WITH WELFARE TRUSTS

There has been much unfavorable publicity regarding health and welfare trust funds. It has been the experience of the writer and auditors throughout the country that these funds are exceedingly well managed and that the trustees on both labor and management sides are exceptionally capable and honest individuals. They work hard and sincerely for no recompense. It is regrettable that an occasional lapse of morals on the part of some individual or corporation can give rise to such unfavorable comment and cause doubt as to the operation of all health and welfare trust funds.

Never Underestimate the Power of the Female

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, special honors came last week to two staff members of the Medford, Oreg., Mail Tribune—both were women.

The fact that women play an important role in the worlds of radio, television, newspapers, and allied fields is not news anymore. But the Mail Tribune's religious news editor won a coveted national award, 1 of 3 given nationally by the Association of Professional Religious Public Relations and Publicity Personnel.

And the skilled society editor again won statewide recognition in the competition sponsored by the Press Women of Oregon for her column, potpourri, for her Sunday society page and for a feature story. Her column will be entered in national competition.

How do the men feel about these award winners? My good friend, Managing Editor Eric Allen, Jr., sums it up in his editorial, Our Prizewinning Ladies, which appeared in the April 18, 1958 edition of the Mail Tribune.

What placed the small Oregon daily in the national eye for its religious news coverage? The reasons are the people involved: Miss Hutchinson and the men and women of the Medford area. This became apparent in the April 18, 1958, story which follows the editorial. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include both and commend the Mail Tribune, its capable editor Robert Ruhl and its staff, female and male for these latest honors which come to a newspaper already long noted as a Pulitzer Prize winner:

OUR PRIZEWINNING LADIES

The men in the newsroom bow to the ladies this week. We're proud of our gals.

Each of the 2 women regularly employed in the Mail Tribune news department has won a high honor for herself, and thus for the newspaper, during the week.

Mrs. Olive Starcher, our women's editor, pulled a repeat performance, and again won honors in the statewide competition of the Press Women of Oregon—for her column, for her Sunday society page, and for a feature story. Her column will be entered in national competition for excellence.

And on page 1 today is announced the fact that the Mail Tribune has won an award of merit from the National Religious Publicity Council, 1 of only 3 in the Nation.

The award is chiefly—almost entirely, in fact—due to the efforts of our church editor, Miss Peggyann Hutchinson.

Peg has taken a real and sincere interest in the work of reporting the religious news of the community, and has worked hard at it. The samples of her work which were sent in to the NRPC competition gave ample evidence that she has provided the Mail Tribune with rounded, interesting and complete coverage of the news of the churches in Medford.

Like every other working newspaperman, or woman, on a small daily paper such as the Mail Tribune, both Mrs. Starcher and Miss Hutchinson have a multitude of duties and tasks.

Miss Hutchinson, for instance, assists Mrs. Starcher in writing stories for the Sunday society section, in laying out the pictures for the section, and in the coverage of some social events. She is also a regular reporter for the paper, covering both the city hall and the courthouse at various times during the week. She has covered public hearings as well as church conventions; criminal trials, as well as weddings; new commercial construction, as well as new church buildings.

Mrs. Starcher, likewise, does a job that goes much further than is implied in her formal title of society editor, which really is a title which is more and more meaningless as the interests of women broaden in today's world, and encompass politics, music, drama, international affairs, the arts—anything, in fact, which occupy the time and attention of well-informed people.

The society section—or women's section, as some prefer to call it with perhaps greater accuracy—has long been a regular part of most daily newspapers.

On the Mail Tribune, as it has grown, the women's section under Mrs. Starcher's guidance has grown too, and now on a regular basis covers far more than the parties of "the 400," the current weddings and engagements, or the activities of the lodges and clubs of the city—although these are not skimped, either.

Her Sunday picture pages have covered a wide variety of subjects, from wild flowers to water skiing, and from homemaking to the activities of the great decisions groups.

The church section is relatively a more recent development. And on the Mail Tribune, only in recent years has it had the growth to which we feel it is entitled—representing, as it does, a major area of interest and activity for an increasing number of our readers.

At the ceremony in New York last night at which Miss Hutchinson accepted the award for the Mail Tribune and a citation for herself, a brief message from the newspaper, outlining its beliefs about religious news coverage, was read. It said:

"A good newspaper is, in effect, a mirror held up to the face of the community it serves. It prints the news—which is to say that it tells the story of what happens to people, and what people do, what they think, what they believe, and what they hope.

"An important part of this responsibility to mirror the community is the obligation to report the spiritual life of the community, largely through the activities of its religious institutions, for they are the outlets through which people give expression to their religious beliefs.

"We plan our church coverage in the belief that church news is, in truth, news; that it should extend beyond the simple listing of services and sermon topics, and that our readers are better served when we make the effort to make religious news coverage a significant part of our day-to-day operation."

We are proud of our girls. They certainly deserved the awards they have received.

We are equally proud of the people who work, mostly anonymously, to turn out the other parts of the paper—the sports pages, the farm page, the general news pages for both local and telegraph news.

It is no secret that we make mistakes, both of commission and omission. But that is true of all newspapers, despite the most conscientious efforts to avoid them.

What this editorial is all about, really, is to say that it is the constant endeavor of the Mail Tribune to bring its readers the best, most complete, best-written and best-edited paper it is within our power to produce.

When our people win awards such as those which Mrs. Starcher and Miss Hutchinson have won, we are delighted, pleased, and proud.

But our objective, of course, is not to win awards—it is to bring our readers a constantly improving daily newspaper.

E. A.

"PEG" HUTCHINSON GIVEN HONOR AS RELIGIOUS WRITER—WRITER IN NEW YORK TO ACCEPT AWARDS

The Mail Tribune last night was presented with an award of merit for distinguished coverage of religious news during 1957.

The award was one of three presented. The others went to the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press and the United Press Association.

The award was presented at the Riverside Church in New York City, and was accepted by Miss Peggyann Hutchinson, church news editor for the Mail Tribune, who herself was cited for "her extremely fair, accurate, and complete reports of religious activities in the Medford district," which have "won for her the confidence of ministers and all church people in the Mail Tribune's circulation area."

CASSELS RECEIVES AWARD

The awards were presented by the National Religious Publicity Council at the 29th annual convention of the Association of Professional Religious Public Relations and Publicity Personnel. Receiving the award for the United Press was Louis Cassels, of Washington (whose byline has frequently appeared in the Mail Tribune), and for the Free Press, the award was received by Adrian Fuller, religion editor.

The Mail Tribune's citation said:

"The Medford Mail Tribune is known for its high standards of professional journalism not only throughout its home State of Oregon but throughout the Nation. In 1934 it received a Pulitzer award 'for the most disinterested and meritorious public service rendered by any American newspaper during the year 1933.' It has always maintained the high caliber of reporting and editorializing which won for it that most respected of journalism awards."

SHOWN BY REPORTS

"Part of the public service rendered by the Mail Tribune is the unfailing attention it pays to news of the activities and interests of all religious organizations in Jackson County. This is shown by its full reports on through-the-week events in the life of the county's 80 churches, the considerable space given each Friday to stories and photographs concerning local religious activities, and the regular reporting of the wider State and national affiliations of Jackson County church men and women.

"Because the Medford Mail Tribune has an established policy of portraying reverently and completely the principal religious festivals and events important in the life of its community, without neglecting the wider national and world setting of these events, the National Religious Publicity Council presents to it this award of merit."

DEDICATED WORKER

Miss Hutchinson's award said:

"Miss Peggyann Hutchinson combines, to an unusual degree, the qualifications making for a superior type of religious news writer. She is, first of all, a dedicated church worker, a Sunday-school teacher, and a faithful member of her congregation. As a devoted Christian she brings to her journalistic tasks the insight, sympathy, and understanding which gives an added dimension to her news stories.

Her wide experience as a journalist with the United States Navy for 4 years and broad educational background in news and communication techniques, including radio and television, has given her an exceptional preparation for her present service as religion editor of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune. Her extremely fair, accurate, and complete reports of religious activities in the Medford district have won her the confidence of ministers and all church people in the Mail Tribune's circulation area.

"Because her personal efforts and professional dedication to her work as a daily journalist have contributed immeasurably to the understanding and knowledge which readers of the Mail Tribune have of religious affairs, the National Religious Publicity Council is honored to receive her as a fellow of this council."

FLEW TO NEW YORK

Miss Hutchinson flew to New York to receive the award, and will return next week. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ansley E. Hutchinson, 912 South Holly Street, Medford, and is a member of the First Presbyterian Church here. She has been with the Mail-Tribune since 1956.

The citation to the United Press read, in part:

"Through its assignment of its most respected and experienced writers to cover events important in the life of religious groups, the United Press has shown that it regards religion as an integral aspect of modern life, which cannot be separated from the other affairs of men."

The citation to the Detroit Free Press noted that the newspaper "has earned for itself an honored place on the growing list of American daily newspapers which are giving religion the high place it deserves in their news and editorial columns."

Unsolved Problems of Natural Resources Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, as human population grows and the economy expands, the wise use of natural resources becomes increasingly the concern of all thoughtful citizens. This is evident to Members of Congress not only in the volume of legislation involving resource management, but also in the fact that more and more frequently we are hearing from our constituents about conservation matters.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to a clear-visioned speech delivered by Mr. William E. Towell, director of the Missouri Conservation Commission, at the 23d North American wildlife conference held March 3 to 5, 1958, in St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Towell, a native of St. James, Mo., is a career conservationist. After 20 years with the Missouri department but while yet a young man, he is gaining distinction as an able administrator and leader among that growing body of professionally trained people who man our State and Federal conservation agencies. America is fortunate to have these dedicated public servants.

Speaking before the conference which annually is the largest assembly of conservation leaders and workers on this continent, and probably in the world, Mr. Towell made clear that resource waste is an uncured cancer eating at the

vitals of America. I commend to you his thoughtful and forceful address:

NATURAL RESOURCES GOING OUT THE WINDOW

(By William E. Towell, director, Missouri Conservation Commission)

"Going out the window" is a phrase that has developed specific meaning through usage. It implies waste. It signifies the act of throwing things away, never to be regained. The title of this paper, therefore, suggests that we are destroying our natural resources. In case there be any doubt, I think we are destroying them. According to the laws of physics, matter cannot be destroyed—only changed in form. But if the new form is not more beneficial to society than the original form, then there is a loss—not to matter, perhaps, but to mankind. At the very best, we are not getting wisest use for the greatest number.

The fight for conservation can never be relaxed, and we must direct the fight. Our enemies are greed, selfishness, apathy—and ignorance. Some of the most appalling misuses of natural resources are perpetrated under the banner of conservation. Even in apparently legitimate conservation projects, we may close the windows of waste to open larger doors of destruction. We must consider 1978 as well as 1958; we must consider the whole complex of human use instead of the individual project.

We cannot possibly consider all natural resources in the time allotted to this panel; I can only attempt to highlight a few that most demand we close the windows of waste. In our minds we must still reserve room in which to consider long-range effects of atomic radiation, of air pollution and of powerful new pesticides on both man and wildlife. But for now, let us consider some of the windows where the forces of conservation can best stop the wastage of natural resources.

Soil and water are the two most basic resources of life. You and I know this; we have repeated it over and over again. But how many people really recognize the obvious fact that man, no less than all other members of the plant and animal kingdoms, is utterly dependent upon the availability of soil and water in sufficient quantity and quality. Civilizations and cultures die when these resources are exhausted or even degraded. We need only look back into the history of northeast Africa or southeast Asia for the proof. Lands once prosperous are now sterile deserts. Though science today can transform seemingly abundant resources into food, clothing, and shelter—and probably more ways will be found to produce these essentials synthetically—our ultimate survival still rests with water and the soil. We had best not assume that science will save us; science can also destroy us.

Soil resources are going out the window: agricultural production in America is not geared to the food requirements of the Nation, but to the competition for wealth. Subsidies to maintain guaranteed higher prices stimulate greater production—not for food but to add to growing surpluses. Again and again our western wheatlands are lifted by the winds to darken the eastern skies—just to produce crops that are not to be eaten. Acreage allotments encourage the farmer to grow uncontrolled crops or force greater production from fewer acres. In any case, our soil is the poorer.

We read that millions of tons of topsoil are deposited in the Gulf of Mexico every year, (and you almost can see the earth's passage from your hotel window). Yet what percentage of Midwest farmlands are protected by terraces, contouring, and grassed waterways? The size-supremacy of Texas may be threatened by the growing delta of Louisiana (if you'll pardon a minor exaggeration for emphasis), but I think you will agree our soil resources are going out the window.

Water resources, too, are pouring over the sill. One of the few things keeping pace with the population surge of the United States and Mexico, and possibly Canada, is the consumption of water. Water tables drop lower and lower as the demand goes up and up. As water supplies grow less in critical areas, which needs will suffer most? Will the greatest good for the greatest number determine priorities? And who will decide where the good and number are to be judged? Already these questions are acute in some localities—but they remain unanswered. Antiquated water laws, or the absence of any controls at all, threaten wildlife and recreational interests. Fishing and recreation were ruled out as greatest good for the greatest number at the John Martin Reservoir in southeastern Colorado. Under the prior-appropriation doctrine, floodwaters stored in the reservoir had to be released when irrigation demands imposed their prior rights. Will obsolete laws influence court decisions and new legislation in States just beginning to face up to their water problems?

Shortages in critical areas and conflicting interests in use are only two phases of our water concern. A growing problem, along with a booming population and industrial expansion, is the abuse of water that makes it unfit for further use—pollution. In spite of Federal and State pollution control legislation, many streams throughout the Nation are simply open sewers. It seems barbaric that in 1958 a civilization such as ours can still foul its nest by dumping poisons into its streams. The water we drink in Jefferson City comes from the sewers at Omaha, St. Joseph, and Kansas City. Municipal and industrial wastes, dumped raw into stream channels, constitute one of conservation's greatest challenges: not only as an enormous public health problem but as a serious waste of fish, waterfowl and recreational resources.

Only a determined fight in the last session of Congress kept pollution control appropriations in the budget. Even a greater fight looms ahead, because the President has told Congress that this program should be discontinued entirely after the next fiscal year—although the bill for navigational development on the wild Missouri River was much higher than the water-pollution money for all rivers. For every barge on the Missouri, a half-million people must drink from it. Our fight for water is only beginning. Conservationists will face determined opposition from shortsighted industries and municipalities before the trend is really reversed.

A more insidious situation has become apparent lately, since industry has become public relations conscious. Knowing it dare no longer openly oppose pollution control measures, industry often joins the fight to shape legislation that is so watered down as to be scarcely effective, and conservation wins a hollow victory. By and large, the only forces openly opposed to pollution control are large municipalities which fear tax rises should pollution control become a reality. We can deal with opponents—but who will save us from our "friends"?

Constant vigilance is required to gain recognition of wildlife and recreation values for the public in flood control, irrigation and hydroelectric impoundments built with that public's money. Government ownership of shorelines has been forcefully advocated by conservationists, just to insure that the paying public may have access to these lakes. Previously Federal agencies had adopted a policy of only partly controlling lake shores under flooding easements. Proposed amendments to the Federal Coordination Act of 1946 would require evaluation of wildlife and recreation gains or losses before any new projects are authorized. These amendments would also require appraisal of the effects on these resources for impoundments previously authorized but not yet started. These changes are of utmost importance to all wildlife conservationists—but they will require a fight for the public interest.

In a determined battle, conservationists have so far blocked appropriations for the proposed Bruces Eddy Dam on the North Fork of Idaho's Clearwater River. This big flood control—hydroelectric project would stop spawning salmon and steelhead trout from migrating to one of their biggest breeding areas and would flood a major winter feeding range of elk and deer. In 1955 Congress authorized studies of the effect of this impoundment upon fish and game resources but proponents are unwilling to wait for the results of these studies. Some of the impoundment's opponents urge construction of Hell's Canyon Dam on Snake River as an alternate to Bruces Eddy that would not be so destructive to wildlife. Basically, this fight is for more than fish and big game—as most such struggles are. It involves major political issues and the battle between public-power and private-power factions. But fish and game conservationists must be ready to rally against this or any other threat to these resources or out the window they will go. Wildlife cannot be isolated from land and water decisions.

Another battle is being waged in the marshlands and in the pothole country to save waterfowl from threatened destruction. Northern nesting potholes are disappearing at an alarming rate under the stimulus of agricultural subsidies so that crops may be raised to go uneaten both in the United States and in Canada. Marshes and swamps along the flyways are being drained constantly for agricultural and industrial developments. The rate of waterfowl habitat loss far exceeds the rate of wetland acquisition by Federal and State agencies. Ducks and geese are flying out the window because there are fewer places for them to rest, feed, and breed. Meanwhile, the places left for waterfowl are under attack by agricultural forces because ducks and geese eat nearby grain—grain already in surplus supply.

We argue among ourselves on how to finance this urgent program of wetland acquisition: That is, how we can supply with the right hand what the left hand is taking away. The need for increased Duck Stamp fees is generally agreed upon, but we do not agree upon a sufficient amount to reverse the drainage trend. It is our job, if we are to promote wildlife conservation, to convince the sportsmen that they will have to pay the costs necessary to preserve these resources. We cannot afford to make this another feeble attempt of "too little and too late."

Wetland needs of waterfowl should receive primary consideration in planning of all large impoundments. The proposed Kasinger Bluff Reservoir in western Missouri, for example, could become a major waterfowl haven, without lessening its effectiveness for flood control. But multiple uses and secondary benefits such as this must be recognized and included in the early planning stages of water developments.

It is difficult, and perhaps unwise, to separate those resources actually going out the window from those that are being pushed dangerously close to the ledge. There are constant threats by private interests seeking to gain control of public forests and recreation areas for purely personal gains. Grazing interests never abate their longing to acquire control of Federal rangelands. Lumbering interests covet all remaining virgin timber under Government control. Fish, game, and recreation values have to withstand the determined competition of mining claims, oil leases, inundation, or the clutch of the military for airfields or bombing ranges. The

defensive struggle to maintain a sane balance never ceases.

Forest resources cannot be separated from the soil, from flood control or water storage, from wildlife or recreation. All are interwoven into a complex ecological pattern, and when one thread is broken the whole fabric begins to unravel. But in many ways forest resources, too, are making dramatic exits out the open windows. According to Timber Resources Review (U. S. Forest Service, 1955), fire is potentially the greatest forest enemy—but in 1952 insects killed 7 times as much sawtimber as fire did, and disease killed 3 times as much. Together these 3 destructive agents killed nearly 13 billion board-feet of sawtimber in 1 year. Perhaps of greater significance is that these losses amounted to 44 billion board-feet of potential growth.

Even though fire losses in our forests are now greatly exceeded by losses from insects and disease, this does not mean that fire protection activities can be relaxed. Expansion of fire-control efforts is needed everywhere, particularly to areas now lacking organized protection, for fire still remains the greatest potential enemy. But our new challenge is primarily one of organized protection from other forest enemies, principally insects and disease. And I think we must face up to our wasteful methods of forest utilization. Of every 4 cubic feet of timber cut, 1 cubic foot is wasted. It goes out the window in the form of sawdust, slabs or usable logs left to rot in the woods.

Still another challenge is the 115 million acres of forest land and in which less than 40 percent of the trees are desirable species. One-fourth of our commercial forest area is producing less than half of the timber that this land is capable of growing. In fact, many open windows are draining away America's forest wealth with unspectacular trickles that have cumulative effects.

Furthermore, we must continue to insist upon a correlation of efforts between foresters and wildlife people. The multiple-use—and wise use—of forests is our constant concern.

We have seen several wildlife species disappear completely through open windows: the passenger pigeon, the Carolina parakeet, the heath hen. Other species like the sage grouse and the whooping crane are barely hanging on to the sill, waiting for us to shut the window or to kick them on out.

What are we doing to stem the tide of habitat destruction? Are we going to sacrifice our remaining game because it cannot compete with the modern exploitive agriculture? The conservation reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act and the small watershed program under Public Law 566 offer great possibilities to slow the rate of habitat losses. Are we taking full advantage of these opportunities? In fact, do we know how we can take such advantage? And are we also proposing further measures?

Other means must be found to encourage private landowners to manage their lands for game production. If we do not find some way to aid the farmer in providing beneficial wildlife practices, either wildlife goes out the window entirely or it remains only with those few who can afford to lease private hunting areas and pay for the necessary wildlife management. Unless we find a better solution, commercial put-and-take hunting areas may be the only answer for many sportsmen. The best waterfowl areas and big game ranges will be available only to a financially privileged few. I do not believe that building public fishing lakes and acquiring public hunting areas is enough of an answer for us, either. Our chief responsibility is to maintain wildlife production on private lands, and at the same time make it available for public harvest.

Land use is not the only window out of which wildlife is going. Antiquated views on sportsmanship and game laws contribute to such fallacies as permitting the harvest of only buck deer from herds far outnumbering the capacity of their range. Well-meaning sportsmen abhor the thought of killing a mother deer or her fawn but do not seem to grasp the fact that they will otherwise die of starvation and disease or fall to predators. Nature's harvest is ruthless, but sure.

Fisheries management is complicated by a similar problem—major fishing pressure concentrated upon a few favored game fish species. On one of our big impoundments in Missouri, 85 percent of the total fish production is of the so-called rough species; yet, the annual harvest from this lake includes only 15 percent of these species. Game fish production suffers from this competition of overpopulated nongame types. But when more liberal methods of harvest are proposed or commercialism is permitted, there is immediate objection by the fishing public.

It is inevitable that some natural resources will go out the window. Progress cannot be made without mistakes; advancement will always cost something. The mere fact that we recognize some of our own inconsistencies indicates progress.

But some of our lost resources represent impure and simple waste. No one can condone waste, although we attempt to justify the squandering exploits of early pioneers and somewhat later industries on the grounds that the supplies of resources then seemed inexhaustable. But today we take our stands—or say we do—against waste for economic or political expediency. We are wise, now; we know that the resources are not unlimited. But waste continues.

Despite our preoccupation with atomic power, satellites, and intercontinental ballistic missiles, our strength—even our lives—still depends upon soil and water, forests and minerals, and upon the plants and animals which they produce. The base supporting everything we call man and his civilization is the raw materials provided by nature; culture is only our ability to use these materials. And the most important culture of all, the one which we can never afford to let escape through open windows, is the organized effort of conservationists to preserve our heritage—which has made possible our prosperity, our progress and our strength as a nation—our natural resources.

I want to make this one last observation. In the struggle today between nations, we say we are defending our way of life by spending huge sums in building air bases around the world, in buying loyalties of other nations, in building satellites and warheads, in using all our resources for defense. Are we heading into a situation where, because of hysteria and fear, we may spend all our true wealth, the natural resources? Someone must see that we do not build a Maginot Line solely to defend the resources already expended in building it. That someone, I think, will have to be us.

Methodist Church in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the information of the Members of Congress and readers of the RECORD the following letter received from the Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church—one of our great Christian churches—as well as the resolutions referred to. The thoughtful objectivity evidenced in the resolutions merits like consideration:

HAWAIIAN MISSION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Honolulu, T. H., April 18, 1958.

Hon. JOHN A. BURNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please find enclosed with this letter copies of resolutions pertaining to statehood, nuclear fallout, and manmade satellites. These resolutions were adopted at the annual meeting of the Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church held in Honolulu, March 16, 1958.

We are forwarding these resolutions to your office for your information and record. We believe that these matters are of interest to you and commend them to your use in our behalf.

We appreciate very much the services you are rendering our Territory as our Delegate to Congress. With every good wish to you and your staff, we are

Sincerely yours,
HARRY S. KOMURO,
Superintendent,
Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church.
ROLAND D. SAGUM,
Chairman,
Commission on Christian Social Concern.

RESOLUTION ON STATEHOOD

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has repeatedly demonstrated its political maturity; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have again and again voiced a desire to become full members of the United States; and

Whereas the present status of Territory imposes certain limitations upon the democratic rights of the people; and

Whereas both political parties have repeatedly promised statehood to Hawaii; and

Whereas a constitution has been written and approved, pending establishment of Hawaii as a State; and

Whereas the 1956 general conference of the Methodist Church endorsed statehood for Hawaii: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Hawaii mission annual meeting now in session go on record in favor of immediate passage of a bill in Congress to bring the Territory of Hawaii into full statehood.

(Hawaii mission of the Methodist Church in annual session, March 16, 1958.)

RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR FALLOUT

Whereas a significant number of scientists of international reputation in the field of nuclear physics are deeply concerned over the increased percentage of radioactivity in the atmosphere; and

Whereas representatives of Government and some scientists have denied the existence of any present danger; but

Whereas all are agreed that there is considerable increase in radiation; and

Whereas they also agree that at some point such radiation is a threat both to those living now and to generations yet unborn; and

Whereas there are now stockpiled enough nuclear weapons to create that threat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Nation to take the moral leadership of the world in seeking international agreements to limit experimentation in this field to that which can be conducted without risking the physical welfare of the population of the earth, and to provide a universal plan of nuclear control. We further urge that research in

the peaceful use of nuclear power be intensified and that results be considered public information.

(Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church in annual session, March 16, 1958.)

RESOLUTIONS ON MANMADE SATELLITES

Whereas the launching of research satellites we believe to be a giant stride in the field of scientific knowledge; and

Whereas scientific findings have traditionally been in the public domain: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government to release to the general public such scientific data as it gains from satellites.

Whereas artificial satellites have been successfully projected into space; and

Whereas manned exploration of space seems imminent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the creation of a United Nations authority for the control of such explorations, and declare that any bases established in space or upon the moon, or upon any planet, shall be subject to United Nations authority. Further, we urge that this authority have the power of enforcement, and that, to this end, the United Nations be given ultimate regulatory powers over all space carriers of either men or material.

(Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church in annual session, March 16, 1958.)

Walter Reuther's Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bob Siegrist's daily radio news commentary program over station WLS and WGEZ is being handled by Dr. J. B. Matthews while Mr. Siegrist is on vacation.

In today's broadcast, Dr. Matthews details some of his views on Walter Reuther and his philosophy, based on his many years of research and personal acquaintance with the three Reuther brothers.

Dr. Matthews' broadcast is as follows:

I propose to show that the very foundations of Walter Reuther's career were erected, first, on ruthless violence; second, a typically Communist disregard of the rights of private property which are observed in every civilized society; and, third, a revolutionary defiance of law and order.

Walter Reuther is a many-sided personality. When he chooses, he is the ranting Socialist orator who strives to incite class prejudice and the mob spirit. At other times, he is the polished demagog, giving forth with an urbanity of speech which leaves the so-called intellectuals entranced.

The well-known political essayist, Peter Drucker, says that American politics have undergone a revolutionary change during the past 60 years. We have made, writes Drucker, a transition from Mark Hanna to Walter Reuther.

If Drucker is only half right, the American people will do well to learn all about the background of Walter Reuther. If Reuther is to crown his political career by becoming the Socialist equivalent of Mark Hanna, the sooner his record is fully exposed, the better off we will all be.

Reuther was weaned on socialism, went through a phase of pro-Stalinism, and has reverted to socialism in its modern dress of welfare statism and anti-anticommunism. He is a national board member of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action. He is also vice president of the socialistic United World Federalist.

Inasmuch as Walter Reuther has not repudiated any of his past, it is relevant to any consideration of his present.

For more than 25 years, I have followed the amazing career of Walter Reuther closely—from his student days when he was a campus Socialist agitator to his present pinnacle of power as a labor-union leader.

I met Reuther personally during the 1932 election campaign when he and I were both stumping for Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party.

Reuther, then a student at Detroit's City College, invited me to speak before the school's Social Problems Club which he had organized and of which he had characteristically become the chairman.

A few weeks after the 1932 election, Walter and his brother Victor decided to abandon their formal education in favor of a less academic preparation for their careers. They decided to spend some time in the workers' paradise of the Soviet Union.

And so in February 1933 Walter and Victor came to New York on the first lap of their journey to Russia. A small group of Socialists, of which I was one, gave the young Reuthers a dinner party the evening they sailed. After dinner, we saw them off on the boat.

For years, the Reuthers have tried hard to distort the facts of their travel to, and their stay within, the Soviet Union. It has been made to appear that they simply went on a general world bicycle tour, covering more than a score of countries without any special interest in any one of them.

The fact is that the Reuthers were absent from the United States from February 1933 until October 1935, a period of at least 32 months. More than half of that time was spent in the Soviet Union.

I can say of my own knowledge that there was no secret about the Reuther boys' bubbling eagerness to get to the Soviet Union. This was evident in their dinner conversation the evening they sailed from New York. Several of us at the dinner party had already been to the Soviet Union and that was the main topic of discussion with the Reuthers. The workers' fatherland was the real goal of the Reuthers when they boarded ship in New York Harbor; and a prolonged residence in the workers' fatherland was the goal they had achieved when they walked down the gangplank in San Francisco almost 3 years later.

I should say here that the term "workers' fatherland" was standard Communist jargon in those days; and in a letter home the Reuthers used that term in referring to the Soviet Union.

Once established in jobs in the large automobile plant at Gorky in the Soviet Union, the Reuthers wrote with almost hysterical enthusiasm about the achievements of communism in Stalin's slave state. They contrasted conditions in the Soviet Union with life in the United States, to the emphatic disparagement of the latter.

You have all heard about the now-famous letter which the Reuther boys wrote to Melvin and Gladys Bishop in January 1934. This letter runs to approximately 1,500 words. It gushes with maudlin sentimentality over almost every aspect of life under communism. I give you a single passage from the letter. The Reuthers wrote: "We are watching daily socialism being taken down from the books on the shelves and put into actual application. Who would not be inspired by such events?"

While Walter and Victor Reuther were being inspired by the applications of socialism in the Soviet Union, millions of Russians were being herded off to a living death in slave-labor camps. While the Reuthers were being inspired by the trappings of Stalin's tyranny, millions of Russians were literally starving to death as a result of the Kremlin's applications of socialism. I, myself, was in the Soviet Union a few months before the arrival of the Reuthers and, with my own eyes, I witnessed scenes of indescribable horror. At every stop of the train on which I was a passenger, I saw thousands of men, women, and children fighting like maddened animals to get aboard the train—just trying desperately to get somewhere else, any place as long as it meant getting away from where they were.

It is characteristic of the Communist mind, once it has been committed to Socialist dogmas, to look upon the terrors of socialism merely as regrettable necessities—or even as supporting evidence of Socialist progress.

One passage in the famous letter of the Reuther boys has been little noted, if at all. It may provide a significant key to Walter Reuther's career. The letter says: "The workers in England have more culture and polish when they speak at their meetings, but they have no power. I prefer the latter." Yes; preference for power above almost everything else has characterized Walter Reuther's ascent to the heights of labor union leadership and political power.

There is not the slightest doubt about the authenticity of the Reuthers' letter to Melvin and Gladys Bishop. Roy Reuther, the third of the brothers, showed me the letter in Flint, Mich., on February 20, 1934. I am able to pin down the exact place and date because my records show that I was in Flint on that date lecturing for the League for Industrial Democracy. Roy Reuther attended my lecture and afterward showed me the letter.

I knew Roy well, having seen him many times while he was a student at Brookwood Labor College in Katonah, N. Y., where assorted radicals of Stalinist, Trotskyist, Lovestoneite, and socialist persuasion were studying to become union organizers. On showing me his brothers' letter from the Soviet Union, Roy remarked with obvious distress that Walter and Victor had apparently gone completely Stalinist.

I also knew Roy Reuther during that period as a member of the revolutionary policy committee, a small group of Socialist Party members who were trying to execute a party-splitting maneuver under the secret leadership of a well-known Communist.

While it was definitely anti-Stalinist, the Revolutionary Policy Committee was out-and-out Communist in its ideology. As a member of the RPC's national committee, Roy Reuther subscribed to the following Communist doctrine. "Workers' councils organized in direct response to a growing revolutionary situation shall constitute the basic unit or organs by which the working class can carry through an armed insurrection."

I have discussed my acquaintance with Roy Reuther in order to show the whys and wherefores of his reaction to the pro-Stalinist letters of his brothers, and the reason for his telling me about it.

Compensation of Military Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Law Journal for March 31, 1958, an enlightening editorial discussing the need for adequate compensation and incentives for lawyers in the armed services. The editorial discusses the testimony recently given before the Senate and House Armed Services Committees by the American Bar Association regarding the problems the armed services meet in recruiting and retaining in the service qualified lawyers.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPENSATION OF MILITARY LAWYERS

The American Bar Association has informed Congress that the legal branches of the armed services are having so much trouble recruiting and holding lawyer personnel, that they are in danger of being unable to perform the mandatory functions required by the code of military justice.

The trouble, according to a report of a special ABA committee, lies in inequities in the pay schedules that apply to military lawyers. The report explained that lawyers in the military do not now receive adequate pay or career incentives comparable to what they could earn either in civilian practice or as civilian lawyers for the Government.

A recently completed ABA survey of 2,700 lawyers in the military services revealed that among young lawyers serving obligated tours of duty, over 99 percent planned to leave the services as soon as they completed their first enlistment periods. Eighty percent of the senior officers said they would leave as soon as they finished their minimum 20-year service period qualifying them to retire.

The American Bar Association house of delegates has gone on record as favoring the pending Thurmond bill (S. 1165) which would offer adequate compensation and incentives and would tend to equalize pay scales as between lawyers and other professional personnel in the services. That legislation is being actively supported by the ABA's special committee on lawyers in the Armed Forces under the chairmanship of Osmer C. Fitts, of Brattleboro, Vt. The committee's report was laid before the Senate and House Armed Services Committees now studying military pay legislation.

In a separate statement submitted to the Senate committee, ABA President Charles S. Rhyne pointed out that military law is a highly technical field requiring officer-lawyers of above average ability and experience.

"Therein lies the interest of the American Bar Association," he said. "The legal departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force are at this time providing legal services with approximately 50 percent inexperienced legal professional personnel * * *. There is no question that the efficiency of the legal services is impaired by the constant and expensive turnover of military lawyers."

At the present time inexperienced lawyers are called upon to handle legal work involving millions of dollars of Government money and also courts-martial cases involving the death penalty—tasks which normally would be assigned to mature, experienced lawyers.

The ABA survey of military lawyers disclosed that about 79 percent of all those replying to the questionnaire said they would reconsider plans to leave the services if the Thurmond bill is enacted and professional pay scales equalized.

Speaking of the "critical nature" of the problem of retaining experienced personnel in the legal branches, the ABA report says in part:

"The legal departments of the military services are facing a serious personnel shortage * * *. The critical nature of the situation is pointedly affirmed by the recent experience of the Judge Advocate General's department of the Air Force, when 238 applications for regular status were received for 387 spaces, as contrasted with 60,000 applications from Air Force line officers for approximately 20,000 spaces.

"Unless corrective action is taken, the legal departments will not be sufficiently manned with experienced lawyers to perform the mandatory functions prescribed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice."

In referring to the "inequities in pay within the military services" which compels the military lawyer to serve for "less pay throughout his career than either his line or professional contemporaries," the report emphasizes that the present heavy turnover of personnel in the JAG departments is excessively costly to the Government.

Every career officer that stays in the service eliminates the need for three newly commissioned officers each 7 years, the report said. The present replacement program is costing the Government at least $2,100,000 yearly, it added, estimating the annual cost of the Thurmond bill plan at about $6,500,000.

"Therefore, the cost of such legislation will be partially offset by the lessened rate of turnover," the report said.

Honor the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article from the Chelsea (Mass.) Record, for April 21, 1958, which merits the attention of all the readers of the RECORD.

HONOR THE TAXPAYERS

This revised version of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address has a present-day application:

"Twoscore and four years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new misery, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created taxable. Now we are engaged in a great long form, testing whether that taxpayer, or any other taxpayer so confused and so frustrated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that struggle. We have come to dedicate a portion of our income to the great causes, useless and foolish, which have taken our money that this Nation might continue to support other nations. And yet, in a larger sense, we cannot afford, we have not got, we will not have, this hallowed money. For the brave taxpayers, broke and penniless, who paid here have dedicated it far above our poor power to add, subtract, multiply, divide, refer to separate schedule Z, etc. The world will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue will never forget it if we don't. It is for us, the living, rather to be here dedicated to the unfinished payments which they who made here have thus far so reluctantly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the tremendous payments still remaining before us—that from the examples of these financially bankrupt we take increased deductions for the cause for which they gave the last full measure of their money—that we here highly resolve that these paupers shall not have forked over in vain, that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall have a new birth of lower taxes and higher wages, and that government of the taxpayer, by the taxpayer, for the taxpayer, shall not perish from the earth."

Use of the Word "Recession"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce under the leadership of John B. Alexander, its president, and its very effective secretary, Frank M. King, has adopted a resolution memoralizing the press, radio, TV, and public officials to avoid the use of the word recession.

The resolution points out that there is a dynamic growth in the San Francisco Bay area and urges that all concerned assume a positive attitude on the current economic situation.

While there is a dynamic growth in this area, and that growth will continue, nevertheless, the unemployed within the area are not going to be impressed by semantics. The butcher, baker, and candlestick maker who is a member of the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce will hesitate to take words instead of money for goods.

I think it well that we look up and not down in trying to work our way out of the paradoxical economic condition in which the country finds itself facing rising prices and rising unemployment. I commend the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce for urging all of us to renew our confidence in the ability of this country to go forward.

Text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION TO BAY AREA PRESS, RADIO, TELEVISION, STATE ASSEMBLYMEN, STATE SENATORS, UNITED STATES CONGRESSMEN, UNITED STATES SENATORS, AND EVERYBODY ELSE

Whereas San Leandro enjoys a healthy economic climate and the area's employment is generally at a high level; and

Whereas the entire San Francisco Bay area region is experiencing a similar dynamic growth; and

Whereas there is a need for constant and universal positive thinking by all forms of mass media, by California and Federal legislators and everybody else: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce board of directors strongly and unconditionally recommends that all forms of mass media, and that all State and Federal legislators representing the San Francisco Bay area, and everybody else do in-

mediately assume a positive attitude on the current economic situation; and therefore, be it further

Resolved, That the constant and needless use of the misleading word recession be eliminated, axed, excluded, abandoned, eradicated, extirpated, ejected, jettisoned, dumped, ousted, parted with, discarded as useless trash, thrown out, heaved overboard, scattered to the four winds, and put the kibosh on in all forms of printed and spoken information; and therefore, be it further

Resolved, That all mass media present their careful analyses of business conditions in a positive manner and that State and Federal legislators representing this area and everybody else constantly reflect this positive attitude in all activities.

Unanimously adopted April 17, 1958.

JOHN D. ALEXANDER, *President*.
FRANK M. KING, *Secretary*.

Directors of the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce today called upon communication officials and newsmen of the bay area press, radio, television, as well as State and National legislators to eliminate all use of the needless and misleading word "recession" in their work.

The chamber's action came on the basis of the city's healthy economic climate and the similar dynamic growth which the entire San Francisco Bay area is experiencing. A recent summary of San Leandro construction projects just completed, underway or planned total more than $22 million in investment and will add 2,000 or more employees when in full operation.

Chamber directors' unanimously approved resolution came following a kickoff campaign luncheon by the chamber and San Leandro auto dealers urging the public to buy the things they need and want now. This psychology is in line with President Eisenhower's stated position that the so-called economic dip is psychological, and maintenance of our prosperity only requires continuation of sound purchasing practices by consumers to protect the economy, said Chamber President John D. Alexander.

With the chamber's slogan "Buy Now—Boost Jobs—And How," chamber leaders heard William Martin, top executive from Detroit's Chrysler headquarters, speak on the value of retailers and all businesses moving goods in terms of fulfilling needs and wants. This can be done with creative selling and the proper attitude on the part of the public.

Otto Z. Fox, Charleston, S. C., Receives America's Highest Brand Names Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent testimonial dinner in New York City, Brand Names Foundation, an organization designed and created for the purpose of protecting legitimate products by the producers of commodities familiar to every American, awarded a bronze plaque as a top award for 1957 competition to Otto Z. Fox, owner of Fox Music House, Charleston, S. C. This bronze award was the result of Mr. Fox's having been selected from the competition of 134 firms and 25 retail categories. The ceremonies attendant to this fine and distinguished honor awarded to my friend, this outstanding Charlestonian, culminated a week's celebration, and it was held in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in the great city of New York on April 16, 1958.

Charleston and the Nation are proud of Mr. Fox. Mr. Fox is identified with the civic and community pride for which Charleston has been famous over the centuries. Mr. Fox never loses an opportunity to contribute to every program designed for the betterment of the vast and sprawling community of Charleston. He is a fervent believer in the American enterprise system and the right of small business to exist in this era in which big business is getting bigger and little business is getting smaller. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress this singular and outstanding contribution Mr. Fox has made to music and to the industry which produces the finest musical instruments the world has ever known.

This week, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fox visited me in Washington and was my guest along with his charming wife for lunch in the Capitol of the United States. I want the records of the Congress to show that from the city of Charleston came the outstanding music dealer in the Nation for 1957, and I want the RECORD to show that this fine American achieved this honor in one of the most competitive communities the world has ever known. He achieved this distinction in an era when the capacity to stay in business taxes every fiber of every business and every sinew of every American.

An Untapped Pool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reservists and the Reserve program have always been among my prime concerns. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Armed Services Committee, I have a great responsibility to the Nation for overseeing the Reserve program of the Department of Defense. Much commendable progress has been made during the past years but I and my subcommittee are constantly looking for even more improvement in the Department's Reserve policies and programs.

In that connection, the Air Force has recently developed a program deserving of recognition and praise from Congress. I refer to the joint efforts of the Air Research and Development Command and the Continental Air Command to better utilize for defense purposes the talents and scientific knowledge of Air Force reservists. Their aim is to employ the pool of untapped Reserve scientists.

An article in the April issue of the Air Reservist entitled "Untapped Pool of Scientists," explains how the Air Force is making use now of the wealth of experience of its reservists, rather than waiting until after the whistle blows. Already reservists have undertaken specific research problems and special projects which have resulted in large savings to the Government. For example, Flight B of the 9263d Air Reserve Squadron of Springdale, Conn., saved the Government $150,000 through its work on intelligence and electronic warfare techniques.

This is how the reservist can pay his own way—by service rendered in peace as well as war. In fact, the Reserve research and development program could very well pay for itelf completely.

In time, scientists and technicians throughout the country will be absorbed into this very worthwhile activity. Reserve training centers across the land may find themselves involved in important research projects.

Last July I had the privilege and honor of dedicating a new Reserve center at Shreveport, La. I know that the facilities at such centers are excellent for many kinds of training and could be used for research activities as well.

My compliments to my friend Lt. Gen. "Bill" Hall, the outstanding commander of Continental Air Command and to Lt. Gen. Samuel Anderson, the capable commander of Air Research and Development Command. Further, I extend praise to all those officers and men in both commands, and the reservists themselves who are making this program so worth while.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD this article from the Air Reservist of April 1958:

UNTAPPED POOL OF SCIENTISTS

(By Fred Giachino)

There's a virtually untapped and unsolicited pool in America's Reserve Forces, and the Air Force is proving it could make a heck of a splash.

The pool includes over 6,000 air reservists, trained and in many cases eminently qualified, who are available for contributions to the advancement of the Air Force's space-age mission.

The splash is taking the form of a two-pronged program designed to utilize the scientific potential of these reservists to the maximum. The Air Research and Development and Continental Air Commands have cooonjured projects which will allow such reservists to maintain and increase valuable technical skills in fields especially needed in today's defense structure.

In addition, approximately 1,400 research and development spaces have been allotted and are being filled at 30 Continental Air Command Air Reserve Centers, Headquarters Air Research and Development Command and its subordinate commands by eligible air reservists.

Further, Air Research and Development Command is contemplating plans to involve the more than 4,500 remaining specialists wherever and whenever possible in such activities as avionics, armament, aircraft and propulsion, missiles, geophysics, nuclear systems, exploratory research, weapon systems management, human factors, and sundry other scientific free-lance studies.

EVALUATION BEING MADE

Though the latter group remains in the background pro tem, it is being evaluated for its potential. This enlightenment or recognition of the Air Reserve potential is not the result of sputniks, messers 1 or 2, but the product of considerable spadework during the past 2 years. Its basic concept

is timeless—as practical yesterday as tomorrow. Maj. Gen. Richard H. Carmichael, United States Air Force, Director of Personnel Procurement and Training, expresses it most succinctly:

"Reserve training should be geared to active establishment tasks and problems. * * * Training of this nature is more meaningful to the individual and it can make a tangible contribution toward the accomplishment of the Air Force mission * * *."

The Continental Air Command Air Reserve Centers chosen to inaugurate the plan form the primary prong of Research and Development Reserve activity. Strategically located near industrial areas where large research and development populations exist, they are expected to provide more effective training at minimum cost.

However, even though the majority of the 1,400 spaces currently allotted are being systematically diverted from other locales to the Air Reserve Centers, this phase of the program is still in its infancy. Actually, it will not be until the advent of fiscal year 1959 that the Research and Development spaces will be pinpointed in these specific centers.

Thus far, it has been the second prong which has been most active. This phase, emanating from Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command and its subordinate commands, already has seen basic projects devised and completed.

Brig. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, deputy commander for resources, declares that our real potential pay-off is during the reservists' peace time active duty tours and inactive duty training. Therefore, the program has been designed to exploit the pool of untapped Reserve scientists and to use such skills as may be found there today—not just after the whistle blows.

Perhaps the dynamo most closely allied to the planning and implementation of this program for Air reservists is Col. William R. Weber, Assistant for Reserve Affairs, Air Research and Development Command. Under the direction of Col. Arnold L. Smith, Air Research and Development Command Director of Personnel, he has taken the initial steps to acquire the necessities to make the ambitious program tick. However, from all indications, the entire command has been imbued with that sense of urgency.

Colonel Smith voices the command's sentiment in this way: "The value of the Reserve program to the Air Research and Development Command lies in the utilization of the talents of our reservists now. Our Research and Development Reserve officers represent a wealth of experience in industry and the military service, and, as such, are particularly well equipped to handle many specific research problems and special projects."

How are Air reservists being selected for Air Research and Development Command projects?

Air Research and Development Command's first or test project was typical of how and what happens. In that instance, a specified task was selected. Then on the basis of the square peg selective method employing electrical accounting machine punch cards which job-man match the available individuals while giving such pertinent information as education, experience, and proficiency in technical groupings, four qualified reservists were chosen and given the project of surveying industrial research and development facilities.

In order of rank, the pioneers are Lt. Col. Thomas Cosgrove, Lt. Col. Carl Luneke, Maj. William Djinis, and Capt. Richard Bielfoss. They were then called on active duty for 15 days at Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command.

Their problem was to develop a pilot questionnaire for sampling industry and universities pertaining to long-range planning for research and development facilities. The survey covers a group of 800 industrial corporations and its results will be used with other information being developed for final determination of the Air Force.

The work done on these questionnaires will contribute immeasurably to the future of Air Force research and development. It will facilitate Air Research and Development Command's attempt to forecast Air Force research and development requirements which must be based upon sound knowledge of existent and planned research and development facilities in industry, colleges, universities, and in Government.

The men chosen for the inaugural problem at Air Research and Development Command are indicative of the basic talents to be found within the Air Force Reserve.

Col. Cosgrove has had over 30 years' experience in electronics and general engineering fields, including engineering economics. He is currently employed by the city of New York with the mayor's bureau of the budget, and trains weekends with the New York Air Reserve Center.

His comment was typical of the four individuals chosen for the survey: "These projects give the reservists an opportunity to get into long-range Research and Development planning and allow professional experience obtained in civilian occupations to be merged with military experience and thinking.

Major Djinis, another mob assignee who trains with Gotham's Air Reserve Centers, is the senior project engineer with the Reeves Instrument Corp. His civilian duties have run the gamut of functional analyses and research, investigating such problems as automatic guidance systems, nuclear reactor control instrumentations, specialized computer systems, and the initiation of technical studies leading to new contract proposals. He has had several technical articles published and has received patents in the fields of crystal radiation detectors and thermal computer components.

Major Djinis applauds the fact that the talents and experience of reservists are being utilized to the best advantage through such problems where vital solutions are needed.

PLEASED WITH TEAM PROJECT

Colonel Luneke is from Ohio where he is a mob assignee with the Dayton Air Reserve Centers. He is one of USAF's civilian aeronautical engineers and has been employed in that capacity at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base for the past 21 years. He is especially pleased with the group or team-type of project for which he was selected, being of the mind that it utilizes the individual's capabilities to a greater degree than working an individual project.

Captain Bielfoss, an Illinoisian who trains with the Chicago Air Reserve Centers, is an estimating engineer for the Guardite Co. of Wheeling, Ill. Guardite is a division of the American Marrieta Corp. and designs and builds high-altitude aeromedical equipment for the Air Force. He is convinced that these scientific projects will increase the interest of the involved reservist in the problems of the Air Force, since it will add a greater element of value and belonging for the individual, when he has had a say in these problems.

Another excellent example of the second prong in action is the project undertaken by members of Flight B of the 9263d Air Reserve Squadron (New Haven Air Reserve Centers) of Springdale, Conn., working through the Rome Air Development Center in New York.

There was no 15-day active duty tour involved. Rather, 9263d's contribution could be a model of how responsible and qualified reservists may turn reserve time into research time.

Composed of a group of scientists and engineers, Flight B recently produced a new approach for intelligence and electronic warfare techniques which are being accepted by Air Research and Development Command for Air Force application. The unit took the initiative and contacted the Rome Air Development Center, then chose one of the several projects offered for possible study. Their completed research compares to the first phase of a study contract and has resulted in a $150,000 saving to the Government.

The findings included the successful production of several techniques pertaining to the studies of liquid level detection.

During the 6-month project, the flight submitted regular monthly activity and progress reports to the Rome Air Development Center in order to establish official control and observation of the scientific program.

The individuals involved represent some of the outstanding industrial firms in the New England area. Thus, Lt. Col. Leonard S. Horner, Majs. Charles A. Mills and Millard F. Smith, Capts. Charles O. Baughn, Jr., Alexander Bliznick, and Wayne O. Montgomery, 1st Lt. Jack E. Antes, and T. Sgt. Raymond C. Rodger may also stand up and be counted among the pioneers of the Reserve research and development forces.

Obviously, the projects discussed are not considered as merely "busy work" by either its Air Research and Development Command or Continental Air Command champions. Its enthusiastic proponents view the good they will do the Air Force, the reservist and, in turn, the Nation. During this era of mounting costs, the reservist must pay his way in value rendered in peace as well as war. The research and development program for reservists is definitely a shot in this direction.

Air Research and Development Command's Science and Warfare Office, under the guidance of Brig. Gen. Marvin C. Demler, deputy commander for research and development, has been a prime advocate in the utilization of Air Reservists. The general acknowledges that Air Research and Development Command has many problems in which reservists can contribute. He recently summed up the aim of the command toward such individuals:

"If we can just get one good workable solution from reservists to one of our problems, this entire Reserve research and development program will pay for itself."

Looks as though the general already may have several—and it's barely the beginning.

The University of Texas Oratorical Association Prize Winning Orations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the year 1958 marks the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas. However, one student organization on the campus of the University of Texas, the Oratorical Association, has the distinction of being even older than the university itself.

In the year 1883, one night before the new University of Texas was to open its doors, a group of students met in the home of a faculty member and founded the Athenaeum Literary and Debating Society. Partisans of the Rusk Literary

and Debating Society, a rival organization which is still active, dispute this fact and contend that their organization was founded before Athenaeum. Nevertheless, both groups were the forerunners of the present Oratorical Association. It is the task of the Oratorical Association to direct and coordinate all extracurricular speech and forensic activities on the campus of the University of Texas.

Under the leadership of Dr. Donald M. Williams, its faculty sponsor, and Meyer Witt of Palestine, Tex., its student president for the past 2 terms, the Oratorical Association provides an opportunity for the students of the University of Texas to participate in several types of competitive speech and forensic events.

The University of Texas varsity debate squad, one of the major activities of the Oratorical Association, has an enviable record of victories in major debate tournaments throughout the country, and just recently returned from the annual spring tournament of the Missouri Valley Forensic League, held this year at the University of Wichita, where it won several top awards.

Another of the fields where the University of Texas Oratorical Association provides an opportunity for the students of the university to participate in forensic work is in the area of intramural speech contests. Each semester the oratorical Association sponsors a series of various types of intramural speech events which are open to all students except varsity debate lettermen. This series of speech contests draws a larger number of participants than the intramural speech program of any other university in the United States.

In a third area, the field of prize speech contests, the Oratorical Association, in cooperation with the Department of Speech of the University of Texas, awards nearly $1,000 a year to the students of the university who win these various prize contests in debate, oratory, and declamation.

One of the most notable of these prize events is the annual Battle of Flowers oratorical contest which is held in April of each year. This contest is sponsored by the Battle of Flowers Association of San Antonio, Tex., and it provides the $400 in prize money which is awarded the 3 winners. The first place winner of the contest not only receives $200 in prize money, but also delivers his oration, which must deal with the subject of Texas history and Texas independence, before the annual banquet of the Battle of Flowers Association. This banquet is held every year in San Antonio, during the impressive and gala Fiesta de San Jacinto, commemorating Sam Houston's victory over the forces of Santa Ana on the battleground of San Jacinto.

While the Battle of Flowers Association of San Antonio sponsors the annual oratorical event, which is now in its 34th year, provides the prize money, and judges the orations, the supervision and direction of the preliminary and final round of the contest is the task of Professor Thomas A. Rousse and Dr. Donald M. Williams.

Professor Rousse is the distinguished and long-time chairman of the department of speech at the University of Texas. He is a widely known authority in the field of forensics, and rhetoric, and public address, and has written extensively in those fields. Professor Rousse was for many years the debate coach at the university, and many now-famous Texans are indebted to him for the expert guidance they received from him while a member of his debate squad. Professor Rousse served as president of the Speech Association of America in 1955, and he has for many years been a top national officer of Delta Sigma Rho, the distinguished national forensic fraternity. While I was a student in the University of Texas Law School, Tom Rousse and I was classmates, and we have been friends ever since.

Dr. Donald M. Williams, associate professor of speech at the University of Texas, is the young and able director of forensics and the very active faculty sponsor of the Oratorical Association.

The chairman of the oratorical committee of the Battle of Flowers Association, of San Antonio, is the capable Mrs. Merton M. Minter, of San Antonio, Tex.

This year the first-place award of $200 in the Battle of Flowers contest was won by H. G. Wells, of Tulia, Tex. Mr. Wells, who will deliver his oration at the annual banquet of the Battle of Flowers Association in San Antonio, on April 24, is a second-year law student at the University of Texas, and a former history teacher in the high schools of Texas. The title of his oration is "A Concept of Liberty."

The winner of the second-place award of $150 is Miss Almalee Cartee, of Coral Gables, Fla. Miss Cartee is a sophomore student majoring in speech at the university. She has won several intramural and prize contests during her short collegiate forensic career, and promises to be one of the most outstanding women debaters ever produced by the University of Texas. Miss Cartee's oration is called "Our Priceless Heritage."

The winner of third place in the contest, and $50 in prize money, is Andre Bacon, of San Antonio, Tex. Mr. Bacon, a junior in his studies at the University of Texas, has successfully participated in several speech events. His oration is entitled "Heritage."

Mr. President, these prize-winning orations demonstrate that their young authors have a full grasp of Texas history, and that they possess the ability to communicate their knowledge of Texas history and the ideals and beliefs that flow from that knowledge and understanding, to others. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these orations: "A Concept of Liberty," by H. G. Wells, of Tulia, Tex.; "Our Priceless Heritage," by Miss Almalee Cartee, of Coral Gables, Fla.; and "Heritage," by Andre Bacon, of San Antonio, Tex.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 3¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $263.25.

There being no objection, the orations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONCEPT OF LIBERTY

(By H. G. Wells)

It was over 100 years ago that a man mounted his horse and rode through the gates of an abandoned mission and into the darkness. He had been ordered by his commander, W. B. Travis, to ride for help. His name, of course, was Jim Bonham, and the mission that now served as a fortress for the Texas forces, was the Alamo.

Escaping through enemy lines, he rode to Goliad and there used all of his powers of persuasion to get reinforcements for the men at the Alamo. Rebuked in his attempt, he returned to San Antonio and found that the Alamo was now completely surrounded by Mexican forces, the roads blocked by Santa Anna's men. Knowing that an attempt to reach the Alamo would place his life in peril, he tied a white handkerchief about his hat as identification, and rode past the startled Mexicans and through the Alamo gates.

Today, the story of Jim Bonham's return to the Alamo, and the story of the fall of the Alamo are familiar stories all over the world. They have been read and reread, told and retold, and they never grow old, or less thrilling, or even a little bit lusterless. Ask a Texan what the Alamo was all about, and he will relate proudly the story of our forefathers' fight for independence. Ask him why Jim Bonham left the Alamo, and he'll more than likely be quick to answer, "To get reinforcements." But ask one who knows the story by heart, "Why did Bonham return?" and you must wait for an answer.

Probably some of you here are among the many who have said to himself as he read of Bonham's unforgettable return to the Alamo, "Why, why did he return?"

There are those who say that the fight by the Texans was stimulated by a desire for land and by dreams of wealth.

But does this explain why Bonham returned when he was aware that those within the Alamo faced almost certain death? Some say that the Texas fight was a battle for self-survival, but does this explain why Bonham returned when he could easily have escaped? Any high school student would reply that the Texans fought for independence. Ask them what independence is, and a clear majority will answer "freedom."

But ask them what freedom is, and you will receive a diversity of answers. Last year, as a high school history teacher, a student gave me this definition: "I suppose that you could say that freedom is doing what is right as opposed to doing what is wrong."

How would you define "freedom?" What was the concept of freedom that motivated those who won for us our freedoms, who gave their lives as downpayment for our liberty?

If you seek an answer, you must first remember that the men of the Alamo fought for a dream.

Unlike the Mexicans who opposed them, the Texas forces were not professional soldiers but were volunteers. Most of them were farmers who were lured to Texas by the promise of cheap land and the dream of a way of life. They were mountain men who were brought by Davy Crockett from Tennessee to fight for Texas independence. They were representative of the people who pioneered our State. Therefore, to understand the dream for which they fought and which they considered more important than life itself, one must look to the pioneers of Texas in the 1830's.

Their diaries and letters reveal them to be a hard working people who met nature on her own terms and won in the battle for survival. Nature was their friend and their

adversary. They knew nature. It is not surprising that there was much talk about natural rights. The men of the Alamo said that Jim Bowie was their leader by natural right. They also felt that they had a natural right to worship as they pleased. This right to worship was important to them. One of the pioneers recorded in her diary that her family returned home from the runaway scrape on a Sunday. They found their home burned, and those crops that were not destroyed were badly in need of attention. It was, she states, the only Sunday she could remember that her parents worked instead of devoting to worship. The early Texans felt that helping their neighbor was a natural thing. A letter written in 1832 tells of the arrival of a new family in a Texas community. The writer states: "There was a family nearby who had a wagon and they were kind enough to move our belongings to our new home. Father offered to pay them, but they refused saying that wasn't the Texas way." A piece of correspondence records that a stranger traveling through a Texas community became ill and died. It relates that the stranger was nursed in his illness, buried and mourned by those of the community.

To the early settlers freedom included a right to education. Numerous accounts tell us of the struggle to find teachers; to build schoolhouses. It was difficult to provide any type of formal education for the children. One diary records: "Mother taught us to read and we recited to Pa and Uncle Redus when they were in from the field for the noon meal."

And to all of the early settlers patriotism was a real, living, and vital part of their way of life. The American Revolution was still fresh in their memory. The July Fourth celebrations were attended by all and included plenty of stump speechifying, as they called it.

These things were a part of what our founders considered the free way of life. Of course, all those who came to Texas did not share this attitude. There was a minority who thought freedom was something different. A pioneer who lived in the days of the men of the Alamo relates in his correspondence the story of one of his neighbors. We'll call him Mr. Morgan. Mr. Morgan seemed to dislike everyone. His neighbors helped in gathering his crops, and he grudgingly consented to help them in return, but he had little more to do with the rest of the community than was absolutely necessary. He was found to be a cattle rustler, and only the fact that his family would have been left in the wilderness without support saved him from being hanged. There was no jail nearby in which to imprison him. He refused to take part in the building of a community church and would not allow his children to attend the school which was built by his neighbors. Finally he was killed while attempting to murder the man who had revealed his cattle-rustling activities.

If you say that freedom is the right to do as one pleases, I answer that Mr. Morgan shared the same concept.

Was this the concept that Travis had in mind when he wrote from the Alamo, "Under the flag of independence we are ready to peril our lives a hundred times a day"?

It would be absurd to suggest that men would fight for such a freedom. Yet it seems that are still some Mr. Morgans in our midst today. For example: There are those who espouse the theory that there's nothing wrong with breaking a law, if you can do it without getting caught. It seems to me that these people join Mr. Morgan in saying freedom is our right to do as we please. And certainly we all know of those among us with whom it is unpopular to be patriotic Perhaps our standard of values is changing. To the Texas pioneers, education was worthy of sacrifice, yet in last week's Saturday Evening Post there was a cartoon which came too close to the truth to be very funny. A teacher resigned giving as his reason the fact that he had received a better paying position. The next day he showed up at the school as usual, but as janitor.

To the early Texas settlers who volunteered to fight for a way of life, religion was important. They fought for the right to worship as they pleased. Yet there are many today who interpret this freedom as the freedom not to worship at all. We are free even to ignore those freedoms for which our founders gave their lives. These men died for the right to govern themselves, yet today there is an embarrassingly large number of us who have not even bought a poll tax. And one who becomes active in politics does so at the risk of being labeled a crook.

Peter Marshall stated that the Founding Fathers sought freedom not from law but freedom in law, not freedom from government, but freedom in government; not freedom from religion, but freedom in religion; not freedom from others, but the freedom to live with others as neighbors.

Today there is much talk about our freedom, but we do not speak of the concept of our Founding Fathers unless we realize that they envisioned a positive freedom, and active freedom that includes, as the high school student pointed out, the doing of what is right.

Why did Jim Bonham return to the Alamo? The records show that prior to his coming to Texas, Bonham received a letter from W. B. Travis in which Travis said: "Great things are astir in Texas, come on out and take a hand in affairs." And although we are not sure, I like to believe that Bonham returned to the Alamo because he realized that freedom calls for taking a hand in affairs, that freedom is the opportunity to do what is right, rather than the right to do as one pleases.

Today, the Alamo stands with such names as Guadalcanal, Valley Forge, and Heartbreak Ridge as a reminder that our freedom was bought at a tremendous price. And today the same message that brought Jim Bonham to Texas beckons you and me to keep freedom alive:

Great things are astir in this world, big things are happening, within our lifetime the dreams of democracy and freedom will be accepted or rejected by millions of people. We need your help in preserving our freedom. Come on out and take a hand in affairs.

Our Priceless Heritage

(By Miss Almalee Cartee)

Many years ago men traversed the frontiers of the United States to reach a country of magic and legendary fame. This land was to bring sought-after fortunes to many, sadness and death to others. Yet, men still came, attracted by the magnetic force of the Lone Star State. Some gave their lives in the great battles of the Alamo, San Jacinto, and Buena Vista; but they blazoned the trail of freedom for all who followed. They were the great ones, and their names are now only historic relics and remembrances. But the ideals for which they fought live on today. These men were hewing a way of life out of a wilderness.

I am not a native of Texas. A little over 2 years ago, I set foot for the first time on this magic soil. I grew to learn that the Lone Star State was more than a land of oil wells, tall tales, and 10-gallon hats; that it was a State with a thrilling and colorful history; a State whose people had a sincere pride in its accomplishments. I can still remember the first time that I visited the Alamo. It etched a vivid picture in my mind—a picture of the Texas fighting man as he must have been those great days. He was a man who traveled to this section and became a part of the fight for independence. Because he came before, I am able to come today, just as he did, drawn by the magic wonder of Texas. Who was this Texas fighting man?

A sober-faced lad, a rifle slung over his shoulder, a battered hat shading his eyes, he is the one we remember on Texas independence day. A squint-eyed man in buckskin, crouching beside the walls of the small mission at the Alamo, his hands wet with sweat as he waits for a firing order, he is the one we honor. A jaunty captain, gallantly manning the cannon to keep alive the hope of victory, he is the hero. He wears many uniforms and has many names. He fought in many places and many years. He is the Texas soldier. He gave his life to put down wrong and to gain the priceless ideal of freedom. He rests today in the bivouac of the dead. His silent ranks are marked by rows of crosses and banners stirring in the breeze. His voice is stilled now, yet he speaks. From the grave this soldier can tell many stories. Listen.

"I am 183 Texans massacred at the Alamo. I met old Santa Anna in the Mexican War of 1846 and knocked him good. I was 13,283 men who didn't come home, but we kept the enemy on their own side of the Rio Grande." These Texas soldiers were the great ones, who died in their greatness for a belief in independence. They were a part of the spirit of Texas. They had belief in the dignity of the individual, in government subject to the control of its citizens, in rule by law, not by men, in the right to live, to worship, and to work where one chooses. These men believed in individual freedom as a way of life. They were not planning to die. They had come to Texas across the frontier to find excitement, to make a fortune, to run from trouble at home, or to take part in a revolution for freedom as their forefathers had done in 1776. On all of them some of the glory rubbed off.

They were men like Jim Bowie who wrote, when the Battle of the Alamo was reaching a crisis, "We will rather die in these ditches than give them up to the enemy." There was Davy Crockett, the legendary coonskin hero who left Tennessee with the parting words, "You can go to hell, and I'm going to Texas." Buck Travis, the young lawyer, came to Texas for fortune and forgetfulness. Of course we remember Bonham, the young South Carolinian who rode out from the Alamo for help, and who rode back, to find his greatness in death. These were the great names which were recorded in the history books and legends of the Alamo. But there were some two hundred others. Their spirits live on the story of a fight for freedom. After that heroic battle of the Alamo, Santa Anna took up the bemused march that was to lead to the field of San Jacinto, and ultimate victory for Texas independence. This final battle ended in a slaughter, and the struggle of the Mexicans was convulsive and brief. As the Texans swarmed over the defenses, with what breath they could spare as they finished the bloody business, they yelled "Remember the Alamo. Remember Goliad." And Sam Houston, the commander of ambition and destiny, still sitting on his horse with a shattered right leg, was from this moment on to be called a hero. The war was over.

There were two things that these battles proved, not only to the people of Texas, but to the peoples of the Nation and the world. They showed, first, that freedom is an innate right which all men strive for and, second, that freedom is worth the price which men must pay to attain and to preserve it. The Texas fighting man is now only a symbolic hero, but he established for future generations an example of devotion to duty and devotion to a principle of human right. The ideals that he sought to preserve have found expression in every phase of Texas governmental, social, and economic life, and they

will continue to stand as long as men value the principle of free society. The spirit of the soldier who died at the Alamo, Goliad, or San Jacinto, speaks out to us today in a history which each person is proud to remember as part of his heritage. This Texas fighting man might have thought, as he sat in a division camp near the site of San Jacinto:

"I'm not bragging for all I've done. Bragging just doesn't go with fighting. It's too bad that votes and speeches can't do it all—that it takes iron and blood. There's nothing pretty in the roll of drums, or the spit of guns, or even the blare of bugles on a battlefield. But it's part of history's hammer and anvil of justice. It's not glory nor fame I did it for, but because I had to; because there was a great ideal to save by fighting." The soldier's creed is ended. It is necessarily short, for he expressed his philosophy in actions, and his tale was an admirable one.

No, I am not a native of Texas. A little over 2 years ago I set foot for the first time on this magic soil. Now, I want others to learn what I have learned, that Texas is more than a land of oil wells, tall tales, and 10-gallon hats; that it is a State with a thrilling and colorful history; a State whose people have a sincere pride in its accomplishments. Only when people everywhere know the true story of Texas, only when they realize the ideals of freedom and liberty for which the Texas soldier died, will his job be completed. Only as we, you and I, help to make those ideals prevail can we pay a just and lasting tribute. Then, and only then, can we rest assured that people everywhere will reverently and proudly, "Remember the Alamo."

HERITAGE

(By Andre E. Bacon)

Could you ever imagine a Texas without Sam Houston? Could there have been a Houston without a Texas? For the best answers to these questions, let's look in on Texas in 1833.

"Hell and Texas" took its place in the vocabulary of the 1830's as a mild cuss word; a loose expression or Texas would have been mentioned first. A person who left town under cloudy circumstances was said to have GTT, gone to Texas. A Texas lawyer of this time, advising a client who was disturbed in mind over the circumstances of his coming to Texas, recommended, "Leave this place before sundown." "Leave!" exclaimed the client. "Where'll I go? Ain't I in Texas now?"

Another lawyer of this time, the barrister of Nacogdoches, later wrote, "All new States are infested, more or less, by a class of noisy, second-rate men who are always in favor of rash and extreme measures. But Texas was absolutely overrun by such men." What Texas needed was a leader, brave enough for any trial, wise enough for any emergency, and cool enough for any crisis.

Yes, in 1833 we are on the brink of an abortive revolt in Texas. Stephen Austin is imprisoned in Mexico. Jackson, still trying to purchase Texas, is being embarrassed by his envoy to Mexico, Antony Butler, who is trying to stir Texas to revolt over the arrest of Austin.

Is there a man on the scene, of great enough stature, to command this situation, to lead Texas to independence, to guide the ship of state if independence is won? Fortunately, yes. But if he had not been there, I wonder what flag would fly over Texas today.

With his visible fortunes at their lowest ebb, Sam Houston received a letter from Tennessee at the Wigwam Neosho. Elizabeth Houston was dying. In September of 1831, Sam wept at the bedside of a heroine, his mother. She pressed the hand that wore a ring with a motto in it. And then Elizabeth Houston died. Heed your mother's last gesture Sam Houston, and listen to these words of Ralph Waldo Emerson. "Never mind the ridicule, never mind the defeat; up again old heart, there is victory for all justice; and the true romance which the world exists to realize will be the transformation of genius into practical power."

Sam Houston stood upright again, mounted in his country's esteem during the Stanberry affair, then turned west and rode to Texas and enduring fame. But what if Mexico had sold Texas to the United States in 1833? Suppose that Texas had been annexed before Sam Houston rode upon the scene. How would we remark Sam Houston today?

For what did happen let us drop in on Captain Elliot, British Chargé d'Affaires in the Republic of Texas. It is 1843 and Captain Elliot is writing to a colleague about Sam Houston. "His career * * * has been strange and wild. * * * A domestic tempest of desperate violence, and calamitous consequences; habitual drunkenness; a residence of several years amongst the Cherokee Indians * * * a sudden reapperance on this stage with better hopes and purposes, and commensurate success, but still with unreclaimed habits. Finally, however, a new connection with a young woman brought up in fear of God, conquered no doubt as women have been from the beginning and will be to the end by a glowing tongue, but in good revenge making conquest of his habits of tremendous cursing and passionate love of drink." Years later when asked why a girl of her upbringing would marry such a man as Sam Houston, Margaret answered, simply, "He had won my heart."

The annexation of Texas brought its problems to the United States, but it was our best way out. Texas had come into the Union as a slave State, but the status of the great domain beyond the mountains which formed its dowry was to be determined. North and South buckled on their armor, and the session of Congress that was to convene in December of 1849 was anticipated with a sense of apprehension.

The early weeks of Congress saw a confusion of suggestions to which no great attention was paid. The Nation awaited the voice of Henry Clay. For 6 years the great compromiser had lived in retirement with his blooded horses and his bluegrass. In 1820 and again in 1833 this moderate southern statesman had calmed the seas of national politics troubled by slavery.

In January of 1850 he laid before the Senate an expertly balanced program to which Sam Houston had contributed some important ideas. Mr. Clay made a 2-day speech in support of his proposals. He portrayed the glories of the Union, which he and every other old man present had seen born and grow. He said these could be preserved if each side would pursue a reasonable course of give and take.

Sam Houston braved the hostility of his homeland to speak in favor of the Clay proposals. Shall we join the others in the Senate gallery? Senator Houston has begun his speech. "I must say that I am sorry that I cannot offer the prayers of the righteous that my petition be heard. But I beseech those whose piety will permit them reverentially to offer such petitions, that they will pray for this Union, and * * * ask of him who buildeth up and pulleth down nations * * * to unite us. I wish, if this Union must be dissolved, that its ruins may be the monument of my grave."

Sam Houston was governor when Texas was to vote on the secession ordinance in February of 1861. In the days before the vote was to be taken, Governor Houston took the stump for Union. Let us join him at the close of his tour at Galveston. The behavior of the crowd is ugly. Will he dare to speak? Yes, there he is, up on the balcony of the Tremont House. The crowd is silent. Governor Houston begins his speech. "Some of you laugh to scorn the idea of bloodshed as the result of secession. But let me tell you what is coming * * * your fathers and husbands, your sons and brothers, will be herded at the point of the bayonet. You may after the sacrifice of countless millions of treasure and hundreds of thousands of lives, as a bare possibility, win southern independence * * * but I doubt it. I tell you that, while I believe with you in the doctrine of State rights, the North is determined to preserve this Union * * * they move with the steady momentum and perserverance of a mighty avalanche; and what I fear is, they will overwhelm the South."

For his support of Union, Sam Houston was deposed as governor. At this time he wrote "I stand the last almost of my race stricken down because I will not yield those principles which I have fought for. The severest pang is that the blow comes in the name of the State of Texas."

On July 25, 1863, Gen. Sam Houston was sick unto death with pneumonia. He slept through the night with Margaret at his side. When morning dawned she asked for her Bible and began to read in a low voice. General Houston stirred. It was mid-forenoon. Margaret put down the book and clasped her husband's hands. His lips moved. "Texas—Texas—Margaret"

As the slanting shadows of sunset crept upon Steamboat House General Houston ceased to breathe. Heritage? Texas gave to Sam Houston enduring fame. Sam Houston gave us Texas.

Suicide at the Summit for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an article concerning a meeting at the summit:

WEST WYOMING, PA., *April 11, 1958.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
United States House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It is believed that machinery is now set in motion to persuade United States officials to consent to a high-level, face-to-face conference between the leaders of this Nation (the United States) and the Soviet Union for what is known as summit conference.

The enclosed letter to the editor of one of our countywide daily newspapers concerning summit talks is self-explanatory.

On behalf of district 12,. the American Legion, Luzerne County, Department of Pennsylvania, I urge you to work for passage of a "sense of the House" resolution opposing a summit conference.

In the best interest of this Nation and the freedom-loving people of the world, district 12, the American Legion, representing more than 13,700 Legion veterans, urge you to do all within your power and command to make our sentiments known among the Members of the United States House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS J. GRECO,
Commander, 12th District,
The American Legion.

SUICIDE AT THE SUMMIT FOR UNITED STATES

EDITOR, TIMES LEADER-NEWS:

The campaign now underway to persuade United States officials to consent to a high-level, person-to-person conference between the leaders of America and the Soviet Union should be of special interest to all freedom-loving Americans. Unless action is taken immediately by responsible Americans, such a summit conference may soon take place. And it will take place if the overwhelming majority of Americans continue to stand on the sidelines waving the banners of apathy.

Americans, we have too much at stake to be indifferent.

It is appealing to one's sense of justice to think it is necessary to have to argue against a meeting of our American President with the world's top-ranking hapgman, Nikita Khrushchev.

Presently, the Communist plan is to get us to attend international conferences. And every time we sit down with the atheists, make no mistake about it, we lose on all fronts.

Unfortunately, Americans are being sold on the virtue of summit talks. This rush act ignores utterly that America has nothing to gain unless she agrees to the wetting of all her powder in exchange for a Soviet promise. Every realistic American and Legionnaire knows that something very essential is missing at any Soviet conference table—the vital element of integrity and honor. Its absence makes any Russian agreement worthless because the first tenet of communism is that any means justifies the end. The Soviet record of violating every one of 69 solemn treaties, pacts, agreements, and guaranties since World War II speaks eloquently for itself. If any security and preparedness concessions are made at any summit talk, it will mean only another Communist triumph in the cold war to add to its long list.

There are thousands of reasons why such a meeting is unthinkable and every one is a dead hero or heroine of the revolt against Communist tyranny in Hungary in October-November 1956. Have we forgotten so early, Korea? And what about Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and others?

One by one the leaders and presidents of these onetime free nations were stunned by the heavy blows of the Red hammer while the simultaneous action a swish of the Red sickle swept entire populations only to be added to the Red harvest of 900 million enslaved people.

Summit talks. Who would do all the talking? How good are the Russians at talking? Let's look into the record at the U. N. During 1955 the Soviet Union used 40 percent of the speaking time in the United Nations, while the United States used only 4 percent. Imagine the Soviets used 40 percent of the speaking time. And it happened right here on our home grounds.

Shall we, the sentinels of freedom, crawl on our bellies to some summit solution with the Kremlin gangsters that once more, to our shame, can only be at the expense of life and liberty of other peoples? Or shall we rise up proudly to the pinnacle of principle and courage that our Founding Fathers bequeathed us?

Our Declaration of Independence commands that we have no meeting with Khrushchev. The ideals contained in that freedom document will be perpetuated, not by agreements with slave masters, but by alliances with freedom fighters. We need, not Khrushchev, but the heroes of Hungary, Poland, etc. Let us not betray them by clasping his hands red with their blood.

Your voice, your pen, must not remain silent. You can act now to head off another summit conference by writing to Senators JOSEPH CLARK and EDWARD MARTIN, and tell them to work for passage of a "sense of the Senate" resolution opposing a summit conference. Also, write to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD to put himself on record, too, against any such high-level meeting. Write, right now.

LOUIS J. GRECO,
Commander, 12th District,
American Legion.

In Time of Emergencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden News of April 17, 1958:

IN TIME OF EMERGENCIES

New York City was visited by a severe snowstorm in late March. Traffic facilities in that city are more advanced, probably, than anywhere else in the Nation. It is interesting therefore to take note of the following which appeared in the New York Times during the period of the storm:

"Cars stalled in Nassau.

"Suffolk roads crippled.

"The Rockland Coach Co. suspended all services.

"The parkways looked like junk-car yards.

"Five airlines canceled 190 departures.

"Most inbound flights canceled or diverted.

"Buslines to suburbs canceled."

Well, how do you suppose it happened that the great city with 9 inches of new snow in its streets and 23 inches in many suburbs functioned rather busily?

Well the news columns of the New York Times tells how as follows:

"Commuter travel on the New York Central, Long Island, New Haven, and Pennsylvania Railroads was generally good.

"Arrivals of long distance trains were only 30 to 90 minutes late.

"Rail stations were crowded.

"Departures were generally on schedule.

"Frozen switches caused the minor delays on railroads."

The Memphis Press-Scimitar commenting on the above said:

"And that's the way it always is in emergencies. The airlines, with their great speeds and requirements of delicacy in handling, are knocked out early. The bus lines fight it valiantly, but they are ineffective in the end if for no other reason because masses of abandoned cars block their way. And on the railroads, it's just a busy day.

"The railroad men get to their jobs, if they have to crawl. And they stick to them. Their equipment is built to take it, and does.

"When is the Nation going to wake up and treat the railroads right? We are the only nation in the world which is abandoning railroad mileage."

The Memphis paper has asked a very pertinent question.

When World War II broke out the country again became very railroad conscious and all during the war the railroads did a tremendous business. But as soon as the war was over many people forgot about them again.

If war should break out tomorrow this country would again become very dependent on the railroads. It would be only a question of a short time until we needed them for transportation purposes the same as for freight purposes. Would they have enough passenger cars left to supply the needs of the traveling public? We doubt it.

The country should do better by its railroads. They are a vital necessity in emergencies. If we do not treat them better when there are no emergencies existing we may not have them when emergencies do come.

National Guard Opens All-Out Fight To Prevent Proposed Economy Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a timely editorial from the April 11, 1958, issue of the Augusta Herald, Augusta, Ga., entitled "National Guard Opens All-Out Fight To Prevent Proposed Economy Cuts":

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald of April 11, 1958]

NATIONAL GUARD OPENS ALL-OUT FIGHT TO PREVENT PROPOSED ECONOMY CUTS

The Army National Guard, as if to show off its vaunted battle readiness, has turned from the defensive in its fight to halt a 10 percent reduction in strength and is laying siege to the enemy on two fronts—the Pentagon and Capitol Hill.

The guard, which has no inconsiderable political weight, has one main objective—to halt a Defense Department order for paring down the guard's effectiveness by 6 of 27 divisions. In order to do this, it hopes to influence Congress to appropriate the $51.8 million which will be necessary to keep the guard at its present strength of 400,000 men.

Dropping of the six guard divisions is being urged by the Defense Department for reasons of economy and to tighten its organization. The guard may overcome the first, since Congress seems well-disposed to grant the needed extra funds. But the citizen soldiers may not have as much luck with the second Defense Department objective.

The Defense Department—or, to be more exact, the Army—wants to reorganize all guard units along the lines of its own pentomic divisions for a closer dovetailing of Reserve and Regular components. Such reorganization has been given the approval of top Army brass—but not the endorsement of the powerful National Guard Bureau. The latter wants to keep all guard divisions, even if some changes in unit distribution are necessary to meet the requirements of modern warfare.

The guard's contention is that stripping it of 40,000 men is not going to make the guard stronger, as the Army contends it will, but is simply going to weaken it by 40,000 men—an eminently sound arithmetical deduction.

One of the most amazing things about the Army's reorganization proposal is that it is being undertaken completely without reference to the guard's traditional role as a State organization. Backers of the guard say the militia's function as a force available for disaster and emergency use and as a part of the State's internal security has been entirely ignored. This they find disturbing enough to make them carry their fight to Washington with renewed vigor and determination.

One thing about the proposed reduction in strength has struck us as highly inconsistent. That is, why the Defense Department feels it is necessary to trim the guard in the

name of economy while the administration daily is pumping more and more millions into all channels of defense spending.

Since the close of World War II the United States has gone to considerable expense of time, money, and energy to build up its Reserve program—including the National Guard, which has been one of its most dependable sources of trained reservists. It would seem to be the height of folly for this country now to undo all this work, particularly when the need for economizing has not been clearly shown when the units scheduled to be dropped could be utilized in other ways.

What Part Will I Play as a Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes an essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned always has some connection with civic or governmental responsibility.

This year, the subject assigned was: What Part Will I Play as a Citizen.

Three winning essays are selected from each class group. I am proud of the fact that of a total of 12 winners, 2 come from the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio.

Thomas L. Braun of Coldwater, Ohio, is one of the 10th grade winners. His prizewinning essay is as follows:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN

(By Thomas L. Braun)

When we look to the future we sometimes forget what it consists of, for our future if any, will flourish on the happenings of history. And the history of our future will be the present which we live today; therefore, the lives which we lead today as so-called teen-agers, and the respect that we show toward the gifts of yesterday will reveal the outcome of our future. A simple and easy deduction, but one that is sometimes wished to be forgotten is that in order to speak of the future, one must have a history from which to learn and be in the present time in order to think about the future.

When we think of history, it reminds us of the days and ways in which our forefathers lived. As they lived their lives, played their part, and observed their duties toward citizenship in their country, they lived the same as we do. Maybe not inasmuch as conveniences are thought of, but they had their trials, tribulations, their misgivings, and also their happiness and fervent love toward each other and their country. In doing their duty as citizens, they often sacrificed their pleasures, loved ones, and many times their lives for the welfare of the new generations who were to surpass everything beyond their wildest expectancy. That is the way the history of our country is. It's the story of humble and yet of proud people who loved their way of life, and yet gave the greatest example of frontier citizenship.

Citizenship today, however, is not only love but the fact of loyalty and respect toward our American heritage. In the present of today we have every opportunity to express ourselves as good citizens. First of all, we have our duty to ourselves, our country, and to our fellow citizens. We owe our duty to ourselves by partaking in the many opportunities of education that our present-day modernized world has to offer. For, without a good basis of knowledge for ourselves, what chance do our future generations have, of maintaining a good and strong democratic country in which to live? The duty that we owe our country is one of loyalty. In event of any aggressive action from another country, it is our duty to remain loyal and fight for her protection. The duty we owe to our fellow citizens cannot be surpassed by anything on earth, because it is the duty of love. In time of danger and distress, it is not only a duty of good citizenship to heed them, but that of love, a virtue given to us by God that will never die.

In the future, our duties as citizens will be to maintain, support, and strengthen the course of the future. In every man's life, he has a goal, and that is to be free and able to do what he pleases, and go where he pleases; therefore, it is our duty as citizens to maintain the freedom of not only ourselves, but of every man on the face of the earth. No human is born as a slave, but many are born into slavery. There is no greater feeling of freedom to man than to work the fields, or stand on the hill with the wind blowing the grass at your feet, to look down on a valley, with a river flowing through it, winding its way from the snow-capped mountains in the distance, and to feel yourself next to God.

This is the reward we get for maintaining our respect, our loyalty, and our love, all of which is true citizenship. The example of citizenship which we put forth in our years on their earth will be the basis of their lives and also their standards which will yield to them newer and better rewards. And, if they follow these standards of citizenship, maybe it will be the beginning of everlasting peace.

Judith C. Wehrley, of Eldorado, Ohio, is also one of the 10th-grade winners. Her prizewinning essay is as follows:

WHAT PART WILL I PLAY AS A CITIZEN?

(By Judith C. Wehrley)

There are many kinds of citizens—good, bad, and indifferent. The good, who do all they can to help their country; the bad, who seem to do all they can to hurt it; the indifferent, who just don't care one way or the other.

Which kind of citizen will I be? I intend to do all that is in my power to become the good kind. I am only a teen-ager and have not had the opportunity to show much of the world what kind of a citizen I am now. Only in my small community, my school, my church, and my home have I been able to show what kind of a citizen I may become as I grow up.

What can I do to become a good citizen? I know that my training in citizenship was started by my parents when I was very small. First and foremost, I have been taught to live by the golden rule—to do unto others as I would have them do unto me. I have been taught discipline, courtesy, and to show respect to everyone I meet. It has been impressed upon me the importance of living compatibly with my fellow men. Now I must put into practice all these teachings.

I must learn to give of my talents in whatever field they lie—business, education, religion, science, politics, or entertainment. There is a great need in each field. Whichever one I enter, I shall do the best of which I am capable.

I must make every use of the educational advantages our schools and colleges have to offer. I realize how inportant a higher education is in our modern society.

I will attend the church of my choice and support it in every way that I can, not only in a financial way, but by attending services and participating in the church activities. Here I will learn to love my fellow men and to live a Christian life. If I can do this, I will be a good example for all with whom I come in contact.

We read and hear much about juvenile delinquency in today's world. If I can live my life in the right way and always see the need of being a decent, clean-minded citizen, perhaps in some small way I can serve to influence some boy or girl to turn from the wrong path of life. If my influence can aid even one teen-ager, I will be glad for this opportunity.

Perhaps the big part I will play as a citizen will be as a wife and mother. I feel the need to excel in both these roles. As a wife, I will help my husband to be a good and useful citizen. As a mother, I will raise and train my children to be the kind of citizens our country needs. If I am able to do all these things, I will feel that my life has been worthwhile.

This is the part I hope to play as a citizen of our United States of America.

These fine young people won a trip to Washington by their good works, and Legion and Legion Auxiliary officials are guiding the winners to the really important places in and about Washington this week.

I commend the reading of each essay to interested people everywhere.

Let's Adopt a Definite Course and Follow It—or Turn Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the current civil war in Indonesia must certainly create certain doubts about our present foreign policy. The situation in which we find ourselves today is not unique from the standpoint of the apparent reluctance on the part of our State Department to exert pressure in behalf of the anti-Communists.

It was not too long ago that the free world was outraged by the merciless assault upon the Hungarian people by Communist troops. Then the Nagy government of Hungary, which had temporarily shake nthe yoke of oppression of Soviet rule, declared itself independent and pleaded with the West for assistance in its fight to remain free.

While the freedom fighters were given sympathy in abundance by the United States and other free nations, Russian tanks rolled into the streets of Budapest and drowned their hopes in pools of blood. This was the last real opportunity of a Soviet satellite to rid itself of communism and join the community of free nations.

In keeping with the spirit of the United Nations Charter, western nations felt impotent to assist. The free world sat in the amphitheater of Europe and witnessed the rape of Hungary by the Soviet Union.

The Hungarian situation is not entirely analagous to that of Indonesia since the Hungarian freedom fighters were in control of the government. Hence, the

anti-Communist forces engaged in the civil war in Indonesia must technically be called rebels. That is apparently the only difference in the two situations.

The Indonesian rebel forces are avowed anti-Communists. In fact, the reason behind present hostilities is the determination on the part of a large segment of the Indonesian population not to be dominated, much less subjugated by the Communist type of government.

It seems quite clear to me, as it should to other Members of Congress, that while our intentions may be good and our sympathy again with the forces opposing communism, the forces of freedom will inevitably succumb to the Communist elements. Battles are not won by sympathy. They are won by the force of arms. Here we find the pro-Communists being supplied with the weapons of war while the gallant rebels are receiving no assistance.

At a recent press conference, Secretary of State Dulles was asked whether it was true the Indonesian Government has been receiving assistance from the Communist world. He replied in the affirmative, stating that the Russian Government has placed at the disposal of the Indonesian Government $100 million in aid. He indicated, however, that to his knowledge no military assistance had been given. When asked, Secretary Dulles stated that the United States Government's official policy regarding the rebellion was one of hands off.

The New York Times of Wednesday, April 2, 1958, in reporting on the Secretary's news conference reported that some of the aid already received by the Indonesian Government has been ships—ships which are obviously blockading the anti-Communist forces in Sumatra and the Celebes.

The morning papers of Monday, April 7, 1958, reported that the Djakarta Government has concluded an agreement with the Governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia whereby those nations would sell military equipment to the Indonesian Government with no strings attached. The irony of this announcement is the fact that in the instance of Yugoslavia and Poland, the United States has been giving them military and economic assistance, respectively, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Is this position not inconsistent with the purpose of the Mutual Security Act? Is this the way to win the minds of freedom seeking people to the cause which has swallowed more than $76 billion in a program designed to deter the spread of communism? Teddy Roosevelt's famous admonishment, "speak softly, but carry a big stick" so frequently comes to mind when one conscientiously appraises the Hungarian and Indonesian episodes.

I do not profess to be an expert in international relations nor do I claim to have any more solutions to the complex international problems which concern us as a Nation today. But, I am convinced there is something wrong when we lose ground because the assistance being given is not available when and where it is needed the most. Certainly one does not have to be an expert on foreign policy or international relations to sense the faltering of one force as opposed to another.

There is not enough money in the entire United States to buy the remaining free nations of the world. Certainly I do not recommend that we engage in open conflict when internal strife develops as it is in Indonesia—as it did in Poland or in Hungary. But, I do strongly urge that the Department of State reexamine its present policy and determine whether it is possible to aid anti-Communist forces. If we are committed to the global struggle for freedom. If it is the conclusion of the Department of State that this is not possible, then I believe it is time we make an agonizing appraisal of our foreign commitments and entanglements.

Proponents of the present foreign-aid program repeatedly talk in terms of preventing the spread of communism. Is our position in the Indonesian struggle an admission that we are engaged only in a program of deterrence? Have we given up the idea of spreading the principles of democracy? If the answer is in the affirmative to these questions, then our task can only be an endless and probably futile one. Seems that we must make up our mind as a Nation just where we are going and how we intend to get there. Or the alternative is to take a different path than we have travelled over the past 13 years.

The Mind of Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article from the Thursday, April 17, 1958, issue of the Manchester Guardian Weekly, by Max Freedman entitled "The Mind of Vice President NIXON":

Vice President NIXON must often wish that he could revise his early campaigns in California. He has been haunted by them as his national stature has grown more impressive. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that he has been tormented by a brutal myth which has usurped the place of reality. In the judgment of some Democrats he is a cruel, political warrior who savaged his way to greatness. To listen to these critics, one would almost believe that there had never been a rough political contest before he matched his name with destiny. These charges should defeat themselves by their very violence, yet somehow they are sustained by stubborn prejudice. It is a mere act of justice to scrutinize this indictment in the light of the neglected record. In doing so it is quite unnecessary to defend every act in Mr. NIXON's early career or to deny that he sometimes blundered into harsh and capricious extremes. No one is trying to polish a politician's halo. All we seek is a measure of perspective and fairness.

There seems little doubt that Congressman Voorhis, an energetic and respected Member, went down to defeat when he agreed to meet the unknown Mr. NIXON in debate. In the limited arena of one congressional district Mr. NIXON gave a prophetic display of the powers which in after years made him the most dextrous Republican advocate in the country. The campaign against Helen Gahagan Douglas, fought for the more splendid prize of a seat in the Senate, was disfigured by smudges of prejudice and angry bitterness. But one must be curiously indifferent to all the available evidence to believe that every wrong was committed by one side while the other party moved serenely in the majestic robes of political virtue. There are more registered Democrats than Republicans in California. Mr. NIXON could never carry the State by a campaign which outrated the patriotism of the Democratic Party or impugned the loyalty of its accredited leaders. He insists that he won because of his exposition of the public issues, not because of his rough arraignment of Mrs. Douglas.

Mr. NIXON profoundly resents the charge that he imitated the blundering brutalities of McCarthy, or that he is a repentant isolationist converted to more generous policies under the stress of necessity. His voting record in Congress certainly clears his name of the false charge of isolationism. The spots on his record do not vanish so easily, however, as one revives the memory of the two national campaigns in which he took so strenuous yet so inglorious a part. He pleads in extenuation that many of his remarks have been tortured into spiteful error; and he adds with mournful conviction that many people have wrongly ascribed to him the prejudices and antipathies sown with such angry gestures by Senators McCarthy and JENNER. All the same, when the last syllable of the candid defense has been heard one is still left with the impression that Mr. NIXON would not object if the memory of these early campaigns were covered in the mercy of swift oblivion.

Mr. NIXON believes that the congressional election this year will be dominated by the economic debate over the recession. In coming years he sees every national campaign influenced by the play and commotion of world events. Recent speeches have shown his capacity to speak with courage and conviction on matters of extreme controversy. These qualities gleam with yet more distinction in the relaxed intimacies of private conversation when he lets his mind brood on the overcast world scene. He ponders with reluctant admiration the Communist gift for planning its strategy against vast stretches of time. Never for one moment does he underestimate the strength of the Communist empire, either in its moods of calculated caution or in its strident thrust for world domination. He might not be so eager as other members of the administration to flourish the maxims of pious sentiment (and the world would have no reason to regret this respite), but American policy in his hands would be sternly braced to endure the long challenge of communism.

Many Americans who carry an ugly image of Mr. NIXON would be very surprised if they heard him expound his personal philosophy in world affairs. He has studied these world problems with an incisive and creative mind. What is more, he can state his views with eloquent conviction. Most important of all it is a generous, constructive, and spacious philosophy, akin to the vision which once led Senator Vandenberg and not very different in essentials from the saving faith of the Democratic sages. The Democrats will not like this comparison but they really must begin to examine Mr. NIXON and not the malignant myth of their own invention.

Nothing is more impressive than his instinctive sympathy for Britain and France, expressing itself in the desire to make the alliance a still stronger shield to protect the

threatened freedoms of mankind. He understands the passionate divisions of British public opinion and extends to Prime Minister Macmillan a most generous comprehension of the difficulties facing the British Government. But he would show the same magnanimous judgment in dealing with a labor government in London. Generous to allies, he remains skeptical of Russia. He believes Mr. Khrushchev wants to stop the tests before America and Britain fully develop the small tactical bombs that would forever destroy the advantages now held by the numerical superiority of the Russian and Chinese armies. A hard, disciplined, able growing mind that is the final impression after an evening with Mr. NIXON. He may yet grow into a statesman. The experiment is worth watching.

Red Duplicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 15, 1958, concerning a meeting at the summit:

RED DUPLICITY

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Comdr. Louis J. Greco of the 12th district of the American Legion on his fine article concerning a summit meeting which appeared in the readers' column on March 7.

I believe it is appropriate at this time to outline briefly the Communist record in such conferences.

Talks at the summit: Three American Presidents have traveled 40,454 miles, spent 36 days talking with Soviet Premiers. Roosevelt met Stalin at Teheran in 1943. Result: Stalin entered into four major agreements, violated them all. Roosevelt met Stalin at Yalta in 1945. Result: Stalin entered into 6 major agreements, violated 5. One agreement, to enter the war against Japan, was kept by the Soviet Government. Truman met Stalin at Potsdam in 1945. Result: Stalin entered into 14 major agreements, violated them all. Eisenhower met Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955. Result: No concrete agreements. Khrushchev promised a new spirit of conciliation in 3 major fields—disarmament, German reunification, and East-West contacts. No substantial progress has developed in any of these fields.

Talks between foreign ministers: Six American Secretaries of State have traveled 113,268 miles, spent 426 days talking with Soviet Foreign Ministers. Cordell Hull went to Moscow for talks with Molotov in 1943. Result: Soviet Government made three major agreements, violated them all. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., went to San Francisco in 1945, where he talked with Molotov. Result: One major agreement, violated by the Soviet Government. James F. Byrnes went to Moscow, to London, to New York, and three times to Paris for talks with Molotov in 1945 and 1946. Result: Soviet Government made 10 major agreements, violated 9. George C. Marshall went to London for talks with Molotov in 1947. Result: Soviet Government made one major agreement, violated it. Dean Acheson went to Paris for talks with Vishinsky in 1949. Result: No agreement. John Foster Dulles went to Berlin, Vienna, twice to Geneva in 1954 and 1955 for talks with Molotov. Result: One major agreement on an Austrian treaty has been kept by the Soviet Government.

As a result of 19 top level conferences between the United States and the Communists, 40 agreements were made; only 3 agreements were kept by the Soviet Government.

JAMES J. WALSH,
Member, Post 395, American Legion.
KINGSTON.

School Assistance Laws Best Educational Legislation Ever Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I believe that the school-assistance laws, Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, are examples of some of the best educational legislation ever enacted by the Congress. They meet a real need by providing educational facilities and services to many thousands of children for whom local educational agencies in the various States would not be able to provide such services adequately without the assistance authorized in these laws. When these laws were passed in 1950 many people did not realize how the need for them was going to grow; but since then they have been revised and extended on 2 or 3 occasions by unanimous votes of both Houses of Congress. The House Committee on Education and Labor has held extensive hearings on the need for extension of both laws this year and H. R. 11378 was formulated after careful study.

The extension of these laws as provided in this bill is of great importance to good school progress for all those children who are connected with Federal property through residing on it or having parents employed on it in work in which the United States has a definite interest.

Public Law 874 provides a measure of Federal support for school districts which have financial burdens because their available revenues have been reduced by the acquisition of some of their real property by the United States under certain conditions, or because they provide free public elementary or secondary education for specified percents of their total average daily attendance residing on Federal property or residing with parents employed on Federal property or both, or because there has been a sudden and substantial increase in their school attendance resulting from Federal activities. The amount of the Federal payment is related to the local revenue lost by the loss of tax base and to the additional attendance burden assumed by the school district by reason of the Federal activities.

No provision is made for reimbursing the States for State aid paid on account of these Federal impacts because a State can impose certain taxes on the residents of Federal property which cannot be imposed by local communities. The law is based further on the assumption that generally throughout the Nation about half of the local tax income to finance the current operating expenses of schools comes from taxes on places where people live, and the other half from taxes on places where people work. Specific formulas are included for determining when a school district is eligible for assistance and how much it is entitled to receive. A district is determined to be eligible when it is shown that the Federal impact constitutes a distinct financial burden. All assistance is channeled through the Office of Education, and any interference or control over any aspect of the local educational program by any Federal agency is prohibited.

Since 1951, the first year of operation of the school assistance program, the number of participating school districts under Public Law 874 has trebled, eligible Federal properties claimed have more than trebled, the number of federally connected pupils has more than doubled and Federal payments have nearly quadrupled. This rapid growth has been caused by first, increased Federal activity; second, increases in school population; third, increased interest in the program by State and local officials, and fourth, liberalizing amendments to the legislation.

For example, in the eligible districts in 1957 federally connected pupils accounted for 15.4 percent of their total attendance as compared with 16.6 percent in 1954 and 17.5 percent in 1951. The slight decline in percentage of federally connected pupils is attributable to the increased number of new applicant school districts each year, which reported a smaller degree of Federal "impact," than the original applicants. The average percent of Federal payments to total school budgets remained over the 7-year period at approximately 5 percent. The average Federal payment per child increased from $56.60 in 1951 to $92.30 in 1957; but the total per capita cost of education in eligible districts increased from $177.90 to $285.

Applicant districts receiving Public Law 874 funds in fiscal year 1957 had a total attendance of about 7.6 million children or about one-fourth of the total public school enrollment in the Nation. In 1951 the estimated 2.9 million children in attendance in eligible districts was only one-eighth of the Nation's public school enrollment. Thus the Federal payments are now helping to support free public education over twice as broad a base as in 1951.

Under Public Law 815, approximately 1,500 local educational agencies have been aided by grants. The United States Commissioner of Education had allocated $715 million by June 30, 1957, to 3,715 eligible projects. The recipient local school districts had added more than 300 million of their own funds to these projects. Thus, more than $1 billion in

public school construction has been initiated under this program, and the approved projects will provide facilities to house some 950,000 pupils. When existing authorizations have been fulfilled, schoolhousing will be provided for an additional 100,000 pupils.

In the first 7 years of operation of these school assistance laws, 21 local educational agencies in Rhode Island were granted $1,135,602 for maintenance and operation of schools for federally connected children; and 6 school systems received grants totaling $3,005,706 in school construction assistance for such children.

GENERAL RATIONALE OF THE BILL

By the extension of these two laws, the Congress will continue to recognize its responsibility for the impact on local school attendance of Federal activities conducted largely on tax-exempt Federal property. Thus, in theory, the Federal Government will assume the role of a local taxpayer for schools with respect to Federal property as defined in these laws. The varied activities conducted on Federal properties require in many instances large numbers of resident military and civilian personnel whose presence necessitates the performance of public services not distinctly Federal in character, such as the maintenance and operation of schools for the children of resident personnel. The Federal Government is now the largest single owner of real property in the United States, owning more than 11,000 properties, which exceed in area the 6 New England States plus Texas. Many of these properties are being used for activities instituted by the Federal Government or in the Federal interest. Thus the Federal Government has the responsibility for assisting in providing educational services for the children who would be prevented from enjoying adequate educational advantages otherwise by the tax-exempt character of these properties. Additional educational services are required in many nearby or "bedroom communities" which, though they are separate political subdivisions, must provide free public elementary and secondary education for children who attend their schools and whose parents are employed on tax-exempt Federal properties outside their school district boundaries. The enactment of H. R. 11378 will be a real boon to school districts in the various States which have taken upon themselves the function of providing excellent educational advantages to thousands of families that are serving the Federal interest.

The Record of Soviet Ambassador Menshikov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 16, 1958, in which he discusses and comments on the record of the new Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov:

THE RECORD OF MR. MENSHIKOV—SOVIET ENVOY'S BAN ON UNRRA RELIEF TO NON-REDS IN POLAND IS RECALLED

(By David Lawrence)

For several weeks now the American people have been told that the new Soviet Ambassador, Mikhail Menshikov, is a nice fellow and that maybe, if he is a typical example, the Communists aren't such bad folks after all. So the new envoy has been wined and dined, visiting delegations of Americans at the Embassy here have been charmed by his smile, and he has been invited to sit down with some of the capitalistic elite in the Midwest.

But what is the true background of Mikhail Menshikov, and why, it might be asked, hasn't public attention been called to it before? For in the official proceedings of the Congress of the United States there is a record of his willingness to let human beings starve in order to further the Communist cause. This is in the report of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs printed in 1946 after a study in Eastern Europe from August to October 1945. The report tells the sad story of what four Members of Congress found out about Mr. Menshikov's cruelty to hungry men, women, and children in Poland. Here is the full text of an extract from that report to Congress:

"The committee made some effort to investigate the operation of UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration) in Poland but unfortunately was somewhat limited in its efforts, due to the fact that UNRRA had not as yet had sufficient opportunity to become organized upon a permanent basis. However, under the temporary arrangements that had been concluded, the committee was deeply disappointed in both its operation and the distribution of its supplies.

"The temporary head of the UNRRA delegation was Mikhail Menshikov, a Soviet citizen, who wielded great control and influence over the distribution of UNRRA's yet meager supplies. The distribution was limited to recipients who were active supporters of or collaborationists with the provisional Polish Government.

"Upon the committee's return to this country, it lodged a strong protest with the President of the United States and was happy to learn that soon thereafter Mr. Menshikov was recalled and his place taken by Brig. Gen. C. M. Drury, of Canada. Since the committee's return to the United States, it has kept in close and direct contact with UNRRA operations in Poland and has noted great improvement both in the operation and in the distribution of relief supplies."

Three of the 4 members of the above-mentioned committee are still in Congress—Representative THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois, Democrat, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee; Representative FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio, Republican, and KARL MUNDT, Republican, now Senator from South Dakota.

Since Mr. GORDON is temporarily out of the country, this correspondent interviewed Representative BOLTON and Senator MUNDT. Mrs. BOLTON said:

"Yes, I remember the experience and what we found. Unless a person was a Communist, he didn't get anything to eat. It was a very bad situation, and the people who needed our food most didn't get it. Mr. Menshikov was to blame for what happened, and we said so plainly on our return to Washington."

Senator MUNDT, confirming this, said:

"That is correct. As stated in the report, Menshikov was distributing these UNRRA supplies to the Communists and not to the other people—and claiming credit for the Soviets, rather than for this country. The Soviets were contributing very little, if anything, to this relief agency. By getting the leadership echelon partly into the hands of the Russians, they very skillfully maneuvered their people at the top in these countries which even then, I suppose, they had in mind taking over. This was a very handy tool to win friends and influence people—that's what they used it for."

When Ambassador Menshikov came to Washington he was received with open arms by various persons here. He was given time on television and he was publicized widely as exuding the best of feelings toward the American people. Yet behind the mask of smiles is a cruel streak. Here is a man who abused his trusteeship as the custodian and distributor of food to starving people. He was the agent of an international relief organization, but his first allegiance was to communism—he was willing to see human beings suffer unless they accepted Communist domination, even while he used relief supplies to reward those who were politically on his side. It is a sorrowful chapter. It is not important alone as a revelation of what one Communist did, but it's an example of the tyranny and inhumanity which lie behind the whole Communist creed and the Communist government.

One wonders why the Department of State didn't look up the record before giving its approval to Mr. Menshikov as an ambassador to the United States. For every government has a right to decide whether an individual is "persona grata"—acceptable to it—and certainly the record shows Mr. Menshikov had committed a serious offense against the American as well as the Polish peoples. With such a record revealed, Mr. Menshikov's usefulness in America can be considered at an end. His own government ought to recall him and, meanwhile, American organizations should hesitate to invite to their rostrums and banquet tables anyone who has such a record of willful cruelty to human beings. If they do, such functions should be picketed by those who wish to register a protest against inhumanity.

Resolutions Memorializing Congress To Repeal the Federal Excise Taxes on Transportation of Persons and Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolutions adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on April 7, 1958:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal excise taxes on transportation of persons and property

"Whereas the Federal transportation tax on the movement of passengers and freight was adopted as a wartime tax to discourage movement of civilian passengers and freight in 1942; and

"Whereas hostilities having ceased, this tax rather than being of a benefit to Massachusetts welfare, is now working as a detriment to Massachusetts economy; and

"Whereas the transportation tax, being inapplicable to certain carriers for hire, is working a hardship on those carriers for hire to whom said tax applies and which are en-

sential to the national defense and welfare; and

"Whereas the transportation tax because of its nature or application tends to become discriminatory as to communities and individuals, and tends to restrict trade areas, thereby interfering with the free flow of commerce: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the 3 percent Federal transportation tax on commodities shipped by carriers for hire, and to repeal the 10 percent transportation tax on passenger fares; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

House of representatives, adopted April 2, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence April 7, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Kansas Commonsense in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 18, 1958, on page A2552 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there appears the story of Bill Graham and his one-man foreign aid program in India.

Bill Graham is now in Pakistan using his direct Kansas commonsense aid to foreign industry on a self-liquidating loan approach rather than gratuity.

The following Reuters dispatch from Karachi, which appeared in the Kansas City Star, Sunday, April 20, 1958, is self-explanatory:

HEAR KANSAN'S AID PLAN

LOANS FOR BUSINESS OUTLINED ON VISIT IN PAKISTAN

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, April 19.—A Kansas businessman today started to sell his ideas on private enterprise for the little man to the people of Pakistan.

After a conference with Pakistani officials, Bill Graham, head of Private Enterprises, Inc., explained how he will bankroll Pakistanis to develop their small businesses.

"Give us a man with energy and the ideas for making money," the 47-year-old Graham said. "We will advance him up to $20,000 as an interest-free loan.

"He gives us half his profits until finally he can repay the loan. We make a profit, he finishes up a little capitalist. This is business—not an American charity deal."

A local investment corporation now is taking loan applications from Pakistani businessmen. Graham, who will fly to the United States tomorrow, will return in 2 months to make the final decisions on what businessmen get how much money. Preference will be given to men wanting about $5,000.

For Tariff Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor which appeared in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal:

FOR TARIFF PROTECTION

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I have been subscribing to your paper for several years and have always enjoyed your editorials because they are invariably based on facts and are written without bias.

I do want to take exception, however, to the editorial "The Kangaroo's Pouch" (March 31).

As a small manufacturer, I have been directly affected by cheap foreign imports, particularly in recent years by competition from Japan, which involves, in many instances, the complete imitation of our products.

Several of our Congressmen have suggested aid through subsidy, but I don't think this is the answer, nor do I feel that the average businessman would be interested in this type of aid.

You editorial appears to follow the erroneous thinking which has been evident all through the current testimony in favor of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act at the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. In the first place, the argument seems to be made without fear of contradiction that this country is exporting more than it is importing. I haven't had the opportunity to check these figures, but it seems to me that a good part of our export volume consists of surplus farm commodities and manufactured goods being furnished under foreign aid giveaway programs.

The second and more important error, and the one that is the most misleading, is the argument, as expressed in your editorial, marginal firms that cannot meet competition should try something else. In effect, this means to go out of business in a situation such as we are personally faced with. This argument might hold water if business in this country were operating in a free economy. I don't have to tell you that this is not the case. We would have no trouble competing with Japan if we did not have to pay high real estate taxes in the city of New York, a large part of which, in addition to our sales tax, goes to support a welfare program which has no residential requirement as far as its beneficiaries are concerned. In effect, business in New York and other large cities is being called upon to support hundreds of thousands of migrants from the south and from Puerto Rico. Do the Japanese manufacturers have this burden?

Do they have our high income taxes, a good part of which go to support foreign aid giveaways? Are they forced to comply with laws requiring time-and-a-half after 40 hours, and double time on Sundays? Do they have a minimum wage law which requires them to pay $1 per hour?

I imagine you can complete this list more readily than I can; the point is, how can any manufacturer in America, whose merchandise is made with small machines, and involves a certain amount of hand assembly work, hope to compete on an equal basis with a manufacturer in Japan? I might add that this type of product embodies the great bulk of our national products, involving hardware, textiles, and small appliances.

The only people that aren't hurt are large manufacturers, such as the automobile companies and, to a certain extent, the steel companies. These people all have large plant investments abroad, which may help their year-end profits, but doesn't do any good as far as employing American labor is concerned.

I think when it comes to the matter of logic and emotionalism, as referred to in the last paragraph of your editorial, the shoe is on the foot of the free traders, and not with the protectionists.

V. K. SCAVULLO.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y.

The High Cost of Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, rising costs of highways, particularly in connection with the big Interstate Superhighway System, are causing increasing concern among those in the States charged with responsibility for planning and financing road improvements generally. The public, too, is becoming aware of the huge bill that will have to be paid in order to provide the major road improvements.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an interesting editorial on this problem which appeared on April 17, 1958, in the Shenandoah Valley, a weekly newspaper edited and published at New Market, Va., by John G. Miller. The editorial follows:

A $25 MILLION ROAD IN A $25 MILLION COUNTY

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from Virginia and a good-roads advocate and expert, if there is any, sees the hole in the doughnut in the new interstate highway program. He points out that the extreme cost of this program, which requires the several States to put up 10 percent of the cost, is strangling the farm-to-market roads.

So astronomical are the costs of this modern network of speedways, that the Richmond brethren are scratching their heads in an effort to figure out where to get the money to do the matching, even if all sources of income were tapped. That 10 percent of the State's share looks small on paper, but when one figures out the cost of the program in Virginia, it amounts to a terrific drain on the highway funds.

Mr. BYRD hinted at the uneconomic side of the case when he pointed out that the program seemed to be foisted on the State despite the fact that much of the new construction parallels highways such as U. S. 11, which is presently in position to carry the load of traffic well.

The early estimates of the cost of the new Interstate System ran as high as a million dollars a mile in metropolitan and highly populated areas. To be sure, the average cost was not placed that high. Later we heard that the program was slowed on account of the fact that, though the income from the extra gasoline and tire taxes was bringing in the estimated amounts or more, the costs of building the highway were much higher than first anticipated.

It may be that a million dollars a mile will be the average cost. Think of what that means. Shenandoah County will have about 35 miles of this high speed highway according to the published plans. If it cost an average of a million dollars a mile, that would be $35 million for Shenandoah County. Let's be reasonable and shave 5 million from that figure and you have a $30 million tab of which amount the State has to chip in $3 million.

Well that sounds too high to be true. So let's cut it another $5 million and settle for $25 million. Let's hope that is still too big, but there is a limit to which you cut these Government programs which are to be built in the future.

The chances are that the $25 million may be about right. The recently awarded contract for a 5.7 mile portion of the bypass east of Harrisonburg was let at slightly over $4 million, not including cost of rights of way. That makes a good round figure of $700,000 a mile. With 35 miles of road to be built in Shenandoah County, it would appear that the cost would be $24,500,000.

The figure is only approximate of course, but in traversing Shenandoah County there will be a number of bridges over streams, over existing highways, etc., and it is likely that when the program gets rolling the contractors will be pretty well booked, so they will jack up their bids to make the extra profit that less competition permits.

So there you have it. A nice new $25 million highway for Shenandoah County. We find that the assessed valuation of Shenandoah County property for 1957, both real estate, and personal property, public utilities and what have you, was $24,250,000. So we will have a $25 million road in a $25 million county. According to mathematics, when the job is done we should have a $50 million county, half of it brand new.

Of the $25 million for the new road the State of Virginia will have to chip in $2,500,000. Man, what that would do to the roads other than U. S. 11 if it were spent on them. According to the present rate of money expended for new construction in Shenandoah County from State and Federal revenues for farm to market roads it would take a quarter of a century to get that much money spent. Maybe twice that long. If the Federal highway project goes through and the State has to divert money from existing revenues to paying its 10 percent there won't be any money at all for secondary and country road construction.

Man, do those figures make you dizzy? Do they add up to anything important to all of us? It sure is something to think about.

On the basis of that record, we can't see any advantage of spending more money on the interstate road system in an effort to bolster the incomes of our citizens. It seems to us, other ways should be found.

The American Stockholder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have just concluded the reading of a most interesting book entitled "The American Stockholder" by J. A. Livingston, who has acquired a well-deserved reputation as an outstanding financial writer.

I commend the book to the attention of every legislator on State and national levels. It not only brings a fresh viewpoint to this important subject but presents most important information without which the intelligent legislator can not exercise the judgment required of him.

There is an interesting subnote in the book, indicating that any person not mentioned in it, on appropriate identification, may purchase the book at the regular price. Not being mentioned in the book, I exercised the privilege of borrowing the book from the Congressional Library. I apologize to the author for thus depriving him of his royalties.

Trade Act Extension Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Pasadena, Calif., Star-News of April 18, 1958, published a thought-provoking and, in my opinion, an excellent editorial on why the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended.

The editorial also is a tribute to Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who is an articulate administration spokesman on international trade.

I commend this editorial, which follows, to the attention of every Member of Congress:

Henry Kearns, former Pasadenan, now Assistant Secretary of Commerce, recently told his friends here "a retreat from our reciprocal-trade agreements would be a scorched-earth retreat. It would leave in its wake ruined industries and loss of thousands of jobs."

President Eisenhower, in his battle with Congress, has been stressing the same theme. It is good to hear it also from Mr. Kearns, for this idea should be driven home to every American, be he employer or employee. Everyone has a major stake in the issue.

Mr. Kearns also stressed that present world trade creates jobs for at least 4,500,000 Americans.

Republicans who remember the pre-Roosevelt era may find this ironical. Historically, the GOP had been a high-tariff party. In those days, while this Nation was building its industrial empire, American business required protection from imports which were the product of cheap labor. At that time, too, American industry was required to import few raw materials.

Today the United States is no more isolated economically than it is politically. The picture has changed. Unfortunately, many in Congress still do not realize this. Last year's extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, for instance, passed the House by a single vote.

This year the struggle is even more bitter. High-duty advocates want to curtail, rather than enlarge, the President's authority to reduce tariffs on a gradual selective basis. The issue has crossed party lines. What used to be a protective policy espoused only by the GOP is now accepted by many Democrats, particularly those from the South.

Should the reciprocal-trade program be jettisoned, or even crippled, American payrolls would feel the blow.

America's exports last year totaled roughly $19.5 in United States goods, or one-fifth of total world exports. Exports are directly connected with imports. Last year the United States imported approximately $13 billion in foreign goods.

Between $10 billion and $11 billion in imports comprised noncompetitive raw and partially processed materials which we do not produce yet which are essential to our economy. If we are to sell abroad, we must also import from abroad.

Despite the early day battles over tariff, America grew through foreign trade.

If we are to learn from experience, then one has only to bear in mind the effects of the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930. Its severe import restrictions reduced foreign competition with our industries but, at the same time, cut our export trade from $9.6 billion in 1929 to $2.9 billion in 1932, a drop of 70 percent.

Foreign trade did not begin to rise again until this act was expunged by act of Congress.

With this catastrophe in the background it is hard to see how anti-reciprocal-trade forces can rally the support they have in Congress.

Henry Kearns did a service, not only to the President, but to the people as well, in his recent talk in Pasadena.

The Blight of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, this week the city of St. Louis, Mo., is host to the North American Wildlife Conference. Some 1,100 conservationists are taking part in discussions covering the whole broad range of conservation, including soil, water, timber, and wildlife. Delegates represent all types of organizations, public and private, in 48 States, the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and the provinces of Canada and Mexico.

As usual, the conference was opened by one of this Nation's great conservationists, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute and former Director both of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and of its predecessor, the United States Biological Survey.

"Gabe" will hit hard at partisan and personal politics in an address on March 5. He says they "have wrecked more good conservation programs," both State and Federal, than all other forces combined. As he points out, in a sense, conservation is national defense—for a nation without rich soil, clean water, productive forests, and adequate recreation for its people cannot retain a place of leadership among nations. In Dr. Gabrielson's words: "Soil erosion, overgrazing, and exploitative forest management have destroyed more nations than bombs, shells, and gunpowder."

Dr. Gabrielson's address, which is of concern to all of us, follows:

THE BLIGHT OF POLITICS, OR CONSERVATION BE DAMNED

(By Ira N. Gabrielson, president, Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, D. C.)

Webster's dictionary offers four modern definitions of politics, an honorable word that in its original meaning merely meant the science of government. Webster, however, must have known something about conservation issues when he coined definition No. 4. This speaks of politics in terms of political scheming, factional interests, and partisan rivalry. This is the politics that is bad for natural resources, and Webster's definition, in reverse order, makes a fair outline for a discussion of the wrong kind of politics in conservation administration today.

"Ding" Darling, when chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey, frequently said that the two worst enemies of wildlife were Republicans and Democrats acting as Republicans and Democrats. During the nearly 25 years since that time, I have seen little to refute that statement and much to convince me of its wisdom. Partisan and personal politics have wrecked more good conservation programs than all other forces combined.

The use of jobs in conservation agencies to repay political debts, or similar positions in any other agencies requiring the services of technically and scientifically trained personnel, is one of the most pernicious aspects of the American form of government. In selecting men to fill such positions, party bosses usually are more concerned with a man's loyalty to the party than they are with his qualifications to fill the job. In some States, the two-party system is little more than a myth, and, in these, personnel and programs often continue for many years simply because there is no change in party control of the State government. In many States, however, there is a continual turnover of power between two relatively equal political parties. When this situation prevails, the common practice is to "throw the rascals out" once every 2 or 4 years and replace the entire upper echelon of the conservation department with a new set of rascals of the new governor's choice. The extent of the overhaul is governed to some extent by the legal safeguards given the employees through civil service or similar institutions, and somewhat on the number of political friends to be paid off.

The political appointees owe political debts and loyalties and are far more sensitive to outside pressures than career employees in the same positions. In the usual situation where turnover is rapid, the heads of the departments know that they will be through in a couple of years and so they do nothing. If they do act, they frequently take the easiest course by following the path of least resistance rather than bucking political headwinds toward a sound program.

When such political appointees do evolve constructive programs—as some of them do—the programs usually are thrown out with the incumbent himself in the next housecleaning in the State capital. Republicans rarely can see any merit in sound conservation programs initiated by Democrats, and vice versa.

I do not mean to infer that this practice always turns up incompetents. More often than not, the conservation administrators placed in such positions, even in the most politically minded administrations, are men of sincerity who are interested in the resources and who honestly try to do their jobs. Usually, however, when they take over their offices, they are totally unfamiliar with the programs or with the responsibilities of their positions. If permitted by circumstances to remain long enough to learn their jobs, they sometimes become competent administrators, and, in fact, a few of the best fish and game administrators in the business today have come up through this somewhat devious route.

I do wish to say, however, that politically appointed heads of conservation agencies, at best, work under decided handicaps. The administration of fish, wildlife, and all other natural resources requires sound long-range planning and programing. The finest administrators backed by the best biologists and technicians that money can hire can hardly be expected to plan and put into operation long-term programs when they know that their own tenure of office will end with the next State election.

We have a prime example of what partisan politics can do to a career organization in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which is only now recovering from its devastating bout with the spoils system. The Biological Survey had, since it was founded in 1885, been headed by career scientists, and the Bureau of Fisheries, save for one disastrous experience with the spoils system in the early New Deal days, had been headed by trained fisheries men. When these 2 were combined in 1940 to form the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the career tradition was maintained. In 1953, all the top positions in this Service were placed in the schedule C category—in other words, they were made political appointments. The career men holding those positions were downgraded to meaningless jobs of small responsibility and eventually forced out of the Service, if not by actual pressure, at least by personal and professional pride. Morale sank to a low ebb all along the line. Many excellent career employees of long service, with nowhere to go but down, left to take jobs with universities and State conservation departments. Ironically, some of the men were loyal Republicans, but they had never thought of their jobs in political terms. The result was a chaotic 4 years of inaction, vacciliation, and generally unwise decisions. The important position of chief of wildlife research and others equally vital remained on an acting basis throughout that period.

The Republicans have redeemed themselves somewhat in the eyes of the conservationists by the forthright actions of Secretary Fred Seaton and Assistant Secretary Ross Leffler. Under their leadership, the wreckage is being salvaged and repaired, and the Federal agency entrusted with the management and restoration of the Nation's fish and wildlife services is getting back on the track and is moving forward. It now appears that the Fish and Wildlife Service has reassumed its interrupted tradition as a career agency. It will not regain its old status completely, however, until the Commissioner and his staff are included in the career service.

Among the States, the management of natural resources often is handled in the same way. In fact, it frequently is worse because there quite often is a turnover in the governor's office every 2 or 4 years. Where no protection against political raiding exists for conservation personnel, the direct effects generally reach far down into the ranks of conservation officers.

Indiana is not the only State that operates almost completely through the spoils system, but it offers a good example of a State whose conservation administration machinery is model-T structure in a swept-wing age. Indiana once could boast of having one of the most progressive fish and game programs in the Middle West, but that was for only a decade. In recent years, the Hoosier State has changed administrative personnel so often that only a confirmed optimist could expect to occupy the director's desk and plan ahead for more than a year or two.

The State forestry program in Indiana is in no better condition. Employees of all conservation agencies in this State are subjected to the vicious political assessment program that compels all employees to contribute to the faction or party in power.

In Oklahoma there has been a similar lack of continuity in the game and fish administration. That State has had five directors in the past 15 years. Oklahoma, superficially, has had a sound basic conservation organization, and it has achieved much under tremendous difficulties. It has had a commission form of administration for the past 10 years and a director appointed by the commission—both features characteristic of the best in the Nation. It fell short of the ideal, however, in several respects. The entire commission could be removed at the pleasure of the Governor, and the director could be fired without hearing or cause on a majority vote of the commission.

There were many loopholes in an otherwise sound structure through which a number of potentially able administrators were chucked before they had time to learn their jobs. In addition, the director often found himself short circuited in his relations with his subordinates when various commissioners bypassed his office and issued orders directly to his staff. Such a situation, which is not unique in Oklahoma, is dangerous. It can lead only to divided loyalties and poor morale.

Oklahoma voters, by a large majority, in 1956 passed a constitutional amendment which was planned to remove the affairs of the new Department of Wildlife Conservation from partisan political interference. Commissioners now are appointed for staggered terms of office with one vacancy occurring each year, and the director can be dischaged only for proper cause after a public hearing. Both moves were steps in the right direction.

Unfortunately, however, in protecting the organization from partisan politics, the State legislature, in its vitalizing act, left the door open for the kind of political meddling which Webster called factional interests. The act permits the State legislature to void or negate any rules or regulations passed by the Commission, and on its face, it appears to remove power from the governor and place the same power in the hands of the legislature. This definitely was not the intent of the voters, and it looks as though they may have traded one type of political interference for another. Certainly the activities of several State senators in recent months strongly suggest a determined effort to use the department for political purposes.

Factional politics can play hob with State conservation departments, even where there is practically no turnover in political power between parties. The latest example of this can be found in the recent history of the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission. For many years, Louisiana was close to the bottom of all States, no matter what standard was used to judge the efficiency or effectiveness of wildlife administration. Under the leadership of the Louisiana Wildlife Federation, the State, in 1952, finally pushed through a constitutional amendment designed to protect the commission from political tampering.

Under the new departmental administration established by this amendment, the status of the Louisiana department rose rapidly. Within a year or two, it was recognized as one of the most progressive in the Nation. It had a well-trained staff of biologists, a well-organized law-enforcement staff, a fine information and education organization, and a progressive program. Its director, although not a career conservationist, was an able administrator with the ability to seek advice from his informed subordinates before making decisions.

When Governor Long assumed office, he immediately descended upon the conserva-

tion department. The director was fired and a new director appointed by a commission packed by the Governor through legally questionable tactics. Almost overnight, Louisiana slipped back into the old ways. Game farms, which had been found to be of little value in improving hunting in Louisiana, was reopened, habitat-improvement programs and research were curtailed, and the morale of the entire staff dropped. Some of the biologists left to seek jobs in other States or in other fields. Those who remained must compromise their professional ethics to satisfy the whims of political appointees. Public hunting grounds, carefully built up by the previous administration were closed and converted into refuges for deer and upland game, a practice that has been found to be of little value in augmenting game stocks on surrounding lands.

After this raid, Governor Long immediatley began a campaign to make his wrecking job permanent by trying to push through a new amendment which would repeal the constitutional status of the State wildlife agency. Fortunately, the move failed when the Governor was repudiated by a 3-to-1 majority of the voters. Still, however, the commissioners, appointed by Governor Long, are hampered by local and State politics, unable to serve properly the sportsmen of Louisiana. It will be a long time in recovering from the disruptive forces that all but shattered it 2 years ago.

The present Governor of Kentucky removed a competent State forester because he would not play factional politics with his organization.

These are only examples of the many cases of poor administration of natural resources that could be mentioned if time permitted.

A similar situation could prevail in Florida if present proposals for a constitutional revision in that State are accepted by the people. The proposal affecting the fish and game agency would remove the earmarking of fish and game license funds, and would place complete control of both revenues and personnel of the department in the hands of the Governor. In other words, the proposed "improvement" in the fish and game department would unquestionably pave the way for a prompt return to the worst kind of a politically controlled administration. Florida got away from that sort of thing a few years ago, and the politicians are making a supreme effort to get control of the fish and game funds and personnel again for political patronage.

Factional politics likewise can occur within a well-organized department to the detriment of the public and of the department concerned. The most common example of this is when commission members are appointed according to political or geographic subdivisions of the State. It is difficult to attain a balanced program on this basis.

Another common failure of commissioners is when they feel they must meddle in affairs that should be left to the professionals within the department. They insist that their favorite areas receive the heaviest stocking of birds or fish and the lion's share of the output of the State forestry nurseries. Often a single strong appointee to a conservation commission will dominate all of the other members and the entire departmental organization under its nominal control. The fine progress made by the Tennessee Game and Fish Department is in jeopardy at the present time because of domination and personnel meddling of certain commissioners. This is a difficult situation to correct. Usually, it can be licked only through pressure on the commission by militant citizens' groups on the outside.

Factional quarrels within the Department are more easily solved, but often only after they have done great damage to the morale of the organization. I have examined departments where the fishery men were sniping at the game men, the forestry people were feuding with the soil experts, and the conservation officers were mad at everyone. A strong administrator, backed by an intelligent commission, usually can solve such situations promptly by knocking heads together and the judicious use of the pruning axe.

As long as mankind exists there will be politics both in the good sense and the bad. Politics in its highest meaning is an indispensable part of the American way of life. In its narrower and less-honorable aspects, however, particularly when applied to the administration of natural resources, it is both a blight and a blot on the name of democracy.

In anything as important as the conservation of renewable natural resources to the future of America, party-first politics and petty personal politics have no proper place any more than they have in matters dealing with national defense. In a sense, conservation is national defense of the most important kind; for a nation without rich soil, clean water, productive forests, and adequate recreation for its people cannot retain a place of leadership among nations. Soil erosion, overgrazing, and exploitative forest management have destroyed more nations than bombs, shells, and gunpowder.

In order to assure sound conservation programs, political interference, from within or without, must be kept to a minimum. We must select the best trained and most experienced administrators to handle these programs and permit them to work without improper pressure from the office of the governor, from legislative bodies, or from narrow or pressure groups among the people themselves. Any sound law should have machinery for removing an incompetent or dishonest administrator from office for due and reasonable cause, but due cause should not include the way he voted in the last election or the fact that he failed to stock the farm pond of a commissioner or governor-elect.

All conservationists should work to remove the blight of this kind of politics from the management of natural resources. Great progress has been made in this field since the early 1930's when the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners drafted a model law to cover the administration of wildlife resources. The basic elements of the law have been widely adopted and have provided more good management of the resources than any or all other systems yet devised.

The enactment of a law, and the inauguration of a sound program, does not stop the politicians from trying to retain political control of the funds and positions in the department, however. Many States have started such programs only to have resource management fall back into the old ways as soon as the conservationists relaxed their vigilance.

It is and will be a constant battle to get and keep sound, continuous programs going.

Extension of Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James T. Vocelle, chairman of the Florida Industrial Commission, has issued a very interesting statement on the extension of unemployment benefits. Mr. Vocelle is a recognized authority in this important field and it is with pleasure that I submit his statement for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement follows:

I have just returned from Washington where, among other things, I attended hearings being held by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on numerous bills which have been introduced in Congress concerning the extension of unemployment-compensation benefits. In the light of present economic conditions, it appears desirable to briefly review the situation with respect to unemployment insurance in general; Florida's place in the picture, and the overall effect of pending legislation on the subject.

It is well for us to remember that while unemployment insurance did not come into being in the United States until 1935, it is not a new program but has been in existence for many years in other countries of the world. It was enacted by Congress in 1935, after a thorough study by leading economists of the country in the light of the tremendous impact upon the Nation's economy resulting from the disastrous depression of the early 1930's. We saw what it meant to our Nation's economy to have lines of people out of work, vainly seeking to find employment, and having no way to turn for bread for their families except in breadlines.

This created a double burden in that unemployed workers were not only nonproductive and, consequently, were unable to purchase goods in the market but also had to be cared for by gainfully employed members of society, thereby exacting double drain upon the economy. I am unalterably opposed to doles and, in my opinion, nothing is worse than giving people something for nothing. I am also in complete accord with St. Paul's admonition to the Thessalonians when he said, "If there is any man among you who will not work, neither let him eat."

A completely different situation arises, however, when people who have been genuinely attached to the labor market find themselves out of work through no fault of their own and are unable to secure work. Such a situation requires action and some provision must be made for such cases. This is what the Nation is faced with at the present moment, and it is when unemployment insurance can come in and make its contribution toward the solution of some of the problems.

In adopting the unemployment compensation law, Congress provided for a flat 3 percent payroll tax against employers with eight or more employees on the first $3,000 of wage earnings for each employee. There were exception, of course, to covered employment such as agricultural and domestic workers. This coverage has since been extended so as to include employers with four or more employees. Provision was made for States to enact unemployment-insurance laws and for employers to receive credit up to 90 percent of the Federal tax for State taxes paid, or which would have been paid except for State experience rating provisions. All the 48 States, in addition to Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, have unemployment-insurance laws and the effect of these laws has been to reduce the Federal tax to three tenths of 1 percent. This is the source of all funds used for administration of such programs on both the Federal and State level.

Florida's law has been so geared as to reduce the costs of the program to the employers of Florida to such an extent that we warned the employers of the State beginning with the 1953 session of the legislature, being the first session after I became

chairman of the commission, that our experience rating was so liberal as to jeopardize the solvency of the program and that unless a change was made, the State's unemployment fund would be reduced to the point where the employers of the State might be called upon to pay the maximum 3 percent tax in the time of a recession when they could afford it the least. This warning was based not only on our own research but on the basis of a most comprehensive survey of the entire unemployment insurance program by the Tax Foundation, whose board of trustees comprises the leaders in big business in the country. In a report issued in 1953, the Tax Foundation called attention to the fact that Florida did not have a high enough average tax rate to meet the impact of recession. Our pleas, however, fell on deaf ears until the 1957 session when Associated Industries, representing a large group of employers in the State, saw the logic of our position and an amendment was made to the law which has helped the situation considerably, although not to the full extent needed to meet the full impact of an extended recession. As a matter of fact, the statistics show that the average tax rate paid by the employers of Florida has decreased in 10 years from 1.44 percent in 1947 to .69 percent in 1957, making the average rate paid in Florida the lowest of any of the 51 jurisdictions with the exception of Colorado, Iowa, Virginia, and Arkansas. The amount which the employers of Florida would have been called upon to pay in 1957 on a basis of 2.7 percent tax would have been $58,131,000. They actually paid $15,462,315.

Florida also has the unenviable distinction of providing the smallest amount of benefits of any of the 51 jurisdictions, and Florida probably has more restrictions on the payment of benefits than any of the other jurisdictions. This also is a situation to which we have directed our attention and while the maximum amount of weekly benefits has been increased, since I have been chairman of the commission, from $20 to $30, the maximum duration of 16 weeks has been left unchanged. Governor Collins in his message to the 1957 legislature recommended an increase of the maximum duration to 20 weeks but formidable opposition prevented the change being made.

At the present time unemployment is widespread over the Nation. Florida, however, has had a lower impact than the rest of the country. In some of the States unemployment has risen as high as more than 12 percent of workers covered by unemployment insurance and the national average for the week ending March 30 was 7.8 percent, while in Florida during the same week 4 percent of covered workers were drawing unemployment benefits. This represents an increase of eight-tenths of 1 percent since January and is 178 percent above the claims load a year ago.

The demands upon Congress for something to be done to alleviate this situation are enormous and many bills have been introduced on the subject. In analyzing these bills, from my viewpoint, some considerations must be kept uppermost in mind. One is that I think it would be disastrous to divert the unemployment insurance program from an insurance program into that of a dole. Likewise, I am opposed to federalization of the program and feel that it should be left as it is on a Federal-State relationship. However, when some States drag their feet and fail to have a completely sound program geared to meet the reasonable needs that may arise, it is an invitation for Federal intervention. Regrettably, Florida is in this boat and the fact that we have the lowest benefit payments of any of the 51 jurisdictions, save Arkansas, is one of the strong arguments being used by the proponents of federalization at this time.

It is my considered judgment, after having listened to the arguments presented before the Ways and Means Committee, that something is going to have to be done to provide more extended benefits in many of the States to workers who are out of work through no fault of their own and cannot find employment. In order to keep unemployment compensation on an insurance basis and to prevent federalization, I feel that the administration's proposal as presented in the House of Representatives by Congressman REED of New York, ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, and being H. R. 11697, is the soundest approach to the problem that has been presented I do not think that this bill is a panacea but I feel that it will help to make up for some inadequacies now existing in the program. I feel that those who need assistance outside of the unemployment insurance field should be cared for on a basis of need through the public assistance approach.

Basically the Reed bill does these things:

1. It extends duration of benefits for an additional 50 percent beyond that provided by State laws to those workers who have exhausted their benefits after December 31, 1957. Payments would be made to eligible claimants for weeks of unemployment beginning 30 days after the law becomes effective and prior to April 1, 1959.

2. It does not change any provisions of the State law with respect to amount of benefits nor to eligibility provisions. A person still must be unemployed through no fault of his own to be eligible. The Federal Government will advance the funds for payment of the extended benefits.

3. It is not a grant but is a loan which must be repaid by the States either out of a direct appropriation or by transfer from the State's unemployment trust fund. If this is not done, then the repayment will be made by a small increase in the Federal unemployment tax on employers beginning with the year 1963.

It seems to me that we cannot ignore the rising tide of unemployment throughout the country and that Florida, prior to the present recession, had the highest rate of exhaustion of benefits of any of the 51 jurisdictions. Since Florida normally experiences highest unemployment in summer it appears that a long, hard summer lies ahead of us.

If a blanket extension of duration of benefits is made as provided in what is known as the Mills-McCormack bill pending before Congress, which also provides for an outright Federal grant, it would mean that the employers of Florida would be called upon to pay not only for unemployment in Florida but for their share of unemployment in States having a much heavier ratio. This is because funds for the program would come from Federal general revenue. Under the Reed bill the employers in each State would carry the burden of extension of duration in their own State and the employers of Florida would be called upon to pay only the cost of extension in Florida, which would be relatively small compared with what the burden would otherwise be if we had to share the costs in other States as well.

I think it well to point out the limitations contained in Florida's law on the payment of benefits. In order to qualify for unemployment compensation in Florida these conditions must be met:

1. The worker must be unemployed through no fault of his own.

2 The worker must be physically able to work full time.

3. The worker must be actively seeking suitable work and satisfy the Commission that such is the case.

In addition to these qualifying conditions the worker must have been genuinely attached to the labor market and no one can receive unemployment compensation benefits unless he has earned at least $200 during the base year, and he also must have been paid wages during his base period equal to or in excess of 1¼ times his highest quarter wages. The worker is also limited to benefit payments in any 1 benefit year not to exceed 25 percent of his total wages in his base period. There is also the overall ceiling of 16 weeks at a maximum of $30 a week, which means that no worker could receive more than $480 in unemployment insurance benefits in any 1 year.

Under Florida law the minimum weekly benefit payable is $10 and the maximum $30, depending upon the earnings of the worker. Thus Florida benefits are payable for a minimum of 5 weeks at $10 per week, or $50, to a maximum of $30 per week for 16 weeks, or a total of $480. Under the provisions of the Reed bill the amounts payable would be extended 50 percent. In the first example claimant could draw $25 more at $10 per week for 2 weeks and $5 for 1 week. In the second case claimant could draw $240 more at $30 per week. The extension of maximum number of weeks under this bill would still leave Florida's maximum duration of 24 weeks below that being paid by the vast majority of the States.

While, as I have stated, I do not think the Reed bill by any means represents a complete answer to the problems I feel that it goes as far as unemployment insurance could be expected to go without destroying its basic insurance principle. I feel though, in the light of the present situation, the 1959 legislature should carefully re-examine Florida's place in the picture so that we may preserve unemployment insurance as a State program and yet at the same time measure up to the responsibility which we have to provide reasonable benefits for unemployed workers who have been genuinely attached to the labor market and who are seeking work and who are unable to find it. To do less than this, in my opinion, is to invite disaster and to evade the moral responsibility that goes with living in a free society.

Tumult in the City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, last week the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, had their annual national convention in our city.

Among the speakers was Mrs. Ray L. Erb, chairman, national defense committee. Mrs. Erb's address states with clarity and sincerity the underlying viciousness which is Soviet Russia. She points out that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is intoxicated with a dream of world domination.

I hope all my colleagues will take time to read Mrs. Erb's excellent speech, which follows:

TUMULT IN THE CITY

Many years ago I was taught a poem which helped to inspire, in my heart and mind, appreciation of, and devotion to, my native land. I doubt if any of today's youth are familiar with it, but I am wondering if some of my contemporaries in the audience might be. Though consisting of nine verses, I shall read but a few lines.

"There was tumult in the city
In the quaint old Quaker town
And the streets were rife with people
Pacing restless up and down—
People gathering at the corners
Where they whispered each to each
And the sweat stood on their temples
With the earnestness of speech.

'Will they do it?' 'Dare they do it?'
'Who is speaking?' 'What's the news?'
'What of Adams?' 'What of Sherman?'
'Oh, God grant they won't refuse!'

So they surged against the State House
While all solemnly inside
Sat the Continental Congress,
Truth and reason for their guide.
O'er a simple scroll debating
Which, though simple it might be,
Yet could shake the cliffs of England
With thunders of the free.

Quickly, at the given signal,
The old bellman lifts his hand,
Forth he sends the good news, making
Iron music through the land.

That old State House bill is silent,
Hushed is now its clamorous tongue
But the spirit is awakened
Still is living—ever young."

Tonight I am forced to ask—in how many hearts in America today is that spirit living and in how many minds in America is there the comprehension of the vision of those leaders of old—or loyalty to the statements they so courageously signed. The tumult of that memorable first July 4th, when the Liberty Bell rang out our independence, was the reaction of a young and vigorous country marking a momentous step away from state control and toward self government.

The shouting and singing which arose from the crowd waiting for a decision that hot afternoon in Philadelphia was joy for their new freedom but fear for the dangers it might bring for each of them. They knew that the signers of that declaration would be considered traitors in the eyes of their former rulers and that many would pay dearly for their courage and convictions. Even in that restless crowd, facing an uncertain future, it was one thing to declare their independence and quite another to maintain it.

Every Daughter of the American Revolution knows well the inspiring history of the years since our national independence was declared; the individual liberty enjoyed and the magnificent successes achieved.

Today many of our citizens seem to have strangely lost America's vision and faith in our form of government. They stand idly by while that superb protector of their liberty, the Constitution of the United States of America, is being undermined and annihilated.

Many ancient and modern nations have cast off oppression, but those which have been able to enjoy a few precious moments of liberty are most rare, for they soon relapsed into their old political vices.

There is tumult in our hearts today as we observe mere illusions being accepted as reality; license taken for liberty; treachery for patriotism; revenge for justice. We are deeeply concerned and distressed over the disregard for the next generation, the expression of which is the ever-increasing astronomical national debt. A Member of Congress recently said: "If we continue to go on as we have in the past three decades, our children's children will be left with a Nation so mortgaged that it will be void of all individual incentive or initiative."

Have we been free so long as to have forgotten what enslavement means? Have we become smug in our fake security and apathetic regarding the worldwide struggle for the minds and souls of men?

May we never forget that we are dealing with men misled by the illusions of error, and, in many instances, by evil incentives.

The hour of trial has indeed become a reality and one which must be met with confidence and strength. In order to safeguard our future it becomes obligatory that we endeavor to preserve the inheritance of a great past.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is intoxicated with a dream of world domination. Our people must be protected from the clever and consistent propaganda of those who would destroy us. It is imperative that clear thinking permeate the mists of confusion with the ensuing determination to courageously confront our enemies, and now, with no further postponement, time is of the essence.

Many Americans are asking: What shall we do? Where shall we turn for guidance? These are questions no Daughter of the American Revolution should hesitate to answer. When the tumult and the clamor arise, when fears and suspicions overtake our leaders, and when some Americans doubt the rightness of their own liberty, we Daughters have a proven and well-tried solution to offer. We can demand that our people and our Government return to the Constitution, the safeguard of all of our liberties, the champion of our freedom.

The world is looking for an answer to the promises of tyrants and for a way out of the slavery that seems to be their lot no matter what words their governments employ to rob them of their individual rights. They would like to follow our pattern of limited government but they are told daily of the failure of our freedoms, and the glory of the superstate. We must restore our constitutional government not only for our own security and that of our children, but as a promise of what constitutional government can do for other nations.

America's noblest destiny is to demonstrate the keeping of freedom.

I believe in America's power of regeneration. I believe we can remake ourselves from within in order that we be not remade from without.

We daughters have only to rely upon the demonstrated wisdom of our Bill of Rights with its proven power to give men the good life. With dedication and determination we can preserve the Constitution and our Nation in all its glory and majesty.

Let us help make the courage of eternal youth run once more in the veins of our country. The vital breath for the future of our Nation is individual liberty.

At this great meeting let us renew our vows of devotion to the great ideals which have animated us. May we rise above the present confusions to meet today's challenge, and work forward to the new day when truth will triumph over falsehood, when statesmanship will prevail over blackmail, and when government of the people, for the people, and by the people will be the common heritage of all mankind.

Let us raise our thoughts to the fearless independence of that majestic symbol of our Nation, the American eagle, as it soars above the tumult of today.

This is the challenge, my fellow Americans, and we will not fail.

Communism: A False Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth a very timely and penetrating discussion on communism and the churches by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, which appeared in Human Events on April 21, 1958, and which is an excerpt from Mr. Hoover's book, Masters of Deceit:

COMMUNISM: A FALSE RELIGION

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

Something utterly new has taken root in America during the past generation, a Communist mentality representing a systematic, purposive, and conscious attempt to destroy Western civilization and roll history back to the age of barbaric cruelty and despotism, all in the name of "progress." Evil is depicted as good, terror as justice, hate as love, and obedience to a foreign master as patriotism.

Numerically speaking, this mentality is limited to a few men and women, the disciplined corps of the Communist Party, USA. However, Communist thought control, in all its various capacities, has spread the infection, in varying degrees, to most phases of American life.

This mentality, imported to our land for the purpose of eventually leading to a destruction of the American way of life, poses a crucial problem for every one of us. It can destroy our constitutional Republic if it is permitted to corrupt our minds and control our acts.

In our tolerance for religious freedom, for separation of church and state, we sometimes lose sight of the historical fact: Western civilization has deep religious roots. Our schools, courts, legislative bodies, social agencies, philanthropic organizations, as well as our churches, are witnesses to the fundamental fact that life has a significance that we ourselves do not create.

It is part of our tradition and belief that each of us is obligated to give, when reality requires it, a reason for the faith that is in him. The presence of communism in the world and in our own country is a kind of stern reality which should make each of us explore our own faith as deeply as we can and then speak up for its relationship to our American way.

The very essence of our faith in democracy and our fellow man is rooted in a belief in a Supreme Being. To my mind, there are six aspects to our democratic faith:

1. A belief in the dignity and worth of the individual, a belief which today is under assault by the Communist practice which regards the individual as a part of the class, the mass, and a pawn of the state;

2. A belief in mutual responsibility, of our obligation to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and care for the less fortunate, which is affronted by Communist policies of calculated ruthlessness;

3. A belief that life has a meaning which transcends any manmade system, that is independent of any such system, and that outlasts any such system, a belief diametrically opposed by the materialistic dogma of communism;

4. A belief in stewardship, a feeling that a great heritage is our sacred trust for the generations yet to come, a belief that stands today as the competitor to Communist loyalty to Marxism-Leninism;

5. A belief that the moral values we adhere to, support, and strive toward are grounded on a reality more enduring and satisfying than any manmade system, which is opposed by the Communist claim that all morality is "class morality";

6. A belief, which has matured to a firm conviction, that in the final analysis love is the greatest force on earth and is far more enduring than hatred; this forbids our accepting the Communist division of mankind that by arbitrary standards singles out those fit only for liquidation.

It is only as we thus take stock of what we mean by saying that our culture has religious roots that we become ready to make an accurate appraisal of Communist ideology and tactics.

The most basic of all Communist comments about religion is the statement of Karl Marx that religion is "the opium of the people." This Marxian doctrine has been restated by William Z. Foster and applied to Communist action in these words: "* * * God will be banished from the laboratories as well as from the schools."

Inherited from fanatic minds abroad, this mentality poses today a crucial problem for every patriotic man and woman in America. If allowed to develop it will destroy our way of life.

Communists have always made it clear that communism is the mortal enemy of Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and any other religion that believes in a Supreme Being.

"Don't think that the Communists have changed their minds about religion," says Nikita Khrushchev. "We remain the atheists that we have always been; we are doing as much as we can to liberate those people who are still under the spell of this religious opiate." As long as communism remains, the assault will continue.

To the Communist, Marxism-Leninism is the "perfect science." It accounts for everything; it has a plan for everything; it can be the source of everything a man needs. Therefore, said Lenin, "we shall always preach a scientific philosophy; we must fight against the inconsistencies of the Christians."

No Communist can be permitted to set an abstract truth above an expedient lie, or to extend compassion to an enemy whom the party intends to smear or liquidate. The Communists dismiss our sentiments motivated by spiritual force as silly prattlings that reflect bourgeois weakness. Therefore, they have their own morality, Communist morality, as stated by Lenin:

"We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts. * * * We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle."

That is why a Communist can commit murder, pillage, destruction, and terror, and feel proud; lie and feel no compunction; seek to destroy the American form of government and feel justified. Communism has turned the values of western civilization upside down.

It would seem that Communists, in view of the above, would make clear, always and at every point, their opposition to religion. Often, however, tactics have made it necessary to play down or to conceal entirely the party's intentions, in line with Lenin's advice: "* * * but this does not mean that the religious question must be pushed into the foreground where it does not belong."

The Communists realize that the vast majority of non-Communists believe in God. Too bold an approach might antagonize them, doing the party more harm than good. In line with theses tactics, the party is today engaged in a systematic program to infiltrate American religious groups.

"The Communist Party," said the national committee in 1954, "declares that it seeks no conflict with any church or any American's religious belief. On the contrary, we stretch out our hand in the fellowship of common struggle for our mutual goal of peace, democracy, and security to all regardless of religious belief." Members are being told: "Join churches and become involved in church work."

The party's objectives inside religious groups are several:

1. To gain respectability; "* * * a church is the best front we can have." Comrades, by associating in church circles, secure an acceptable status in the community, greater credence for their opinions, and the lulling of non-Communist suspicions.

2. To provide an opportunity for the subtle dissemination of Communist propaganda. Churches are convincing places in which to identify Communist programs with such genuine religious values as peace, brotherhood, justice. One member bragged how in a church talk he had plugged for Marx. The Communists are careful, however, not to overdo it. One fellow was too ambitious. He was challenged by alert church members and relieved of his leadership duties.

3. To make contact with youth: through class discussions, recreational affairs, etc. The object is not necessarily to recruit (although in one church several young people did join) but to plant a seed of Marxist-Leninist thought.

4. To exploit the church in the party's day-to-day agitational program. In the 1930's and 1940's the approach was chiefly through immediate economic and political problems, with the party attempting to exploit the church's legitimate interest in better housing and the elimination of social injustices.

Today this tactic is overshadowed by the peace issue. Every possible deceptive device is being used to link the party's peace program with the church. One Communist Party section issued instructions that every clergyman in the community be contacted to give a sermon on peace. Encourage party church members to organize discussion groups, perhaps showing a peace film. If possible, circulate peace literature. If you can't get inside, stand outside. One organizer said: "We are to dress up like other people and stand outside churches in our neighborhoods and use the slogan, 'Peace on earth, good will toward men.'"

5. To enlarge the area of party contacts. One party section advocated: join small churches (100 to 500 membership), so that one can more easily work himself into a position of leadership. Make as many personal contacts as possible. Learn where the church member works, what his hobbies are, etc. Someday he might be used. One party member, active in youth work, learned that the parents of several young people were working in an industrial plant. Securing this information was most important, he said.

6. To influence clergymen. A dedicated clergyman, being a man of God, is a mortal enemy of communism. But if he can, by conversion, influence, or trickery, be made to support the Communist program once or a few times or many times, the party gains. If, for example, a clergyman can be persuaded to serve as sponsor or officer of a Communist front, to issue a testimonial or to sign a clemency petition for a Communist "victim of persecution," his personal prestige lends weight to the cause.

Behind these deceptive tactics, however, can be seen the real nature of communism. For the member, religion is not a private affair. No tolerance is allowed. He cannot be a Marxist and adhere to a religion. The party is today desperately working to mold atheistic materialism as a weapon of revolution, a revolution which, if it is to succeed, must first sap religion's spiritual strength and then destroy it.

The party's attack can be traced through four stages:

1. Recruitment: keyed to the party's general approach toward non-Communists, the issue of religion is minimized. "Try to win recruits on the basis of wages and the class struggle rather than religion"; and "go ahead and tell a fellow you believe in God to keep from getting into an argument." Likewise it is urged: "If we approach a churchgoer we do not hit him over the head and tell him his idea is crazy. We take a tactical approach."

2. Early indoctrination: keyed to patience if recruits continue to attend church after joining the party. They must be gradually "educated." If new members begin to ask questions, they are to be made to feel, not that their fellow Communists are trying to take away their belief, but that these Communists are "advanced thinkers," that they hold a "scientific" concept of the universe, and that religion is to them simply "old-fashioned."

3. Special indoctrination: Keyed to the real job of teaching Marxist materialism are special indoctrination classes. "Our program thus necessarily includes the propaganda of atheism," said Lenin, directing his words, of course, to party members.

4. Final goal: The utter elimination of all religion (called bourgeois remnants) from the heart, mind, and soul of man, and the total victory of atheistic communism. Religious attitudes keep cropping up, however, even in the trained member. One individual admitted that it had taken him a long time to give up his religion. "It was one of the hardest parts of my party development."

Here, then, is the fight the Communist leaders wage. We do not believe they can ever win it. So-called religious survivals represent something far deeper in man than the Communists can grant; some eternal reaching toward a creative source. But if the party does not realize the true nature and strength of these survivals, it does realize that religion is its most potent foe.

To meet this challenge no hesitant, indifferent, half-apologetic acts on our own part can suffice. Out of the deep roots of religion flows something warm and good, the affirmation of love and justice; here is the source of strength for our land if we are to remain free. It is ours to defend and to nourish.

Financing Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1958, the Federal Reserve Board transmitted to the chairmen of the Banking and Currency Committees and the Select Committees on Small Business of both Houses of Congress a document on the financing of small business which was very clearly labeled a study of financing of small business. The Board of Governors was very careful in the letter of transmittal not to refer to the document as a report. The four chairmen of the congressional committees joined in the statement, submitting this study to the Congress for its attention. They, too, carefully referred to it as a study and not as a report.

In the preparation of the document as a committee print for use by Members of Congress, unfortunately, somebody placed upon the cover of the document the word "report" instead of "study."

That has brought about an unfortunate situation, due to careless reporting and careless editorializing on the part of some members of the press. One editorial in the Wall Street Journal editorialized about this study, indicating "it would be well if Congress paid attention to it" and further stated that the "report" indicated the Small Business Administration was a temporary and a

"distress organization," holding out no promise to small business primarily because the agency was set up "to grant loans to applicants who cannot get them anywhere else." It then goes on to say that this is unsound business practice, and the Government should not encourage loans to poor credit risks.

It is easy to write, but it takes real hard work to become properly informed before writing.

Not only was the study not a report but the study itself very plainly states that no member of the Board participated in the writing of the material submitted, and, on the contrary, the "views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank."

Now let us turn our attention for a moment to the contents of the study to determine whether or not there is anything there to sustain the criticism and improper conclusions found in the news item.

The study very properly states that the law has always required of the Small Business Administration and its predecessor lending agencies, that before the Government makes any credit available, it must appear that the loans cannot be obtained from private financing.

This provision has been found sound and workable. It is necessary in order to protect private enterprise from Government competition.

That does not mean, however, that loans are to be made to bad risks. As a matter of fact, the Government lending agencies, and particularly the Small Business Administration, have a very good record in that respect. Actually, there have been more complaints made against the Small Business Administration because it adheres too strictly to the requirement of the law that no loan be made unless there is "reasonable assurance of repayment." The loss ratio by the Small Business Administration is much, much smaller than that experienced by private lenders.

There are many reasons why small business can get no loans from private lenders other than the fact that it is a bad credit risk. There are plenty of good credit risks among the small-business men of the country who have been unable to get private loans. The Small Business Administration is filling that void to the limited extent permitted by existing law.

There is nothing in the study as presented by the Federal Reserve Board which justifies the conclusion that Government encourages private lenders to consider poor credit risks.

There is no doubt that the Government can and should play a greater role in connection with making risk or equity capital available to small business and there is much to be said for making loans available for a term beyond the 10 years permitted by the existing law to the Small Business Administration. Constructive criticisms along those lines will be helpful to the Congress in performing its duty. News items and editorials, such as referred to above, will do nothing except to create confusion.

In connection with the foregoing, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the following letters written to and received by the ever-vigilant George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, April 16, 1958.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGER: Thank you for your letter of April 14. I am glad to have your further comments about the Small Business Administration.

The report to which the Wall Street Journal release referred is a technical study of the problem of small-business financing, prepared by the staff of the Federal Reserve System with a number of university or independent scholars also collaborating. The conclusions drawn in the individual studies are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Board of Governors. The published study was given to the press without an accompanying release prepared by the Board or its staff. Such comments as the press may have made of the study, or such points as the press may have taken out of context, are, therefore, the responsibility of the press and in no way the responsibility of the Board.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

APRIL 14, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN,
Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I noted in the Wall Street Journal today: "Reserve Board says small business agency, banks fail to aid growth." Of course both this office and our head office at Burlingame, Calif., will closely scrutinize and study the report issued by the Board to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the select Committees on Small Business. However, we do believe there is some need for a clarification and proper evaluation of the operations of the Small Business Administration.

As the saying goes: "Rome wasn't built in a day" and it goes without saying that in our opinion, after closely scrutinizing the operations of the agency from its inception, it may be found that the operation of the agency was handicapped from the first instance through impediments. To substantiate that statement—from the very first instance the National Federation of Independent Business vigorously opposed the establishment within the agency of the Policy Board, and we are referring to the Secretary of the Treasury or his alternate, and the Secretary of Commerce or his alternate, and the SBA Administrator.

When the vote came up on this in the United States Senate in the first instance this office wired 96 Members of the Senate opposing that part of the act. In other words, we maintained that the administration of the act should rise or fall on the actions of the Administrator himself, and we have lived to see the day that we were correct in our findings.

We know that when the agency was originally established and a few months into its operation, after a hurried nationwide visit in key regional offices of SBA, and upon reporting our findings back to Washington the result was that the whole operation of the SBA as to its lending policy was changed as it related to those eligible to secure SBA loans.

The Wall Street Journal report further states: "The study criticized the SBA for granting loans only when small business finds it impossible to get them anywhere else." What's wrong with that? I believe it may be found in the act itself that small business is expected to attempt to secure loans from private sources, and when they are not available and the credit standing of the applicant is okay, the Small Business Administration moves in. In other words the procedure used by SBA is not in competition with private banking circles.

The report further states: "The tremendous postwar increase in indebtedness of small businesses might raise the question of whether credit had become too readily available." The writer's experience in private business for better than a quarter of a century or more prior to my connection with the federation leads me to believe that where small business goes in for financial loans from private banking institutions their applications are generally scrutinized very very carefully before any consideration is given to the loan.

We believe, from reviewing the operations of the Small Business Administration, and after having recently completed personal visits to SBA Offices in Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York City, that the Agency is showing consistent progress more in keeping with the will of the Congress and the full intent of the act.

We further believe, due to the splendid action of the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, which voted and approved improved SBA legislation expanding the powers and operations of the Agency, and more important, the key to its operation as to financing matters—authorizing a new Advisory Board consisting of the Administrator, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of the Treasury, and not less than 3 nor more than 5 small-business men, this will go a long long ways in bringing long overdue financial assistance to small business where such credit is not available through private banking institutions, and in closing we might add that the opinion we have expressed above is also the opinion held by some members of the banking fraternity.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER, V. P.,
National Federation of Independent Business.

APRIL 17, 1958.

EDITOR, WALL STREET JOURNAL,
44 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I noted with considerable interest on the editorial page of today's Wall Street Journal "Topsy-turvy business," which certainly calls for our attention in view of the interest our nationwide membership—all independent business and professional men, has in the operation of the Small Business Administration.

You state: "The temporary Small Business Administration will probably outlive us all." You are correct, and it will outlive us all until such time as banking institutions throughout the Nation are permitted to make long-term capital loans to small business. You are well aware that under present banking laws the banks more or less are regulated by State and Federal law on long-term loans.

We are leaving no stone unturned, which after all is the majority vote of our membership, to have the Senate take concurrent action on the improved Small Business Administration legislation which was voted by practically unanimous action in the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress—to be exact, 392 for and 2 against.

Our understanding of the recently released report of the Federal Reserve Board "Financing small business" is that it was not a report of the Board itself but was merely a report of the staff which was engaged to study the situation.

Page 19 of the report carries letter of transmittal dated March 31, 1958, directed to the Chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, House Committee on Banking and Currency, House Select Committee on Small Business, signed by Wm. McC. Martin, Jr., chairman, in which he stated: "Last fall the research staffs of the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve banks undertook a study of the financing problems of small business." We could find nothing in Mr. Martin's letter to the committees where he called the Small Business Administration a distress organization, nor do we find in his letter any comments as quoted: "hold out any promise for development" of small businesses.

We believe in fairness to your nationwide readers of the Journal that you may find it convenient to publish this letter as it goes without saying many thousands of small business people throughout the Nation do read the Wall Street Journal.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

A Brass Ring for Mr. Gary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a well-deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable J. VAUGHN GARY, which appeared in the Richmond News Leader on April 18, 1958.

It is an old southern custom, and it has been of enormous usefulness to the South, that when a man really establishes his hold on a congressional seat he generally is spared opposition from within his own party. And because over much of the South there is no opposition from outside his own party, the Southern Congressman builds up seniority as a monument picks up patina.

This genteel approach to politics is the green envy of officeholders elsewhere. They watch Southerners climb committee ladders with patient and effortless ease, and rage against the apathy and indifference of the South. Doubtless it is true that so placid a custom has its drawbacks, for there is something to be gained from the hurly-burly of a hot campaign: A man emerges from it a little more responsive to his people. But the other side of that argument is that many Southern solons are able to exercise a legislative freedom they could not exercise otherwise; they are more independent of pressure groups and less beholden to kingmakers.

Anyhow, what we started to say is that J. VAUGHAN GARY is now benefiting from this venerable southern custom. The Richmond Congressman won a bress ring on Wednesday, when the deadline passed for filing primary candidacies, and thus enjoys a free ride to the November general election. "Opposition," Bill Tuck once remarked feelingly, "is a hateful thing." We are pleased that Mr. GARY has been spared this expensive travail this spring.

It was not always so. Looking back over Mr. GARY's campaigns, one is impressed by the number of skirmishes he has had to fight in order to retain his seat. He has been in the House 13 years last month, and no fewer than 13 candidates have tried to knock him off his perch. Among these, interestingly, was a Communist candidate by the name of David P. Bennett, who ran against Mr. GARY in the general election of 1948. Bennett was one of the only real, live Communists we ever had around this town, and a right attractive youg fellow he was. He came by the office one day looking for some clippings. He got 775 votes. What ever became of Alice Burke?

Mr. GARY scrambled into the House on March 6, 1945, 3 months after Dave Satterfield's retirement, as a plurality winner. He had 10,444 votes, against 8,407 for Ashton Dovell and 2,663 for Curtis M. Dozier. Seventeen months later, he had his closest race, when he defeated Minetree Folkes, Jr., 17,527 to 15,152. In November of 1946 he toppled F. Earle Lutz, Republican nominee. In 1948 Mr. GARY dumped James E. Gardner in the primary, and defeated Republican Dick Poage in the general election. Mr. Folkes tried again in the primary of 1950, but with even less success, and Mr. GARY had only a couple of lady candidates against him that November. He hasn't had any Democratic opposition since 1950, but 3 Republicans, Walter R. Gambill (1952), J. Calvitt Clarke, Jr. (1954), and Roy E. Cabell, Jr. (1956), have managed to claim 41 or 42 percent of the vote against him each time. Mr. GARY hasn't had a specially easy road.

The Richmond attorney, now 66, has served this district well. He ranks 10th among 30 Democrats on the House Appropriations Committee; he is respected by his colleagues especially for his experience in postal affairs, but he is gaining wisdom and understanding in foreign affairs also. The seniority he has gained in the House benefits this district, just as each additional year of experience benefits Mr. GARY. He deserves reelection, and it's good to see him get a merited green light past primary day.

Racial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to the editor of the Mobile Register, Mobile, Ala., by one of the colored citizens of Mobile County, which letter appeared in the Register under date of April 17, 1958. The letter from this citizen, Henry E. Royal, voices the sentiment of the overwhelming number of our colored citizens who have discussed with me the integration problem, and I feel it will be of interest to the citizens of other States outside the South.

RACIAL RELATIONS

DEAR SIR: I am an American citizen, born and reared up in the deep South; born in the colored race and I'm very proud to be just what I am, for God made me what I am. I would like very much to express my personal opinion concerning today's racial situation.

I think it is a horrible situation that's facing our country today. And I personally think the United States Supreme Court should review the integration bill and laws and leave it up to the whole of American citizens to vote on and not bring something forcefully that 98 percent of the country is against.

I know my people and my race and we don't need, and we don't want, integration. What would it benefit either race? What we need is a peaceful solution and mutual understanding and Christ Jesus in our lives today more than ever before.

I can see so much trouble and unrest in integrated schools. Something we do not need as gift or for price. What would benefit our race more than anything I know today would be more and better jobs with better pay. Better schools with equal but separate facilities—this would provide better living conditions for our people and would help to prove our ability of being a first-class, honest citizen. And this would allow our race to provide our own places for recreation and would better our conditions to meet our obligations of indebtedness. This would help us more.

I hope and pray not for my benefit alone, but all America, that a peaceful solution will be found. We do not need integration.

HENRY E. ROYAL.

CODEN, ALA.

United States Owes Debt to Representative Fallon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying when from impartial sources there is heard a well founded expression of commendation for one of our fellow members who has distinguished himself by exceptional service for the advancement of the interests of our country. Such a tribute has recently been paid to the dean of the Maryland congressional delegation, Congressman GEORGE H. FALLON, who through arduous efforts and signal ability lead the bipartisan effort for the enactment of the Federal road program.

Voicing the sentiments of all who are conversant with the details of the handling of this gigantic undertaking, the Baltimore News-Post has published an editorial entitled "United States Owes Debt to Representative Fallon." It so accurately and eloquently expresses the viewpoint of countless numbers of them that I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNITED STATES OWES DEBT TO REPRESENTATIVE FALLON

There is gratification for everyone in America in the second major Federal anti-recession step, the program to invest an additional $1.8 billion of Federal and State money in the Nation's roads now.

Everyone benefits by every turn of any wheel that reverses the decline of the Nation's whole business, and everyone, aside from driving on them, will benefit by every day of the earlier completion of the national roads that are the lifeline of the Nation's whole business that provides the jobs and the income for all of us.

It is gratifying that new jobs will be provided this very year, an estimated 88,000

that will grow to 520,000 when roadbuilding reaches full pace in another couple of years.

Those 88,000 jobs are for on-site workers, the men motorists see on the rights-of-way. But road dollars, just as defense dollars do not go just to soldiers and sailors, go to the payrolls for materials from suppliers and manufacturers in all 48 States.

This starts with pencils for draftsmen, through timber and ore and coal and petroleum, steel and aluminum, autos and trucks and tractors, sand and gravel, cement and asphalts and explosives, even to glass and paint for the signmakers and those who put down the white-line lane markings at $1,000 a mile.

These payroll benefits are substantial, for Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, Tennessee estimates that 90-cents of each road dollar goes into wages and salaries.

It is gratifying that the price tag in tax money for all of this is not staggering, for this is simply spending right now money that the 1956 Federal road law anticipated spending next year and the year after that.

It is gratifying that the Congress and the President were in accord on a road-construction speedup to aid the Nation's whole business right now, and that both Houses of Congress acted so promptly and so overwhelmingly in favor of it, a renewed demonstration that party politics are not entangled in the road program.

It is gratifying that the Congress took a stand on roadside billboards and barred them from at least 65 percent of the new 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System.

The News-Post and Baltimore American have a proprietary interest in the Federal road program because the 1956 law that created it was predicated solidly on the Hearst Newspapers' plan for better roads as the key for relief of the country's highway crisis.

Maryland will benefit by $6,700,000 this year.

Thus it is doubly gratifying that this congressional step puts the main roadbuilding back on its 13-year schedule and averts a stretchout, perhaps to 20 years, that might have us in 1976 building roads to a concept that had become obsolete the year before.

For persistence in returning the program to its timetable, the Nation's whole business owes measures of thanks to Senator GORE and Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland's Fourth District, Baltimore City, chairman of the two Houses' Subcommittees on Roads.

Now let the bulldozers roar.

Life and Problems of a Young Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no field of legislation more complex than agriculture. Sometimes I think it is helpful to look closely at one of the trees in the forest of agriculture, the individual farmer. Recently, when I was in my State, I had occasion to talk with a young farmer of excellent reputation. I asked him to write to me concerning his life and his problems. I think his answer will interest every member of this body. It illustrates the tremendous demands which are made upon a young man if he is to be a successful farmer in my part of the country. It also illustrates that this kind of farmer is not, as many people seem to feel when they discuss the farm problem, getting paid for doing nothing. There still is a need for sound Government assistance to help this kind of farmer achieve a sensible credit position so that he will not grow old before his time.

Mr. Speaker, here is the letter:

Mr. FRANK M. COFFIN,
Maine Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFIN: I have not forgotten the matter that my wife and I promised to write you about. I keep thinking every day that I must just sit down and write but somehow there just aren't hours enough.

This evening I'm going to start this anyway. I do hope this letter, along with others I now hope to write, will prove of interest to you. I told you the night of February 15 about our undertaking. I will just briefly outline it here again.

On January 1, 1958, my wife and I took on by purchase the 200-acre farm on which we now have 55 head of milking cows and young stock. I was able to get this place by promising to pay my father and others of lesser importance a total of $32,000. As we had no funds to pay any downpayment we now owe all the amount. I want to say that as of January 1 our total cash on hand was less than $500.

Sometimes, Mr. COFFIN, we now really wonder if it was the right move as you see in order to meet our debts outside of normal operating expenses of the farm—taxes, grain, repairs, fertilizer, etc.—we have to pay out nearly $400 a month. A little simple math says that the total for the debts like that for a year is nearly $5,000. I am going to feel very pleased if I can gross $20,000 this year. After paying the debts and operating expenses we would not make it if it were not that my wife holds a good job in ———. We are unable to save any amount of money to make any improvements in the dairy business at all.

Right here one might say that maybe if we would refinance and take a longer time to pay as on our present plan we have to pay the $32,000 in about 12 years. That is all well and good but who will lend that kind of money at reasonable terms. I have tried a number of places and I can't stand the interest rates or in most cases I am nicely told "No." The Farm Housing Administration would help me out but in our State of Maine they just don't get enough money. All they have is $100,000 for the whole State to put on real estate. As you can readily see, Mr. COFFIN, that amount doesn't go far on the amount of farm real estate that we have in this State of Maine.

I should say right here and now, Mr. Coffin, that my wife and I are not the only ones with such burdens to carry. There are many more though. Mr. ——— and his wife can tell similar stories. And there are others.

You asked me the other evening how hard my hours were. Well, these hours are for 7 days a week. I rise at 4 in the morning and get to the barn about 4:45 after I have eaten some lunch. I am working all alone now milking on an average 30 cows and feeding and caring for the cows plus about 25 young stock. I get the morning's work done about 10:30 so I can then eat and do the other things that must be done to make the place run. Tomorrow I must take grain in to be ground. Today I went to an extension meeting on the planning of better forage programs.

I have to start the evening chores by at least 2:30 in order to ever get done at night. I usually am in the house for supper with my wife by 7:15. I never see my daughter, 1½ years old, other than on weekends as she is to bed at 7:15 and my wife works during the week so we board her out during the weekdays.

You may ask now, Mr. COFFIN, how do I stand this life. Well, in the first place I love cows and like to handle them. Of course, I would like to get a fair return for my efforts. We have wanted to get a hired man but as yet the operating budget won't stand it so I have to put in the long day. I hope to be able to save enough now by working alone so I can hire my dad who will be 66 years old this summer. He will be my only help to put in the crops and harvest them this summer. I do so hope that in a couple of years that we can find a way to get a young man as a steady man. I have to get a man as I can't stand this work for many years or I'll be an old man young as the saying goes. You may wonder, Mr. COFFIN, how old we are. I am 25 years old and my wife is 21.

I try to attend all the extension meetings in the area that I can. There is one group of very interesting meetings that you mentioned in your address in———the ones on farm affairs. You will find enclosed a copy of some matters discussed at one of these meetings. I will try to send you material on others that might interest you. These meetings are getting a lot of interest and at them there are many ideas given on what different ones think could be done to help the situation that we farmers are in.

Well, Mr. COFFIN, it is late and I must close now. I do hope this letter can give you a clearer picture of one farm problem at home. The problem of how young farmers start in with little money and big investment.

Very sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, among the significant papers to be presented to the North American Wildlife Conference in St. Louis, Mo., this week is one by Mr. William E. Towell, director of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

Mr. Towell directs one of the finest State conservation departments in this Nation. This model department, with a successful program and an excellent staff, shows what the States can do in the natural resource field.

Mr. Towell says some of our natural resources have gone out the window of waste; some are going, and others are being pushed dangerously close. His advice: Shut the window—by conservation.

This excellent paper, to be presented March 5, 1958, follows:

NATURAL RESOURCES GOING OUT THE WINDOW
(By William E. Towell, Director, Missouri Conservation Commission)

"Going out the window" is a phrase that has developed specific meaning through usage. It implies waste. It signifies the act of throwing things away, never to be regained. The title of this paper, therefore, suggests that we are destroying our natural resources. In case there be any doubt, I

think we are destroying them. According to the laws of physics, matter cannot be destroyed, only changed in form. But if the new form is not more beneficial to society than the original form, then there is a loss, not to matter, perhaps, but to mankind. At the very best, we are not getting wisest use for the greatest number.

The fight for conservation can never be relaxed, and we must direct the fight. Our enemies are greed, selfishness, apathy, and ignorance. Some of the most appalling misuses of natural resources are perpetrated under the banner of conservation. Even in apparently legitimate conservation projects, we may close the windows of waste to open larger doors of destruction. We must consider 1978 as well as 1958; we must consider the whole complex of human use instead of the individual project.

We cannot possibly consider all natural resources in the time allotted to this panel; I can only attempt to highlight a few that most demand we close the windows of waste. In our minds we must still reserve room in which to consider long-range effects of atomic radiation, of air pollution, and of powerful new pesticides on both man and wildlife. But for now, let us consider some of the windows where the forces of conservation can best stop the wastage of natural resources.

Soil and water are the two most basic resources of life. You and I know this; we have repeated it over and over again. But how many people really recognize the obvious fact that man, no less than all other members of the plant and animal kingdoms, is utterly dependent upon the availability of soil and water in sufficient quantity and quality. Civilizations and cultures die when these resources are exhausted or even degraded. We need only look back into the history of northeast Africa or southeast Asia for the proof. Lands once prosperous are now sterile deserts. Though science today can transform seemingly abundant resources into food, clothing and shelter, and probably more ways will be found to produce these essentials synthetically, our ultimate survival still rests with water and the soil. We had best not assume that science will save us; science can also destroy us.

Soil resources are going out the window: agriculture production in America is not geared to the food requirements of the Nation, but to the competition for wealth. Subsidies to maintain guaranteed higher prices stimulate greater production, not for food but to add to growing surpluses. Again and again our western wheatlands are lifted by the winds to darken the eastern skies, just to produce crops that are not to be eaten. Acreage allotments encourage the farmer to grow uncontrolled crops or force greater production from fewer acres. In any case, our soil is the poorer.

We read that millions of tons of topsoil are deposited in the Gulf of Mexico every year (and you almost can see the earth's passage from your hotel window). Yet what percentage of Midwest farm lands are protected by terraces, contouring and grassed waterways? The size-supremacy of Texas may be threatened by the growing delta of Louisiana (if you'll pardon a minor exaggeration for emphasis), but I think you will agree our soil resources are going out the window.

Water resources, too, are pouring over the sill. One of the few things keeping pace with the population surge of the United States and Mexico, and possibly Canada, is the consumption of water. Water tables drop lower and lower as the demand goes up and up. As water supplies grow less in critical areas, which needs will suffer most? Will the greatest good for the greatest number determine priorities? And who will decide where the good and number are to be judged? Already these questions are acute in some localities—but they remain unanswered. Antiquated water laws, or the absence of any controls at all, threaten wildlife and recreational interests. Fishing and recreation were ruled out as greatest good for the greatest number at the John Martin Reservoir in southeastern Colorado. Under the prior appropriation doctrine, flood waters stored in the reservoir had to be released when irrigation demands imposed their prior rights. Will obsolete laws influence court decisions and new legislation in States just beginning to face up to their water problems?

Shortages in critical areas and conflicting interests in use are only two phases of our water concern. A growing problem, along with a booming population and industrial expansion, is the abuse of water that makes it unfit for further use—pollution. In spite of Federal and State pollution control legislation, many streams throughout the Nation are simply open sewers. It seems barbaric that in 1958 a civilization such as ours can still foul its nest by dumping poisons into its streams. The water we drink in Jefferson City comes from the sewers at Omaha, St. Joseph, and Kansas City. Municipal and industrial wastes, dumped raw into stream channels, constitute one of conservation's greatest challenges; not only as an enormous public health problem but as a serious waste of fish, waterfowl, and recreational resources.

Only a determined fight in the last session of Congress kept pollution control appropriations in the budget. Even a greater fight looms ahead, because the President has told Congress that this program should be discontinued entirely after the next fiscal year, although the bill for navigational developments on the wild Missouri River was much higher than the water-pollution money for all rivers. For every barge on the Missouri, a half million people must drink from it. Our fight for water is only beginning. Conservationists will face determined opposition from shortsighted industries and municipalities before the trend is really reversed.

A more insidious situation has become apparent lately, since industry has become public-relations conscious. Knowing it dare no longer openly oppose pollution-control measures, industry often joins the fight to shape legislation that is so watered down as to be scarcely effective, and conservation wins a hollow victory. By and large, the only forces openly opposed to pollution control are large municipalities which fear tax rises should pollution control become a reality. We can deal with opponents, but who will save us from our friends?

Constant vigilance is required to gain recognition of wildlife and recreation values for the public in flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric impoundments built with that public's money. Government ownership of shorelines has been forcefully advocated by conservationists, just to insure that the paying public may have access to these lakes. Previously Federal agencies had adopted a policy of only partly controlling lake shores under flooding easements. Proposed amendments to the Federal Coordination Act of 1946 would require evaluation of wildlife and recreation gains or losses before any new projects are authorized. These amendments would also require appraisal of the effects on these resources for impoundments previously authorized but not yet started. These changes are of utmost importance to all wildlife conservationists, but they will require a fight for the public interest.

In a determined battle, conservationists have so far blocked appropriations for the proposed Bruces Eddy Dam on the north fork of Idaho's Clearwater River. This big flood control hydroelectric project would stop spawning salmon and steelhead trout from migrating to one of their biggest breeding areas and would flood a major winter feeding range of elk and deer. In 1955 Congress authorized studies of the effect of this impoundment upon fish and game resources but proponents are unwilling to wait for the results of these studies. Some of the impoundment's opponents urge construction of Hells Canyon Dam on Snake River as an alternate to Bruces Eddy that would not be so destructive to wildlife. Basically, this fight is for more than fish and big game, as most such struggles are. It involves major political issues and the battle between public power and private power factions. But fish and game conservationists must be ready to rally against this or any other threat to these resources or out the window they will go. Wildlife cannot be isolated from land and water decisions.

Another battle is being waged in the marshlands and in the pothole country to save waterfowl from threatened destruction. Northern nesting potholes are disappearing at an alarming rate under the stimulus of agricultural subsidies so that crops may be raised to go uneaten both in the United States and in Canada. Marshes and swamps along the flyways are being drained constantly for agricultural and industrial developments. The rate of waterfowl habitat loss far exceeds the rate of wetland acquisition by Federal and State agencies. Ducks and geese are flying out the window because there are fewer places for them to rest, feed, and breed. Meanwhile, the places left for waterfowl are under attack by agricultural forces because ducks and geese eat nearby grain, grain already in surplus supply.

We argue among ourselves on how to finance this urgent program of wetland acquisition: That is, how we can supply with the right hand what the left hand is taking away. The need for increased duck stamp fees is generally agreed upon, but we do not agree upon a sufficient amount to reverse the drainage trend. It is our job, if we are to promote wildlife conservation, to convince the sportsmen that they will have to pay the costs necessary to preserve these resources. We cannot afford to make this another feeble attempt of too little and too late.

Wetland needs of waterfowl should receive primary consideration in planning of all large impoundments. The proposed Kasinger Bluff Reservoir in western Missouri, for example, could become a major waterfowl haven, without lessening its effectiveness for flood control. But multiple uses and secondary benefits such as this must be recognized and included in the early planning stages of water developments.

It is difficult, and perhaps unwise, to separate those resources actually going out the window from those that are being pushed dangerously close to the ledge. There are constant threats by private interests seeking to gain control of public forests and recreation areas for purely personal gains. Grazing interests never abate their longing to acquire control of Federal range lands. Lumbering interests covet all remaining virgin timber under Government control. Fish, game, and recreation values have to withstand the determined competition of mining claims, oil leases, inundation or the clutch of the military for air fields or bombing ranges. The defensive struggle to maintain a sane balance never ceases.

Forest resources cannot be separated from the soil, from flood control or water storage, from wildlife or recreation. All are interwoven into a complex ecological pattern, and when one thread is broken the whole fabric begins to unravel. But in many ways forest resources, too, are making dramatic exits out the open windows. According to Timber Resources Review (United States Forest Service, 1955), fire is potentially the greatest forest enemy, but in 1952 insects killed 7 times as much sawtimber as fire did, and disease killed 3 times as much. Together these 3 destructive agents killed

nearly 13 billion board feet of sawtimber in 1 year. Perhaps of greater significance is that these losses amounted to 44 billion board feet of potential growth.

Even though fire losses in our forests are now greatly exceeded by losses from insects and diseases, this does not mean that fire protection activities can be relaxed. Expansion of fire control efforts is needed everywhere, particularly to areas now lacking organized protection, for fire still remains the greatest potential enemy. But our new challenge is primarily one of organized protection from other forest enemies, principally insects and disease. And I think we must face up to our wasteful methods of forest utilization. Of every 4 cubic feet of timber cut, 1 cubic foot is wasted. It goes out the window in the form of sawdust, slabs or usable logs left to rot in the woods.

Still another challenge is the 115 million acres of forest land in which less than 40 percent of the trees are desirable species. One-fourth of our commercial forest area is producing less than half of the timber that this land is capable of growing. In fact, many open windows are draining away America's forest wealth with unspectacular trickles that have cumulative effects.

Furthermore, we must continue to insist upon a correlation of efforts between foresters and wildlife people. The multiple-use and wise use of forests is our constant concern.

We have seen several wildlife species disappear completely through open windows: the passenger pigeon, the Carolina parakeet, the heath hen. Other species like the sage grouse and the whooping crane are barely hanging onto the sill, waiting for us to shut th window or to kick them on out.

What are we doing to stem the tide of habitat destruction? Are we going to sacrifice our remaining game because it cannot compete with the modern exploitive agriculture? The conservation reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act and the small watershed program under Public Law 566 offer great possibilities to slow the rate of habitat losses. Are we taking full advantage of these opportunities? In fact, do we know how we can take such advantage? And are we also proposing further measures?

Other means must be found to encourage private landowners to manage their lands for game production. If we do not find some way to aid the farmer in providing beneficial wildlife practices, either wildlife goes out the window entirely or it remains only with those few who can afford to lease private hunting areas and pay for the necessary wildlife management. Unless we find a better solution, commercial put-and-take hunting areas may be the only answer for many sportsmen. The best waterfowl areas and big game ranges will be available only to a financially privileged few. I do not believe that building public fishing lakes and acquiring public hunting areas is enough of an answer for us, either. Our chief responsibility is to maintain wildlife production on private lands, and at the same time make it available for public harvest.

Land use is not the only window out of which wildlife is going. Antiquated views on sportsmanship and game laws contribute to such fallacies as permitting the harvest of only buck deer from herds far outnumbering the capacity of their range. Well-meaning sportsmen abhor the thought of killing a mother deer or her fawn but do not seem to grasp the fact that they will otherwise die of starvation and disease or fall to predators. Nature's harvest is ruthless, but sure.

Fisheries management is complicated by a similar problem, major fishing pressure concentrated upon a few favored game fish species. On one of our big impoundments in Missouri, 85 percent of the total fish production is of the so-called rough species; yet, the annual harvest from this lake includes only 15 percent of these species. Game fish production suffers from this competition of overpopulated nongame types. But when more liberal methods of harvest are proposed or commercialization is permitted, there is immediate objection by the fishing public.

It is inevitable that some natural resources will go out the window. Progress cannot be made without mistakes; advancement will always cost somethhing. The mere fact that we recognize some of our own inconsistencies indicates progress.

But some of our lost resources represent impure and simple waste. No one can condone waste, although we attempt to justify the squandering exploits of early pioneers and somewhat later industries on the grounds that the supplies of resources then seemed inexhaustable. But today we take our stands, or say we do, against waste for economic or political expediency. We are wise, now; we know that the resources are not unlimited. But waste continues.

Despite our preoccupation with atomic power, satellites, and intercontinental ballistic missiles, our strength, even our lives, still depends upon soil and water, forests and minerals, and upon the plants and animals which they produce. The base supporting everything we call man and his civilization is the raw materials provided by nature; culture is only our ability to use these materials. And the most important culture of all, the one which we can never afford to let escape through open windows, is the organized effort of conservationists to preserve our heritage, which has made possible our prosperity, our progress and our strength as a nation, our natural resources.

I want to make this one last observation. In the struggle today between nations, we say we are defending our way of life by spending huge hums in building air bases around the world, in buying loyalties of other nations, in building satellites and warheads, in using all our resources for defense. Are we heading into a situation where, because of hysteria and fear, we may spend all our true wealth, the natural resources? Someone must see that we do not build a Maginot line solely to defend the resources already expended in building it. That someone, I think, will have to be us.

Tenth Anniversary of State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for the people of Israel and for Jewish people everywhere. All men who cherish freedom can join the citizens of the new State of Israel on the 10th anniversary celebration of her independence day. We have always been keenly conscious and fully sympathetic to the sufferings of the Jews. We have been amazed by their exemplary fortitude in adversity. We have profound admiration for their firm determination to pursue their national goal. Today we are deeply moved by their accomplishments and advancements in their newly-created state which is already firmly established as a democratic and progressive country. I join the citizens of Israel on the observance of this solemn occasion and wish them joy and happiness in their ancient homeland.

The Fruits of Freedom—An Address by Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, President General of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to represent the district in which Mrs. Frederic Alquin Groves, of Cape Girardeau, Mo., resides. Mrs. Groves, the first Missourian ever elected president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the second woman west of the Mississippi River to hold this distinguished office, was elected for a 3-year term on April 20, 1956.

In this capacity she presided at the sessions of the 67th Continental Congress of the DAR, which convened in Washington last week. It was my privilege, with Mrs. Jones, to be a guest of Mrs. Groves at the banquet of that distinguished group on last Friday evening.

We in southeast Missouri are particularly proud of the distinction which Mrs. Groves has brought to the State of Missouri, and that is one of the reasons why I have requested permission to have the address Fruits of Freedom printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But first I think my colleagues would be interested in knowing more about this great citizen of Missouri, whose talents and whose capabilities have been recognized on a national level, and for that reason I would like to briefly recite some of the accomplishments of this gracious lady, who has been so signally honored by the members of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mrs. Groves joined the Nancy Hunter Chapter, one of the oldest in Missouri, 24 years ago. Devoted service to her chapter led to broader leadership as Missouri State chairman for the membership committee, building fund, State registrar, State vice regent, and State regent.

From 1952 to 1955, she was vice president general and organizing president of the Vice Presidents' General Club. As a State and national promoter of the Children of the American Revolution, she was instrumental in putting Missouri Children of the American Revolution activities on a sound financial basis.

Among her accomplishments as State regent of the Missouri society are two publications with wide national circulation which are much sought after by genealogists everywhere even today. These publications are the Genealogical Guide, a Master Index of Genealogy, found in the DAR Magazine, and the Missouri State Directory. Leadership and accomplishments such as this brought

the Missouri society to new peaks of excellence.

Mrs. Groves' tireless activity in leading the fight against legislation adverse to good government principles as recognized by the NSDAR, resulted in getting the Humber resolution—world government—rescinded in Missouri, the seventh State to rescind the resolution among others.

Proir to her marriage to Mr. Frederic A. Groves, she was Allene Wilson, the daughter of Judge Robert L. Wilson and Jane Allen Wilson. Her mother was a charter member and early regent of Nancy Hunter chapter, Missouri. Also, a member of this chapter is her one daughter, Marjorie Phillips—Mrs. George O.—who has served the chapter as corresponding secretary, as treasurer, and is currently State DAR chairman of the museum. Her two granddaughters, Allene, 7, and Eloise, 4, are members of the Children of the American Revolution, representing the fourth generation of the family in this group. Mr. Frederic A. Groves, her husband, is a civic leader and successful businessman in the automotive, banking, and farming fields. She is of a distinguished family with ancestors from Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky.

With a membership of more than 184,000 members, the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, is composed of women descendants of those who "with unfailing loyalty rendered material aid to the cause of independence as a recognized patriot, as a soldier or sailor, or as a civil officer in one of the several colonies or States." It has historical, educational, and patriotic objectives, and numerous projects are undertaken in furtherance of good citizenship and the preservation of the American way of life.

Mrs. Groves is no exception. She is affiliated with the following patriotic societies and has served as State treasurer, State vice regent, State regent, and national vice president of the middlewest section of the Daughters of the American Colonists. Too, she holds membership in the following: National Society of Colonial Dames of America; Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century, and the Huguenot Society of the Founders of Manakin in the Colony of Virginia; National Councilor of the Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America; the Daughters of the Barons of Runnemede; the Order of the Crown in America, and Daughters of Colonial Wars.

Widely versed in business, Mrs. Groves holds the position of executive vice president in a prosperous business and, in addition, serves as director on three boards. A member of the Episcopal Church, she has served several times on the diocesan board of the Women's Auxiliary. A history major and graduate of the University of Wisconsin, Mrs. Groves was a member also of Pi Beta Phi Fraternity. She is a member of the River Hills Garden Club, and a charter member of G. F. of P. E. O.

Mrs. Groves' lifelong interest in, and dedication to, patriotic, religious, and civic organizations brings to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution a wealth of experience and a record of outstanding leadership enhanced by a fine personal background of splendid educational attainments and gracious habits of living in her private life.

Now that you know about Mrs. Groves, I feel that you will be interested in reading the stimulating address delivered by the president general at the opening of the 67th continental congress:

THE FRUITS OF FREEDOM

As I look over this vast audience and bid you welcome, I am aware of two deep and compelling emotions; first, a sense of great pride in this manifestation, this proof, of your interest, your loyalty and your devotion; and second, a feeling of lively gratitude for the privilege we enjoy of meeting here and of being together. To all of you, and especially to those of you who have traveled long distances to be here with us, I wish to express my appreciation and my heartfelt thanks.

We are here for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to our society and, in no less measure, to our Nation. May the results of our discussions prove to be mutually enlightening, and very real and constructive contributions to the welfare of our country.

I have taken as my theme this evening "The Fruits of Freedom," and I propose to examine some aspects of our society, with special emphasis on certain cultural aspects. It is a fact that here in our country we have an unprecedentedly high standard of living, a standard extended not just to the few, but, as never before, to the people as a whole. We have here, at the very least, the favorable climate for an intensive, active, and richly rewarding cultural life. But have we preferred to settle, instead, as our Communist critics claim, for a materialism, a gadgetry, that puts comfort and ease and security above all else? Have we in some way lost sight of the higher values? What is our true situation? What is our present danger?

Through the many years since the creation of our Republic, our American way of life has justified and largely fulfilled the vision and ideals of our Founding Fathers. Our ancestors came here from the Old World with the firm intention of creating a brave New World, a Christian society, a new society better and more just than the old social orders of Europe; it was to be a society based upon the rights and dignity of the individual, under a limited form of representative government, in which every citizen would be endowed with the same rights before the law, and equal opportunity in a free economy.

Certainly few countries have achieved as much, have garnered as rich a harvest, as we have in the less than 2 centuries since the birth of our great Nation. In the past 50 years, especially, we have witnessed a cultural advancement, in large measure due to, and certainly coupled with, increased leisure with which to study, appreciate and benefit by the best that other nations and societies have contributed. It is our economy that has provided this leisure, and at the same time, general access as never before to the cultural harvest of our civilization. We have responded, out of a great longing and hunger for all branches of knowledge, of history, of the practical and the fine arts. We have expressed this longing in a public participation broader and greater in scope than anything previously known.

The great, the basic quality of this rich cultural life is that it is offered to all classes and is participated in by individuals of all races, creeds and stations in life. Let us take 1 example, 1 area of cultural development. At the beginning of the century we had perhaps 3 or 4 orchestras of major standing. They were in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston. In the past 50 years, appreciation and love of music have developed so rapidly that some 30 cities have major symphony orchestras; there are excellent symphony orchestras in many of our smaller cities; community orchestras of high caliber flourish, to the number of 650; and most of our universities and many of our high schools have their own student orchestras or bands.

Throughout the country we have art centers, museums—some 2,500—and civic centers which can house not only circulating art exhibitions, but orchestras, opera companies and theatrical groups. In this respect even small towns and communities can enjoy the advantages previously reserved to the larger cities. In the last few years we have developed tremendously our great love for the theater, for all forms of the drama. We have long had thriving little theater groups, on a widespread community basis; there are over 400 university- and college-drama departments and little theaters. We have creative writing groups as well as groups or workshops for those interested in studying and practicing the techniques of musical composition, of dramatic construction, or of painting. Our creative spirit is constantly, vigorously, searching for new fields of experience; we have been insatiable in our desire for the extension, the broadening, the enrichment of our knowledge and achievements.

Our consuming interest in the creative arts is perhaps no greater than that to be found in other nations. But we are singular in that we have had the leisure and the means of gratifying our desires, and we are singular too, I suggest, in the pace of our cultural activity and interest. Finally, the level of this cultural activity—our actual performance—measures up bravely and successfully to the actual performance of contemporary foreign cultures.

This has been possible, is possible, because we have always been a free people, free to earn our living at anything we chose, free to live where we chose, free to worship in our own way, and to vote for our own convictions. It is, to take one vital area, as a liberty-loving people that we have chosen to give—and have been able to give—our public schools the very best physical equipment, the libraries, the laboratories, the auditoriums, the sports arenas—all within the reach of the poorest student. And we have done so because we have been eager to supply the cultural advantages that increase the capacity for, and appreciation of, creative living; and because we have been intent on higher values, not just physical comfort and security.

The same basic concerns have led our great financiers to endow hospitals and research foundations so that our health standards are among the highest in the world. We have led the world in research to help raise the living standards and health standards of the common man. All of our efforts have been directed toward the realization of the good life, to be shared by all classes, and not reserved for just a few. And it is a fact that we have achieved these goals of welfare for the people at large more effectively and more completely than any socialistic regime has yet been able to do.

Our free economy, based on private property, free enterprise, and profit, and our limited form of government have permitted us to apply our energies to consumer goods, to labor-saving devices, to homes and to cars, rather than to the support of large standing armies or the promotion of wars. Yet in two world wars, we astounded the enemy, as well as our Allies, with our sudden manufacture of war materials without which neither war would have been won. It was the tremendous capacity and pace of our war production that proved to be the de-

termining factor in both world wars, and which gave the victory to free men.

Our society was not built upon, and has not profited from, the sweat and toil of others, as were some of the great colonial powers of the past. When we assumed responsibility for a colony such as the Philippines, we have helped them to become free and independent as soon as possible. We have never invaded another nation's territory except in self-defense; and have never enslaved another people. We have sent our armies and air fleets and navies, our war material and our food supplies to help other nations fight for their freedom. We have spent our energies and our resources, our manpower and our private capital, liberally and heroically to help build a better world. We have accepted gravely the responsibilities of a world power and have fought for justice and freedom for others, as well as for ourselves.

Now we are accused of being soft, of loving our material comforts more than we do our self-respect. The pursuit of happiness announced by our Declaration of Independence has degenefated, we are told, into the pursuit of purely physical and material well-being, comfort, and security. Our social structure is said by the enemy to be ready to fall, like overripe fruit. The fruits of freedom, they say, are blighted and deceptive, illusory and misleading; there is no soundnes at the core.

We are faced, then, with these questions: Are we secure in this good life we have created for all our people? Is there indeed a danger that we will succumb to the lure of materialism and to compromise with the Communists? Socialism has promised the common man all the good things of life that he cannot earn for himself. These promises have not been kept by any Marxist economy, because no government can give any individual anything more than it has first taken from him. It is only freemen who can make the good life for themselves, and do it independently of their government. That government is best that governs least. It is socialism that is based solely upon materialism, with its denial of other and higher values, with its denial of God. It is not material benefits that enslave people to materialism; it is the exclusive pursuit of material goods; it is the false worship of material possessions; it is the denial and rejection of other values.

Our answer to the challenge rises loud and clear from all over our country. We are saying with one voice to our Government, "We will not succumb. We will not compromise for the sake of ease and comfort. Spend as much as is necessary to remain free. We can afford as a Nation to survive. We will make any sacrifice necessary for wise and necessary expenditures, but not for bureaucratic power or blunders in high places." There can be no question that Americans will rouse to this danger as they have to every other peril with which they have been confronted in their history.

But deeper even than this, the real issue before us today, the basic issue that divides the free world from the enslaved, is: "How much should any government do for its people? How much can any self-respecting citizen accept from his government and remain free?" We must make now the most important decision of our lives. It is simply this: What kind of America do we want? Will it be, will it continue to be, a limited form of representative government, with our individual rights respected and guaranteed to us, or will we accept socialism in return for security, for Government favors and handouts?

More than half of the people of the world are now enslaved under some form of totalitarian government, or are struggling in the throes of some revolutionary change that will lead in most instances to socialism. These enslaved peoples constitute, alas, our greatest peril, because they are unable to revolt, but must work like robots for a centralized, all-powerful government which dictates their every move and thought.

Can free men maintain their liberties in such a world? We Daughters of our American Revolutionary Fathers, know that we can survive because we have inherited a Constitution that will protect us if we will but preserve it to the last letter. We know that as a free people we will voluntarily make every sacrifice necessary to remain a free and Christian Nation and to defeat permanently the Godless philosophy of communism.

But now our very way of life is at stake. Our present peril affects every American woman of every age and station in life. The freedoms which we have always taken for granted are now subject to proof. Russia's very successful propaganda has frightened us into a temporary state of defeatism. We are perhaps too much impressed by a man-made moon encircling the globe—a scientific device, which even if produced in great quantities, could never win even a limited war.

Victories are of the spirit as well as of the mind and body. Only people who have known freedom are willing to fight, and to fight hard enough to retain it. We American women have known such freedom; that freedom, I repeat, is at stake.

It has been said by statesmen and analysts that the American woman is the most pampered and indulged of any women anywhere in the world. Our free economy has given us modern homes, cars, mechanical kitchens, the conveniences of supermarkets—obvious benefits—and the leisure to study and to carry on community activities. But without our free economy and our representation in the House and Senate, we might soon find our lives approaching those of the Russian women. There the women plow the fields, work in the streets, cut cobblestones, and do the work of men. All but the few live in houses without any creature comforts or facilities. They bear children without hope of any future better than their own. Unless a child shows unusual ability, is he given anything beyond the rudimentary classes? If he shows a marked degree of promise, of application, he will be given education in the higher schools, in order to be a servant of the state. But he will never be a free citizen.

We women, and our children, who have profited most by our form of government and our free economy, are the ones who will suffer the most by the loss of our individual freedom. We must realize that everything we have, every advantage we enjoy, every opportunity for serivce, every vestige of our free existence—and not just those labor-saving devices that we have long become accustomed to—but all the true, the precious fruits of freedom, can be lost if we lose our form of government—a Republic functioning under that most superb body of laws ever conceived: The Constitution of the United States of America.

If we win this struggle for men's minds and souls, we must think straight about ourselves, and about our enemy, and we must learn to put first things first. God forbid that it be necessary to fight another war, but if it is necessary, then Americans will be in the first line. But we should first ask ourselves what we are fighting for. It must not be for socialism, with its cult of power in the hands of a few; it is, it must be, for those true spiritual values that keep men faithful to their ideals, and give them courage to endure hardships, in the knowledge that they are fighting in a just cause. Let us be proud, not apologetic about our high standards of living, enjoyed by the greatest number of people in any society. Let us ignore the accusations of materialism hurled at us by our detractors. Let us assume the responsibilities of our power in the free world to find, if humanly possible, a solution to our differences with communism, but let us impress upon the Russians and their neutral supporters, that we will never offer appeasement of any sort. The story of appeasement wherever found always has the same ending—degradation.

The free world is still looking to us for leadership in the struggle between liberty and serfdom. Freedom-loving peoples in evry land have become accustomed to looking to us for assistance of a material and moral nature. Every year we Americans contribute a sizable portion of our savings to preserve world peace. During the Korean war, we sent 1,200,000 of our young men 5,500 miles across the Pacific to fight for the principle of collective security. Our sacrifices for other nations in their struggle for freedom, have established the long record of our altruism, unmatched by any other power. We have always been motivated by an idealistic concept for others as well as for ourselves—the concept of the good life, a concept we can still achieve for all of the free world, if we can win the present cold war with the Kremlin against socialism.

As a nation we have used our strength to help less fortunate nations. We have shared our industrial skills with the underdeveloped nations. We have sent our Christian missionaries abroad as well as our soldiers; we have sent our doctors, our scientists, our engineers, to fight ignorance and poverty, sickness and superstition. We have applied our moral strength that law and order might prevail. We have used our economic strength that industries may thrive and prosper, that men may be employed. It has always been our privilege as well as our responsibility to use our strength for righteous purposes, never to enslave man's spirit.

But now, in these days, we are passing through our greatest testing. This is the crucible wherein our metal is tried and our motives purified. It is only by a period of testing that a nation, like an individual, matures into full spiritual being. Many aspects of our economy, our political and cultural life, are showing the maturity that comes with the fullness of achievement. If we Americans can pass through this present period of our spiritual endurance and can retain our limited form of Government, with our Bill of Rights intact, we shall have before us the bright promise of the greatest era of national achievement that any people have ever experienced.

This has been called the American century. Up until now, we have had possibly the greatest influence upon our contemporaries of any nation of the Western World. The remaining half of this century must see communism wiped out as a hoax, a false promise, an atheistic philosophy; and in its stead arise some form of representative government, as the best form of society for free men. Only by proving the falseness of communism as a way of life, and the rightness of some form of Republican self-government as the best guaranty for world peace, can we hope to enter into a period of true spiritual achievement, with justice and freedom for all, a golden era such as this world has never known.

To the questioning free world we give this answer: We offer our Christian faith and principles in contrast to the atheism of the Kremlin. We offer our constitutional Government in answer to the slave state. We offer our free economy as an answer to their slave-labor camps. We offer the freedom of the individual as an answer to the hopeless victim of socialism. These are indeed the fruits of our American heritage. These are our shield and our hope. With these principles we shall create a new era of peace and plenty for all mankind. With these we cannot and shall not fail. Without them, no government can long prevail.

Over a hundred years ago, the American patriot, Daniel Webster said, in an address given in Albany, N. Y.: "If it be true that the Constitution of the United States * * * has fulfilled all the just hopes, and more than even the most sanguine hopes, of the country, is there a question that, however it may be with others, however others may stray from the great object of national regard, for us and ours we will adhere to it, we will maintain, we will defend it, to our dying day."

As your president general, I echo these words for the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Morris Long, Distinguished Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting article about a valued friend of mine of many years standing, Mr. Morris Long of Clinton, Mass.

Mr. Long's career is inspiring and reads like a Horatio Alger story. From humble beginnings through hard persevering work Mr. Long rose successively in the life of his community until he became a very successful retail merchant.

Esteemed and beloved by all who know him, he was the first Jew to hold public office in Clinton by virtue of election to the school committee for three terms, one of them as chairman. He has regularly participated in the civic and charitable life of the town.

As a founder of the Jewish Congregational Shaarei Zedeck he contributed much to the construction of the local synagogue. For many years he has been associated with the Zionist movement and with the United Palestine Appeal Organization, vice president of the Worcester Zionist District, B'nai Brith, Clinton Council of Jewish Welfare Board, and executive committee of the New England Zionist region. His charitable activities have been long continued, zealous and successful.

Still active at 83, Mr. Long goes about his daily business with his characteristic good humor and optimism and I join many of his other friends and well-wishers in extending him best wishes for continued good health, success and long life.

The article follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette of April 4, 1958]

CLINTON MERCHANT ACTIVE IN HIS 65TH BUSINESS YEAR

(By Tony Mastro)

CLINTON.—At an age when most folks have long since retired and taken to their rocking chairs, Morris Long, of 54 Haskell Avenue, is entering the 65th year of a still very active selling career in the retail clothing business.

Long, who will be celebrating his 83d birthday April 15, is the granddaddy of local merchants. He can be seen bright and early every morning unlocking the doors of his clothing store at 184 High Street. His cheery "good morning" has been greeting passersby for more than 35 years.

CARRIED 250-POUND PACKS

His selling career in Clinton began in 1893, when as a Worcester boy of 18 he traveled here in the old horse-drawn cars. With a 250-pound pack of dry goods strapped to his back, he peddled his cloth house to house to women who "in those days," he said, "made their own clothes rather than buy ready-to-wear garments."

The trip from Worcester to Clinton, he recalls, took almost 2 hours.

As business picked up he began making his rounds in a horse and wagon rented at $1.50 a day from the Martin Murphy stables on Church Street near the Central Fire Station.

Business prospered so well that 2 years later he bought his own horse and wagon and opened his first store on Mechanic Street, remaining there 2 years.

FIRE DESTROYED STORE

He then opened a store in the Doggett Building on High Street. He remained there for 28 years, until a 1923 fire swept all the stores in the block, including his own.

His business ruined because of not enough fire-insurance coverage, Long, undaunted, started from scratch again and moved to his present location.

A beehive of activity and energy, Long throughout the years still figures prominently in political and civic affairs.

He was the first Jew in town history to be elected to the school committee. Elected in 1935, he served three 3-year terms, one of them as chairman. He was a member of the high school building committee in 1935 when fire destroyed the school's main building, as happened again in February of this year.

NAMED TO COMMITTEE

Last week, he was appointed by selectmen to serve on the school building committee to oversee and plan for construction of a new high school on the present and Central Park sites, voted at the March 5 town meeting.

He was a founder of the Jewish Congregational Shaarei Zedeck Synagogue on Water Street and a member of its building committee, of which he was president 7 years. He was the United Palestine Appeal Organization's first chairman, is now vice president of the Worcester Zionist District, and a member of the Worcester B'nai B'rith, the Clinton Council of the Jewish Welfare Board, and the executive committee of the New England Zionist Region.

In 1927 he was chosen one of the Zionist Region delegates to study conditions and supervise United States distribution of goods in Palestine. Recently he was named a delegate to the National Jewish Welfare Board committee meeting to be held April 17 through 20 in Washington, D. C.

STILL DRIVES DAILY

Hale and hearty at 83, Long drives his car every day, and in the past 35 years has attended every Zionist convention in the country.

Married to the former Eileen Stone, he has three sons, Milton, employed in the advertising department of Town and Country in New York City, Irving, of Natick, manager of the Clinton store, and Stanley Long, of Marlboro. His only living daughter, Miss Libby Long, of this town, also works in her father's store.

Asked if he had any regrets, Long, a bright twinkle in his eye and a smile breaking over his smoothly lined face, curtly said, "I never look back, but only ahead."

His recipe for a long life?

"Hard work and good friends go a long way," he said.

Italian Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the Italian elections:

ITALIAN ELECTIONS

It is interesting for Americans to watch political events in Italy, particularly the coming campaign for the general elections scheduled for May. Thirty-two million Italians, as voters, will choose 596 deputies and 224 senators.

Such a campaign is accompanied by the usual meetings and assemblies of the contending parties and the plastering of the walls and fences with flamboyant posters and throwaway sheets containing trenchant cartoons, lampooning candidates and poohpoohing issues. Personally, I love cartoons and caricatures of men and events. Cartoons are often more effective than polemics and speeches, especially when liberty and democracy are threatened. "Cartoons," says the famous cartoonist David Low, "are a more direct medium with a wider appeal, since pictures speak even to the illiterate."

I am no expert on Italian politics. I have trouble enough with politics in the United States. But, from what I have observed and read about, politicians in Italy are not too unlike the politicos here in our country. Human nature is pretty much the same everywhere. Human reactions are generally the same in every country, with due allowance for local influences and national idiosyncracies. There are decided exceptions. I would say that Nenni, the extreme left Socialist, is such a one. He could not fit into the American scene. He is sui generis. He sways in many directions. He is very much like a mule with two heads—one in the front and one in the rear. One does not know, nor does he know, whether he is going or coming. And being a mule he is without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity. Nenni, at times, makes common cause with the Communists.

To me, all Communists are obnoxious, but Togliatti is particularly so. He certainly is dissimilar to anyone in the United States. He is too dangerous for comfort. He is a mere puppet of Moscow and all the more dangerous for Italy. Togliatti is the Italian prototype of his Russian boss, Khrushchev. He probably applauded that Russian braggart, when he recently said in Budapest that, as for the West, "we advise them not to poke their noses, or as we Russians say, their pigs' snouts, into our socialist garden." That is the language of a bully and gangster.

Togliatti would turn Italy into a Communist state with all its trials and tribulations for its people. He would even tell you conditions are getting better in the Soviet Union. He probably would tell you that when one dies in the Soviet Union, they bury one now in a coffin.

And what can be more absurd than the chatter of Nenni and the babble of Togliatti on peace. They are the most contentious and cantankerous persons one knows. They represent the very opposite of peace. Their conduct and character are consistent with the Kremlin's presenting the dove as a symbol of peace. Actually, the dove is a quarrelsome, not peaceful bird. Just so, Nenni

and Togliatti would stir up quarrels and muddy the waters for their selfish ends.

Italy's Christian Democratic Party, the ruling party, presents a platform to the voters that manifests complete loyalty to Western Democracy. It proposes to keep faith with the North Atlantic Treaty. Any plank of the platform of the Christian Democratic Party headed by former Premier Amintore Fanfani, is a recommendation for an East-West agreement to end the production and testing of nuclear weapons, but only under effective supervision. Fanfani and his party call for close political ties with other European countries of Euromarket and Euratom. The Christian Democrats will continue to seek the liberation of Hungary and other satellite countries from the Communist yoke. The Christian Democrats seek to protect free enterprise and would tighten control over economic monopolies and cartels. The urge better schools, fairer taxes and the spending of more monies for the development of the underprivileged suffering of Italy. Party workers will spread the gospel of their platform at some 20,000 election rallies to be staged all over Italy. One hundred and twenty-five thousand canvassers have been trained to make house-to-house calls to win votes. Hundreds of trucks will tour remote areas, staging outdoor campaign movies.

The Christian Democratic Party, under the able leadership of Fanfani, the old Tuscan economist, could make giant strides by winning over the Italian population to the ways of democracy. If the Christian Democratic Party is called upon to form a government, Signor Fanfani will probably become Premier. In the event the present Premier relinquishes the Premiership after the elections, Fanfani would be a worthy successor. Italy has made a good record under the Christian Democrats. It has signed various treaties for European collaboration, it has strengthened its position in Trieste, it has become a most worthy member of the United Nations, it has done a great deal toward rejuvenation of industry in the south, although much more remains to be done in that regard. The financing of a land reform program is almost completed. The INA-Casa plan, which seeks to provide housing for the indigent, has been expanded, unemployment has decreased, there has been a steady increase in national income, and economic progress has been continuous. Even greater would have been the progress, had not the Communists sought to impede the progress of Italy by their obstructionist tactics.

Togliatti and his confreres have one objective—the overthrow of the Democratic Italian Government—by fair means or foul. Instructions from Moscow are, put forth a weak sort of Parliament in Italy to serve as arms for launching the missiles of the Communist revolution.

It is to be hoped the Italian electors will resent this Kremlin interference in their domestic elections and register that resentment by a thumping victory for Amintore Fanfani and the Democratic Parties. Italians should boldly resist the effects of the tainted lucre that Moscow sends into Italy to influence voting. Italians would fight off any physical invasion of their land by Russians. The invasion by the subtle means of money and fifth column is just as dangerous—even more dangerous, since it is an attack that is covert and unseen. Khrushchev's aim is the same in both cases—the overthrow of Italy's democratic regime.

Italians, I am sure, must realize the diabolical mischief of Khrushchev. One day, through (the now deposed) Bulganin he sends in honeyed words to Italian Premier Zoli a proposal for coexistence and the next day he seconds Togliatti's campaign to win the coming elections—a victory that would make Italy a mere dependency of Soviet Russia. Common sense must force Italians to fight off such an insidious campaign. There can be no slackening of the struggle against communism.

Communism is far from dead in Italy. It still has strength of numbers of its adherents. Ten years ago they almost threw out DeGasperi and other democratic leaders. Now there has been a drop in party membership and Communists are on the defensive. Leaders in Milan, Naples, and Sicily have deserted the party. Labor unions under Communist domination have been losing steadily to democratic unions. The fight of 10 years against communism has not been fruitless.

But the Communists are still sufficiently strong for liberty-loving Italians everywhere to continue their fight against the baneful ideology that would make Italians slaves of Khrushchev, the new imperial czar.

Italians (and Americans too) must keep incessantly in the fore the recent tragedies attendant upon the unrest in East Germany and Poland and the uprising in Hungary.

Italians must be told that their choice is freedom and liberty or tyranny and brutality. Let Togliatti (and Nenni too), if he will, wash away the horrors of Poznan. Let him explain to Italian voters the murder of the innocent in Budapest by Russian tanks and machineguns.

It is hoped that in the coming election, the democratic parties will emerge stronger than ever. The job of insuring victory will not be easy. With precinct captains and leaders working hard and ceaselessly until the election, the votes necessary to obtain a majority of seats in the National Chamber may be attained.

In the cold war against Soviet Russia and its new Czar every member nation of NATO must be democratic and strong. We, in America, therefore, realize the importance of the Italian election. Democracy must win it, so that Italy as a NATO adherent remains strong. Thus this election is not merely a matter of domestic concern. It concerns the United States and all other democracies.

The Plight of the Railroads in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the executive secretary of the chamber of commerce of Greater Berwick, Pa., Mr. J. R. Bower, in which he discusses the economic plight of United States railroads and its impact upon the major industry of Berwick, the American Car & Foundry Industries, Inc.:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF GREATER BERWICK,
Berwick, Pa., April 19, 1958.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The chamber of commerce of Greater Berwick is extremely alarmed about the plight of the railroads of the United States. We all agree that our railroads are the lifeblood of our country and that something must be done to relieve them to some extent on their overhead costs. We all know that Senator SMATHERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, has been holding hearings on the entire transportation problem.

Secretary of Commerce Weeks has made a statement that we heartily approve, "that in view of this situation, it is extremely important to take every practical step to arrest declines in the Nation's economic activity without delay, to the extent that this may be done by tax reductions, with minimum loss of necessary tax revenues. It is imperative that such steps be taken now.

"There seems to be no other tax whose elimination could give more of a stimulant and restorative treatment to our economy at this particular time than the repeal of the 3-percent excise tax on the transportation of freight and the 10-percent tax on transportation of passengers. The net revenue loss to the Treasury on the transportation property tax, allowing for the fact that it is a deductible business expense for income-tax purposes, would not exceed $225 million, and might be considerably less."

We, in our community, are particularly interested in the abolition of these excise taxes, as it will place the railroads in position to purchase better equipment, as our community relies on ACF Industries, Inc., manufacturer of freight and passenger cars, to regain a large portion of our employment.

The elimination of these excise taxes will be of vast benefit to the entire Nation and especially so to our community.

We ask your support to vote for elimination of these taxes.

Very truly yours,

J. R. BOWER,
Executive Secretary.

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Make Available Surplus Farm Products to Correctional Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolutions adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on April 7, 1958:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to make available surplus farm products to correctional institutions

"Whereas His Excellency the Governor, in his annual message to the general court on January 1, 1958, stated: 'The utilization of surplus food should be expanded to include benefits to correctional and other State institutions. If a portion of the available food surplus were so utilized, it would result in very substantial savings to the Commonwealth'; and

"Whereas the extension of surplus food to include correctional institutions will help to make effective use of the foods that are presently in warehouses and storage bins: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so that surplus food may be distributed to correctional institutions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of

each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

House of representatives, adopted March 31, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence April 7, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

William C. Handy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very beautifully written article from the New York Times concerning the last rites of our great friend, Mr. William C. Handy, Father of the Blues.

Thousands of people packed the streets of New York to pay final tribute to this great man, and in death as in life, he received the plaudits and acclaim of the common people of America for whom he wrote his striking musical compositions and songs.

I had high regard for Bill Handy because in his field he was a genius and in his heart a great American and a great humanitarian whose wholehearted desire it was to improve the lot of his fellow man.

His work for the blind is but one instance of his willingness to extend himself in order to help others.

Bill Handy's name and music will live forever. He wrote from his own heart and the hearts of his people and popularized a new school of music which has gathered many adherents throughout the world. He lived a long, fruitful life. His passing will be deeply mourned by millions of people everywhere and I extend my most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Handy and his family.

The above-mentioned follows:

BAND SEES HANDY OUT OF HARLEM—RITES FOR AUTHOR OF ST. LOUIS BLUES DRAW 150,000 TO NEIGHBORHOOD—JAZZ NOTABLES ATTEND—COOTIE WILLIAMS PLAYS HYMN AT SERVICE—BRASS HORNS LEAD LONG CORTEGE

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The sad trumpet of Charles (Cootie) Williams blew a requiem yesterday for W. C. Handy, father of the blues.

Mr. Handy, who was 84 years old, died Friday. Yesterday, last rites for the composer of the St. Louis Blues were conducted at the Abyssinian Baptist Church, 132 West 138th Street.

The police estimated that 150,000 persons watched the slow progress at the funeral procession, led by the 30-piece brass band of the Prince Hall Masonic Temple, 454 West 151st Street.

A sleek maroon Cadillac hearse, rather than the traditional black-plumed horses of New Orleans, bore the coffin of Mr. Handy to its resting place at Woodlawn Cemetery, the Bronx.

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED IN CHURCH

Nearly 2,500 persons crowded into the Abyssinian Church for the rites.

The mourners were quiet as the Reverend Richard A. Hilderbrand, of the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, offered a prayer. He said Mr. Handy had "captured the heartthrobs of a forlorn and stricken people and set them to music."

Then Mr. Williams took his place in the organ gallery. He hunched his shoulders and put one hand over the mouth of his golden trumpet as it sobbed the opening notes of Mr. Handy's favorite hymn The Holy City.

Mrs. Handy, in black straw hat, black mourning veil, black coat and dress, sat composed and silent.

Mayor Wagner called Mr. Handy "an example for generations to come."

The Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., pastor of the Abyssinian Church and a Member of Congress, said:

"His personal blues are now finished. No more the problems of Beale Street. No more the irritations of Memphis. No more the vexation of the St. Louis woman. No more the cynical Love, Oh Love, Oh Careless Love.

POWELL CONTINUES

Mr. POWELL paused. After a moment of silence he continued:

"Gabriel now has an understudy—a side man. And when the last trumpet shall sound, I am sure that W. C. Handy will be there to bury this world, as a side man."

Within the church were great Dixieland jazz figures like Wilbur de Paris and Claude Hopkins, the famous "Shuffle Along" pair—Eubie Blake and Noble Sissie—and Cab Calloway.

Irving Caesar, the composer, and Oscar Hammerstein 2d, the lyricist, Langston Hughes, the poet; Marion Anderson, Harry Hirshfield, Ed Sullivan, and Col. Hubert Julian, the once-famous Black Eagle of Harlem, were also in the congregation.

There were also public dignitaries including Borough President Hulen Jack; and Paul Cunningham, head of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, of which Mr. Handy had been a member for more than 30 years.

The mayor of Memphis sent a message offering the W. C. Handy Memorial Park in Memphis as Mr. Handy's last resting place. Mrs. Handy rejected the offer with thanks.

Outside the church the funeral procession assembled as television cameras watched. To the strains of Nearer My God to Thee the coffin was borne out. The crowd joined in singing the hymn.

Finally, all was ready. The band, bright in blue uniforms and gold braid, came first, playing the cadenced tones of Chopin's funeral march. Behind bearer on foot, 2 flower cars, the maroon hearse, and 31 cars of mourners.

The cortege turned up Lenox Avenue. Here a huge truck was drawn to one side of the street. It served as an impromptu reviewing stand for a dozen Harlemites. Further up the street cameramen clicked lenses atop a horse-drawn cart.

CROWD THINS OUT

At 152d Street and 7th Avenue the formal procession ended.

Here the crowd had thinned to a handful. The band stood at one side and struck up the St. Louis Blues in funeral tempo. After a few bars it switched back to Chopin's funeral march.

The funeral cortege re-formed without the marching band and pallbearers. It accelerated up the approaches of the bridge over the Harlem River. A Voice of America broadcaster talked ceaselessly into his portable microphone in French.

The wind in gusts from a gray sky whipped at the coats of the dispersing mourners. As the last cars sped up the approach to the bridge, Wolford Edwards, the conductor, turned to his bandsmen:

"All right, men, St. Louis Blues again. A little faster this time."

Attridge on Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a truly remarkable article on spring which was written for the Saturday Evening Post by my valued friend, the most talented author, Mr. Richard Attridge.

This magnificent article on spring is the best of its kind that I have ever read. It ranks, in my opinion, with the greatest writings of past and present, and I do not think it could be excelled. The article is not only written with great perception, understanding, and ability, but it stirs feelings and sentiments that inevitably grip every human being at this time of year.

I heartily commend Richard Attridge upon his fine work and laud the Saturday Evening Post for printing it. Richard Attridge is one of our great contemporary American writers.

The article follows:

Spring is just around some windy corner, and we'll soon encounter the almost-forgotten sights and sounds of this gently blustering season. There's the early crocus sticking its inquisitive saffron head through a lingering patch of snow; the pale sunlight of forsythia, lighting even the drabbest day; white-capped mill ponds, stretching and tossing after their icy hibernation; pussy willows sunning themselves like wise kittens; and increasingly frequent flashes of bright birds back home after their vacation down South.

There's the first faintly perceptible yellowing of bare-limbed maples, beginning to get dressed in their cool summer green; wind-swept streets, and smoke-puffs of clouds across the face of the moon; snow banks of spirea blossoms making believe that winter has come back; lines of Monday morning wash whipping like bright flags under the high-riding sun; early gardens trying on their Easter bonnets; buds swelling and flowers shaping under the restless touch of nature we all feel in our hearts.

There's the sound of peepers in springtime pools, reminding us that even April can get a little frog in her throat in such changeable weather; the drip of maple sap from a boy-broken tree branch, and the back-to-work buzzing of bees; the chirping of newly hatched chicks, and the squeaking of baby pigeons in town steeples and towers; the eager rush and gurgle of city gutters and country trout streams; the satisfying crack of the first clean-hit ball, and the equally satisfying mud-sucking sound of boys' shoes, unfettered by galoshes, as the kids play catch in a soggy field.

There's a new ring to Sunday church bells, unhurried but clear over the balmy air, telling us that perhaps it is not yet irrevocably later than we think—echoing all the grace notes of nature's spring song, which promises us once more that there is always a new beginning, another chance for our sad old world, one more hope for us all in due season.

Appendix

Agricultural Research and Education in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas State College at Manhattan, Kans., has for several years carried on an agricultural research and education program in India.

Recently, Dr. Arthur D. Weber, dean of agriculture at Kansas State College, visited India and made a study of the projects under their agricultural research and education program.

Dean Weber is one of our Nation's outstanding agriculturalists, and is so recognized nationally and internationally. On his return to the United States, he made a report to Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State College, on our work in that nation. He entitled it "Some Impressions of the TCM-University Contract Project for Agricultural Research and Education in India."

As I had an opportunity to visit India last December and check some of the work being done by our own Kansas State College and other institutions of learning, I would commend this article to those interested in the progress we are making in the improvement of agriculture and education in that country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE TCM-UNIVERSITY CONTRACT PROJECT FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN INDIA

(By Arthur D. Weber, Dean of Agriculture, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.)

It was my privilege to be in India from December 13, 1957, to January 28, 1958, for the purpose of reviewing the work of members of the Kansas State College technical assistance team and observing other phases of the technical assistance contract programs being conducted by the University of Illinois, Ohio State University, and the University of Tennessee. These contacts also afforded me an opportunity to become acquainted with the organizational setup for India's agricultural research, resident instruction, and extension service activities. From these observations and through the acquaintances I made among India's agricultural leaders in government and in higher institutions of learning, I gained the impressions which are the basis of this statement. As a further introductory comment, I wish to state that since I concur heartily with the views expressed by director C. Peairs Wilson in the report he submitted following a visit to India during the summer of 1957, I shall concern myself here primarily with policy matters and an overall critique of the project. His report contains an excellent appraisal of the institutions where Kansas State College team members have been stationed and of administrative and other problems with which they were confronted.

At the outset, I wish to express as my deep conviction that members of the college contract technical assistance teams and the TCM staff, and their wives, deserve high commendation for their good work, which is being carried out under unusual, and in some instances, difficult circumstances. Everywhere I went I found evidences of respect and appreciation for the technical assistance program and those working with it.

In this connection, I feel that I would be remiss if I failed to mention that Dr. Frank W. Parker, chief agriculturist, TCM, New Delhi, is held in the highest regard by Indian agricultural scientists and administrators. His broad outlook and clear understanding of India's basic problems and the role research and education must have in the solution of these problems have brought to the technical assistance effort the vision and leadership which are essential to the attainment of the objectives agreed upon by the Governments of India and the United States of America.

It was also heartening to observe the support and overall administrative guidance being given to the TCM-University contract project by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Minister-Director Howard Houston.

Interest in and concern for India and the direction she will take in solving her problems also are being manifested by other great world powers. The intensity of this interest and concern is being revealed in numerous ways, not the least of which is by official visits to India by heads of governments and other high officials. Effects of such visits are plainly evident in many places; so much so, in fact, that I keep asking myself whether it would be presumptuous to suggest, even urge, that the President of the United States lend encouragement and strength to our technical assistance program by visiting India.

Impressions gained on my visit to India are forceful reminders of the importance of understanding why the United States is furnishing technical assistance to India and other underdeveloped countries. Such understanding is especially important to those who are directly responsible for technical assistance projects, irrespective of whether their responsibility is that of administrators, technicians, or in some other capacity. For obligations assumed for technical assistance can be discharged most effectively by those whose sense of urgency has been sharpened by an awareness of the issues involved.

Then, too, impressions gained since my return from India have served to emphasize that citizens generally, and especially Government officials and Members of Congress, must have a sympathetic understanding of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries if the best interests of the United States are to be served abroad.

Yet it is not easy to state clearly and in simple terms what are the right reasons for technical assistance. Nor is it worthwhile to belabor the matter by repeatedly defining objectives, especially by public statements in the countries where assistance is being given. There the program—what it is, how it is administered, and what it accomplishes—would be the main public relations effort. Nevertheless, back of the program are the reasons for it; and too frequently, it seems to me, these reasons are not clearly understood either in the United States or India.

Whatever means are used to acquaint people with the reasons for technical assistance, the basis for understanding the program, in my judgment, is that the interests of the United States are promoted when an underdeveloped country resolves its problems and remains democratic and free. It is significant that India has chosen democracy and freedom. China, with many of the same problems as India—food production being the key to most of them—has chosen another route. The implication is crystal clear: Technical assistance has become freedom's first line of defense.

Those who doubt that it is in the best interests of the United States to help underdeveloped countries in their struggle to maintain and increase the food supply would do well, I believe, to ponder on this statement made by Sir John Boyd Orr in his book The White Man's Dilemma: "People will eixst on a meager diet if they have never had, and do not know that a better can be made available. But when the food position deteriorates, and food becomes scarcer and dearer, or when hungry people learn that more food can be made available, they naturally blame the government and are easily induced to overthrow it."

Basically, India's problems stem from the mores and the social and economic conditions responsible for a woefully inadequate food supply. In the long run, research and education, as has been demonstrated in many countries, offer the best permanent solution to these problems. Fortunately, India has intelligent, well-educated leaders who appreciate this fact and want to effectuate needed changes and improvements. It is because the problems are so far-reaching and the difficulties so great that outside assistance is welcomed by these men, dedicated as they are to the concepts of democracy and freedom.

The ultimate goal must be, it seems to me, a degee of literacy throughout India commensurate with the need for general understanding of the country's pressing problems and of the ways and means of solving them. But the food production problem is so critically urgent and so basic to the solution of all the others that it warrants immediate and special attention.

Here again it is fortunate that India has in its colleges of agriculture and veterinary medicine and in its agricultural research, community development, and extension service setups the basic ingredients for an integrated and coordinated system of research and education—a system that could have a tremendous impact on Indian agriculture by providing a sound basis for greater and more efficient production. I would be less than frank, however, if I failed to record my disappointment in observing that thus far existing agricultural institutions and agencies have contributed little to the well-being and economic advancement of India's farmers and stockmen.

On the other hand, I found that Indian institutions and officials recognize this shortcoming, and, as a consequence, consider the TCM-University contract project for agricultural research and education useful in promoting Government of India interests. I do not wish to imply that Indian coopera-

tion leaves nothing to be desired. In some instances, complacency and satisfaction with things as they are were plainly evident. And occasionally it appeared that cooperation was regarded as the price that had to be paid for equipment and commodities. I am happy to be able to report, however, that these were exceptions; in the vast majority of cases Indian cooperation appeared to be wholehearted and satisfactory.

It is not easy to measure the porgress that is being made in the attainment of this project's objectives. It is significant, it seems to me, that ways and means of attaining objectives are being discussed and implemented. There is growing understanding and appreciation of the reasons for the success of the land-grant college system in the United States. Throughout India, agricultural leaders, largely, I believe, because of our technical assistance effort, are beginning to realize that agricultural research, resident teaching, and extension service activities are not unrelated, separate programs with incompatible procedures and objectives to be guarded jealously by their repective proponents. Instead, there is an increasing awareness of the urgent need to integrate these activities at all levels, from top administration to the farms, where in the final analysis progress in the attainment of the basic objectives of technical assistance will be measured. How to effectuate such integration presents many knotty problems, owing to the fact that marked administrative and working realignments will be necessary to assure real progress

How to apply the results of agricultural research is being demonstrated by members of technical-assistance teams in such things as grassland improvements, poultry, and dairy production, crops and soils test plots, and the training of extension leaders and specialists. Participation of team members in research and teaching conferences is another important contribution to the overall project.

Training of Indian participants in American colleges and universities deserves special emphasis in any appraisal of the progress being made toward the attainment of basic objectives, in my estimation. For these men will bring enhanced technical competence to their home institutions and a better understanding of how to identify and solve farm problems. They will also have observed the operations of a land-grant college or university and thus will appreciate why the integration of agricultural research, resident teaching and ex ension are so essential in attaining greater production and improved efficiency.

The most important consideration with respect to the TCM-University contract project, as I view it, is whether India will realine her agricultural institutions and agencies within the rural university concept. I shall not dwell on what this would entail since several publications are available on the subject. Suffice it to say that it is my deep conviction that this development, more than any other, will assure the attainment of basic objectives which promote the interests of both the United States and the Government of India.

I also gained the impression that this realinement is something that will have to be worked out for each institution in accordance with broad guiding principles, but without adhering to any fixed or stereotyped pattern of organizational structure. This is necessary, it seems to me, because each institution has its own unique situation, resulting from the circumstances of its origin and development and from its relationships with other institutions, including those of Government.

Recent developments at the Coimatore Agricultural College illustrate how rural university status can be attained through compromise and adaptation to the institution's own special needs and requirements. And the proposed U. P. Agricultural University at Tarai state farm would provide an excellent opportunity to demonstrate how an institution of this kind should be organized and run. It would also serve as a key university or model for new developments and even for realinements elsewhere in the country.

As one becomes acquainted with this project, the possible need to extend it for a number of years—perhaps 10 or even longer—takes on added meaning. The guiding principle in this regard, in my estimation, should be the extent to which the basic objectives have been attained, and India's ability to carry on without outside technical assistance.

It seems to me that allotments of funds for the purchase of commodities, except books, could be withdrawn first. Equipment and other commodity purchases should be handled by TCM instead of by the colleges and universities, as at present, in my judgment.

Allotments for training of participants in American universities and colleges probably should be withdrawn last; but even after such training has been discontinued, funds might well be made available for maintaining professional contacts among these men in India and for continuing relationships with their American counterparts and American institutions.

It will be important in the years immediately ahead to follow through with technical assistance to specific projects; otherwise, apparent gains could easily be lost. A good example is the grassland improvement project at Rajkot.

I have recommended that the Kansas State College contract be extended to 1960, and that extensions thereafter be considered in the light of needs and the ability of the college to continue to release key personnel to the project.

It is important that staff members assigned to work on TCM university contract projects be considered as partners in the total technical assistance effort. Fortunately, working relationships are improving as a result of the establishment of a contract coordination unit in TCM. It is to be hoped also that group leaders, and officials of TCM and of the Government of India will see to it that insofar as possible team members will not have reason to complain because advance arrangements were not made for their families' personal living accommodations. Similarly, it would appear that frustrations arising because of program difficulties and misunderstandings could be minimized by careful, initial planning with the Indian college before the team member's arrival in India. Yet it should be made crystal clear to the prospective team member, it seems to me, that his success will be determined to a large degree by his own resourcefulness and patience. A man's personal attitudes and psychological fitness for a foreign assignment should count heavily when team members are being recruited.

Finally, I should like to observe that, in my judgment, tangible results from technical assistance when expressed in terms of increased production and improved efficiency of Indian farm operations will come very slowly. The magnitude of the difficulties to be overcome and the nature of the problems to be solved are such as to cause one to wonder whether changes can be brought about in time to attain basic objectives of the TCM university contract project.

Yet I believe that there will be time enough to get the job done because: (1) Indian farmers love the land and possess the inherent qualities of interest and intelligence necessary to bring about significant changes and improvements; (2) technical assistance, through coordination of agricultural research, resident teaching, and extension service activities, can reach the Indian farmer and cause him to change his viewpoints and practices; and (3) India's academic, scientific, and political leaders will meet this challenging opportunity to advance their country's interests by providing the administrative framework, organizational structure, and support necessary for the evolutionary developments that have been envisioned for the institutions primarily responsible for the destiny of Indian agriculture.

Texans Regret Veto of Rivers and Harbors Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I continue to receive expressions of regret from people in my State that the President saw fit to veto the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD telegrams I have received on this subject from the Honorable Jim Lindsey of Del Rio, county judge of Val Verde County; Harvey Weil, president of the Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce; and R. E. Sallee, chairman of Nueces County Navigation District No. 1.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial, Veto Delays Worthy Projects, from the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the telegrams and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEL RIO, TEX., *April 17, 1958.*
Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of Democratic Leader,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope veto of water bill can be overridden. San Felipe Creek flood-control project in Del Rio is needed badly. Any suggestion you have for me to do will be promptly taken care of.

JIM LINDSEY,
County Judge, Del Rio.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *April 23, 1958.*
Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The following wire was sent today to Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ: "Rivers and harbors omnibus bill which was vetoed by the President is of great importance to this port and the economy of the entire area. We urge that the President's veto be overridden so that vital projects may become reality."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,
HARVEY WEIL, *President.*

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *April 23, 1958.*
Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following is a copy of a telegram which was sent to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman, Public Works Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., this morning:

The waterways legislation, which was recently vetoed by the President, is of vital importance to Corpus Christi and this area of Texas. We urge that the veto of the

omnibus bill be overriden in order that local meritorious projects can be initiated.

NUECES COUNTY NAVIGATION DISTRICT NO. 1,
R. E. SALLEE, *Chairman.*

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times of April 17, 1958]

VETO DELAYS WORTHY PROJECTS

President Eisenhower's veto of the $1,578,812,000 flood control-navigation projects authorization bill must be branded as another picayunish action.

Like the blue-penciling of the natural gas act bill, the President strained for small reasons to justify the veto.

There is a vast difference between his veto message and the statement which came afterward from Representative JIM WRIGHT of the Texas delegation.

Eisenhower said that while many of the projects proposed were worthwhile, some were included against advice based on "careful study and considered judgments of the professional services and other executive agencies concerned."

Congressman WRIGHT retored that the veto message "was predicated almost wholly on a completely erroneous assumption that the bill contained a lot of projects objected to by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of the Budget. * * * This is not true. There has never been an omnibus rivers and harbors bill sent to a President which was more overwhelmingly approved by these agencies."

In the senatorial debate on the 1956 similar bill that the President also vetoed, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico, had pointed out that projects on which the Army engineers' reports had not been received had been included in that bill because they were "of an emergency nature," and "complete and full justification of the economic feasibility of these projects should be established before appropriations are made for their construction."

The point Senator CHAVEZ made then, and equally applicable today, was that Congress would have the opportunity when the authorized projects came up for appropriations to review their feasibility and elimipate those which could be labelled as pork barrel.

In the meantime, unless the veto is overridden by Congress, the projects which the President himself admits are worthwhile face needless delay. These include all of the Texas projects which were in the authorization bill.

The delay also affects the ability of the public works program that would be initiated to stimulate the lagging economy of the Nation.

It would have been far more appropriate for President Eisenhower to have approved the authorization bill and cited those projects which he believed to be not worthwhile, and to have announced his intention to oppose appropriations for them when money was sought in Congress.

As matters now stand, the few rotten apples in the barrel have spoiled the whole in the opinion of one man, against big majorities in both Houses of Congress.

Fifty-nine Million Dollars in Benefits Paid Last Year to Wisconsinites by Private Health-Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great glories of the American system of free enterprise is how our people, by and large, look after themselves.

If there is a need, such as the need for financial security because of some emergency, the need is usually met by private companies and groups which act on a private basis to satisfy the demand on the part of the American public.

I was interested, therefore, to hear from Mr. Robert R. Neal, general manager of the Health Insurance Association of America, with regard to the growth of the important industry represented by his association in looking after the well-being of American families.

For example, last year, to the people of Wisconsin, no less than $59.7 million was paid in benefits, so as to cover bills resulting from illness, and to replace the income lost thereby.

Let me reemphasize that we of the United States do not believe in having the Government do for the people what the people should at least try to do for themselves. We recognize that government has an important role to play in many areas of our way of life. But we infinitely prefer to have the needs met, insofar as humanly possible, by private groups, such as the private insurance industry.

The great miracle of the free-enterprise system is that the profit motive has provided the incentive for the soundest possible public service in all the world.

As I have previously pointed out in the Senate, private insurance companies constitute an indispensable element in the life of this country and in the life of most of its 49 million families.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from Mr. Neal and the attached release on coverage in Wisconsin and throughout the United States be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
April 17, 1958.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Health Insurance Institute has just completed a study of health and accident insurance benefits paid by insurance companies to citizens of your State in 1957.

I know you will be interested in the enclosed release which outlines the extent of these benefits for many of your constituents. As you will note, these payments increased over 1956, and this rise is also reflected in figures for the entire Nation.

The Health Insurance Association of America consists of 260 insurance companies which issue approximately 80 percent of the health insurance business written by insurance companies.

The Health Insurance Institute is an important part of our association and serves as a central source of health insurance information for the public on behalf of insurance companies. Its purpose is to bring about a better understanding of the many types of health insurance policies and to inform our companies of public attitudes so that increased service can be provided.

If our office can be of assistance to you at any time in providing facts, statistics, or other information on health insurance, I hope you will call on us.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. NEAL,
General Manager.

Benefit payments by insurance companies to the people of Wisconsin who are covered by health insurance policies reached a new high during 1957, the Health Insurance Institute reported today.

In the period from January 1 through December 31, 1957, said the institute, over $59.7 million was paid out to help cover the cost of hospital and doctor bills, and to replace income lost through sickness or disability. This represents a 19.6-percent gain over the 1956 figure of $49.9 million, and is based upon reports from insurance companies doing business in the State.

The rise in benefit payments in Wisconsin was also reflected in the figure for the Nation as a whole, the institute further noted. Persons protected against the expenses of hospital and medical care and treatment received a total of $2.5 billion in benefits from their insurance company policies in 1957, up 16.1 percent over the previous year's high of $2.1 billion. By the end of the year, an estimated 70 million persons were covered by health cost policies bought from insurance companies, more than all other types of voluntary health plans combined.

The Health Insurance Institute is the central source of information for the Nation's insurance companies serving the public through voluntary health insurance.

A Hanging in Effigy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Mr. John M. Cummings, a very able news commentator of the Philadelphia Inquirer, has written a very interesting article entitled "A Hanging in Effigy Isn't So Very Funny." It relates to the very distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HANGING IN EFFIGY ISN'T SO VERY FUNNY
(By John M. Cummings)

HARRISBURG, April 22.—United States Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, has a keen sense of humor. The chairman of the Select Senate Committee Investigating Rackets in Labor and Management laughed heartily when shown a photograph which appeared on page 1 of Monday's Philadelphia Inquirer.

In the photograph Senator MCCLELLAN, in effigy, was shown dangling from a rope anchored to a window of Moose Hall on North Broad Street. It was placed there by members of local 107 of the teamsters union as one means of showing their contempt of the committee, and indeed, the Senate itself.

To the general run of citizen this hanging in effigy of the chairman of the committee was about as funny as events last year in Little Rock, in the Senator's home State of Arkansas. In both cases lawless elements flouted constituted authority and by their actions focused attention on a condition that bodes no good for peace and order in this country.

It may be argued, of course, that the 2,000 or so teamsters who assembled at Moose Hall to give a rousing welcome home to Raymond Cohen, the secretary-treasurer and

boss of local 107, represented only a relatively small minority of the 14,000-member union. This group, it is contended, represents the hard core of Cohen's following. It has its own ways of expressing on the rank-and-file the wishes and the demands of the top echelon.

Again and again, while on the witness stand in Washington, Cohen and others connected with the union took refuge behind the fifth amendment to the Constitution. To answer truthfully a question propounded by the committee or its counsel would tend to incriminate them in thievery and skulduggery.

Because he defied the committee, and because he retreated time and again behind the fifth amendment, Cohen was acclaimed as a hero by the faithful 2,000 assembled in Moose Hall. By way of emphasizing their low opinion of the committee, the local increased the pay of its lawyers by $1,000 each.

When a conflict of interest was suggested, one of the lawyers, John Rogers Carroll, stoutly defended their right to represent both the fleecers and the fleeced. He said this had the approval of a committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association. At a meeting the committee concerned with ethical practice reversed its previous findings. Carroll was ordered by his law firm to withdraw as soon as possible.

A number of odoriferous conditions have been exposed by the McClellan committee. The stench of none reached quite so high as that given off by the officers and minor satellites of local 107 of the teamsters. And then they had the audacity to acclaim the ringleader, Cohen, as a knight in shining armor, when he came home to declare that what he and his associates did with the local's money was in no way the business of the Senate or any other subdivision of the Government.

A grand jury investigation has been called for by the committee of 70. District Attorney Blanc so far has been District Attorney Blank.

No physical hurt was experienced by Senator McCLELLAN when he was hanged in effigy by the teamsters. He thought the whole thing was very funny. Law-abiding Philadelphians suspect the crowd that roped the effigy would gladly perform the same service for the man it represented.

Youth Sunday Sermon by Kenneth Roberts Harding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Youth Sunday sermon delivered in St. Patrick's Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., by Kenneth Roberts Harding, who is one of the pages of the House of Representatives. We are very proud of the young men who serve us as pages. They are an important part of the organization of the House of Representatives. This is an illustration of the fine outlook on life that these young men have:

YOUTH SUNDAY SERMON DELIVERED APRIL 20, 1958, IN ST. PATRICK'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH BY KENNETH ROBERTS HARDING

Today we are celebrating Youth Sunday, 1958. This is the one day in the year when the young people of the church conduct the morning prayer service. This is why I am preaching instead of Mr. Williams. This is why my fellow teenagers have been leading the prayers, reading the lessons, and carrying on every other phase of the morning prayer service. Of course, the purpose behind the Youth Sunday exercises is to remind the congregation, young and old alike, that youth today is very much an important part of the Episcopal Church.

Since this is the Youth Sunday service, I think it is an appropriate time for us to stop for a moment and say: Youth: we're gonna take a look at you. We want to know where your generation is going. We're putting the spotlight on you. We want to know how you are similar to the generations that have preceded you; even more importantly, we want to know how you are different; and most importantly, we want to know how you and the world are going to adjust to these alleged differences. In other words, youth, we want to know exactly what the state of American youth is today.

Well, my friends, the spotlight is on us, and by us, I mean a generation that is unique in the annals of history. In the next few minutes I shall try to provide the answers to many of the questions which we have concerning youth.

First, let's see how similar we are to generations now gone by. Well, we certainly look the same. We have 2 arms and 2 legs, 5 fingers on each hand, and 10 toes. We come in all sizes, shapes, and personalities. You can look around the congregation and see for yourself that kids haven't changed in looks too much. Take a look at me, for example. Here I am, a 17-year-old high school senior. Now, just looking at me, you couldn't tell what year it is. You couldn't tell me whether this is 1958 or 1928. So, you see, we still look a lot like members of older generations did when they were young.

Kids still act about the same as they did years ago. Childhood is still a happy time, a time of growing up and of learning. Kids still play as they did; almost everywhere you look, you can still find kids playing dolls, or shooting marbles, or playing grownup, or slugging a baseball or each other, or swooning over movie kings and queens, or dating, or eating, or dancing, or doing about a million and one other things commonly called kid stuff. You can still find juvenile delinquency, too, but the percentage of juveniles, while it presents a large problem, is so small that it isn't really going to affect the future of the majority of today's youth.

Now, just what is different about us? We look, act, talk, sleep, dress according to fads, and eat, so that, for all intents and purposes, the youth of today seems to be quite similar to the youth of yesteryear.

The fact is that we are the same; we are not really different. What is different is the world we live in. This is what makes this generation so unique. Today's generation is the first to grow up in a world gravely threatened with communism. Today's generation is also the first to grow up in the space age. What the future holds for us, we don't know. This is what sets this generation off from the others, and consequently our thinking has changed, and our attitudes are a bit different.

Today's generation has many worries hanging over its head. Why shouldn't it? It seems to follow that a troubled world will have troubled inhabitants. There is always the threat of world war III; the Reds continue to break one promise after another; America is behind in the space race; and now it seems that economic difficulties are becoming widespread. It is no small wonder that the youth of today is troubled. World events have certainly influenced his thinking.

Of course, when I say troubled, I don't mean that everybody goes around with a face about 6 miles long, has rags on his back, and is bemoaning his plight. No; I don't mean that. What I do mean is that youth, especially the teen-age segment, is not as carefree as it used to be. In the back of our minds we are disturbed.

If this is what is in the back of our minds, what then is in the front of our minds? According to a survey recently made by Parade magazine:

"We are concerned with basic matters, such as marriage, children, homes, etc.; we are optimists: we expect to raise our educational and economic status well above the level of any previous generation; we are willing, even eager, to accept responsibility."

It seems that these statements are pretty accurate; we are willing to be concerned with basic matters; we are optimists; and we are willing to accept responsibility. I think, however, that I would go a little further and say that we are a group bustling with energy and ambition: we, I believe, very earnestly want to better ourselves, our society, and this old world. Today the world presents us with a challenge of competition, and the stakes are high. American youth is ready now to take on this challenge and is determined to win out. Now, I think you can see what we are like: a group of people who, collectively speaking, are anxious to use what's in the front of their minds to make sure that what's in the back of their minds does not materialize any further than it has already.

Our way of life is also changed, and it is still changing. The widespread use of the automobile has given youth a lot more freedom than our parents ever had. The ruling hand of the home is not as strong as it once was. In recent years we have all tasted prosperity and want more of it. We want to build upon the works of previous generations.

What about religion? Has this changed, too? I'll answer that one with an unequivocal "Yes," and I'm sure Mr. Williams will agree with me. This change, fortunately, has been for the better, for religion—Christianity, I mean—has grown tremendously. More and more people are going to church; more and more people are seeking the divine guidance of God; more and more people are accepting the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The emphasis within religion has changed too. I don't think people are as concerned with all of the frills and ritual of religion as they used to be. We are more concerned with the practical benefit we received from Christianity; such as how to live a better life; how to secure better relations with our fellow man; how to live so that we might go to heaven when we die—things like this.

Now, how do we plan to adjust to all of these economic, social, political, and religious changes? We have one mighty weapon and that is Christianity.

Our biggest enemy today is communism. Why is this so? Because it completely obliterates the dignity of every man, woman, and child. There is no place for personal freedom and worship under the communistic system. It defeats the purpose of the Declaration of Independence, of democracy, and of Christianity. Renewed faith in God is needed to make us work harder and more effectively. We must always be on our guard against the propaganda pitch the Reds are making. We need renewed faith to spread the teachings of Christianity, especially to the people behind the Iron Curtain, hoping that someday they will see the light before it is too late.

In the past few months we have come face to face with the greatest frontier man has ever known, the frontier of outer space. On October 4, 1957, mankind for the first time stood on the threshold of space when Russia launched her first sputnik. Now Russia has launched a second sputnik, and we have launched two Explorers and a Vanguard. Soon satellites will be orbiting around the Moon and Mars. Space ships will be speeding

out into the realm of the unknown—searching, searching, always searching for the truth.

However, among the clamor to get into space there seems to be a feeling of why go into space? What's wrong with earth?

This seems to me to be a step in the wrong direction. It seems to be a feeling similar to the feeling 500 years ago that the earth was flat and that anybody sailing on the ocean would fall off the earth if he went too far. This is no time for feelings such as this. We can't hold up progress, especially when it is as crucial and necessary to this country as space exploration is.

Many of the same skeptical people seem to think our religious ideas will change once we get out into space; they feel that we are apt to forget God. Perhaps many of our religious ideas will be changed as we discover the truth, but I don't think we are about to forget God. On the contrary, I think that our faith in God will continue to grow as space exploration starts.

Let's look at it this way: This is God's universe. We are God's people. God made us. He made human nature. It is the nature of mankind to know about his surroundings. Therefore, it is human nature for us to explore space. And, therefore, it must be part of God's great plan for us to know about His universe.

Space exploration is a new field, and, therefore, there is a greater need for God. Space is an awfully big place, and an awfully lonely place. The burden of loneliness on space travelers will be eased by faith in God. Man is still unsure of his footsteps in space, and he needs God's helping hand to guide him.

Perhaps we will find that we earth creatures are not the only living human beings in existence. Will this so terribly upset our religious philosophy? No. It will strengthen it. This, too, must be part of God's plan.

The Episcopal Church has adopted the following stand in regard to space travel:

Seek ye the truth; come whence it may; cost what it will.

Think about it for a moment: Seek ye the truth; come whence it may; cost what it will.

American youth is ready to seek the truth now. We are ready to pay the consequences. We are also remembering the words of Jesus Christ, who said: "I came that you might have life and have it more abundantly."

This is youth; American youth. We are somebody, and we have a future. We shall have life, and we shall have it more abundantly.

And now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Moratorium on the Payment of Federal Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the following resolution received from the city of Livonia, which is located in my district.

CERTIFIED COPY OF RESOLUTION

The undersigned, Maria W. Clark, duly elected and qualified city clerk of the city of Livonia, does hereby certify that at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Livonia held March 31, 1958, at 33001 Five Mile Road, Livonia, Mich., at which time and place the following members of the council were present: Austin T. Grant, Frank O'Neill, Sydney B. Bagnall, Rudolf R. Kleinert, David L. Jones, Peter A. Ventura, and John T. Daugherty; absent: None; the following resolution was duly made and adopted:

"Whereas the economic conditions not only in the city of Livonia, but throughout the entire Nation, is creating a tremendous increase in unemployment; and

"Whereas renowned economists have advised that an excellent way of alleviating the ourrent economic recession is to declare a moratorium on the payment of Federal income taxes, thereby increasing consumer purchasing power: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Council of the City of Livonia hereby requests the Congress of the United States of America to take immediate steps to give President Eisenhower the authority necessary to declare a moratorium on the payment of Federal income taxes for a period of 90 days; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the city clerk be and she hereby is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Representative in the United States Congress, and to the Honorable CHARLES POTTER and PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, United States Senators; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the various cities, villages, and townships in the county of Wayne, urging them to enact similar resolutions, and that they forward copies of their resolutions to the Congressman of their district and to the Honorable CHARLES POTTER and PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, United States Senators, Washington, D. C."

A rollcall vote was taken on the foregoing resolution with the following results: Ayes, O'Neill, Bagnall, Kleinert, Jones, Ventura, Daugherty, and Grant; nays, none.

The president declared the resolution adopted.

In witness whereof, the undersigned has hereunto affixed her signature on the 15th day of April A. D. 1958.

MARIE W. CLARK,
City Clerk, City of Livonia, Wayne County, Mich.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the Grass Roots Digest is published by one of the country's preeminent schools of journalism, that of the University of Missouri, and in a recent issue of the Digest a true grassroots editorial was printed, pinpointing the subject Freedom of Information.

Written by one of the most capable and hard-driving newspapermen of my acquaintance, Joe Snyder, the editorial advances an urgent plea for wisdom and fairness in dispensing Government information. I may say that I agree fervently with its content.

Under leave to extend, I include the article from the Gallatin (Mo.) North Missourian in its entirety:

The right of the people to know what is going on in Government at all levels is one of the basic rights of the American people under our system of government. But during the past decade there has been a growing tendency to conceal and cover up, under the guise of national safety, anything which tends to put those concerned in a bad light.

Reporters and editors have a clear duty to perform in ferreting out information that the people should have and making it available to the public through the columns of their newspapers. At the top level they will frequently run into the obstacle that information which can have little bearing on military or defense secrets is labeled "classified" and withheld from the public. It is their job to obtain all the facts and make them generally available.

Congressman Moss, Democrat from California, heads a House subcommittee which is inquiring into Federal information practices. Representative Moss has obtained widespread support from newspaper, radio, and television editors who have been battling the veil of secrecy which too often is thrown around operations that have only the faintest connection with national security.

Recently Moss and Murray Snyder, Assistant Secretary of Defense, who heads the Pentagon's public information department, went round and round at a meeting in New Orleans of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association. Moss pointed to the "smug smog of secrecy" which has surrounded United States development of intercontinental missiles, along with the Russian sputnik trips into outer space. Snyder attempted to justify the haze which consistently covers many of the operations and much of the thinking at the Pentagon.

In time of war there are many facts which must be withheld from the public in order to keep them from the enemy. But it has been well established that the Pentagon and many other branches of Government conceal facts from the American people which are already generally known to Russia or any other foreign power which has the slightest interest in them.

The American system of Government is based on information about Government at every level available to all the people.

Democracy has no opportunity to work, however, if facts are unnecessarily concealed. And as far as we're concerned, that concept applies not only in Washington but in Jefferson City, the Daviess County Courthouse and the city hall.

A Pioneer Celebrates Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Tablet, a fine Catholic weekly newspaper published in Brooklyn, N. Y., is celebrating its 50th anniversary this month, and I should like to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in its pages on Saturday, April 19:

FIFTY FULL YEARS

By the grace of God and with the loyal support of thousands of devoted subscribers, the Tablet has completed 50 years as the dedicated organ of the diocese of Brooklyn and as an articulate member of the Catholic press of the United States. From a small, struggling start, our newspaper has grown in size and stature to the position of acknowledged leadership and influence which it holds today.

In retrospect we must properly and gratefully attribute what success we have achieved

to the blessings of Divine Providence above all. In a multitude of ways known chiefly to those who have worked in the Tablet office, God's helping hand has been manifest. Through many and repeated crises, only the help of God could have carried the Tablet along.

Through the years the encouragement, assistance, and loyal devotion of a host of friends among the hierarchy, the clergy, the religious, and the laity, as well as that of many non-Catholics, have been the mainstay of our newspaper. Especially are we indebted to the bishops of Brooklyn and to the diocesan clergy for their unremitting interest and cooperation.

From its inception our newspaper has found inspiration and guidance in broad policy from the utterances of our holy father, the Pope, to whom the Tablet has always given unqualified filial respect and loyalty. As a Catholic publication, after the mind of Christ's vicar on earth, our editors have always striven to present the news in an honest, truthful, and factual manner. In the expression of Catholic opinion, thinking with the church and with the holy father, we have sought only to serve the cause of Christian truth, Christian justice, Catholic idealism, and sincere patriotism.

Guided by the sound principles of Catholic philosophy and theology and by the standards of traditional Americanism, the Tablet has been able to view and to review the parade of human events, local, national, and international. The judgments our editors made on events and personalities in the passing parade, though trenchant, vigorous and direct, found their inspiration in dedication to Christian principle. They came from the honesty and courage of those who seek only the honor and glory of God, the welfare of immortal souls, the progress and prosperity of holy mother church and the preservation of our American heritage.

In the first years of its publication the Tablet faced and met head on the challenge of ignorance, bigotry, and suspicion in reaction against a rapidly growing and expanding American Catholicism. With honesty and courageous forthrightness blended with patience and charity, the Tablet defended the faith of the American Catholic and his right to be respected as a patriotic, loyal citizen.

During the depression days of the thirties the Tablet sounded a clear and loud alarm against the growing menace of communism. Identifying communism as an international conspiracy of aggressive atheistic materialists bent on world domination, the Tablet prophesied accurately the evil effects to our Nation and to the peoples of the world that would result from the recognition of Soviet Russia and the subsequent growth of Communist influence and power in world affairs. So vigorous were our expressions in those days that even some of our friends chided us with seeing nothing but Red. Events have proven that we may have erred on the side of moderation.

In the prewar days of the late thirties our editors took their motto from the holy father: "Nothing can be gained by war that cannot be achieved in peace. In war all is lost." Stoutly the Tablet resisted with all its strength and energy all efforts to involve our beloved country in a world war. Time and again, with accurate prophecy, we pointed out the devastating effects of our involvement upon ourselves and upon the world at large. Time has vindicated our judgment.

Though deeply dedicated to peace among nations, in the actuality of war the Tablet stood firmly with all loyal Americans in the defense of our country, and in the will to victory. We accepted the judgment of our leaders and called for a closing of ranks and complete unity of purpose and effort in the war.

Through the years the Tablet has endeavored to meet unflinchingly every challenge without swerving from its avowed purpose to serve truth and justice. The course has been extremely difficult at times. Those who stood in opposition to the Tablet's policies were both vehement and vociferous. But the force and vigor of the opposition was always more than balanced by the loyal devotion of our thousands of devoted friends who never failed to give us the encouragement and support we needed.

These have been a full 50 years. With gratitude to Almighty God and to all who contributed to the success of the Tablet, we renew our dedication to the cause of Christ, our loyalty to holy mother church, to our holy father the Pope, to our well-beloved bishop. We hope to continue with the help of God, to remain for many more years worthy champions of Christian truth and justice and of patriotic Americanism.

The Accomplishments and Aims of the Tablet on Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following, written by Patrick F. Scanlan, managing editor of Brooklyn's Catholic weekly, the Tablet, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, is an article on the history and the aims of a notable newspaper:

SERVING THE CATHOLIC CAUSE FOR 50 YEARS

(By Patrick F. Scanlan)

When the Tablet was first issued in April, 1908, Pope St. Pius X was supreme pontiff, Rt. Rev. Charles E. McDonnell, bishop of Brooklyn and John Cardinal Farley, archbishop of New York. Theodore Roosevelt was President of the 46 United States, Charles Evans Hughes, Governor of New York, George B. McClellan, mayor of the city and Bird S. Coler, president of the Borough of Brooklyn.

People in those days did not have many of either the luxuries or comforts of today. Automobiles and radios were exceptionally few; airplanes were even rarer; television, atomic energy and talking pictures unheard of; most of the electrical and mechanical household utilities of the present time were unknown; even electricity was used in few houses, while oil heat was a comfort yet to be realized.

Men and women worked hard. A 6-day week and, in most cases, a 10-hour day were the lot of the average citizen. While weekly wages were low, the cost of living was but a fraction of what it is today. Comparatively few women went to business and nearly all who were married confined their work to the home. Life was not complex and juvenile delinquency was an unknown expression. The police blotters, even in downtown or heavily populated areas, would not contain the arrest of even one youth for many months.

Serving under 3 bishops, 15 members of the board of directors, and with numerous priest-associates, this writer is humbly thankful to have seen the tablet grow from an 8-page weekly with a circulation of 15,000 to a 24-page publication with a sale of 150,000; a paper whose business has shown a phenomenal growth, become a valuable diocesan asset, and performed untold good for the promotion of religion and everything connected with the church, as well as serving both the country and community in an acceptable way.

Readers who have disagreed with some policy, editorial, article, or believed this or that issue should either be taken up or treated differently, have usually manifested a spirit which was not only friendly but helpful to the publication. Controversies, as our columns testify, have been carried on in a way which has not injured the interest or influence of the paper.

When this paper commenced, there was no such issue as communism or a dozen other topics which are now outstanding both nationally and internationally to which alert papers give a large amount of space. Wars and rumors of wars, income and sales taxes, inflation and large debts, crime waves and indecent prints were not confronting the people as they are today.

THE TABLET'S OBJECTIVE

The Tablet through the 50 years of its existence has had continually before it the concise profession of purpose set forth in its first editorial, printed on another page. In addition, besides offering an avenue of communication—and the only public one—between the ordinary of the diocese and the clergy, religious and laity, it has unremittingly sought:

1. To follow closely and to promote consistently the doctrines of the church and to render loyalty to the holy father and his decrees and to the bishop of the diocese and his policies; to uphold at all times moral values as well as religious teachings and to oppose those forces which threaten morality and religion.

2. To propagandize and support all activities of the church; to encourage and arouse Catholics to take a more active part in the apostolate of bearing witness to Christ always and everywhere; to strive to win support for the extension of our faith in mission territories, for the expansion of our schools and colleges, for increased vocations, for every form of Christian lay activity, both individual and organized.

3. To inspire, encourage, enrich, and ennoble the faith of our readers in order that they may be better Catholics; to endeavor to give every reader a greater knowledge of the faith in order that he or she might be able to understand and appreciate it more fully and hence be in a position to explain it to others more intelligently and effectively.

4. To promote the best interests of the United States and to oppose her enemies.

In following this 4-point program, the Tablet has sought to serve as a force for Catholic unity and for the promotion of good citizenship. In addition, it has endeavored to be a channel of information for non-Catholics, as well as Catholics, in the defense of truth and of the things that pertain to God.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

With 50 years completed in the service of God, His church and our country, the Tablet looks hopefully to many more years of accomplishment. Our labors will continue to be undertaken in uncompromising loyalty to the principles, ideals and objectives which have spelled success; to a consistent and persistent devotion to the diocese—bishops, clergy, religious and laity—and with intense pride in the word Catholic and everything it means.

In thanksgiving to God for His many blessings and for permitting our publication to thrive as a free, dedicated and constructive auxiliary of His church, the Tablet looks forward to a future in keeping with the past, that we may labor worthily for the ancient faith, for all it represents and for its adherents everywhere, and for our beloved country and the best interests of all its citizens.

Greetings to the Tablet on Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of Brooklyn's Catholic weekly newspaper, the Tablet, recognition and congratulations have come from many and I would like to record here but a few:

THE HOLY FATHER'S BLESSING

(A letter to Bishop McEntegart signed by Msgr. Angelo Dell'Acqua, substitute secretary of state of Pope Pius XII)

The holy father has given me the honored privilege of expressing his warm felicitations on the occasion of the golden jubilee of the Tablet, the official newspaper of the diocese of Brooklyn.

It is fitting indeed that you commemorate this auspicious anniversary, for from humble beginnings, under the providential care and blessings of Almighty God, this publication has become a potent means by which Catholic teachings are diffused to the faithful.

His holiness would have me remark that during the 50 years of its existence the Tablet has, on numerous occasions, evidenced its loyalty to the holy see by bringing to its readers the apostolic messages of the supreme pontiffs and at all times urging them to pray for the vicar of Christ and His intentions.

In rendering heartfelt thanks to divine providence for the manifold benefits bestowed upon the church through the services of the Tablet, the pontiff also commends your excellency and your revered predecessors for the encouragement and guidance extended to the zealous priests and able Catholic laymen, who, through the past 50 years, have given unstintingly of their time and talents to make this publication an evermore effective instrument for the propagation of our holy faith and for the salvation of souls.

As a token of his participation in this golden jubilee, the holy father, prayerfully invoking copious graces and favors upon all who encourage the work of the Catholic press and make it more fruitful, cordially imparts to your excellency and to the editor and staff of the Tablet his paternal apostolic benediction.

I gladly take this occasion to renew to your excellency the assurance of my high esteem and cordial regard.

PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

To the staff and members of the Tablet joined in the observance of the 50th anniversary of their newspaper, I send greetings.

Over the past half century the Tablet has contributed much to the spirit and growth of the diocese of Brooklyn. Continuing in the American tradition of free and responsible journalism, it can look forward to a splendid future of public service.

Congratulations and best wishes.

VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON

It is a pleasure to join others in extending congratulations to all who are associated with the Tablet on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Fifty years is a long time in this fast-moving world in which we live and I think we tend to forget, with our daily concerns, just how much progress America has made in this period of time.

The newspapers of this country have had a large hand in this progress and the religious press in particular has often served to remind us of the proper prospective with which we should view events. We are indeed fortunate to have religious liberty and a free press that faithfully reports and comments on daily happenings around the world, thereby contributing to the enlightenment and advancement of our people.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

On the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Tablet, I am glad to join a host of other Americans in expressions of tribute to its 50 years of dedication to the spiritual life of the community and the preservation of those American ideals, institutions, and traditions which have molded the character of succeeding generations of our people.

During the Second World War and the Korean war and even the occupation of Japan, when our forces were hard pressed and the issues may have seemed by many to be precarious, there was never any doubt as to the militant pro-Americanism of the Tablet and its editors. Their support of our position was invincible.

For this I have always been grateful.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

To some, 50 years is a long span of time. To others, it is but a brief moment in history. The 50 years just past have witnessed the birth and development of the Tablet. In that period, the official organ of the diocese of Brooklyn has gained an enviable reputation as a fearless and forthright member of the American press.

Uncompromising in its position where the freedom of America is concerned, the Tablet has made itself a powerful force in exposing concealed communism—the deadliest danger ever to threaten our free way of life.

My heartiest congratulations to the Tablet on this, its golden anniversary.

A. HOLLY PATERSON

Congratulating the Tablet on the 50th year of its publication is not just the writing of routine words of greetings and good wishes. For the Tablet is not a routine newspaper.

I have read its informative columns for many years, and although I am not of the Catholic faith, I have found in the Tablet's appeal to logic and reason refreshment not usually found in the secular press.

Its fortitude in fiercely fighting not only those who advance the banners of atheistic communism, but those who wittingly or unwittingly help them on in many ways and means, is to be applauded by all Americans, regardless of religious persuasion.

There are too few fearless journals which really print all the news that's fit to print. Time after time, I have found in the Tablet columns of what I consider highly important news for patriotic Americans to know. Other papers have skipped it or, at best, run a few short, unrevealing paragraphs.

Residents of 149 Labor Surplus Areas Demand Immediate Legislative Relief by the 85th Congress

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since 1955, when I introduced the first distressed area legislation in Congress, I have constantly called attention to the plight of the unemployed in the labor-surplus areas of the Nation and pleaded for congressional action.

During the 3-year interval we have had the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Congress, the 1st session of the 85th Congress, and now the 2d session, and to date no positive action has been taken in alleviating the distress of unemployment in labor-surplus areas.

While it is true that hundreds of witnesses have appeared before congressional committees in and out of Washington during the past 3 years and have filled over 3,000 pages of printed testimony confirming the need for immediate action, the unemployment in the 149 labor-surplus areas has increased, and as a result today it represents nearly 60 percent of the Nation's unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the 84th and 85th Congresses stand indicted in the eyes of the millions of residents of the 149 labor-surplus areas for taking no positive legislative action to aid them in restoring employment in their communities.

The records of the Congress and its committees reveal that I have continually referred to the absolute need for positive legislative action on a bipartisan basis. At the same time I have urged immediate action on some 40 distressed area bills by adopting an attitude of compromise in perfecting suitable distressed area legislation.

Meanwhile, my bill, H. R. 6975, was drafted as a reasonable compromise after much study and expert consultation. The result is that it has been described in many quarters as a fitting compromise and a realistic approach in breaking the legislative deadlock that has resulted because of the difference in the administration bill, S. 1433, and the Douglas-Spence bill, S. 964.

Mr. Speaker, my fervent pleas the past 3 years for bipartisan cooperation and decisive action in adopting a compromising attitude in drafting distressed area legislation were echoed by Gov. George Leader, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, when he testified last week in Washington before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Governor Leader criticized Congress for not taking action sooner on legislation to help relieve unemployment in distressed areas.

Stating that it was his third trip to Washington to endorse distressed area legislation, he said caustically, "You can sit down in your committees in Washington and think those distressed areas will go away, but they won't. We haven't got any action. I hope this committee will give us some action."

Continuing, the Democrat Governor of Pennsylvania said, "The people who live in these labor-surplus areas don't care whether it's a Democrat bill or a Republican bill. They want a program that will put people back to work."

Governor Leader on other occasions, in discussing distressed area legislation said, "A trip to Washington for this purpose is one of the rites of spring. It seems as if an area redevelopment bill is as seasonable a matter in the Nation's Capital as the annual blooming of the

cherry blossoms. This will make my third trip to support legislation of the sort sponsored by Senator CLARK and Representatives FLOOD, CARRIGG, FENTON, and VAN ZANDT.

Governor Leader concluded by saying, "The story so far has been that we have had Republican bills and Democrat bills; but we have never been able to get an area redevelopment law."

On a previous occasion Governor Leader was quoted as saying that he has constantly pointed out and has continuously urged "that the members of both parties sit down together and work out a compromise effort."

Mr. Speaker, here is the Democrat Governor of the great State of Pennsylvania indicting the 85th Congress for its neglect of labor-surplus areas. In connection with Governor Leader's scathing indictment of the 85th Congress, some may say, "Well, the House Banking and Currency Committee is holding hearings." Therefore, let us talk about those hearings that have been in progress since April 14.

To date the committee has heard a half-dozen witnesses, headed by former President Harry S. Truman. Five of the six witnesses have been Democrats, the other witness being Republican Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia.

Of the long list of witnesses yet to be heard, with the exception of Republican Governors Knight of California and Stratton of Illinois, and Republican Mayor Poulson of Los Angeles, all are Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, of all the thousands of words of testimony presented to date to the House Banking and Currency Committee, actually little has been said about distressed area legislation. On the other hand, however, the hearings are being used as a sounding board for political propaganda. Meanwhile, nearly 3 million unemployed in the 149 labor surplus areas continue to suffer from the misery of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 5 million unemployed in the United States at the present time and nearly 3 million, or 60 percent of them, are in the 149 labor surplus areas.

The following chart will prove conclusively that this unemployment in these labor surplus areas is chronic because it has been there for years and as a result must be treated separately from the national unemployment problem which has seasonal characteristics.

Unemployment in major areas of substantial labor surplus—149 areas regularly classified by United States Department of Labor—Selected months, March 1952 to March 1958

Month and year	National unemployment	Percent of labor force	Number of labor-surplus areas	Unemployment in labor-surplus areas
March 1958	5,188,000	7.0	149	2,970,000
March 1957	2,693,000	4.0	149	1,885,000
March 1956	2,551,000	3.8	149	1,793,000
March 1955	2,654,000	4.0	149	2,494,000
March 1954	3,230,000	5.0	149	2,181,000
March 1953	1,602,000	2.5	149	1,443,000
March 1952	1,673,600	2.7	143	1,684,000

Mr. Speaker, the information contained in the above chart was furnished to me by the United States Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Census and proves that if the 84th Congress or the 85th Congress had perfected and approved distressed-area legislation, these 149 pockets of chronic unemployment in the United States would have been eliminated and the nearly 3 million unemployed residents given employment.

Mr. Speaker, I represent 2 of these 149 distressed areas and while some call the present unemployment situation a slump in business, back in my congressional district it is classified as a recession.

This is due to the fact that nearly 17 percent of a 90,000-labor market is unemployed, hundreds are losing their unemployment insurance benefits, and thousands are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

The following chart shows the number of residents of my congressional district receiving surplus commodities from December 1956 to March 1, 1958. Let me call attention to the fact that as of March 1 of this year, 15.1 percent of the overall population of my congressional district, or 45,618 persons are living on surplus commodities.

Surplus commodities, Mar. 3, 1958

County	December 1956		June 1957		December 1957		February 1958		March 1958	
	Recipients	Percent	Recipients	Percent	Recipients	Percent	Recipients	Percent	Recipients	Percent
Blair	16,002	12	15,454	11	15,751	11	18,400	13.2	22,222	15.9
Centre	6,536	10	6,339	10	5,661	9	6,537	9.4	6,537	9.9
Clearfield	14,109	16	13,377	16	12,284	14	17,520	20.0	16,859	19.6
Total	37,247		35,170		33,696		42,457		45,618	
1950 census		12.8		12.1		11.6		14.6		15.1

NOTE.—The above figures represent the total recipients of surplus commodities and are comprised of public-assistance cases, the unemployed, pensioners, and persons whose income is inadequate to meet the minimum requirements of need as established by the income scale of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions that I have outlined are typical of all the 149 labor surplus areas of the Nation.

As I have said before, the unemployment situation in these areas is chronic and the only solution to the problem is distressed area legislation. Therefore, the answer lies with this Congress which has the power to enact suitable legislation to deal with this distressing situation. In the hands of this Congress rests the answer to the problem of unemployment that plagues 149 labor surplus areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, can we not lay aside partisan politics? Can we not compromise the differences in distressed area bills? And above all, can we not get down to the business of approving legislation to aid these 149 labor surplus areas and thus wipe out nearly 60 percent of the Nation's current unemployment?

Mr. Speaker, by approving distressed area legislation, this Congress will be heeding the pleas of nearly 3 million unemployed Americans who are willing and eager to return to work.

Frankly, we will in truth be lending them a helping hand through the medium of a much-needed law to aid the 149 labor surplus areas in the abolition of the gaunt specter of chronic unemployment.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Kansas City Times, in the issue of April 16, an article on postage rates over approximately a one-hundred-year period.

For instance, in 1860 it cost $5.00 to send a letter between California and the Eastern States. It also took 8 days for the letter to travel from California to Missouri by pony express.

This article gives some interesting information on this subject and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NICKEL TOO MUCH? ONCE A LETTER COST $5

(By Roberta F. Caldwell)

Are you worried about pending legislation in Congress which may require you to put 5-cent stamps on your letters? Don't take it too hard.

In 1860 it cost $5 to send a letter between California and the eastern States. It also took 8 days for the letter to travel from California to Missouri, by pony express. Only a couple of years earlier it had taken 3 or 4 weeks (by stagecoach).

Still earlier, letters and packages had traveled from New York to San Francisco by steamer by way of Panama and had been carried across the isthmus on muleback. Parcels over this route were handled by an express company at rates of approximately 75 cents a pound for large packages, $3 to $12 for smaller ones up to about a pound.

With the establishment in 1856 of cross-country stagecoach service along the California trail, the water route declined in popularity. The overland coach, generally pulled by a 4-mule team, took 22 days and nights of continuous travel from Missouri to California.

CAME THE PONY EXPRESS

It was a tremendous improvement when the pony express was introduced. Mail and small packages were carried in saddlebags on fast horses. Since light weight meant faster travel, tissue paper was used for letters. The men rode day and night. Stations were approximately 25 miles apart, and ordinarily riders were changed at every fourth

station. At every station, a fresh horse was waiting.

After operating only about a year the pony express, a romantic chapter in American history, was discontinued in 1861 because a new invention, the telegraph, had just reached California. The pony express carried important news primarily; this could now be transmitted by telegraph. Interestingly, the first telegraph line was owned and operated by the Government as a part of the postal system. Although the pony express was discontinued, the overland stage still carried mail until 1869 when the Union Pacific railroad was completed.

The idea of sending messages from place to place by means of relays of special riders did not originate with the pony express. The method is at least 2,000 years old. The name post office owes its origin to the Roman empire which maintained a system of sending official dispatches and intelligence information from post to post along the roads. The word "post" is derived from the low Latin, posta, meaning station. Originally, a post was a station where horses were kept for the use of men appointed to travel from one station to the next with messages. (Hence, postmen and post house or office.) The master of the posts was the keeper of the relay horses. Thus, originally a postmaster's duties were to care for horses and had practically nothing to do with mail.

FOR THE NOBILITY

The posts of ancient times were only for military messages and State dispatches, not for private correspondence. By degrees, permission was granted private individuals to use the posts. First the prerogative of the nobility, the privilege was gradually extended to the general public.

In America an official, but very erratic, postal system existed throughout the Colonies by 1710. The handling of letters was a haphazard business. The post rider often was an old man. As he jogged along over a corduroy road, he entertained himself by knitting socks or reading the letters he carried.

From earliest colonial times, letters arriving from overseas were supposed to be called for aboard ship. When ready to sail again, the captain left all unclaimed letters at some coffee house near the wharf where they were spread out on a shelf or table to await call.

FRANKLIN WAS FIRST

In 1753 Benjamin Franklin became first postmaster general of the American Colonies. Until then mail had been sent only about once a month between the principal business centers, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Franklin arranged for mail to go regularly twice a week in winter, three times in summer by stage coach.

Early coaches took 3 days or longer between New York and Philadelphia, 6 days or more between New York and Boston. About the time of the Revolutionary War another stage, not so much coach as covered wagon, was introduced. Because it traveled so fast—Boston to New York in only 4 days, New York to Philadelphia in 2 days—it was called "the flying machine." Traveling hours were from 3 a. m. to 10 p. m. each day.

RAIL AND AIR

Through the years, other important steps in the development of postal service have included: Use of fast trains, highway mail, air mail (1918), helicopter delivery, rural delivery (1896), postal savings (1910), parcel post (1913), money orders, insurance, special delivery, registration and certification. Despite all these additions, the cost has gone down more than up. In 1792 the postage rate was fixed at 6 cents on letters traveling up to 30 miles, 10 cents between 30 and 80 miles, and so on, up to 25 cents over 400 miles. This cost had to be paid in advance, but it was not until 1847 that postage stamps were used to show the sender had prepaid the cost.

In 1851 rates were fixed by weight rather than distance, first 3 cents, later (1883) 2 cents for one-half ounce; then (1885) 2 cents an ounce. Between World Wars I and II, the rate went to 3 cents an ounce despite increased services and rising costs.

Three cents—or even 5—for a stamp is still one of today's genuine bargains.

Needed: A Welcome Mat at the United States Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Vera R. Glaser that appeared recently in the Washington Sunday Star editorial section. The article points out the need for an adequate guide service in the United States Capitol. I have joined with Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, in introducing legislation designed to provide visitors with a more appropriate welcome to the building which they, as taxpayers, own. The article imaginatively describes the limitations of the present setup:

NEEDED: A WELCOME MAT AT THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

(By Vera R. Glaser)

Jennie Jones gazed skyward at the dome of the United States Capitol. It was her first trip to Washington. Her heart swelled with the glory and the grandeur.

At that moment Jennie personified 2 million Americans who each year, mainly in spring and summer, make a patriotic pilgrimage to one of the most beautiful cities in the world. For many it is a once-in-a-lifetime event. For all who visit the venerable Capitol Building it is an experience compounded of awe, thrilled expectancy, and a solemn sense of belonging.

The letdown comes fast. There is no welcome mat for visitors without congressional connections.

Two energetic young Representatives, ROBERT J. McINTOSH, Michigan Republican, and FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey Democrat, have spoken out in Jennie's behalf. They are proposing what amounts to an overhaul in the Capitol's model-T public-relations system.

They remind us that Jennie, who could be from Albuquerque or Des Moines, is not a seasoned sightseer. She does not even know the name of her Congressman. She is simply an American taxpayer who wants to observe her Government at work.

How does a stranger go about that?

When a guide with a handful of tickets buttonholed Jennie just inside the east entrance of the Capitol, she bought one for 25 cents. Her half-hour tour included brief glimpses of the Senate and House in session. If she had not paid a quarter, she would have had no way of viewing her elected lawmakers at work—that is, unless she learned accidentally that Congressmen furnish passes to the galleries.

"But who is my Congressman?"

There would be no one around to answer. Forlornly, Jennie would wander through a building in which she is a shareholder in the truest sense of the word.

A pleasanter reception awaits about 5 percent of the tourists who make a point of touching base with a Congressman. They are supplied with descriptive booklets and perhaps a clerk is detached from work to point out highlights of the building.

Handshaking, of course, slows down the wheels of official business and perhaps it is well that so few tourists seek out their Senators and Representatives. This leaves the Jennie Joneses, the servicemen on furlough, the students, and the visitors from foreign lands, who comprise 95 percent of the human flood, with no encouragement at all to absorb the artistic and historic wonders of the Capitol.

Indeed the beloved shrine has become one of the strangest paradoxes in Washington. It houses 531 officials who, by the very nature of their election to office, must be skilled in the art of public relations.

Yet collectively, as the Congress of the United States doing business in the Capitol, their public relations effort falls short.

A quartet of experts, including 2 Congressmen and 2 public relations specialists, were polled by this writer for suggestions on how the Capitol could best fulfill its meaning for Americans. Their views are condensed here:

Consistent with the dignity of a major Nation, guide service should be furnished officially at no charge.

Capitol guides are appointed by political patronage and rely on the 25-cent fees as their sole source of income. Representative THOMPSON labels the system cheap and degrading and has introduced a bill to abolish it in favor of free guide service. Admitting that the Capitol guides make a real and conscientious effort, he nevertheless points to Canada, where free guide service is provided by Parliamentary authorities, as the ideal. The smaller democratic nations—including Australia, Ireland and Switzerland—also provide free guides.

Representative McINTOSH recommends a Visitors Information Center which might be located in the rotunda, to supply names of Congressmen, office and hearing room locations, and the like. "Such a clearinghouse is urgently needed," McINTOSH claims, "to provide facts, soothe tempers, and most important of all, convey a spirit of friendly welcome."

A film describing the work of Congress and the layout of its vast plant, to be shown at regular intervals in advance of the tours, was suggested by one expert.

A simple, basic piece of descriptive literature for public distribution is a must. McINTOSH recommends that the folder also be placed in Federal buildings throughout the Nation as a Capitol preview for visitors. At present, the only source of Capitol booklets are Members of Congress, who receive limited quantities from document rooms and their campaign committees. Most visitors must pass money across souvenir counters to get such literature.

Every department of Government, including the White House, maintains a public information office. The United States Capitol, carrying one of the heaviest loads of telephone, telegraph and mail inquiries, has none.

A central telephone query desk and mail-reply unit are recommended. In recent years thousands of requests, sparked principally by school children and requiring varying degrees of research, have swamped Members. Any relief afforded overworked congressional staffs might serve to normalize their schedules.

Expansion of present constricted eating and comfort facilities is past due. The Capitol contains no truly public restaurant. Visitors pile into the seriously short staff quarters. Four drinking fountains, 4 small men's

rest rooms and 3 tiny ladies' rest rooms serve millions. Elevators are taxed to capacity. Police, doorkeepers and employees are stopped every few feet for questioning by eager tourists. Without taking into account future needs the Capitol Architect estimates current shortage of work space in the building at 106,000 square feet.

Extension of the east front of the Capitol, of course, by enabling the building to serve its dual function as workshop and national shrine, would help solve this serious public relations problem.

The experts are unanimous in calling for a change of attitude. Visitors are guests, they declare, and not herds of sheep. The United States Capitol is a potential classroom in patriotism for those citizens who love her well enough to travel thousands of miles for a close view. But the experts also agree that a big gap yawns between what the Capitol is and what it should be.

Perhaps that is why Jennie Jones had a vague feeling of disappointment as she straightened her flower-sprigged hat and walked back to her hotel to pack.

A National Campaign To Promote the Use of Wood and Wood Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the interest of the Federal Government in the great federally owned forests require that they manage them in the best possible manner. This means building adequate access roads and supplying a sufficient number of able men to manage these highly valuable resources for the best profit to the United States on a sustained yield basis.

However, merchandising wood is up to the industry and I am glad to report that under the leadership of organizations such as the Douglas Fir Plywood Association and the National Lumber Manufacturers Association men and women in forest products businesses are progressively and resourcefully undertaking to promote the use of wood and wood products.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a news story from the New York Times for April 20, 1958, telling of the lumber industry's program:

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1958]

LUMBERMEN RAISE WAR CHEST TO HOLD POSITION IN MARKET

(By John J. Abele)

The lumber industry hopes to improve its health by a million-dollar shot in the arm.

Alarmed by sharp decline in sales and profits over the last 2 years, the industry is moving ahead with plans for a $1,250,000 national campaign to promote the use of wood and wood products.

The program was prepared for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association by the Baltimore advertising agency of VanSant, Dugdale & Co., Inc. It is designed to combat inroads into lumber's traditional markets by a growing flood of competitive materials—metals, plastics, concrete, brick, asbestos, and others.

While the use of these materials has been increasing steadily in construction, lumber's share has been declining. Shipments last year were at a 9-year low of 33,600,000,000 board feet, 11 percent below the 1955 figure. During the same period sales fell to $2,900,000,000 from $3,500,000,000, a decline of 17 percent, and profits plummeted 65 percent to $67,500,000 from $190,600,000. Profits in 1957 represented 2.3 percent of sales, against 5.4 percent in 1955.

HOUSING DROP CITED

The decline in new housing starts from 1,300,000 units in 1955 to 990,000 last year was one factor in lumber's poor showing. Another was the declining use of wood in each house built. In 1920, for example, about 18,900 feet of lumber were used in building the average home. By 1953 that figure had dropped to 10,500 feet. The decline is believed to be continuing.

Competitive materials bear a large part of the responsibility for lumber's lost markets. Among them are aluminum window frames, steel doors and structural work, plastic floor coverings, asbestos siding, asphalt roofing, and wall panels of various compositions. Not the least annoying to lumber manufacturers have been synthetic materials decorated to look like wood.

These products have been well advertised and aggressively merchandised, often by such industrial giants as the Aluminum Company of America, United States Steel Corp., Kaiser Aluminum Co., Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., and Armstrong Cork Co.

The tens of millions of dollars spent by these companies in promoting their products in newspapers, magazines, and television dwarfs the propoesd lumber program of $1,250,000. Lumbermen concede this but point out that the program is only a start—the last industrywide promotion campaign was in 1932—and may snowball in time as wholesalers and retailers join. Whatever happens the proposed program would represent a sizable addition to present budgets for the promotion of lumber, estimated at about $5 million a year for the entire industry.

So far the program has been approved by two of the largest member associations of the NLMA, the West Coast Lumbermen's Association and the Southern Pine Association. It has also been approved by directors of the Western Pine Association, the remaining member of lumber's big three, which is canvassing its members for their reaction. The program also has received the approval of several smaller member associations of the NLMA's 16-member groups. Final acceptance by the end of this month appears certain.

The regional associations have been conducting a large part of the industry's promotion in recent years but have been supporting particular species of lumber, such as Douglas fir, Southern pine and Northern maple. Supporters of the new program point out that it will not replace this regional promotion but will supplement it by helping to pave the way for increasing acceptance of wood instead of aluminum, steel, plastics, or other materials.

As one speaker at a recent lumbermen's meeting declared: "Your biggest rival is not the man sitting next to you but the producer of competitive materials."

About 40 percent of the proposed program would be devoted to advertising in trade journals in the building fields and consumer publications. Other major items would include information on wood technology and cost for architects, builders, engineers, and financial interests and expansion of field staffs to win greater acceptance of wood by building code and insurance officials.

If adopted, the program might help solve a long-standing grievance between lumber manufacturers and retailers. The manufacturers complain that retail lumber yards are stocking an increasing amount of competitive materials and don't promote lumber as they should. The retailers respond that the manufacturers don't give them much help in merchandising wood.

Address of Hon. Joseph M. Proskauer in Accepting American Liberties Medallion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the acceptance address of the Honorable Joseph M. Proskauer, in accepting the American Liberties Medallion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my privilege to bestow upon Senator Lehman and Judge Learned Hand this American Liberties Medallion with which you now honor me. To become the successor of these two leaders, thus far the only recipients of this award, is a signal honor for which I am profoundly grateful.

I hope to supplement what each of my predecessors had to say on acceptance of this award. From Senator Lehman we had a challenging outline of legislation which would safeguard American liberties. He described eloquently the tactics for America to follow in this struggle for civil liberties by a program of specific enactments. Some draw from the cliché that you cannot legislate morality the inference that the world can get along without a policeman. To this I do not subscribe. The sanctions of the law must still be invoked against the lawbreaker. Yet, I have an old man's belief that we should concern ourselves—as we must—not only with tactics but with strategy; not only with the battles to be waged, but with the underlying principle by which we shall win the war.

Judge Hand spoke of this strategy when he quoted the eloquent defiance of convention with which Shelley closes Prometheus Unbound:

"Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent;
This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;
This is alone life, joy, empire, and victory."

I add another concept. We are admonished in the Book of Proverks: "Remove not the ancient landmark." There is truly no lamp by which to guide our feet more brightly than the lamp of experience. Obviously we cannot fetter ourselves with slavish adherence to convention and precedent; and yet the accumulated wisdom of the world has set for us certain landmarks which give direction to the paths which we must follow in our attainment of full civil liberties. Even the great reformers of the world have very often ignored those landmarks; and while they have raised the banner of revolt against cramping conformity, they have too often disregarded these guideposts of the past and thus brought us new problems and new evils.

The yearning quest of democracy has been for that liberty of thought which Voltaire, in his famous letter to Helvetius, described

as "the life of the soul"; the liberty of conduct free from bigoted interference; those liberties which inhere in our age-old concept of the dignity and worth of the individual. Fundamentally we advance our search neither in slavish adherence to traditional formalism, nor in rash Promethean denunciation of the conventions which society has impoded upon itself.

When we contemplate the curious paradoxes which history discloses, we see more and more clearly the necessity to sift the wheat from the chaff and to recognize the safe efficiency of the beaten path, even when we must at times alter its direction. Luther in flaming words voiced his denunciation of the corruption which had invaded the established church. He founded a reformation which created a new spiritual world. But he lapsed from the moral teachings of Christianity. He urged his followers, in the words of Will Durant, "to burn down the homes of Jews, to close their synagogues and schools, to confiscate their wealth, to conscript their men and women to forced labor, and to give all Jews a choice between Christianity and having their tongues torn out." And Durant concludes: "These utterances helped to make Protestantism—so much indebted to Judaism—more anti-Semitic than official Catholicism."

But Luther's successors through the centuries returned to the beaten path; and today we read in the Book of Common Prayer an appeal that "we may reverently use our freedom and help us to enjoy it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations." There was a Catholic Inquisition and a St. Bartholomew's Day which, too, ignored love and tolerance. But we have come to see the gentleness of St. Francis permeate the thinking of the Catholic Church; within our own time we have heard a Pope declare: "Anti-Semitism is inadmissible to a Catholic; spiritually we are all Semites."

We Jews, too, have at times shown intolerance. Uriel Acosta held the opinion that certain Jewish rites and beliefs were un-Biblical; he was excommunicated from the synagogue in Amsterdam, recanted, and was again excommunicated under humiliating conditions that caused him to take his own life. But, in dying, he left to the great Spinoza the duty and the opportunity to replace the ancient landmark, "to show that not only is perfect liberty to philosophize compatible with devout piety and with the peace of the state, but that to take away such liberty is to destroy the peace and even piety itself."

So we Jews have today returned to the ancient ways, knowing that the whole duty of man is to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God.

Just now we are celebrating the 300th anniversary of the so-called Flushing Remonstrance. In 1657, when Peter Stuyvesant issued an edict forbidding the people of New Netherlands to admit Quakers into their homes, 30 freeholders defiantly proclaimed:

"Our desire is not to offend one of (God's) little ones, in whatsoever form, name or title he appears in, whether Presbyterian, Independent Baptist, or Quaker, but shall be glad to see anything of God in any of them, desiring to do unto all men as we desire all men should do unto us. * * * Therefore, if any of these said persons come in love unto us, we cannot in conscience lay violent hands upon them, but give them free egresse and regresse into our town * * *"

That indeed is a glorious landmark.

Our route leads to a summit where there will be no gap between the promises of our Bill of Rights on the one hand and our way of life on the other. To reach it, we must cling to the fundamentals of freedom. True, when a Faubus defies the law of the land and of humanity, we must use the tactis of the law that Senator Lehman described. True, when superstition and convention are invoked to strangle human betterment, we must, as Judge Hand has taught us, fire ourselves with that defiance which sparked the words of Prometheus. But equally true it is that the way to freedom must always be defined by the great landmarks of the human soul.

The 10 Commandments, as God thundered them forth to Moses on Mount Sinai, and the Sermon on the Mount are still our guideposts. I have always loved to recall that the New Testament tells us that when Jesus was asked what a man should do to be saved, the answer was, not in words newly fashioned, but with a quotation from our Hebrew Scriptures: "You shall love the Lord, your God, with all your heart and with all your soul," and "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

This is the synthesis of what is noblest in Judaism and in Christianity.

That synthesis the American Jewish Committee has followed in the past. We have fostered a belief that no one is truly free unless all men are free; that we must seek unity, but with absolute right of independent dissent; that, in the words of Ralph Barton Perry, "the only kind of unity that can be said to be praiseworthy is a unity which harbors differences and renders them benign"; that the nations should promulgate a guarantee that everyone, of every race and creed and country, should have the fundamental rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our charter proclaims that we should protect the rights of Jews everywhere. But we have wisely interpreted it to mean that we should endeavor to protect the freedom of all men.

Thus the ancient landmark charts our path. Let us highly resolve to follow it to our goal—a world where every man may live in dignity and peace under his own vine and fig tree, and where we shall achieve at last, in love, a true brotherhood of all mankind.

Veterans of World War I of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan has gone on record as being in favor of the enactment of H. R. 11077, the World War I charter bill which is pending for floor action. Shortly after this measure was introduced, I wrote to Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee, urging him to give favorable consideration, and I would like to reaffirm here my support of this proposal:

House Resolution 34

(Offered by Representatives Currie, Yates, Pears and Jeffries)

Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon House of Representatives bill No. 11077, incorporating the veterans of World War I of the United States of America

Whereas the legislature of the State of Michigan notes that there is now before the House of Representatives of the United States, House bill 11077, which has been reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee to the full House of Representatives; and

Whereas the members of the Michigan Legislature look with favor upon this proposed legislation and urge that the Congress of the United States take favorable action on the passage of this bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Michigan Legislature urge the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon H. R. 4412, incorporating the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each of the Michigan delegates to the United States Congress.

Adopted by the House April 11, 1958.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Why Above the Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on April 20, 1958:

WHY ABOVE THE LAW?

(By Judge Ernest W. Gibson, United States District Court, Vermont)

I have long believed that an independent judiciary is the real protector of the freedom of man in our country. I have been greatly distressed at some of the happenings in our administrative agencies, particularly in some of their decisions.

The Congress has provided for a judicial review of one sort or another for many of the decisions of the various administrative agencies of our country—but it also, in some instances, provided that an administrative decision shall be final and that there may be no judicial review of any kind of that decision.

For instance, if a veteran who was disabled in World War II seeks disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration, he may have no judicial review of the final decision of the Veterans' Administration in Washington.

HAVE FINAL WORD

Their word is final—because there is no judicial review of a final decision of the Veterans' Administration in Washington.

I sought to help a veteran secure disability compensation, service connected.

His claim was turned down by the Veterans Board in White River Junction, Vt., and he appealed to the Washington Veterans Board. The Veterans' Administration in Washington sent an investigator, with a secretary, up to Vermont. The investigator went to many who had made affidavits, threatened them, claimed they had given wrong affidavits, claimed the veteran had lied. And when he put the veteran under oath, he was continuously saying to the veteran—"We have information in the files which says otherwise from what you are testifying. Is that true or untrue?"

When the investigator was asked what information they had, who said it, where it was said, and to whom it was said, he would answer—"That is secret information."

A Communist on trial for treason in a Federal court gets much better treatment than that veteran was afforded by the Veterans' Administration.

If the Veterans' Administration, for instance, was subject to judicial review of its decisions, you may be sure that the Veterans'

Administration would never dare act in the manner that it has acted and does act.

VERMONT BANS COWS

Another illustration. Several years ago, some cattle out on the Pacific Coast apparently became infected with the hoof and mouth disease. The Secretary of Agriculture placed an embargo on the importation of cattle from Canada into the United States.

The only hoof and mouth disease cattle, so far as I have been able to determine, were on the Pacific Coast.

All of the Vermont farmers along the Canadian border were required to erect fences to make sure that their cattle pasturing in Vermont did not wander over into Canada. In many instances, farmers had pasture land adjoining their own farms, the pasture land being actually in Canada.

On a particular night up in Franklin, Vt., where there were several customs inspectors apparently watching, armed with flashlights, a couple of cows from one farm broke through the fence and went over the line into Canada, whereupon the customs officials dashed to grab the cattle, and, of course, many other cattle surged across the border through the fence and surged back.

In the melee, the customs people were able to seize about 10 cows. Under the law, these seized cows were supposed to be delivered forthwith to the Department of Agriculture for destruction.

GRANTED INJUNCTION ANYWAY

When the following morning I signed an order temporarily restraining the Collector of Customs from turning these seized cows over to agents of the Secretary of Agriculture and set a hearing for granting of a temporary injunction, I was told by agents of the Department of Justice and of the Department of Agriculture that I had no authority to do any such thing—that such a decision of the Secretary of Agriculture was entitled to no judicial review.

However, I did grant a temporary injunction, and before the case ever came to hearing on the merits, the hoof-and-mouth embargo was lifted—and the cows were returned to the farmer and were not slaughtered.

There are those who will say that to grant a judicial review, however limited, to all administrative decisions would be to ask the impossible.

Such I believe to be a ridiculous statement.

The American Bar Association has recommended the creation of an administrative court.

This administrative court would be authorized to grant whatever judicial review of administrative decisions that Congress decided to give it.

Members of this administrative court would hold the same tenure as does a United States district judge, tenure based on good behavior.

These would be men trained in the law, who would hear both sides of the matter, would write a decision and sign it. They would not be worrying about whether they would be reappointed or what was going to happen to them when their terms of office expired.

The FCC makes a good example of the present trouble with our administrative system.

The Commission has a staff of opinion writers who think up reasons for them. They can think up reasons to support any decision the Commission decides to make. No Commissioner signs it—indeed many times they pay little attention to the examiners' views. All they read, if anything, is staff summaries—this making the hearings practically a useless expense.

MUCH FAIRER WAY

How much more logical, how much fairer it would be if a trained administrative court judge heard the arguments presented on the one hand by the FCC, and on the other hand by protesting applicants—and then he handed down a decision, finding facts, stating the law and the reasons for his conclusions and judgment—and signing the same.

Thus if we could have a reorientation of our administrative practice, a judicial review available, however, limited, of all administrative decisions, and an administrative court designed purposely to handle these matters—an administrative court that would be part of an independent judiciary holding office during good behavior, I believe the freedom of man in our country and his property rights would be much better protected.

Toward 5 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting an article from the Washington Post of Thursday April 24, 1958, entitled "Toward 5 Percent."

TOWARD 5 PERCENT

Reduced to cold figures, the economic challenge to this country in the decade ahead is to produce at least 4 percent more goods and services each year than the year before. And, given the great and growing burden of armaments, that growth rate must be pushed to 5 percent if there is to be the kind of material and social progress which is the core of the historic American dream. This seems to be the central conclusion of the impressive study just completed by a panel of outstanding economists and business leaders as a part of the special studies project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

The hopeful estimate of the panelists is that a 5 percent rate can be achieved, even though before 1930 annual growth did not exceed 3 percent and in recent years has not gone above 4 percent except during World War II. But heroic measures will be required, and for most of those steps urged by the Rockefeller panelists, there is not yet anything like the general understanding and support that would be required for their adoption.

Tax reform, to speed capital accumulation and investment and eliminate widespread inequities in the present system, may be the most difficult political problem. But there will be nothing simple about obtaining needed improvements in the credit system, a sustained and steady expansion of outlays for public works and social security, the better organization and fuller support of research, the adaptation of obsolete segments of the economy to new methods and demands, the elimination of wasteful, progress-impeding subsidies and a much fuller national commitment to partnership in world trade and economic development.

The aim of these reforms is economic growth, and the purpose of growth, in this country, is to expand the area of individual economic choice and to enlarge individual opportunity for personal growth and fulfillment. But the Rockefeller report does not face as squarely as it might the greatest difficulty about all this, which is that the means to these traditional American ends will involve a massive collective effort of reappraisal and action. A later report of the special studies project on the democratic process may deal with the problem, but something of its nature is suggested by the present panel's assertion that:

"The immediate challenge is to our sense of values and to our self-restraint. We must decide between the essential and the desirable; we must choose among our aspirations those which carry the highest value * * * We need, in short, a greater and more articulate sense of national purpose to guide us in this inevitable process of choice. This is in large measure a problem of promoting a broad public understanding of the problems and challenges that lie ahead. As an example, a more general appreciation of the values that could be secured by increased Government expenditure for education or social welfare might well generate broad support for such a program."

To deal with the present recession, during which national economic growth has all but halted, the Rockefeller report proposes a combination of easier credit, accelerated public works spending and a tax reduction (of unspecified amount) which adds nothing new to the debate already under way. But the report does contribute to the present general concern a timely note of urgency and perspective. The Nation's task is not merely to put 2 or 3 million (or more) persons back to work, but to embark upon a program of unprecedented growth—or face the prospect of stagnation.

The American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. Kenyon Cull of Springfield, S. Dak., addressed the recently adjourned 67th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution dealing with the problems of our friends, the Indian Americans, which I think is particularly noteworthy.

Mr. Cull, a native of Standlake, England, and a graduate of Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak., and of the State University of South Dakota at Vermillion, became headmaster of St. Mary's School for Indian Girls at Springfield in 1955. His talk, entitled "The Race That Refuses to Vanish," is the result of his experiences at St. Mary's and very graphically points to the struggle of a proud and mighty people trying to find their place in the white man's world.

I may add that the Daughters of the American Revolution have established a custom which I believe might well be emulated by other great patriotic and service organizations of the Nation. They have, in a sense, adopted this little Indian school in South Dakota, which is privately supported. The Daughters of the American Revolution make a contribution from their own funds every year to this school, helping to support it and helping to make its services available to Indian children.

Moreover, each year, the Daughters of the American Revolution bring several of the girls from this school to Washington in the spring, to be the guests of the National Congress of the Daugh-

ters of the American Revolution, to see their Capital City, and to become better acquainted with the processes of Government.

It seems to me that many of our great public spirited organizations, looking, as they are, for people to help and causes to serve, might well follow the example of the Daughters of the American Revolution and select the cause of the American Indian as one to which they can devote some of their time, talent, and attention.

We all recognize the fact that we, as Americans, have not dealt equitably or amply or fairly with the American Indian. He has been making considerable progress in the last few years, but much remains to be done. All of it cannot be done by legislation; some of it must be done by the cooperative activities of private citizens who are willing to help the red man find a place in the white man's life.

I hope that others who read and hear of this activity will follow the example of the Daughters of the American Revolution and will, in their own way and in a place of their own choosing, devote some of their efforts and finances to help to make easier and happier the lot of the American Indian.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interesting and informative address delivered by the headmaster of St. Mary's School for Indian Girls at Springfield, S. Dak., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam President General, distinguished guests, and Daughters of the American Revolution; the President General has most graciously requested me to address you at this session of the 67th Continental Congress—a session devoted to your magnificent work among our Indian Americans and particularly at St. Mary's School for Indian Girls at Springfield, S. Dak. No words can express our thanks to you all for your continued support and interest in our work at St. Mary's. The best I can say is "thank you," but in saying thank you, I would also add something which I feel sure will be a blessing to you all, "It is more blessed to give then to receive."

At the New Jersey and Pennsylvania State conferences at which I was privileged to speak, the President General requested me to present to this Congress an address which is entitled "The Race That Refuses to Vanish." This I shall attempt to do this morning as frankly and sincerely as on previous occasions, and because so many of our girls are known to you through our scholarship plan, I shall from the outset speak to you of real persons. The names only have been changed.

There are 12 children in the Running Bird family. Three of the girls attend St. Mary's. The father has a heart condition and is unable to work. The family income for 14 people is less than $300 a month. They live in two wooden houses and haul water from a spring 2 miles away. On wash days this means two trips. There is no electricity. A few years ago they had to move their house when a new dam was built, they had to buy the land on which to set it, and it is possible that they will soon have to move again. The two oldest girls are honor roll students and both plan to become nurses.

Wilma Looks Twice lives in a log cabin with her grandparents. There is nothing on the dirt floor besides bedding and the furniture consists of a cooking stove. Wilma suffers from malnutrition.

Grace One Bear lives with her mother and seven children in a new 2-room Government home which was intended for an old Indian couple. Her father is in the penitentiary. The family lives on ADC. Last summer when Mrs. Cull and I visited this home to interview Grace, Mrs. One Bear could not even find the $1 application fee. There were half a dozen puppies outside in the mud and filth but we knew that these would all be Sunday dinners when it got cold. We took Grace, but of course there won't be any tuition forthcoming. Grace is a Sioux Indian, an American citizen, one of the first Americans.

Irma Bluebird is 11. Like so many she comes from a broken home and 3 weeks ago she came to the office in tears and wanted to go home. Her mother was in jail. She had hit a man with a hammer because he wouldn't admit that he was the father of her next child. All this from an 11 year old girl who wanted to go home and look after the other six children in the 2-room shack. Irma also is one of the first Americans.

The High Wolf family lives in a shack 40 feet long and 12 feet wide. There are 15 people in this house and in the shed along side it which has a dirt floor and which serves as an overflow for the many relatives. The father is an alcoholic. These are some of the first Americans, and their environment is part of America 1958.

Little Mary Eagle came to us from another broken home. She was quite retarded and at the end of her first year she did not return. We now know why—at 14 she has had her first baby and the father is her own stepfather. Such is the lot and tragic environment of these young Indian Americans, these first Americans.

Two years ago I had the unpleasant task of sending a girl home. Before she left, she asked me if I knew what there was on her reservation. I told her I had visited all our reservations. "Well," she said, "there are a few shacks, a beer joint, and a juke box and we girls sit around until 2 or 3 in the morning watching the drunks fight it out."

There is very little on a reservation for a young Indian, and when there is little or no parental guidance it is not difficult to see why there are so many Indians in our training schools and in our penitentiaries. Conditions off the reservations in our small towns and the large cities to which so many of our Indian people have drifted are little better and in many cases much worse. Here they find that, unprepared for our highly industrialized society, they are unskilled and, let's be quite honest, unwanted. Here, without work, they live in worse slums and soon fall a prey to the vices of our society. They are a frustrated people from whom almost everything has been taken, including their former initiative, and to whom for decades a mere pittance has been given by a paternalistic Government who assumed that they were members of a race which would vanish as did the buffalo. Daughters, the Indian American in 1958 is far from vanishing. Figures for South Dakota alone indicate that the Indian population is rapidly increasing and statistics show that the reservations will not adequately support 25 percent of the Indian population. No wonder then they drift to the towns. But they are unprepared for our modern way of life—and make no mistake about this—they are unwanted and suffer from discrimination and exploitation, a subtle discrimination, because the average non-Indian displays a shocking ignorance concerning our first Americans, an ignorance which indicates that he does not wish to recognize that there is an Indian problem, a problem which in a few years' time will be one of our greatest social problems.

Exploitation continues as ever in the selling of land and in the prices which Indians pay for many of the necessities of life. But, after all, they are members of a vanishing race which should have vanished with the buffalo.

Four years ago a little Indian boy called Robert was killed in one of those freak accidents. A piece of shrapnel from an aerial bomb pierced his chest at a firework display during the interval of a high-school football game. Of course, for the death of a little Indian American citizen his parents received compensation. At least we know they were able to buy a television set but, after all, he was only an Indian.

At this Congress last year a lady told me that she and others had recently provided a casket for a Sioux Indian. No one, it seemed, was interested in giving this first American a decent burial. But, after all, he was only an Indian who should have vanished from the American scene.

Perhaps you will remember that 4 or 5 years ago an Indian who had served in the Marine Corps died. He was refused burial in the local cemetery because his blood was a little different. He now lies in Arlington Cemetery, but he was only an Indian, a member of a race which originally inhabited this great land, but who should have conveniently vanished from the American scene.

These first Americans, on and off reservations, exist today with a higher rate of tuberculosis than any other racial group and a life expectancy of between 30 and 40 years. We are told that the life expectancy of a baby born on 1 of our reservations in Arizona is as low as 17 years. The figure would scarcely be higher for those born on reservations in South Dakota. This figure can be compared with that of 68 for a white man.

Driven from their native lands with and like the buffalo, ostracized, constantly supervised, kept alive by pitiful rations, existing in hovels and shacks these first Americans refused to vanish. Their treatment is a sordid and sorry page in our history and the ever present hovels and the underfed Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation do not and never will compensate for the bloody massacre of Wounded Knee. There has been considerable talk recently in the press of the starving Indians on this reservation of South Dakota. Whether at this time they are starving or not, is debatable, but the fact remains that like thousands of other Indians throughout our land for decades these people have never received the right kind of food or enough of it and have been slowly starving.

Not far from such conditions and such an environment but sufficiently removed from them to provide a healthy training ground for citizenship and character training there stands at Springfield, St. Mary's School for Indian Girls founded in 1873 by a pioneer and visionary bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church—a school which is well known to all of you but about which I should like to speak for a few moments.

To St. Mary's come girls from the many subtribes of the Sioux, the Ogalala, and the Rosebud, the Sisseton, Cheyenne, and Santee. We have in our student body Arapaho, Ariokara, Black Feet, Chippewa, Fox, Pawnee, Mandan, Shoshone, Bannock, and Apache. They come from the Dakotas, Wyoming, Montana, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Iowa. We have had them from Colorado, California, Wisconsin, and Illinois. We do not ask their degree of Indian blood because a girl who is one-sixteenth Indian may share the same environment and have as great a need as one who is a fullblood. They represent many denominations: Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Roman Catholics.

For these girls who are carefully selected and which Mrs. Cull and I interview in their homes during the summer St. Mary's provides a course of training which has a four-

fold purpose: First, to build and develop Christian character; second, to provide a sound academic training; third, to provide such a course of training and learning experiences which enable the student to become a useful citizen and a leader among her own people; fourth, to provide guidance and financial assistance for all students worthy of an education at the college level. Emphasis, therefore, is placed upon character and citizenship and St. Mary's girls are taught to be proud of and loyal to their immediate family, the Indian people, the church to which they belong, their school, and last, and most important, their country. In the last place, therefore, emphasis is placed on the American, as well as on the Indian—they are Indian Americans.

St. Mary's is an accredited high school—the only accredited high school solely for Indian girls in the country. We teach all the normal subjects in the grades, and in high school, in addition to the language arts, social sciences, science, and business subjects. We offer creative writing, driver education, home economics, religion, and arts and crafts. Fifty percent of our students take piano lessons and every student takes chorus.

All these subjects are very important but the guidance which takes place after school each day and before school the following morning is, in many cases, much more vital to the ultimate training of a St. Mary's girl, because the Indian people have never been taught how to budget their money, how to look after their health, or to understand the importance of time.

Let me give you a few examples. Wilma Three Stars came to school this summer with $45 spending money, $5 for each month of the school year. She was very fortunate because many have very little and some none at all for weeks at a time. Her grandfather also brought $10 tuition. He did not understand that the tuition was more important than the spending money, and both he and Wilma needed guidance on this point. A few weeks ago one of our parents drove 90 miles one evening to bring $2 spending money for her daughter. Both she and her family have to learn that a 3-cent stamp would save both time and money. At times such a lack of judgment and sense of values is most frustrating but we must remember that they have never been taught to budget their money. This, however, does not mean that they do not learn.

As I have previously mentioned our Indian people present a tremendous medical problem. Far too often they see a doctor when it is too late, and they do not understand that it is important to carry out instructions. Many and justifiably, have no faith in the Government medical service. Each year nearly half of our students are found to need glasses and the dental bill for a typical school year amounted to $3,000. Two years ago, after very careful and continued guidance on the subject of wearing glasses, Mary Pretty Bear was still walking around without her glasses. On being asked why she was not wearing them she replied, "You said we were to give something up in Lent. I gave up wearing my glasses."

There is no word for time in the Dakota language. Constantly we must emphasize the importance of time in our modern way of life and we are becoming very successful. Two years ago our entire student body was back at school after the Christmas vacation within 24 hours of the scheduled time. The Indian had no need of a word for time but with the right kind of training he learns quickly if we have patience and understanding.

We have seven members on the faculty, all of whom to be successful must be dedicated, understanding, and devoted to the training of these underprivileged Americans. When the tuition asked of parents is only $100, and many pay far less and some nothing at all, our salaries are small and the need for dedicated teachers correspondingly greater. Our budget has been tripled in the last 2 years to provide for more students and to build a new dormitory. The church provides between 75 and 80 percent of the annual budget and the remainder is given by your society and the Children of the American Revolution.

Our main schoolbuilding erected in 1884 is thoroughly inadequate and unsuitable for present-day use. We must build a new school which will accommodate a hundred students instead of 65. This building we are planning to begin this summer and thanks to your special offering this dream has been made more of a reality though we still need a large sum of money before our needs will have been met.

Our training at St. Mary's emphasizes citizenship and whether a girl returns as a leader to her reservation or takes her place as an American citizen in a normal community, it is the most important part of the training of a St. Mary's girl. Each summer when Mrs. Cull and I visit the homes of our students we see the results of our work. We are not always as successful as we would wish and sometimes we are impatient but last summer in every home except two there was evidence of real progress, of an increase in self respect, and once again we could say as others had before us, "You can tell a St. Mary's girl by the home she keeps."

There are many plans and projects, many agencies, organizations and individuals which believe that they have an answer to the Indian problem. Some are grossly misguided and misinformed; others enlightened and progressive; but whatever the future holds for the Indian people one thing has become very clear; they live in a white man's world and a white man's society. To this modern society they must be encouraged to give all that was, and still is, virtuous and great of their own culture. They must learn to take from the white man's civilization, not his vices only—his drunkenness, his immorality, and his deceit—but his virtues. This will only come about if we as non-Indians understand that our first Americans are people who have similar rights and privileges.

I began this address with a frank but, believe me, not an exaggerated picture of the environment of some of our students. I gave you 3 examples—3 among many—of the discrimination and exploitation which our Indian people still suffer. In conclusion, I would give you one answer—an answer given by our Indians themselves who, with our help, can and must take their rightful places in our American civilization. It is an answer which indicates tremendous progress in spite of tremendous odds and a determination not to vanish from the American scene.

The Fire Thunder family live in a nice, new home in a small town in Nebraska. Their mother is a former St. Mary's girl; their father is an inspector in a factory. They are living as normal American citizens. Their two daughters attend St. Mary's today. Irene Winter Chaser, another graduate of St. Mary's is the wife of a college professor and a mother of two fine children—the entire family accepted as full members of the community in which they live. Irma High Elk with a bachelor's degree is teaching in the State of Washington and Marie Blackbird is a fully trained nurse in a Government hospital. All of these have taken advantage of the training which St. Mary's has offered for the past 85 years. They have all refused to vanish.

I spoke of a little dead Indian boy, of a Sioux with no one to bury him, and of a dead marine who was refused a plot in the cemetery. They were only Indians. Now I tell you of Ella Deloria, an anthropologist, author of the book Speaking of Indians. She is now working among her own people as head of our dormitory school at Wakpala, S. Dak. Miss Deloria is a cultured woman of high character and she is only an Indian. Dr. Vine Deloria, her brother, assistant head of the Home Department of the Episcopal Church with an office in New York is another Dakota Indian, and Ben Reifel, a Sioux Indian, director of the Aberdeen, S. Dak. area office of the Indian Bureau, with a doctor's degree from Harvard, is also just an Indian. They are all members of the race that refuses to vanish and what fine examples of this race they all are.

What progress has been made by our Indian people, many of whom only 40 years ago had not fully embraced the Christian religion, and some of whom can still remember the bloody massacres by the white man, and all of whom have suffered untold privations and discrimination? From the environment of a South Dakota reservation to a doctor's degree from Harvard is a path of progress unique in the history of civilization. In our blindness and with a callous disregard for the first Americans, we have overlooked the tremendous progress which they have made in a few generations. They have been asked in a very brief period of time to adjust from the blanket to the electric blanket. Have you ever thought how long it has taken us with great heritage to reach our present state of civilization? Close to 2,000 years and more.

When one looks back on the sordid and tragic treatment of the first Americans, one must stand in awe of their faith and determination throughout the years. Perhaps it is their faith which has, above all else, kept them from vanishing. This great faith I would leave with you this morning, and I would have you remember that today in 1958 it is this faith which alone remains as our Indians still find themselves unwanted, unprepared, unskilled, and frustrated. It is well expressed in the Indian version of The Lord's Prayer in which the first American realizes his own insignificance in the presence of his Creator. He kneels on the prairie in the bitter cold and intense heat and, in spite of the white man's lack of the Christian spirit, acknowledges the greatness of God:

> Great Spirit, whose teepee is the sky
> And whose hunting ground is the earth,
> Mighty and fearful are You called—
> Ruler over storms, over men,
> And birds and beasts:
>
> Have Your way over all,
> Over earthways as over skyways.
>
> Find us this day our meat and corn,
> That we may be strong and brave,
> And put aside from us our wicked ways
> As we put aside the bad works of them
> Who do us wrong.
>
> And let us not have such troubles
> As lead us into crooked roads,
> But keep us from all evil,
> For Yours is all that is—
> The earth and the sky,
> The streams and the hills,
> And the valleys, and stars,
> The moon, and the sun, and
> All that lives and breathes.
> Wonderful, shining, mighty Spirit.

In these words and in these thoughts and in this faith is revealed the patient suffering and the eternal human hope of the race that refuses to vanish.

The Birth of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Chattanooga Times of April 10, 1958, commemorating the transmittal of the message from President Roosevelt to Congress requesting the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority. A quarter of a century ago Congress began the consideration of a project which was to reshape the life of the entire Southeastern part of the country and raise the general level of prosperity of the United States. That project was the Tennessee Valley Authority. Since that time in 1933 when President Roosevelt introduced his proposal to create the Authority, the Tennessee Valley region has benefited in such a diverse and extensive fashion that it is difficult to recount the benefits. Briefly, however, it has brought low-cost power, stabilized the land, protected the forests, improved navigation, controlled floods, eradicated disease, attracted industry and contributed to national defense. It is doubtful that any other single project has so sparked the imagination of man and so illuminated the possibilities for similar development elsewhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of April 10, 1958]

THE BIRTH OF TVA

Twenty-five years ago today President Franklin Roosevelt transmitted to the 73d Congress a request for legislation creating a Tennessee Valley Authority: "A corporation clothed with the power of Government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise."

A day later the late Senator George Norris of Nebraska, realizing a 12-year dream, introduced the bill to receptive Congressmen. Senators Kenneth McKellar and Nathan Bachman of Tennessee hailed the advent of a great industrial and agricultural development not only for our own State but for the entire Southland.

Today the TVA has been a fact for almost a quarter of a century, the act having been signed by the President May 18, 1933. Today we consider not only the continuing fruition of that development but the concept that gave it birth.

As fortune dictated, Franklin Roosevelt in his physical infirmity spent long hours pondering the problem of regional planning in his native New York State. At his "other home in Georgia" he gave much thought to national planning and particularly to the South and its relation to the rest of the country.

In his message to Congress he pointed out that Muscle Shoals Dam, built for needs during World War I, was "but a small part of the potential public usefulness of the entire Tennessee River." Behind his words was a vision, of a river as a massive resource with its potential for good or evil; a vision shared decades earlier by a famed predecessor, Theodore Roosevelt—and nourished by such men as Pinchot and Norris, Lilienthal and Clapp.

In short, Mr. Roosevelt said, the Muscle Shoals of war days led logically to planning for a "complete river watershed involving many States and the future lives and welfare of millions. It touches and gives life to all forms of human concerns." And there was the flavor of a Teddy Roosevelt in his summation, that of April 10, 1933: "This in a true sense is a return to the spirit and vision of the pioneer."

There are those most assuredly who still speak of the TVA in terms of a partisan demonology, and there is also perhaps a certain dispiritedness arising from the very taking of TVA for granted. The Authority's 25th birthday, lastly, happens to fall 1 day after the fourth anniversary of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. The southland, in the tormented months in between, has thought of little else unless, of late, it be the recession.

But if TVA has not been large in southerners' thoughts just now, its example remains in southern memories. And, once again, 25 years after its inception, it faces a crucial legislative test in the matter of self-financing. Again, it will be an active public concern in coming weeks.

What Franklin Roosevelt sought, in his words, "transcends mere power development: it enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry." National defense, as well as other features, was to be added as a vital aspect.

The 20 dams TVA built in its first 20 years; its steam plants for supplementary power; its fertilizer and malaria-control work; its navigation; all have been a spur and an incentive to private industry as well as a storied example of the whole world of what a truly integrated river development can be.

The TVA has touched the valley and given it added life. It has helped rehabilitate the land and conserve the forests. It has, with no exaggeration, electrified us with the fact of low-cost power and of efficient operation. It remains controversial but the day it ceases to be so it will have lost its vitality. For if it has not realized today the whole of George Norris' dream, it still encompasses the age-old desire to bring forth the oneness in nature—to harness most fully its power to lessen man's burden, to enoble and to enrich him.

Financial Assistance to Schools

SPEECH
OF
HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11378) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to make permanent the programs providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know where this amendment came from. I do not know what it includes. I do not know how far-reaching it would be. I do not know how much it would cost. I know one thing. It has not been discussed in committee. I do not believe there are a half dozen men in the House who could explain it or understand it without reading it, and I have not seen a copy of it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I do not think there are a half dozen men in the House who understand the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the gentleman is underestimating the intelligence of the House a little bit, but I just say this, Mr. Chairman. I have a lot of faith in the intelligence of this House, and for that reason I do not think they need one bit of argument against that amendment and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Independence of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFTTHS. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have a special reason for rejoicing with Israel in the celebration of her 10th anniversary as an independent nation.

Ours was the first government to recognize Israel after she proclaimed her independence in May 1948. The United States also took the lead in sponsoring her admission to the United Nations.

We have not only witnessed but have been privileged, as well, to assist in the momentous task of development and reconstruction which has enabled Israel to surmount seemingly impassable obstacles. The progress made by Israel's economy is probably best indicated by the fact, that, despite the need to feed, clothe, and house 3 times as many people as lived there in the early days of Jewish statehood, and despite the rise in the standard of living of the old settlers, the adverse foreign trade gap increased by only 20 percent, rising from $224 milmil in 1949 to $273 million last year. Moreover, while exports paid for a mere 11 percent of the imports in 1949, they paid for more than one-third last year.

We have been richly rewarded in the help we have extended to this small nation. We have watched Israel welcome about a million refugees of varying tongues and cultures. During its brief lifetime as a nation, Israel has opened its doors to approximately 900,000 Jewish immigrants from displaced persons camps in Germany, Austria, Italy, countries in north Africa, and the Middle East, as well as other parts of the world. Starting with 600,000 Jews in British mandated Palestine 10 years ago, they have increased the number of the Jewish population there to 1,800,000 by today.

That Israel has made such progress is justification of the faith of those who shared in the work of establishing the country, and is proof of the great spirit and the dedication of the people of Israel to its just cause.

In 10 short years Israel has developed into the most advanced nation in the Middle East—an oasis of democracy in an area that still clings to feudal concepts.

Israel has faced many threats to her survival from the moment of her birth. Israel has and is continuing to play a constructive role in the family of free nations.

Israel stands on the threshold of a challenging decade. She merits the continued moral encouragement of all who share her great love for liberty and independence.

Foreign Aid: Necessary in Spite of Its Faults

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, seldom do we see an editorial that considers the arguments for and against, before arriving at a reasonable conclusion.

Too often there is more heat than light.

The American people, through their Congress, must look at an issue from all sides, and not just two, in order that they may be fairly sure of taking the right step toward the solution of a complex problem for which there is no certain answer.

In foreign aid, we must take calculated risks.

It is far better to do something, imperfect as it may be, than to adopt a do-nothing policy, that permits communism to move into the vacuum.

The following editorial titled "The Case for Aid," from the Chelsea Record, of Chelsea, Mass., dated April 14, 1958, brings us the clear and concise opinion that, after all the arguments are in, the decision is in favor of foreign aid.

I ask for unanimous consent to reprint this editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE CASE FOR AID

Numerous political leaders, as well as many average Americans, appear to have a false perspective on the complicated issue of foreign aid. It is regarded as a cheap means of defeating communism; it is seen as an investment in American security, and as a means of winning friendship for the United States.

What is false about this perspective is that it assumes too much, and too simply. Poverty and backwardness are not the only causes of communism. The appeal of communism often is felt most strongly by the intellectuals, by the educated, in some of the underindustrialized countries. Foreign aid is not likely to change the minds of the elite who shovel pro-Russianism or pro-Marxism to ignorant masses. Nor is aid likely to win friends overnight for the white man and for the West.

Then why aid? The soundness of aid is that it permits underindustrialized countries to make more effort at industralization. Also, American aid provides contact with the West and the ideas of the West. It widens the channels of Western influence and reveals a Western example different from that of colonialism. But aid does not work quick miracles. It does not necessarily mean that defense will be easier for us, nor will it bring us quick allies. It does, however, strengthen the power and position of pro-westerners in the underindustrialized countries.

Aid is a long-run investment. Like all investments, it cannot be absolutely guaranteed in advance. The conditions and problems of each country should determine whether or not aid should be given and, if so, how much and what kind. The time has come for developing an overall, coordinated aid program.

The Truth Shall Make You Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the last 6 months the American public has suddenly become aware that a good school system involves a great deal more than simply providing adequate classroom space for the increasing numbers of children who attend our public schools. There have been signs of an awakening to the fact that fine school buildings, although desirable, do not automatically bring about a correspondingly good school system.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most sensible statements of the basic essentials of a good educational system that I have read in a long time is contained in an address delivered recently by Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. Admiral Rickover's address should be required reading for those who are concerned with making our public school systems top flight educational institutions. The address follows:

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE

(Remarks by Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, United States Navy, Chief, Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission, and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, at the Dedication-Inauguration Ceremonies, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y., April 19, 1958)

I thank you for the honor which you have bestowed upon me today. Although I appreciate that a doctorate of engineering is a personal award, I prefer to accept it in the name of all who have been associated with me in the naval nuclear power program. In an engineering project such as ours, whatever credit may be earned belongs to everyone who has shared in the work.

It is a great pleasure to be present at the dedication of the new home of Brooklyn Polytechnic and to address this distinguished audience. As I now have a filial interest in this, my adopted alma mater, may I be permitted to start my speech with a word of caution: Do not, I beg of you, in this beautiful new home lose the traditional spirit of plain living and high thinking which was so well expressed in the remark of one of your academic stars: "What do we want with marble halls? We've got men."

I have always felt that marble halls are not a necessary environment for serious intellectual work. I am therefore pleased to note that the predominating atmosphere here is utilitarian rather than Ionian. This is as it should be in an institution which has always been distinguished by single-minded concern with matters of the mind, and which can match its atmosphere of scholarly austerity with that of any of Europe's famous and venerable centers of learning.

In some curious fashion we, in this country, have convinced ourselves that higher learning has had a fashionable cachet abroad and retains it to this date. Many of us think of academic life in terms of leisurely pursuit of culture in ivy-clad towers, as unreal a picture of most European universities as could be imagined. Far from being islands of aristocratic privilege, these universities have always been intellectual workshops of austere aspect. In the long and honorable history of learning which sets western civilization apart from all others and to which the Western World owes its dynamic quality, the scholar and the student have more often been poor than rich. The medieval and Renaissance universities which shaped the crude intellect of Europe through association with the polished mind of Greece and Rome offered no more nor less than a chance to seek truth, to achieve liberation of the mind from ignorance and superstition.

These universities were built of men—professors and students—rather than of brick and mortar. Lacking fixed assets, they went wherever academic freedom could be found. In truth, that was all they needed. Unincumbered by material possessions, Europe's students were free to wander from university to university, searching for the best professor in their field of study. Traditionally, scholars have been as rich in spiritual freedom as they have been poor in tangible wealth.

I read a story the other day which illustrates this point. It tells of Guarino, a famed Italian of the 15th century, who taught rhetoric and Greek in a small Italian town. Students flocked to his classes from the four corners of Europe. In coldest weather they waited patiently outside the room in which he lectured—shivering in their thin garments, undeterred by freezing rain or snow. It is difficult to imagine such eagerness for learning today. Guarino spent most of his income helping the poorest of his students, and with them he lived in utmost austerity. Still one must not think that life was grim. Medieval students were as full of pranks as are today's. Guarino himself was a sociable soul. He often invited his friends to share with him fave e favole—beans and conversation.

True enough, professors and students formed a cosmopolitan elite, but it was an elite of the mind, not one of social privilege. Communicating with each other in the universal language of scholarship—Latin—steeped in a common heritage of classical Greek and Roman culture, the scholars were the first true Europeans. Upon the unity of spirit and mind which they built must rest today's hope for unification of that divided continent. All of us in the west owe to them our phenomenal wealth and power—all of us benefited when the trained minds of scholars took on the task of putting science to work on man's age-old problems of disease and want.

I do not advocate for our professors and students a return to such austerity, but I wonder whether, in our schools and universities, we have not lost sight of the supreme importance of men as compared to the relative unimportance of buildings. I do not like to see a splendid school more

from modest quarters where it has achieved solid academic success. During a tour of duty in the Far East I may have subconsciously absorbed from the Chinese their misgivings about such moves. For in times past when China was noted for her wisdom, it was considered extremely risky for a wealthy merchant to leave an old and shabby store where he had prospered, lest he offend the good spirits who had brought him success. I suspect this was not so much superstition as that oblique sort of commonsense reasoning for which the Chinese have long been famous. They could readily see that the upkeep of elegant new quarters would have to come out of the pockets of the customer in higher prices or shoddier merchandise. So they would naturally take their business to wiser competitors, and thus in time the new house would eat up the profits, and that would be the end of the foolish merchant.

Now, this is not meant as pure whimsy. I am, of course, not seriously worried that Brooklyn Polytechnic will do less important things in the new big rooms than it used to do in the old little ones. Nevertheless, I believe that overexpansion is risky for any educational institution. It means sometimes a long-term debt; sometimes greatly increased overhead costs, and these must be met some way. Sheer need for survival may force compromise with academic standards. Tuition may become more important than the quality of the student. Endowments with strings attached may have to be accepted, even if they disturb the atmosphere of scholarship which is as necessary to an educational institution as pure air is to man. Research grants which might formerly have been rejected may now have to be accepted for the money they bring in, regardless of whether they fit into the academic program or not. Professors and graduate students may consequently be turned into mere laboratory technicians.

Not a few small colleges which once stood like beacons of light in the world of scholarship have grown, and are now huge run of the mill universities accommodating thousands of students, many of whom are in search of things not strictly academic. But the hard pressed administrator struggling to meet steadily rising costs not only welcomes them; he tries to find courses which will attract them. What had been a good academic program is thus lost in a proliferation of trivial vocational courses and service activities, designed to attract the future homemaker no less than the theoretical scientist, the beautician as well as the physician. The world is thereby the poorer, because excellence has been traded for size.

Size always endangers quality. Colleges and universities are as likely to overexpand when successful as are other types of organizations. They are after all merely one particular type of the genus organization, and they are susceptible to the same virus of elephantiasis which attacks other corporate bodies. The trend towards excessive growth is today as great as it was when the late Justice Brandeis warned us so eloquently of its perils.

Let me elaborate a moment on the subject of this danger:

Most of the work in a modern society must be done by corporate bodies, simply because ours is a civilization of extreme specialization. Few tasks can therefore now be done by a single individual. Most tasks call for large numbers of people working together. Experience has shown this can best be done by establishing an organization. Someone must run things; lines of command and responsibility must be laid down and people must be allotted their several tasks. In any sizeable organization there must be some people who merely maintain the proper environment in which productive work can proceed smoothly. They tend the physical plant and handle personnel matters, their talents are in housekeeping and administration, and their function is, or ought to be, entirely subordinate to that of the productive workers whose labors alone justify existence of the organization.

Whoever has had anything to do with organizations will have observed the tendency of the administrator to gain control over the whole corporate body. Yet it can be stated flatly that the success of any organization can be measured quite accurately by the relative position of the administrators and the productive workers. The successful organizations get along with a minimum of housekeeping staff and keep them confined to their proper place; those whose real work is declining almost always have swollen administrative staffs. Nothing worse can happen to an organization than usurpation of command by administrators. This is because a natural desire to enhance their own importance leads most administrators subconsciously to look upon the organization as an end in itself rather than a mere legal and administrative convenience. They are therefore natural boosters for size; they are inclined to foster expansion for its own sake, sometimes in inverse ratio to the amount of real work done; occasionally after production has all but ceased.

In this country we tend to turn every human occupation into a business. We think that every organization profits by introducing what we term business methods. But a businesslike attitude makes for efficiency only in purely routine matters. It is disastrous when applied to creative people whether they work in an educational institution, a research center or a government department.

The role of the administrator is of necessity less important where creative intellectual work is done than where the work is routine. Any capable administrator can learn enough about the technique of routine production to organize it efficiently and to provide a proper environment for the worker. These are matters for which he has been trained. But few administrators possess the capacity to master the special fields in which creative brainworkers are expert; nor can they, as a rule, understand the mental processes of professional people and the atmosphere of intellectual freedom without which these people cannot work effectively. Without mastery of the subject and understanding of the people, there is little an administrator can contribute to improvement of the mental work done in his organization. Worse, he often becomes more of a hindrance than a help. Not infrequently, all he does is interfere with the professional staff and reduce real productivity by constantly bothering them with trivia. Nobody can waste as much time as a superefficient administrator trying to run a group of eggheads.

I fear that we have gone far toward lowering the output of our brainworkers by overorganizing them. We are drowning in paperwork. We are talking ourselves into a standstill in endless committees, those pets of the administrator. We are losing the genius we once had for improvisation. Nowadays nothing can be done without elaborate preparation, organization and careful rehearsal. We have been diluting responsibility for making decisions by piling layers of supervisory administrative levels, pyramid fashion, on top of the people who do the real work. All of this has resulted in a dangerous lengthening of lead time.

By lead time I mean, of course, the time which elapses between conception of a new idea and the moment when the idea has been transformed into a useful new object rolling off the production lines.

Lead time is an exteremely important factor in military strength. Starting even, one nation will soon outpace another if it has no other advantage than ability to transform ideas more rapidly into mass-produced military hardware. We know that the Russians have overhauled us in lead time for certain items which they have decided to concentrate on in order to achieve their goal of military and technological supremacy. We cannot permit this to go on. If overorganization lengthens our lead time we must heed Thoreau's cry of "simplify, simplify."

As dangerous as excessive lead time in military items is excessive lead time in producing the professional men and women needed to run our complicated society. Never before has the future of a nation depended so greatly on its ability to train enough specialists and to train them rapidly. The efficiency of a country's educational system has become as vital an element for national progress, perhaps even for survival, as its industrial and military strength. In fact industrial and military strength cannot advance if education lags behind.

Our professional schools are not to blame for our chronic shortage of able professional people. They have a clear-cut purpose and must meet definite standards set by State licensing requirements or by professional associations. Most of them are efficient and require no more time to turn out professionals than similar schools abroad.

But professional education in America is handicapped by the inefficiency of our public elementary and secondary schools. These delay preparation of the student for entry upon professional study far beyond the time when his European contemporary is ready to begin such study. Because high school graduates lack a broad enough general education, most professional schools now require completion of from 2 to 4 years of college by every prospective student. This discourages many able students from choosing a professional career. Even where a high school diploma will still suffice for admission—as in engineering schools—previous educational deficiencies must be made up by requiring remedial courses in English, mathematics, and the sciences. In European school systems these courses are completed before the student reaches the age of 17 or 18. Incorporating these essentially secondary school subjects into the engineering curriculum makes the study load unnecessarily burdensome and partly accounts for the high dropout of engineering students before completion of the full course.

A pernicious mañana spirit permeates our public elementary and secondary schools. The time when pupils come to grips with real study has for years been progressively delayed. Each year the American child drops a bit further behind his contemporaries abroad. He still cannot spell in his own language when abroad children his age are already deep in serious literature and are carrying one or more foreign languages, besides heavier schedules in mathematics, sciences, history, and so on. Recently I was told of a German exchange student who, though an average student at home, not only found school here ridiculously easy, but actually stood highest in English—mind you in English—among his American high school classmates.

We waste the best years of our children, when their minds can most easily and rapidly absorb a wealth of facts and when their curiosity is most lively. We do this in the name of democracy and of the sacred comprehensive school which must cater equally, and perhaps even in the same classroom, to children of such diverse mental capacities that among one age group the mental age between the least gifted and the most gifted may differ as much as 6 years.

The excuse for this procrastination is always that ours is mass education while Europe's education is for the aristocracy. This is an erroneous and spurious alibi. Ex-

cept for relatively short periods of time, European higher education has been primarily the concern of the middle class, but with scholarships available for talented children of the poor. In fact, education has long been the principal channel of social advancement for gifted children of Europe's lower middle class, artisans, farmers, clerks. In the past, the aristocratic father did not find it necessary to subject his son to the rigorous mental discipline of higher learning; at least not until his privileges had begun to decline and he had to compete with a rising middle class.

Not school fees—which were always modest—but inability to finance years of unproductive life for their children, has in the past kept the European masses from higher education. Europe is simply poorer than we for lack of ample land and natural resources. Also, in class societies parents tend to feel that what was good enough for them is good enough for their children. The desire to give our children a better education than we have had ourselves goes hand in hand with a high standard of living and an expansive optimism such as we have had in our country since its beginning.

But in Europe, too, the level of life has risen and democracy has been growing steadily. There, too, proportionately more children now attend academic secondary schools and universities. For example, between 1850 and 1950 the population of the Netherlands tripled but the number of university students multiplied 28 times.

Long ago, most European governments took over all or a major share of the cost of education from kindergarten to university. Elementary education was made free in some countries before we ourselves took that step. Fees for secondary and university education have either been abolished or are adjusted to the parents' income. In their internal management European schools and universities enjoy great freedom and it is to be doubted whether the relations between principal and teaching staff is any less democratic there than here.

Though their national gross income is less than ours, the percentage devoted to education is very nearly the same as it is here, as is the percentage of young people studying for the professions, about 6 percent. Professional study, in fact, is much cheaper there—for example, $75 a year for tuition in Holland. But in Europe, a variety of courses are available after elementary school ends. These are tailored to fit the aptitudes of children, as determined by examination. Teachers are on the lookout for gifted pupils and urge their parents to let them go to schools preparing for the university. Due consideration is given the late bloomers who always have a chance to switch tracks later on, though at the cost of losing 1 or 2 years.

The careful manner with which European school authorities seek to find the proper type of schooling for each child's individual gifts is often criticized here as cruel and undemocratic. Weeding out by means of examinations, in particular, arouses pity and horror. Most Americans seem to regard education as a sort of commodity or service which anybody ought to be permitted to get, simply by paying tuition or by having the cost of education met through taxes. Let me give you an example of this curious attitude as reported in a newspaper.

A young principal in a western high school, on checking his pupils' intelligence and achievement tests, found that he had enough talented students to warrant setting up a special course for them, a tough academic curriculum. The children liked it and so did their parents. But not the rest of the community. Furious at what they considered unfair treatment of their own chfldren, the parents of those not included in the hard course not only managed to get it stopped but got rid of the young principal to boot. Though this actually happened a good while ago, similar cases have been reported recently.

I fear that we shall not have real improvement in our educational system until it is widely understood that education is and always has been something which money alone cannot purchase. The only acceptable coin which buys an education is hard intellectual effort. How much education can be bought with mental effort depends on the quality of the teacher and of the pupil. Strong motivation can often offset a modest I. Q., and we also know that a high I. Q. without strong motivation can be ineffective. All that a democratic government can do to insure educational equality for all its children is to throw open the school to everyone who will make the effort to learn. This, most of our European friends have long been doing. Insistence on intellectual effort is where we have fallen down.

We also seem to think it more democratic that in this country public education be controlled by some 50,000 local school boards and State boards of education. Almost everywhere else standards for teacher qualifications; for content of curricula, and for school-leaving examinations are under a national ministry of education composed of highly educated men. We show a surprising lack of confidence in ourselves when we fear to let a Government agency set uniform educational standards. It all depends, of course, on what we expect of the men in such a ministry of education. If we want them to be noted scholars—as do the Europeans—and if we grant such scholars the right to determine curricula and to devise the best teaching methods, then it is difficult to see how their recommendations for educational standards for teachers and schools could possibly endanger our democratic freedoms.

Robert M. Hutchins once asked a former minister of education of the Netherlands what would have happened if the minister had appointed a professor of whom the faculty of the university did not approve. The reply was, "My Government would have fallen." The people of Holland feel strongly enough about academic freedom to require of their Government respect for the right of university faculties to select new members solely on the basis of their academic qualifications.

We do not have such respect for scholarship. Our State universities enjoy no such freedom from political interference. Nor are our elementary and secondary schools run by teachers and scholars, who are the only productive workers in the field of education. In our fear of Government control, we have lost the advantages to be gained from entrusting the curricula of our schools and the training of our teachers to the most highly qualified scholars in our land.

As an engineer, specifications are second nature to me. I cannot conceive of maintaining quality without exact standards. It is obvious to me that these ought to be expertly formulated and uniform in a country such as ours, where people constantly move from one place to another and children often have to change schools several times. Lacking central direction by an agency of high scholastic standing, who then does determine school curricula and teacher qualifications in our country? The answer must be that responsibility for this vital task is quite diffuse.

The quality of our teachers is governed by certification requirements, set by State boards of education. But professors of pedagogy, school administration, and child psychology in our teachers colleges are so influential on these boards that it is often they who prescribe the content of certification requirements. Unfortunately, these influential educationists are seldom qualified to control the professional education of our children's teachers. They naturally consider the subjects they themselves teach most important for teacher education, and they are usually biased against subject matter courses. Indeed, few subject matter courses are to be found in teachers college catalogs. Yet, courses in pedagogy merely teach how to present a subject to the pupil, not what the pupil is to be taught. Putting the emphasis on the how, at the cost of the what, makes American teacher qualifications lopsided. If I may explain:

In all learned professions there are certain tricks of the trade without which the most profound knowledge of subject matter cannot be fully utilized. A trial lawyer must pay attention to his apperance, his voice, his psychological insight into other men's minds; he has to be somewhat of an actor. This professional know-how is not taught in law schools. It is an art acquired during pursuit of one's profession. In education, pedagogy compares with this know-how. It admittedly has great importance in the early school grades where presentation of subject matter to very young minds will greatly affect their grasp of it. But as the pupil's mind matures, method grows progressively less important. Teacher training everywhere includes pedagogy. But in no other country is so large a part of teacher training devoted to study of methods, so little to knowledge of subject matter.

This excessive stress on study of the tricks of the trade benefits no one but professors who teach these courses. These, indeed, will never lack for students. Not only are their courses required for all who want to become teachers, but they can count on a continuous flow of returnees, for a teacher can advance only if he goes back for more of the same courses at stated intervals. His proficiency in his subject matters not one whit. Since even a teacher's time has limits, this control over his professional development prevents all but the most self-sacrificing from acquiring as profound a mastery of their subject matter as is required of their confreres abroad. The ultimate loser is the American child.

Next in importance to teacher qualification is the content of school curricula. Here, too, the faculties of teachers colleges are influential. But members of local school boards, pressure groups of various kinds, school principals, and parents also have something to say in this matter. The people best qualified to render competent advice, the schoolteachers and the college and university professors who must deal with the products of our public schools, all these have little influence. On the other hand, the administrators of our school plant, the principals and superintendents of schools, though seldom professional scholars, these have great influence.

We have thus in this country the curious situation that people with little practical experience in classroom teaching and little knowledge of subject matter decide what the true professionals, the schoolteachers, must teach.

This is again a case of administrators taking command. Perhaps it has happened because our educational plant has grown so rapidly—has had to make room for our fast-growing child population. Each year we increase by 3 million. This is more than our total population at the end of the American Revolution. To provide room for the newcomers is a stupendous administrative task. No other industrial country in the world has a problem of such magnitude in education. Doubtless this has enhanced the position of the school administrator. Perhaps, too, as a people we respect a practical administrator more than a teacher or scholar. Whatever the reason, our school principals and superintendents of schools exercise extraordinary control over curricula and over the teaching staff Rarely is their relation to the

teachers one of primus inter pares. Most often it resembles that of employer to employee.

This would matter less if school principals were always former teachers or if they were scholars. But despite their masters' and doctors' degrees, these men are usually school administrators pure and simple. Their academic titles are seldom won by original research and study of a learned discipline. They are often in such subjects as, the technique of estimating school equipment costs, a scale for measuring anterior-posterior posture of ninth grade boys, or public-school plumbing equipment. Before we allow ourpselves to be overly impressed by degrees in education, we might well investigate in just what fields these have been won. But whatever their academic worth, these degrees open positions of influence in deciding whether the school will provide a solid academic course of study preparing for college entrance, or one which slants the curriculum toward what one Califo rnia school calls the essentials of living. These particular essentials turn out to be such things as how to take care of a home; how to budget one's income; how to buy the right kind of food; and—not surprisingly perhaps—how to make minor repairs on household plumbing.

This sort of thing is likely to happen when teachers and curriculums are put into the hands of people who are by training superintendents of works. There is no doubt that in their special field, these men have done an outstanding job of efficient and honest management. It is only when they impinge on the professional preserve of the true teacher that I voice criticism.

Now that the sputniks have opened the floodgates which damned a torrent of long-suppressed parental dissatisfaction with our public schools, steps are being taken here and there to toughen curriculums and throw out some of the rubbish and trivia cluttering up American education. There is growing recognition that we must free our schools from the experimentalist philosophers who have been in control of our teachers colleges since Dewey and Kilpatrick set out to destroy traditional ways of teaching the young. It is true that progressive education deserves credit for having brought a relaxed and friendly atmosphere into our classrooms. But it has not stopped there. On its own pragmatic terms we must reject it for it is a proven failure. It does not adjust the child to life in a society such as ours. The assertion that it prepares the child for life and that it does this better than a traditional education has simply not been borne out by experience.

Dewey claimed that the primary business of the school is to train children in cooperative and mutually helpful living. I submit that this is an erroneous conception of education in a dynamic, competitive society. It may be appropriate in static cultures which value the status quo above all else, since it does indeed develop pleasant young people who can readily fit into any group and get along splendidly with their peers. But do we really want a happy-ant-school system, as Senator FLANDERS of Vermont put it so succinctly? History shows that there is little comfort for the survival of a society composed of happy, cooperative ants.

I do not believe our present piecemeal attempts will toughen the schools effectively unless we reach a consensus on just what we expect our schools to accomplish. What is their purpose? What sort of person would we like young graduates to be?

Each of us must find his own answer to this question, and must then express his wishes clearly and in a proper democratic way to those who run our schools. For what it may be worth, here is my own answer:

Formal education in schools should, I believe, be clearly differentiated from such learning as may be termed incidental, what the child picks up in the home, in association with contemporaries and adults, and from his personal experiences. The school's concern is with the intellect alone. Young people in this modern world need minds that are well stocked with the kind of knowledge that makes life intelligible. No substitute for a liberal arts education has yet been invented that serves this purpose so well. English, foreign languages, mathematics, sciences, history, geography—these are the subjects which must be mastered. They are the intellectual tools that enable us to order our lives intelligently, to understand the complexities of today's tense and uncertain world.

A school succeeds when it sends its graduates into the world with minds which function markedly better because of time spent in the classroom. The child's own endowments and his determination to develop them will of course set limits to what the school can do for him. All we have a right to expect of the schools is that they will strengthen this determination and allow no other limits but those set by nature to impede any child's intellectual progress.

Unfortulately, the wrong kind of school may handicap the child's progress. Children may not only be barred from mental growth where high tuition withholds education from poor children; just as much harm may be done when pupils are forced into an intellectual strait jacket for the sake of democratic equalitarianism. A school system which insists on the same instruction for the talented, the average, and the below average child may prevent as many children from growing intellectually as would a system that excludes children because of the social, political, or economic status of their parents. Neither system is democratic. Attendance figures may be impressive but they mean little when they represent attendance in schools where the mind lies fallow.

Nothing we bestow upon our children in the way of material advantages can compare with the gift of a good education. We often speak of democratic freedom, and of course we treasure it. But basic to political freedom is personal independence; and this can exist only where the mind has been unshackled from ignorance, from dependence on the opinions of others, and from fear of disagreeable facts. Bombbarded as all of us are, all day long, by subtle sloganeers seeking to convert us to their views, we sorely need mind that have been sharpened by hard intellectual work. We must know how to dig up our own facts, how to discover truth for ourselves. The person who has learned to trust only proven facts, who knows how to find and recognize truth, and who has been trained to decide all issues on the basis of truth and reason—he and he alone is a free man.

In my opinion, the purpose of schools is to help children to develop minds which are free, because no inner deficiencies or outer pressures can then bar them from truth and, through truth, from inner freedom. I believe with Francis Bacon that, "It is heaven upon earth, to have a man's mind * * * turn upon the poles of truth," and this I want for our children.

Distribution of Surplus Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I request your permission to submit the following letter for the RECORD as I feel it speaks eloquently in support of a food stamp plan under which a distribution of surplus food can be made to our needy. Hearings were recently held on this proposal by the House Agriculture Committee, and the letter submitted herewith should disturb every Member of Congress into taking immediate and positive action:

FOOD INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
Detroit, Mich., April 22, 1958.

Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MARTHA: I know you will be interested in hearing that we have just received a call from the welfare department in which Daniel Ryan advised us that they are being swamped by applicants for surplus foods because of unemployment. There has been an average of 500 persons per day over the past week who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, and, therefore, are eligible for these foods.

It is going to be a tremendous job to try and handle them and certainly a food stamp plan which would permit these persons to go to their own retail grocer would go a long way toward solving our problem.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. FITZGERALD,
Executive Secretary.

Award to Staff of Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding newspapers in smaller communities of the United States is the Medford Mail-Tribune of Medford, Oreg. This newspaper was honored some years ago when its distinguished editor, Robert W. Ruhl, received the Pulitzer prize for outstanding achievement in the field of editorial writing.

Now the Medford Mail-Tribune has been honored again at the national level, with an award of merit for distinguished coverage of religious news during the year 1957. The award particularly honors Miss Peggyann Hutchinson, the church news editor of the Mail-Tribune, for her extremely fair, accurate, and complete reports of religious activities in the Medford district.

Because the Nation as a whole has recently been following the annual meetings of various groups representing the fourth estate, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Medford Mail-Tribune of April 18, 1958, describing the award to Miss Peggyann Hutchinson, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of April 18, 1958]

PEG HUTCHINSON GIVEN HONOR AS RELIGIOUS WRITER—WRITER IN NEW YORK TO ACCEPT AWARDS

The Mail Tribune last night was presented with an award of merit for distinguished coverage of religious news during 1957.

The award was one of three presented. The others went to the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, and the United Press associations.

The award was presented at the Riverside church in New York City, and was accepted by Miss Peggyann Hutchinson, church news editor for the Mail Tribune, who herself was cited for her extremely fair, accurate and complete reports of religious activities in the Medford district, which have won for her the confidence of ministers and all church people in the Mail Tribune's circulation area.

CASSELS RECEIVES AWARD

The awards were presented by the National Religious Publicity Council at the 29th annual convention of the Association of Professional Religious Public Relations and Publicity Personnel. Receiving the award for the United Press was Louis Cassels of Washington (whose byline has frequently appeared in the Mail Tribune), and for the Free Press, the award was received by Adrian Fuller, religion editor.

The Mail Tribune's citation said:

"The Medford Mail Tribune is known for its high standards of professional journalism not only throughout its home State of Oregon, but throughout the Nation. In 1934 it received a Pulitzer award 'for the most disinterested and meritorious public service rendered by any American newspaper during the year 1933.' It has always maintained the high caliber of reporting and editorializing which won for it that most respected of journalism awards."

SHOWN BY REPORTS

"Part of the public service rendered by the Mail Tribune is the unfailing attention it pays to news of the activities and interests of all religious organizations in Jackson County. This is shown by its full reports on through-the-week events in the life of the county's 80 churches, the considerable space given each Friday to stories and photographs concerning local religious activities, and the regular reporting of the wider State and National affiliations of Jackson County churchmen and churchwomen.

"Because the Medford Mail Tribune has an established policy of portraying reverently and completely the principal religious festivals and events important in the life of its community, without neglecting the wider national and world setting of these events, the National Religious Publicity Council presents to it this Award of Merit."

DEDICATED WORKER

Miss Hutchinson's award said:

"Miss Peggyann Hutchinson combines, to an unusual degree, the qualifications making for superior type of religious newswriter. She is, first of all, a dedicated churchworker, a Sunday school teacher, and a faithful member of her congregation. As a devoted Christian she brings to her journalistic tasks the insight, sympathy, and understanding which gives an added dimension to her news stories."

The Price of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Who Gets It?" published in my hometown newspaper, the Daily Leader, of Madison, S. Dak., under date of April 16, 1958. The editorial discusses the distressed situation which prevails because the farmers receive such a small percentage of what the consumer pays for the foodstuffs, and asks the question, "Who gets it?" with respect to the money paid for the contents of the family breadbaskets of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader of April 16, 1958]

WHO GETS IT?

Every so often statisticians refer to the wide spread between the price received by the farmer for his products and the selling price at retail.

One thing is certain, it doesn't come from profits taken by food processing and selling firms.

In a recent statement prepared and printed by a New York bank, profits of all corporations large enough to report to the Securities and Exchange Commission, were collected and compared with 1956 and 1957, with the following results for firms handling foodstuffs. These profits, expressed as percent of selling price were:

	1956	1957
Baking	3.3	3.4
Dairy products	3.6	2.5
Meatpacking	.9	.5
Other food products	4.2	3.9
Food chainstores	1.4	1.4

Surely this margin of profit does not affect the retail price enough so that the buyer would notice it.

Our favorite theory is that the American housewife is buying more and more processed foods, with what the trade calls built in maid service. Obviously the processing cost of such foods takes more and more of the total cost, leaving less and less of the food dollar for the raw material.

Governor Rosellini Asks Congress for Legislation To Aid Small Business Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the distinguished Governor of Washington, Hon. Albert D. Rosellini, made an appearance before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The purpose of Governor Rosellini's visit to the National's Capital was to advise and counsel our committee on business and unemployment conditions in Washington, and in the Northwest, and to give us his suggestions and recommendations on Federal legislation to alleviate the hardships of unemployment and to help bring about a return of prosperity and economic growth.

These are subjects on which Governor Rosellini is peculiarly well qualified to advise. The Governor was himself for 18 years a member of the State legislature in Washington, and was Democratic leader of the State senate before being chosen by his people to fill the Governor's chair. He has long been a prime mover in programs for economic development in the Northwest, and a diligent worker for small business. He has established a department of commerce for economic development in the State of Washington, authorization for which was passed in the last session of the legislature of his State. He has been the prime mover in organizing a world's fair to be held in Seattle in 1961, and he has been instrumental in organizing the Colombo Conference, which is to be an economic conference of 18 southeastern Asian countries, the first to be held in this country, this coming fall.

In his statement to our committee, Governor Rosellini discussed many problems and made several recommendations concerning legislation which should be passed by the National Congress. One of the things that he recommended be passed immediately is legislation which would help small-business firms and business firms of an intermediate size gain access to capital. Governor Rosellini emphasized particularly small businesses' need for long-term loans which he said constitutes one of the basic needs for the stimulation of a balanced, orderly economic growth in the Pacific Northwest.

I know that all of the Members will be keenly interested in that portion of Governor Rosellini's remarks and recommendations dealing with this subject, which are as follows:

FINANCING OF SMALL AND INTERMEDIATE BUSINESSES

One of the basic problems in the stimulation of balanced, orderly, economic growth in the Pacific Northwest, as is true elsewhere in the country, is the financing of expansion programs for small and intermediate manufacturing and business establishments. Long-term, insured financing is required for new plants or additions to existing plants, for new equipment or modernization of existing equipment, for working capital, and for inventory purposes. Many small businesses have been forced to curtail employment earlier than would ordinarily be required because of inability to tie up limited working capital in inventories.

Sincere and commendable attention is being given to this recognized problem by Members of the Congress. The chairman of this committee (BRENT SPENCE, House Banking and Currency Committee) has H. R. 6215, which, within the general framework of seeking to stimulate area development and redevelopment, would provide for long-term loans to small businesses. That nationally recognized champion of small business, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has introduced H. R. 10345, to create a small-business capital bank system through the framework of the Federal Reserve System. This also seeks to alleviate the financing problems of small business, with the important ingredient of attempting to keep the process as close to established banking channels as possible. Loans would also be available for redevelopment purposes to municipalities and other political subdivisions. The general stewardship of the established and respected Federal Reserve System lends substance to this proposal.

Time has not permitted my detailed study of these proposals. For that matter evalua-

tion of both these admirable proposals is one that requires the competence of experts. For my part, I prefer simply to endorse the principle of facilitating the solution of the financing problems of small and intermediate businesses, and to identify the few basic principles that I am convinced should guide such considerations:

1. The basic need is to provide a loan structure available to small and intermediate businesses that will permit such companies to enjoy full advantage of tax depreciation provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. To growing and expanding industry, large and small, these depreciation allowances are like money in the bank. Normal short-term commercial bank loan channels do not provide the long-term provisions that permit full utilization of tax depreciation allowances. Testifying before the House Select Committee on Small Business last November (see p. 397, of the hearings of November 19, 20, 21, and 22, 1957) William F. Kelly, on behalf of the Credit Policy Commission of the American Bankers Association, testified: "The banks, as this committee knows, are not set up, they are not capitalized, they are not organized for the purpose of providing equity capital, and they are certainly not organized for the purpose of providing long-term loans." Within this framework, it would appear that justification exists for an addition to the normal financial channels of this Nation that would provide for small and intermediate business the long-term financing advantages that accrue easily to larger corporations. The Pacific Northwest, the State of Washington, the Nation as a whole, face a period of tremendous growth in the new markets of the sixties, resulting from our rapidly increasing population and the expected doubling of the new family-formation rate. If small and intermediate business is to enjoy its just share of this growth, some provision must be made to meet their long-term capital needs.

2. It would appear, from testimony already on record, that some governmental partnership with normal banking channels will be required to make this possible. Legislation pending before the Congress, particularly H. R. 10345, pursues this possibility. In any event, a basic principle that should be applied to modification of the Nation's long-term loan channels to accommodate the needs of small and intermediate business should be to keep such developments as closely allied with private banking interests as possible.

3. There is reason to believe that private capital, at least in some States, could, if it wished, organize to meet the long-term needs of small and intermediate businesses. In my State—Washington—insurance laws permit the establishment of the single purpose insurance company that would be required, and banking laws permit the creation of the mutual loan corporation, which could combine to provide long-term insured financing for small and intermediate businesses. I am told by competent sources that the debentures of such a private loan structure, could, when a significant level of active loans is reached, become legal reserve under the Federal Reserve System. Private capital sources have expressed an interest in the potentiality provided through the laws of Washington. We are desirous of encouraging such interest. Private proposals thus far have been largely exploratory and have not reached a point where they promise early availability of capital for expansion, working capital and inventory loans to small business.

The important consideration, in the long run, is to have early fruition of a long-term insured loan channel available nationally to small and intermediate business. Our complex industrial society, constantly geared more and more to electronics, control devices, and other forms of automation, opens a wide horizon for the small specialized manufacturer. Regional markets, a situation that geographical location imposes on the Pacific Northwest, for example, promise real opportunity for the small and intermediate manufacturer of consumer goods for regional markets. These potentialities can be realized only if small and intermediate manufacturers have available the wherewithal required for their growth.

Certainly, States and regions of this Nation, whose economy has been historically based on raw materials production and export, have a major stake in the encouragement of small business. In Washington, our economy needs the balance that additional value-added-by-manufacture can provide. Our best channel for gaining this is through the growth of small business.

Israel: Ten Years of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the first 10 years of Israel's independence have evidenced the most remarkable growth and development of a new country ever seen in the history of the world. Americans join wholeheartedly in congratulating Israel on this achievement and wishing this new country future health, strength, and peace.

The people of Israel overcame hostile attack at the start of Israel's existence, and subsequent blockade. In the face of enormous difficulties they have developed and transformed the land, raised up industries, trebled the population given hospitable refuge to oppressed people, nurtured and assimilated them, revived an ancient culture, and established stable, democratic government.

These achievements in the face of such difficulties could not have been possible except by a people imbued with religious faith and fervor, and they truly partake of the miraculous.

America's friendship with Israel has been demonstrated ever since America was the first nation to recognize the new state a few days after its independence was proclaimed on May 14, 1948. This friendship is based on a similar experience in pioneer development, and a common dedication to the principles of freedom and democracy. The preservation of the independence of Israel has frequently been proclaimed to be a tenet of American foreign policy.

The presence of a free, stable democracy, with a forward-looking Western type of civilization amidst the ancient countries of the Middle East is of benefit to the Western World, and is an example of economic development in the ways of freedom.

What is most needed in that area is peace. Instead there is a tenuous truce. The attainment of peace would bring in its wake a resurgence of trade and intercourse, of land and water development, and would raise the living standards of the whole area. It is said that peace in the immediate future may be unattainable. The next best thing is security, and with it the gradual growth of mutual understanding and an atmosphere that will finally lead to peace. The free world will support these objectives.

Theodore Roosevelt and Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the life of Theodore Roosevelt is always an inspiration to us and I should like to place in the RECORD this account of his religious faith:

[From These Times of March 1958]

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND FAMILY LIFE

(By Robert W. Olewiler)

"The first essential for a man's being a good citizen is his possession of the home virtues," said Theodore Roosevelt, the 26th President of the United States, "based on recognition of the great underlying laws of religion and morality * * * which if broken mean the dissolution of civilization."

He believed that the right kind of men and women in the homes of the country took precedence over everything else. "No piled up wealth, no splendor of material growth, no brilliance of artistic development, will permanently avail any people unless its homelife is healthy," Mr. Roosevelt maintained.

President Roosevelt preached and practiced the vital duties necessary for a happy and healthy home. He was a champion of the family council meeting. His biographers say that everything of any significance in the Roosevelt home was made a matter for the entire family. An admirer has said that the table was like a Cabinet session, that the children were encouraged to discuss even the most important things, and that Mr. Roosevelt openly and frankly shared his thoughts with them.

He was a helpful father at all times. He once told a friend that "it's a mighty bad thing for a boy when he becomes afraid to go to his father with his troubles, and it's mighty bad for a father when he becomes so busy with other affairs that he has no time for the affairs of his children." While Mr. Roosevelt was abroad, he wrote at least once a week to each of his children. It was not unusual for him to stop dictating around 4 o'clock in the afternoon so that he could go to the nursery and play a few games with his children. He had the deepest confidence in his wife's judgment. "I never make an important move without first consulting her," he told a friend.

Mr. Roosevelt is said to have allotted at least one-half hour a day to his children, even in the busiest periods of his active life. In addition, he often took the children on picnics, and regularly organized constructive playtimes for them in which he joined. The Roosevelt home was one of love and sympathy, where God was worshiped and reverenced, and where the children were reared in an atmosphere of Christian simplicity.

Even though President Roosevelt invited a great many people to dine with him, few were really brought into the inner circle. There was a clearly defined line between the two. Only a selected number of intimate friends were ever a part of the "family

gatherings," and these friends have testified that it was hard to describe the exuberance of joy and fellowship which predominated at such periods.

In a Christian home the father has duties just as binding as those of the mother, Mr. Roosevelt believed. In the lectures that he delivered at the Pacific Theological Seminary at Sacramento, Calif., in the spring of 1911, he said: "We continually speak—and it is perfectly proper that we should—of the enormous importance of the woman's work in the home. It is more important than the man's. She does play a great part. But the man is not to be excused if he fails to recognize that his work in the home, in helping bring up, as well as provide for the children, is also one of his primary functions."

It is easy to understand why President Roosevelt was an ideal family man when it's remembered that he was reared in a home where the spiritual life was a normal thing. Bible reading was a regular and revential practice of his childhood. His sister, Mrs. Corinne Robinson, has written: "Father always had family prayer just before breakfast every morning. It was a joy to us all and never a burden. He would call cheerily, 'Come to prayers.' Each one of the children would then endeavor to be the first one to call out, 'I speak for you and the cubby hole, too.' The first one to call this secured the seat of honor, which was located between the head of the old-fashioned sofa and father. Here he or she sat while he read the morning lesson from the Bible. He had a religion of brightness and gayety. It gave cheer. It was never black, nor did it have any sympathy with depressing and fearful forebodings. God was very real and near to my father."

Theodore's father was once congratulated by his pastor upon the meaning of his son's name—"Gift of God." "Suppose we change it a little and call it a gift to God," said the father, who accepted his fatherhood as a serious responsibility.

That Theodore was reared in a home of Christian faith and joy and thus prepared to be the ideal family man that he was comes to light in the letters that he wrote to his children. These letters reveal a beautiful picture of American family life at its best. When Dr. C. L. Slattery, a contemporary of Mr. Roosevelt, who served an important parish in New York City, took occasion to refer to these letters, he said: "For parents who think themselves too busy (chiefly with their own pleasure) to give any special attention to their children, delegating them uninterruptedly to nurses, governesses, and schoolmasters, it must be startling to read what the most active President of the United States was able to do for and with his children while he lived in the White House."

Dr. Christian F. Reisner, one of Mr. Roosevelt's many biographers, tells us that when the Rough Rider came to the White House, he warned the newspapermen that they must not infringe on the privacy of his home by mentioning Mrs. Roosevelt or any intimate home details in their articles. The correspondent not observing this request was told that he would not receive any of the President's communications, nor would he or any other representative of that paper be allowed in the White House.

One daily paper broke this rule in a most irritating manner, Dr. Reisner reports. The story got around that the Roosevelt children had amused themselves by chasing a turkey over the White House grounds with a hatchet and finally killed it. It was believed that this story was concocted by one of the President's foes, who hoped to picture the episode as a natural outcome of electing a President with a wild west record. Mr. Roosevelt was furious at the implication that he could be such a cruel father and poor sportsman as to teach or permit his children to enjoy such a barbarous pastime. The reporter who invented the tale was permanently shut out of the White House.

That Mr. Roosevelt implicitly believed there's nothing so vitally essential to the welfare of the Nation, nothing around which the Nation should so bend itself to throw every safeguard as the homelife of the average citizen has been crystallized for us by his chief biographer, Mr. Hermann Hagedorn, executive director of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial. Mr. Hagedorn writes in his book, The Free Citizen: "When 'T. R.' talked of the 'home virtues'—and there was scarcely a speech that he made that he did not talk about them at some time or other—the people he was talking to saw in him his words made flesh and blood. They knew about the family at Sagamore Hill, his home at Oyster Bay, N. Y., that for 7 years was the summer White House.

"You might be a Democrat, in which case you wouldn't be likely to be uncritical of any Republican; you might be a Southerner, in which case you would be raging against the President who had invited Booker T. Washington to luncheon at the White House; you might be a corporation executive and be convinced that the President was an anarchist who had sold out to labor; or you might be a labor leader who was sure the President had sold out to the trusts; whatever you were and whatever grievances you were nourishing, you took your hat off to the Roosevelts' family life and wished that yours could have the unity, the fellowship, and the genuine happiness the White House family knew.

"At dinner tables of the rich and the not-so-rich, at country stores, at campfires, in farm kitchens and in lonely ranchhouses, people talked about the family life in the White House, the busy President, the poised and gracious First Lady, who never failed to find time to be companions for their lively brood of 4 boys and 2 girls in the White House as on their Long Island hilltop; and homelife suddenly seemed more important than it had been and, clear across the country, took a turn upward."

George A. Janssen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, at my request Col. N. W. Armstrong, of San Leandro, Calif., has written a brief history of one of Alameda County's great sons, a man who served her well. I am happy to preserve this short sketch of George A. Janssen by making Colonel Armstrong's notes part of the RECORD.

The death of George A. Janssen in Oakland, Calif., on April 8, 1958, ended the career of one of Alameda County's outstanding citizens. For 23 years, prior to his retirement in 1955, Mr. Janssen served as a member of the board of supervisors and no history of California would be complete without a record of the part he played.

Like many other successful people of the Golden West, George Janssen started life in comparative poverty. Following the death of his father, he began work at the age of 14 in order to support his mother and provide an education for his brothers and sisters. He worked long hours as a delivery boy and apprentice in a meat market and attended night school.

Mr. Janssen soon owned his own meat market in the Melrose section of Oakland and became active in civic improvement projects. He headed the volunteer fire department; started a movement that resulted in a splendid branch library. He helped organize and became one of the first directors of the Bank of Melrose and encouraged others to embark in business by making small loans with low interest charges.

Mr. Janssen was married to a young lady who had a millinery shop near the meat market where he embarked in business. The marriage of Miss Christine Meyer and Janssen lasted for almost 40 years when Mrs. Janssen was taken by death.

George Janssen's ability and leadership were recognized when he was appointed Park and Recreation Commissioner by the late John L. Davie, then mayor of Oakland. In 1933, he was selected to fill a vacancy on the Alameda County Board of Supervisors by former Governor of California, James A. Rolph, Jr.

The following year George Janssen was elected to the Board of Supervisors over a field of 11 opponents and thus began a career service to the people of his county which lasted for nearly a quarter of a century.

During his entire political career supervisor Janssen refused to accept campaign funds and paid his own expenses. He gave unstintingly of his time, heart, and energies. His office and home doors were always open to the people he represented.

George Janssen was instrumental in securing funds for the $2 million courthouse occupied in 1936. He served on the Alameda County Commission at the 1939–40 Worlds Fair at Treasure Island. He served as chairman of the Alameda-Contra Costa County Joint Highway District. As chairman of the hospital committee, his tireless efforts resulted in Fairmont Hospital being rebuilt into one of the finest county hospitals in the State.

George Janssen was also a leader and member of numerous fraternal and church organizations, which included the Fruitvale Masonic Lodge, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Rebekah Lodge, the Scottish Rite Bodies of Oakland, Aahmes Temple, Ancient Arabic Order of the Mystic Shrine, Thyra Lodge of the Society Dania at Hayward, Southern Alameda County Firemen's Association, Melrose Merchants, East Oakland Breakfast Club, High Twelve Club, Woodmen of the World, and others.

He believed in and practiced personal charity. No one will ever know how much aid and relief he provided for the unfortunate. During the years of World War II, he aided many families whose sons, fathers, and husbands were overseas. He never demanded nor expected a dollar to be returned.

He is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Fred Carter; 2 grandchildren; a sister, Mrs. Frank Beck; and 2 brothers, Arthur and Henry.

George Janssen's extraordinary record of public service will be long remembered. The county of Alameda and, indeed, the entire State of California mourns the loss of one of our most loved and honored citizens.

Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a petition

concerning the advertising of alcoholic beverages which I insert in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues.

This petition was signed by 92 residents of Gering, Scottsbluff, and Mitchell, Nebr. The group asked publication in the RECORD.

PETITION

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

May we again call your attention to our urgent request for relief from the invasion of our homes by the advertising of the alcoholic-beverage industry. This advertising is aimed at our children and our youth. Parents today are helpless against the mass suggestions through newspapers, magazines and especially TV and radio that to drink is harmless, and conducive to health.

We urge your active support of bills now before you to remove this advertising from channels of interstate commerce and over the air.

(Signed by 92 citizens of west Nebraska.)

Remarks by Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, at the 33d Annual Convention of the Red River Valley Association, Shreveport, La., April 8, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks I present herewith an extremely able address delivered by Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. General Person is, by the way, one of the outstandingly able engineers in the Corps of Army Engineers. He has rendered brilliant service to the Corps of Engineers over a period of years, and it was as a natural recognition of this service to his country that General Person was elevated to the extremely important place of Assistant Chief of Engineers in charge of civil functions.

General Person attended a flood-control meeting in Shreveport on April 8, 1958, where problems of the Red River Valley from Denison to the mouth of the river were discussed at length. General Person has presented some facts regarding the further use of our rivers and harbors which should cause us to think. His reference to the Overton Waterway indicates an alertness regarding major projects which is a byproduct which this officer has received in his years of association in the Army Corps of Engineers. His address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is always good to get back to Shreveport. I am indebted to my good friend Roy Matthias for this opportunity to be with you. I had planned to talk to you today about the misleading propaganda disseminated by people who apply the term "pork-barrel" to our water resource development program. But I am glad to report that I was beaten to the draw by one of the best friends the development of our natural resources has ever had—Senator ELLENDER, whose brilliant speech on the Senate floor on March 4 was a far better answer to our uniformed critics than I could ever have produced. If any of you have not yet read that speech, I urge that you do so.

I would like, because they bear repetition, to repeat some of the facts given in Senator ELLENDER'S speech as to what the American people have bought with the $11 billion which our pork-barrel program has cost since 1824, when Congress first appropriated construction funds for improvement of our waterways. On the navigation side we now have 22,600 miles of improved inland waterways, over 400 improved harbors, and of course the Great Lakes system. These facilities handled over a billion tons of commerce in the last year of record. They have produced over $3 in benefits for every dollar invested. Of even greater importance—incalculable importance—is the effect of navigation on our national economy. For example, without our pork-barrel program our great seaports could not handle our vast world trade, our steel industry would starve for lack of the ore that comes through the Soo Locks, and the Ohio Valley would not have earned its nicknames of Atom Valley and the Ruhr of America without its adequate water supply and its free water transportation. Let me stress here that these benefits are continuing, and the total will go on accumulating as long as the projects last. So much for the navigation improvements.

Flood control became a major part of the national water resource investment program when in 1928 the Congress declared a national interest in preventing human suffering and economic losses from floods in the Mississippi Valley, and authorized the alluvial valley project. This project has yielded $6 in benefits for every dollar invested. In 1936 flood control was authorized on a nationwide basis. The 500 flood control projects completed or placed in partial operation have been in operation for an average of about 15 pears. They have already prevented flood damages totaling $8⅔ billion, which is about twice the amount invested. These projects, like navigation projects, will continue to yield benefits long after we are gone. If that is pork-barrel, the hog-raising industry may well feel flattered.

Floods are a menace which can strike in any river valley at any time, often with devastating force. The alluvial valley of the Mississippi is the only major river valley in the United States in which the authorized flood-control program is as much as 65 percent complete; none of the other valley programs is more than half finished and some are barely begun. Furthermore, these percentages apply to authorized programs, and the authorized programs themselves are not fully adequate to meet the Nation's need for flood control. For every new improvement in every community located within the flood plain of any river increases the potential flood damage, and the need and justification for flood protection measures. Thus, as our valley communities keep growing, the need grows with them. Flood control must be as dynamic as the Nation itself.

For this reason we are undertaking basic review surveys in some of our major river valleys—notably the Lower Mississippi, Ohio, and Columbia Basins—to discover what changes, if any, should be made in our comprehensive flood control plans to accommodate changes that have occurred since the plans were formulated or last reviewed. The flood control program for the Alluvial Valley is the oldest comprehensive project, and on the main stream we have now reached the point where the largest flood of record could be contained; but it is always the recordbreaking floods which cause the great disasters, and the Mississippi River project is not yet ready to hold the unprecedented kind of flood which we know is possible there.

Navigation and flood control alone do not represent the total benefits realized from the civil works program. Large additional values also accrue through conservation and use of our water resources through multiple-purpose development. These include development of hydroelectric power, storage of water for industrial, municipal, and agricultural use, and the numerous benefits which result from improvement of low river flows. In many cases the projects also provide important public recreational values and opportunities for the preservatin and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources. To mention but a few figures showing the impact of these important collateral functions:

Hydroelectric power: 22.6 billion kilowatt-hours generated at Corps of Engineers installations during fiscal year 1957, representing 18.2 percent of the hydroelectric power produced and 3.6 percent of the total production by all sources of the nation's utility systems. This hydropower has been of vital importance to industry and development generally in many parts of our country. This is particularly true in the Pacific Northwest which is almost wholly dependent upon water power.

Water supply: The Corps of Engineers is providing over 1 million acre-feet of storage space in the interest of domestic and industrial water supply, and almost 4 million acre-feet is being operated either exclusively or jointly for irrigation and other uses. In addition, conservation and power releases from reservoirs operated by the Corps of Engineers have in many cases improved the quantity and quality of water available for downstream supplies. These releases in fiscal year 1957 amounted to about 30 million acre-feet (almost 11 trillion gallons). During the recent drought in the southern Great Plains area water in these reservoirs or releases from them prevented the shutdown of important industries and provided the margin of water supply that enabled many communities to live through that difficult period.

Public recreation: Recreational visitor days at corps projects now exceed 84 million per year, which is in the same order of magnitude as the attendance at all of our national parks. This benefit is definitely recognized by the public; but so is the fact that the basic access and public use facilities at completed corps projects often are not adequate to care for the increasing number of visitors. Facilities cost money, and the need for adequate funds for such facilities has not yet been met. Actually, recreation pays in many ways—expenditures by visitors which go into the local economy, purchases of sporting equipment that spread money all over the country, and returns from leases and concessions which are paid into the State and Federal Treasuries.

The projects creating these benefits have not just happened. Men of version have associated themselves with them through the years, and their determined efforts have paid off. Daniel Webster's prediction in 1850 that "ere long the strength of America will lie in the valley of the Mississippi" was a good prediction. I trust that in the valley of the Mississippi he meant to include the tributaries, and particularly the valley of the Red. You have here in this valley a major water course, people determined to develop its full potential benefit, and problems and possibilities in every category of water-resource development.

On the navigation side, your major potential development is the Overton Waterway. A year ago this month General Itschner told

your association that the completed review showed the project to be economically justified. There remain two problems to be solved before construction can start. First is the provision of the required local cooperation, and second is the availability of funds. I am sure that you understand that the first problem must be solved before you can hope for a solution to the second. Your association has had a long uphill fight for the waterway, and a lot of effort lies ahead. I would be less than frank if I failed to point out the danger of delay. The benefit-cost ratio is not very high, and as time goes on we must recognize the danger that price increases and other factors might upset the economic balance. Furthermore, when low-cost water transportation is not available, people with products to move must use other forms of transportation, and other forms of transportation, once established, are not always enthusiastic supporters of navigation improvements.

On the flood control side, your Red River Valley is a sitting duck for a disastrous flood. True, we have built Denison, Texarkana, Wallace Lake, and Bayou Bodcau, and they—especially Denison—were very effective in reducing the heavy damage sustained in last year's floods. But it was never contemplated that these completed reservoirs by themselves would solve the problem. As long as major tributaries—including the Little River—are completely uncontrolled, the threat of catastrophe will hang over your valley.

In contrast to the picture I have drawn of your current flood control position there is a bright spot with respect to water supply which I should like to mention. The officials of the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District and this association are to be congratulated on a job well done in financing the local share of the water supply cost for the Ferrells Bridge Reservoir. You may have set a pattern for similar cooperation on Cooper, and on other reservoirs in the future.

The problems which you have in the Red River Basin are typical of the problems of water resource development throughout the Nation. Significant progress has been made toward solving those problems, here and elsewhere. Much remains to be done, but the importance of our water resources is becoming more and more widely recognized. With the continued efforts of men of vision the problems will be solved. The performance of your association in the past amply demonstrates your ability and determination to provide leadership and vision for this valley. Working together in the future I am sure we will continue to go forward in the program for conservation and development of the water resources of the Red River Basin.

Misrepresentation and Deception: A Case Study of the National Research Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called to the attention of Members of Congress the reprehensible activities of a business enterprise calling itself the National Research Co.

This company's research consists of obtaining information about delinquent debtors by deceit. This company obtains its information by mailing from the NRC Office, Washington Building, Washington, D. C. punch card notices deliberately designed to look official and governmental, designed to make unsuspecting recipient believe that the United States Government is asking him for information.

The reputed mastermind behind the clever operations of the National Research Co. is Murray M. Chotiner of California. As I pointed out in remarks in the House on April 15, 1957, and February 18, 1958, it is Mr. Chotiner's job as the firm's attorney to keep the National Research Co. in business, masquerading as Uncle Sam, as long as possible, despite an order issued by the Federal Trade Commission on June 1, 1956, prohibiting use of the deceptive forms and notices.

So far, Mr. Chotiner is doing very well. The National Research Co. is still fooling some of the public in the same old way.

Perhaps it is difficult to realize just how nasty this business can be. The point is brought home most forcefully, however, in a letter I recently received from a Maryland resident who works in the Washington Building and has had an opportunity to observe personally the worst results of the National Research Co.'s operations. Mrs. Robert E. Brown has kindly consented to the publication of her letter, documenting the sad story of how one man was duped into coming to Washington to cash what he thought was a check from the Government, when all he really had was a worthless National Research Co. form:

The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re: The National Research Co.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was so pleased to read the extension of your remarks printed in the February 18 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have been embittered and enraged over the activities of the National Research Co. for many months. My sentiments or reason for writing this letter are in no way prompted by political bias. I am now and have always been a registered Republican, but regardless of who is behind the National Research Co., I feel that something must be done to stop this company from continuing in their brazen practices and flagrant violations.

I am employed in a law office two doors away from the hole in the wall occupied by the National Research Co. In early January a poor soul was wandering up and down the hall, much distraught. I asked him if I could help him find what he was looking for. He showed me one of the National Research Co.'s forms and said he had been waiting outside of their door for over an hour for someone to come in so he could collect the money they were going to give him. I invited him into the reception room of my employer and talked to him and learned that he was a coal miner who had, until the day before, been employed in a mine in West Virginia. The mine closed and he contacted relatives in Connecticut and told them he had received a check from the Government and was going to Washington, D. C. to collect it and that would give him enough money to make the trip to Connecticut. His relatives there assured him that they would provide a place for him to stay and they would help him find employment there. He showed me this so-called check. While it is true that a person with the benefits of an education would ascertain upon careful inspection that this was not a check, a man in his circumstances would certainly have reason to believe it was just that. The form also specified that in order to establish his identity, he was required to furnish his social security number, place of employment, name of employer, banking account, etc.

When I explained to him that I thought this was a form to get information so that they could collect some outstanding bill of his, he informed me that he did not owe anyone anything. Whether or not he did, I do not know, but he had no reason to tell me an untruth.

I suggested that he see the postal inspector and called an official of the post office. The poor man told me that he had $1.25 in his pocket and that was all, and asked me to give him the names of the streets so he could walk to the post office to keep the appointment I made for him. I gave him cab fare so he would not get lost.

I am sure that you will be flooded with letters of congratulations on your stand, and while I am just 1 individual, I feel that it is better to light 1 candle than to curse the darkness, and I feel that you may have started a whole bonfire. I certainly hope so.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. ROBERT E. BROWN.

Mrs. Brown says that this incident involving the man from West Virginia is just one of many similar occurrences that she has observed. And of course it isn't necessary to come to the NRC office in the Washington Building to be fooled. Most recipients of the NRC forms just fill out the things at home, send them in thinking not necessarily that they are going to receive money but that they are complying with a request from the Government for information, when they are actually inviting the bill collector.

In discussing this matter before, I have repeatedly emphasized, and do again, that the collecting of debts from delinquent debtors is entirely a legitimate business—if legitimately conducted. But the National Research Co.'s practice of locating delinquent debtors by misrepresentation and deception and hiding behind Uncle Sam surely does not fall in the category of legitimate conduct.

Mr. Chotiner has argued before the Federal Trade Commission that his company's practice of misrepresentation and deception for the purpose of locating defaulting debtors in behalf of their creditors is in the interest of the public and consequently should not be considered a violation of law. With this view I, for one, cannot agree. Helping merchants to recover financial losses from debtors is a good thing, but it doesn't justify the perpetration of deceit upon those debtors.

The Federal Trade Commission has taken steps to stop the NRC's improper activities, but the Commission hasn't yet been able to make its order stick. Mr. Chotiner may be able to keep the NRC alive forever the way things are going.

Let us hope that the Government will speeedily demonstrate that it can control this type of distasteful, deceptive, and fraudulent activity.

Repeal of Federal Taxes on Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many leaders in transportation are disappointed that the administration, in announcing its so-called program to aid our lagging railroads, has failed to advocate the repeal of the unfair and discriminatory Federal freight tax of 3 percent and the travel tax of 10 percent. This disappointment is reflected in an able editorial entitled "Railroad Aid," published in the New York Times of April 24, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Senate. I am particularly appreciative of the editorial's views, because the region which I help to represent—the Pacific Northwest—has been severely handicapped in industrial development by arbitrary Federal taxes on tonnage and freight.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD AID

The Administration has sent to Congress, in the form of a letter from Secretary of Commerce Weeks to the Senate Foreign Commerce Committee, four proposals dealing with the long-term problems of the railroads and one dealing with the immediate emergency problem. The last-named takes the form of a $700 million guaranteed loan program.

The suggestions of a more permanent kind proposed to the Senate Committee, which has been investigating the railroad situation, are:

1. More authority for the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit discontinuation of unprofitable services.

2. More precise definition of the private truckers who are exempted from ICC regulation.

3. Clarification of the exemption for those who transport agricultural commodities.

4. Revision of Federal rate-making policies to encourage more service and price competition.

Though these recommendations may be helpful in enabling the subcommittee on Surface Transportation, headed by Senator SMATHERS, to produce a reasonably satisfactory final report, railroad officials can hardly be blamed if they find the suggestions disappointing, standing alone. Certainly, one will look in vain in any or all of them for anything that promises to be a key to the plight of the railroads.

The railroads had hoped—and with good reason—that the administration might recommend, not a lending programs as aid in the present situation, but a repeal of the present excise taxes on transportation. Secretary Weeks, in his letter, observed that such action, while it would be advantageous to the transportation interests * * * should be considered only as part of a general tax revision consistent with over-all fiscal policy.

We have an idea that the railroads would not object to such relief as part of a general tax revision. We know that we wouldn't.

The Citizen's Responsibility for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to accept an invitation to address the Climax Drive Workshop of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report on March 31, last, at the Shoreham Hotel.

However, I was, at the last minute, forced to forego attending the conference luncheon at which I was to speak. In my stead, I asked Mr. Miles Scull, of the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, to deliver my address for me.

Today, Mr. President, I received the following letter from Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with the accompanying draft of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and draft of address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE
HOOVER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1958.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On behalf of the citizens committee I want to express my warm thanks to you for your address prepared for delivery at our recent workshop meeting on the citizen's responsibility for good government.

We were sorry that sudden legislative developments made it impossible for you to give the message in person. However, we are grateful that you sent the capable Mr. Miles Scull, Jr., an associate on the Senate Government Operations Committee, who made an excellent delivery of your prepared remarks.

As we have advised you often in the past, the citizens committee is greatly indebted to you for your keen interest in the cause of good government as shown by your support of major recommendations of the Hoover Commissions.

With best personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

CLARENCE FRANCIS.

THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

I am, indeed, delighted to take part in this public-spirited assembly today.

Your presence here at this citizens committee workshop is most stimulating. This gathering is firsthand and, I may say, most heartening evidence that our Government is a dynamic thing and that you as citizens have a dynamic interest in it.

Also, this occasion presents me with an opportunity to which I have long looked forward: That of discussing a subject which is very close to my heart—The Citizen's Responsibility for Good Government—and, perhaps, of shedding a little light upon a few other things along the way.

At no time since the Founding Fathers forged the Constitution upon which this great Republic rests has Government been of greater importance to us. Not only America, but the free peoples of the world, look to our Government for leadership as the universe crosses the momentous horizons of the space age where man holds in one hand the lighted torch of miraculous human progress and in the other the awesome power to destroy himself with the hydrogen bomb.

Whether mankind holds high the lighted torch of progress as he crosses the threshold of space or whether he smashes everything for which civilization stands in a maddening maelstrom of nuclear warfare hinges greatly on Government's leadership in these fateful days of danger, decision, and crisis. And—nowhere does the responsibility for Government's leadership lie more heavily than on the individual citizen.

For in a democracy the course government takes, the power good government wields, the strength with which it arms itself and the principles of liberty, justice, and freedom for which it stands all depend upon the will, the strength, the courage, and the willingness to sacrifice, if need be, of its individual citizens.

In the final analysis the citizens of America are the government—the invisible power, strength, and force for good that is behind the portals of the White House, the marble columns of the Capitol dome and of which the American flag is the shining symbol. No responsibility they bear is greater than that—to their country.

I suppose it could be said the citizen's responsibility to his government begins with that precious privilege—the right of franchise. It is at the ballot box in the country schoolhouse that the caliber of government is initially determined when the citizen votes for his elected representative to carry out his wishes—at the town hall, at the State capitol, or in Washington.

If the citizen makes a conscientious choice, if he persuades good, public-spirited candidates to stand for office, and if he himself knows what the issues are, he discharges his responsibility properly. If he does not—or if he let's John do it—as many do, he not only fails to exercise a precious right, he fails to perform a duty he owes to himself, to his family, and to his country. He cheats himself and them.

Along with the right of franchise goes the responsibility of knowledge—knowledge of government, knowledge of candidates, knowledge of issues.

No longer is the day when the citizen at the crossroads can look upon the Federal Government as a distant authority at Washington City which, in some vague way, looks after his national interests, as was the case 50 years or so ago.

Today the Federal Government's influence is everywhere, in the States, in the cities, in the towns, on the highways, in the airways, in the main street bank, in the country store, affecting his life in a hundred different ways every hour of the day, every day of the year.

Thus—the responsibility of knowledge—in today's era of expanding governmental activity and influence is imperative—for without knowledge, judicious exercise of the ballot is futile.

In my opinion—the spreading of knowledge—the dissemination of information—the stimulating of interest in government has been, in all probability, the greatest contribution the two Hoover Commissions have made to this Nation—possibly greater than if all their recommendations for improving the Government's operations had been enacted into law.

For this the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to former President Hoover who headed up that great work, his associates on the Commissions and to you.

Again, at no time in history—other than when our forefathers were bringing forth a new Republic of free men at Constitution Hall in Philadelphia—at no time, I say, has there been a greater interest in government than there exists in the United States today. From the PTA meeting—to the city council—to the State capitol and on to the Halls of Congress—there is a tide running strong for better government, more efficient government, and more economy in government—and significantly, I think, for less government, as the Hoover Commissions proposed in some of their reports.

This is all to the good. For the more that the governed are aware of their government, the more knowledge they possess of its operations, the more alert they are to its inescapable frailties, the greater their voice is going to be heard, the greater their influence is going to be, and the better their government is going to be.

Although it is an old cliche, it nevertheless is true, representatives of the government, appointed or elected, are very sensitive to the people. As one, I can tell you that is so.

However, a crusade for better government, such as that which has followed the Hoover Commissions' reports, to succeed must be conducted in a framework of reality—based upon fact. I would offer a gentle rebuke to any who criticizes for criticism's sake only, or who makes false promises beyond the realm of reality. These techniques accomplish nothing, as a matter of fact, they do grievous damage to the cause we all espouse.

I, for one, am proud, very proud, of my Government. I know the Constitution to be the greatest living document by which men rule themselves of all the ages. I believe that the framework within which our Government operates is as sound as the proverbial Yankee dollar of which we are so proud. I also believe that the very great majority of the people who work for the Government are loyal, hard-working, patriotic citizens who give a dollar's worth or more for every dollar they are paid.

Oh, I know today's Government has its shortcomings, its weaknesses, and, at times, its failures. But, my friends, so does any human enterprise of its magnitude, fraught with the crises that today's world presents, besieged by a foreign ideology which seeks to conquer it, at times torn apart by political dissension, yet, still standing like the Rock of Gibraltar, shining like a beacon to free men the world over—strong, vigorous, ready to face whatever uncertainties a troubled future might bring—in truth the greatest Government the world ever has known. I ask you, would you trade it for any other?

The weaknesses we seek to shore up. The shortcomings to correct. The failures not to repeat. But, let us go about this with reality. Let us not endanger the house because grease is burning in the kitchen oven. Let us not condemn all Government because grievous mistakes have been made or a part here or there has failed us.

To be sure, let us correct that which has failed, but let us look upon the whole, not the part, and to the future, not the past. And let us march forward solidly, together to build the whole ever greater and stronger.

My friends, only by doing this can we hope—as the leaders of the free world—to succeed, or to survive.

Thank you.

Time Is Running Out on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very well written article by Joseph Alsop entitled "Time Is Running Out on Us," that appeared in the Saturday Evening Post edition for March 15, 1958.

This statement, written as a result of the extensive travel of the author abroad with careful observations of conditions throughout the entire world, is most interesting, and I am satisfied will be helpful to all of us in approaching some of these world problems:

TIME IS RUNNING OUT ON US
(By Joseph Alsop)

After many months abroad in many countries, observing many great and often ominous events, I am chiefly haunted by the memory of a grin. It was a self-congratulating, false-jolly grin—such a grin as a shrewd, hard peasant might wear when he knew he was bringing his pigs to slaughter in the best possible market. I watched this grin come and go on the broad, expressive, peasant face of Nikita S. Khrushchev, when he received me for a long interview in Moscow in February of 1957.

Khrushchev grinned when he predicted a catastrophic Western defeat in the Middle East. He grinned again when he foretold the future dissolution of the Atlantic alliance. Most triumphantly of all, he grinned when he intimated that the U. S. S. R. was decisively passing the United States in the terrible technical-military contest of modern-weapons development.

Since then, Khrushchev's third forecast has been only too plainly confirmed by the famous sputniks. I would not laugh off his other forecasts either. After much on-the-spot reporting in both areas, I can easily see why Khrushchev expects the destruction of all the vital Western interests in the Middle East. I can also see why he even hopes for the eventual breakup of the Atlantic alliance in Western Europe. Our peril nowadays is many-sided.

Yet this multiple periol primarily arises from a single, central failure. In the last 5 years, by sheer, silly self-indulgence, the United States has allowed its former great superiority in nuclear striking power to be lost to the Soviet Union. This tragic loss of the American lead, belatedly brought home by the sputnicks, has aroused, angered and alarmed the American people. When Allen W. Dulles was at last permitted to tell the congressional leaders the truth about the Soviets' new strength, it is said that Senator HARRY F. BYRD asked only one question, "When will they hit us?"

Paradoxically, however, this is almost certainly the wrong question. There is no doubt that the prime cause of our peril is the growth of Soviet nuclear striking power. But unless we are as great fools in the years to come as we have been in the last 5 years, the U. S. S. R. is highly unlikely to use this striking power against the United States.

The main danger today, in fact, is not the hot-war annihilation of the United States. The main danger today is the cold-war defeat of the cause of freedom everywhere.

One kind of danger is unreal, the other kind is grimly real, for the same little-understood reason, because of the strange rules that set nuclear warfare altogether apart from conventional warfare. By their strangeness, they always remind me of the rules of a lunatic chess game, in which the stake is the survival of human life on earth. Furthermore, these rules of nuclear war have never been tested in practice, in actual combat between two great powers with nuclear weapons. One prays they will remain forever untested. Yet they have their own macabre, remorseless logic. Neither the Kremlin nor the Pentagon can conceivably escape from the logic of these rules. Briefly, they are as follows:

Rule I: The first blow must be the last.

It is this basic rule which makes nuclear war a radically new form of warfare. Even the greatest conquerors of the past have always won their victories in an exchange of blows. But if there is an exchange of blows in nuclear war, the aggressor will pay for his enemy's destruction with his own destruction—which is too high a price.

Rule II: The aggressor's problem is astronomically difficult, and the aggressor requires an overwhelming superiority of force.

To prevent any return blow, the aggressor has to achieve an immediate, total knockout of his enemy's entire structure of nuclear striking power. Nothing less will do; yet these complex structures present a nightmarish multiplicity of targets spread out over very great areas. For example, the American Strategic Air Command has no fewer than 400 airbases in the NATO nations, plus many more in other regions of the world. Simply to score a one-blow knockout of this SAC airbase system, A- and H-weapons would have to be delivered to all these many hundreds of targets with great accuracy and the most careful timing. This would require literally thousands of coordinated air sorties and/or missile firings, all within the space of a few hours at the longest.

Rule III: The problem of retaliation is relatively easy; and retaliation will succeed if a quite modest force survives the aggressor's first blow.

This is because the aim of retaliation is merely to destroy the aggressor. It is ironically easier nowadays to destroy another nation than to destroy that nation's power to hit back in its death agony. The difference lies in the number of targets, plus one other critical fact. In order to forestall a return blow, one must rely exclusively on the restricted but instantaneous killing powers of fire and blast. But in order to destroy another nation, one can also rely on the far slower and far wider killing power of radioactive fallout. Thus only about 50 high-megatonnage H-bombs, exploded at altitude above the great cities, would pretty effectively end the national existence of the Soviet Union. A proportionately small number of air sorties and/or missile firings would be enough to do the job.

Rule IV: For these reasons, the certainty that a modest retaliatory force will survive the first blow is a certain deterrent of nuclear aggression.

Such are the rules. To clarify the argument, I have simplified considerably, but only by omitting important additional features of the aggressor's problem. He has other very grave questions to answer before he dare attack, such as the question about

the effect of great numbers of explosions of his own A- and H-weapons on the world air, which his own people breathe. If the other side is well prepared, moreover, there are certain questions which the aggressor actually cannot answer.

One such is the time-space question, as some experts call it. This question arises when the other side possesses a widely dispersed structure of nuclear striking power linked to a fully effective warning system. The air bases of the American Strategic Air Command, for instance, are dispersed from Turkey to Okinawa and from Greenland to Texas. Our DEW line, in northern Canada, also provides good early warning of attacking aircraft for all the SAC air bases in the United States. Until they have built up an operational stock of intercontinental missiles, the Soviets must therefore choose between two equally disagreeable alternatives if they wish to strike the first blow. They can try to destroy all SAC's air bases simultaneously, sending the air sorties destined for the Texas bases across the DEW line very early. But the whole world-wide structure of SAC's striking power will thus be warned to retaliate, before any of it can be knocked out. Or the Soviets can aim for a simultaneous crossing of all SAC's warning lines, with a staggered destruction of SAC's air bases. The air bases in the United States will thus be warned to retaliate in good time; and in this case the DEW's line warning will be sternly, unmistakably confirmed by the earlier destruction of SAC's more advanced bases.

Perhaps the most disquieting single feature of the Soviet success in missile development is the fact that their intercontinental missiles may shortly provide the Soviet war planners with a satisfactory answer to this time-space question. The existing DEW line cannot see highflying missiles. But radars can be built that will also give warning against missiles. The DEW line's full effectiveness can be restored by all-out effort. The strong deterrent power of the time-space question can thus be prolonged into the period that now lies ahead, despite the far narrower time margins of missile firings.

In sum, if you study the working of the strange rules of nuclear warfare, two points stand out above all others. One is an ugly point. Structures of nuclear striking power and systems of warning must be continuously maintained and continuously modernized, at constantly increasing expense. There is no escaping this vicious circle of military investment except by international agreement. If one side scamps the needed investments, the other side may acquire the kind of superiority that will make aggression a safe bet.

But the other point that stands out is at least not ugly, although it is decidedly bizarre. If needed investments are not scamped, neither side can use this hideous power that costs such enormous sums. In this case, the whole purpose of one side's investments—and it is a perfectly adequate purpose—is simply to prevent the other side's investments from producing any positive result.

For just these lunatic-logical reasons, it was criminal folly for the Eisenhower administration's budget-firsters to scamp America's nuclear investments in the last 5 years. Nevertheless, as of today, the damage does not seem to be irreparable. As of today, the situation seems to be that neither party in the struggle for the world can dare to strike the first blow with nuclear weapons.

It is only too easy to prove that the American Strategic Air Command has now lost its former ability to solve the nuclear aggressor's problem.

On the one hand, the Soviet structure of nuclear striking power has been immensely amplified. In the first Eisenhower years, the Kremlin built up an impressive new force of long-range jet aircraft. In the last 2 years, the Soviets have added a large operational stock of intermediate-range missiles. They are now building an operational stock of intercontinental missiles. Concurrently, Soviet airbases have been multiplied; missile emplacements have been added to the airbases. These are massive extensions of the target system that SAC would have to knock out in one blow. Yet they have not been matched by any comparable increase of SAC's striking power.

On the contrary, the reckless failure to modernize SAC has left a full two-thirds of SAC's total striking power squarely dependent on the overseas bases owned by our allies. All our European allies are now intensely conscious of the threat of Soviet intermediate-range missiles. If only because SAC's aircraft would take so long to cover the distance between the Soviet warning lines and the Soviet missile emplacements, SAC cannot any longer guarantee our allies against Soviet nuclear retaliation. Our allies, therefore, will certainly refuse to provoke their own destruction by permitting SAC to strike a first blow.

In these ways, SAC has been gradually but irremediably transformed into a purely defensive force. SAC's sole role today, SAC's sole capability in the present, is to guard the United States and the West against Soviet nuclear attack.

As for the Soviets, it is only too easy to show how horribly near they came to solving what I have called the nuclear aggressor's problem. The fact sticks out a mile from the first decision taken by the SAC staff, after the hard lesson of the sputniks.

This was the decision to keep a substantial proportion of SAC's aircraft always in the air, with H-bombs always aboard, beyond reach of Soviet surprise attack. This decision has given rise to much ignorant clamor, especially in Great Britain, about American "nuclear aggressiveness." But SAC's aircraft always in the air are the very opposite of aggressive. They are far too few to strike the first blow. In fact, the only possible purpose of this somewhat desperate and hastily improvised expedient is to maintain a certain deterrent of Soviet aggression.

For the future, it must be added, SAC's emergency expedient cannot always be counted on to deter aggression by making retaliation sure. Another of the unpleasant truths known to our Intelligence, but not yet admitted to the American people, is the loss of the American lead in two additional major fields of military technology. The Soviets are already building new radars considerably superior to our radars of the DEW line. They have also put into production an antiaircraft missile with a nuclear warhead, whereas our own nuclear AA missile is at best nearing the testing stage. This combination of greatly improved radars and nuclear AA missiles will neutralize the threat of SAC's aircraft always in the air.

Partly for this reason, the American Government is now anxiously trying to strengthen the West's retaliatory power with intermediate-range missiles emplaced overseas. And we are now making greater efforts to produce antimissile radars, and to move forward the production date of the American intercontinental missiles.

Even after both sides are able to menace each other with intercontinental missiles, however, there will be other ghastly stages when antimissile missiles and satellites with bombs on board come into successive use. Unless there is agreement upon a wholly new kind of coexistence, neither side in the world struggle can ever afford to relax its vigilance and slacken its efforts. It will be fatal to repeat the folly of the 5 years before the sputniks waked us up. Which was the reason, of course, why Allen Dulles reportedly wound up his session with the congressional leaders with the heartfelt exclamation, "Thank God for the sputniks."

At this point, I can imagine the impatient reader muttering angrily, "Well, if the Soviets really can't use their striking power against us, then what the devil have they gained by spending so many billions of rubles to strengthen their striking power, and what was all this talk of mortal peril that you began with?" If I may be temporarily cryptic, I would reply that both the Soviet gain and our own peril lie in a change in the meaning of two words. These are two words I have been using rather loosely—"retaliation" and "deterrent."

In brief, SAC was still a sword, not a shield, in the years when the American Strategic Air Command first began to be described as "the great deterrent." Again, Secretary of State Dulles was not even dreaming about Soviet nuclear aggression when he issued his famous warning that we would meet Communist aggression with massive retaliation by means and at places of our own choosing. The context of this warning was the first Formosa crisis, caused by a threat to Formosa and its outlying islands by the Chinese Communists, who did not even possess tactical A-weapons. In sum, Dulles was enunciating a new strategic theory. He was saying that rather than fight any more limited wars, on the Korean pattern, we would unleash SAC if sufficiently provoked to do so. This Dulles theory has remained the alleged basis of American world strategy to this day.

Politically, the Dulles warning was singularly maladroit. Militarily, the Dulles theory at least had a basis in fact while the superiority of American nuclear striking power still endured.

Even while we had an absolute atomic monopoly, of course, our freedom of nuclear action was restricted by the character of our Government and by our need to obtain the agreement of our allies. The Kremlin gaged these restrictions most carefully. The shrewdness of Soviet judgment of risks was proved at Berlin, in Korea, and elsewhere. But some kinds of risk were always avoided. The Red army was never employed, for instance, even in a local military action. Certain critical and tempting areas of political action also were left strictly alone. Both kinds of risks were considered excessive.

Today, however, although the Secretary of State was still talking about retaliation in his most recent speech to the National Press Club, the Dulles theory of American world strategy has become as phony as a seven-dollar bill. The trouble is that the meanings of the two key words, "deterrent" and "retaliation," have greatly shriveled and shrunk in the Eisenhower years. The United States cannot any longer strike the first blow in a nuclear war, even if our allies unexpectedly concur, without inviting the annihilation of the United States and the West. Therefore we and our allies are not going to begin a nuclear war simply because we are displeased by Soviet pressure tactics in the Middle East, or because the Chinese Communists have suddenly seized the island of Quemoy. Hereafter, there is no real possibility of nuclear retaliation against nonnuclear action. Hereafter, nothing but one side's use of nuclear weapons will induce the other side to use these weapons. This calls for very careful rethinking of the highly dubious idea of graduated deterrents and tactical A-bombs, by the way.

Fortunately for the West, there is still some fuzziness in the line of demarcation between the two kinds of military power which I have been trying to trace. A big frontal attack, such as a Red army onslaught upon Western Europe, would unleash emotions of unpredictable violence. It would also precipitate immediate tactical use of nuclear weapons. Such a major political-military explosion would therefore be highly likely to lead on to a full-scale nuclear war.

For just this reason, the extreme provocation of a frontal attack will almost certainly be avoided. But with this sole exception, the great growth of the Soviet structure of nuclear striking power has now given the Soviets a wholly new freedom. They are now free to undertake almost any kind of adventure except a nuclear adventure. Herein, ironically, lies the Soviet gain from their heavy nuclear investments.

In order to see the peril to us of this new Soviet freedom of adventure, one need only turn to the problem of the Middle East. Joseph Stalin was always convinced that western interests in the Middle East were really too vital, and that playing around in the Middle East was really too risky. From the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Azerbaijan in 1946, until the death of Stalin, "Hands off the Middle East" always remained the Kremlin rule.

Within only 2 years after Stalin's pompous funeral, however, 3 things had happened that changed the Kremlin rule. The gambler, Nikita Khrushchev, had attained a key position as a Soviet policymaker. Soviet nuclear striking power had already begun to be reinforced with long-range jet aircraft as good as SAC's, causing a new growth of confidence. And President Eisenhower and Sir Anthony Eden had gone to the famous summit meeting with the singular ambition of convincing their implacable enemies that they were religiously dedicated to peace-at-any-price.

The first Soviet-Egyptian contacts took place just before the dreadful good-will rally at Geneva, but they were wholly tentative. Immediately after the Geneva rally, however, Dmitri Shepilov hurried to Cairo to sign the Soviet-Czech-Egyptian arms deal. That was how Soviet intervention in the Middle East began.

The risks had been recalculated. Always, since then, Soviet middle eastern policy has been marked by a continuous recalculation of risks. When the Eisenhower doctrine was proclaimed after the Suez crisis, for instance, the Kremlin at first supposed that the doctrine had real military meaning. Hence there was a period of pull-back. The Kremlin remained glumly passive while King Hussein trounced the pro-Soviet forces in little Jordan, and while the West's friends won the stormy Lebanese elections.

But this period of pullback ended in late July of 1957, with the shrewd Soviet intervention that produced the left-wing coup d'état in Syria in August. And now the Kremlin is clearly thinking about taking an altogether novel kind of risk in the Middle East.

The mark of this possible intention is simply a Kremlin promise secretly given to the Egyptians a few months ago. Specifically, the Soviets promised that they would soon openly support the Arab drive to force Israel back to the so-called United Nations frontiers of 1947—which would lop off huge chunks of Israel's present territory. If you know the complex middle eastern situation, you can begin with this secret promise; and step by step, in an almost Euclidean manner, you can deduce the new Soviet intention as you might deduce the next theorem in geometry.

The purpose of the Kremlin's promise is to force the anti-Communist, pro-Western Arab governments to accept Kremlin championship against the hated Israelis. If the promise is kept, this result is sure. Equally surely, the secondary result will be subsequent replacement of the pro-Western Arab governments with pro-Soviet regimes on the Egyptian-Syrian model. Thus, the Soviets hope to win the great game for the Arab lands.

But another result of Soviet support for the Arab demands will be to threaten Israel with imminent destruction as a viable state. The suicidally brave, militarily brilliant Israelis will almost automatically respond to this threat by seeking a showdown fight with the Arabs.

In such a conflict the Israelis can defeat all the Arab armies put together, and the first to be destroyed will be the Soviets' Egyptian-Syrian friends. As the Suez fighting proved, mere shipments of Soviet arms will make little difference. Nothing less than Red army units—no doubt disguised as Moslem volunteers—can be surely counted on to rescue the Arabs.

For just these reasons, the Soviets have thus far refrained from backing the Arabs against Israel, although this maneuver is the quickest way to a great Soviet triumph and Western defeat in the Middle East.

But now, as the promise to the Egyptians indicates, the Soviets are at least considering backing the Arabs. Therefore, the Soviets must also be considering the unavoidable parallel decision to be ready to send Red army units to rescue the Arabs, if this need arises.

Such is the proof that the Kremlin is now thinking about taking the one kind of risk the Kremlin has never taken in all the troubled years since the Japanese surrender. The proof is in turn confirmed by other signs, such as the evidence of just-in-case preparation of a skeleton base for Red army parachute forces in Syria.

But enough has now been said about the Middle East to prove the main point I have been trying to make—that the Soviets have gained a wide new freedom of nonnuclear adventure by their gain in nuclear striking power. The West will hardly risk nuclear annihilation because half a dozen Red army parachute brigades have plummeted into Syria by "invitation" of the new Egyptian-Syrian Government. The same rule applies, furthermore, to a good many other critical and dangerous points that used to be effectively protected by SAC's deterrent power. One such is that same island of Quemoy which caused Secretary Dulles to issue his original warning of "massive retaliation."

The story does not end, either, with this enhanced danger of local military actions that the West is presently unprepared to counter. The whole theme and aim of Soviet policy, ever since the end of the Second World War, has been to achieve a decisive upset of the world balance of power. One means to this end has been the tremendous build-up of Soviet nuclear striking power. The Middle Eastern maneuver, if finally undertaken, will be another means to the same end. Its purpose will be to cut the oil jugular of the British and western Europeans, and so to deal a perhaps mortal economic blow to the military strength of NATO. All the other local actions which the Kremlin may order, at Quemoy or elsewhere, will also be aimed to upset the power balance.

Already, moreover, the Soviets are actively using their new nuclear striking power in still another way, but once more with the same end in view. They are brandishing their missiles and their H-bombs at our allies on the other side of the Atlantic, in just the manner of Adolf Hitler brandishing his panzers and his luftwaffe in the middle thirties. Like Hitler, they are seeking to promote fear, disunity and a general tendency to run for cover. Like Hitler again, they are alternating their threats with honeyed words and invitations to negotiate. As anyone can see who reads the newspapers, these tactics are already having far-reaching effects upon the western alliance. No doubt Nikita Khrushchev was already planning just these tactics when he told me gleefully that "America's allies will not always want American bases on their soil, when they begin to realize that these bases are nothing but invitations to H-bombs."

In sum, the western alliance is now entering a new period of acute danger, in a mood that is increasingly flabby and maudlin, with less and less unity and firmness, and with little preparation for the unprecedented tests that probably lie ahead. The leaders of the United States alone can make the needed preparations for these tests. But thus far they have not seen fit to do so. Such is our melancholy situation and such was the cause of Khrushchev's happy grin.

In this situation, I do not greatly fear the ultimate horror of a nuclear holocaust, for the reasons I have already given. We seem to have waked up just in time to ward off that particular kind of danger—unless, to be sure, one of the great machines of nuclear striking power suffers from some purely accidental malfunction which will cause a holocaust. But as long as the Western nations are armed only with the weapons neither side can use, there are other things to fear besides nuclear war. The danger now is a long series of successful Soviet encroachments, a continual process of Western enfeeblement, a more and more drastic tilt in the world power balance in favor of the Kremlin.

At the end of such a process, one can foresee the United States and the surviving Western allies reduced to the mere status of endlessly beleaguered, endlessly beset, and desperately guarded islands in a Soviet-dominated world. In such guarded, beleaguered islands, the freedom which alone gives meaning to our way of life is highly unlikely to endure for very long.

Such are my conclusions at the end of my first year on the weary road as a permanent foreign correspondent. They sound, I am afraid, like one long, harsh cry of despair. Yet I do not think we need to despair. We need, rather, to make the taxing intellectual effort to understand the New World situation, in all its unfamiliar complexity. We need to re-examine every Western position from Berlin to Seoul, deciding how every vital position may best be defended. We need to make the taxing military-fiscal effort to provide mobile, rapidly transportable and conventionally Armed Forces, whose mere existence will automatically discourage local military actions by the Soviets and their satellites. Finally, above all and at all costs, Western unity must be restored; for it is Western unity the Kremlin most respects and fears.

We are in a last-chance situation, for there is not much time left. But if we can only do all the difficult and painful things I have listed without undue delay. We may yet fulfill our task as the history-appointed guardians of the last, best hope of freedom. And once the Soviets are convinced that they cannot solve their own problems by the simple expedient of destroying the West, I also think they will be ready to consider better avenues of escape from the nuclear nightmare in which they, too, now live.

Financial Assistance To Schools

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11378) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to make permanent the programs providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, insofar as such programs relate to children of persons who reside and work on Federal property, to extend such programs until June 30, 1961, insofar as such

programs relate to other children, and to make certain other changes in such laws.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We have no survey from any department of the Government that indicates where this legislation would lead us. We have no legal advice on the complications involved in the Federal Government's paying off bond issues already issued or part of a bond issue to be issued hereafter. It is certainly a good example of what not to do in amending legislation on the floor of the House. I think the amendment should be voted down.

The Right To Shirk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of an address on the so-called right-to-work laws, by Rev. Jerome L. Toner, O. S. B., Ph. D., dean of industrial relations, St. Martin's College, Olympia, Wash.:

THE RIGHT TO SHIRK?

(Text of an address on the so-called right-to-work laws by the Rev. Jerome L. Toner, O. S. B., Ph. D., dean of industrial relations, St. Martin's College, Olympia, Wash., before the Catholic Seamen's Club, Seattle, Wash., on February 18, 1955)

When Chief Justice William Howard Taft, former President of the United States, solemnly stated in the American Steel Foundries case of 1921 that "a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer * * * (and that) labor unions (born) out of the necessities of the situation, were essential to give laborers an opportunity to deal on equality with their employer * * * (to obtain) his daily wages for the maintenance of himself and his family," he was stating an economic, social, legal, and moral principle categorically contrary to that purposed by the promoters of the right-to-work laws.

President Herbert Hoover made Chief Justice Taft's policy the law of the land in 1932 when he signed the bill which said that "the public policy of the United States is hereby declared (to be) that the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment. * * * (Therefore) it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment (through) concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid of protection."

In the light of these principles and the realities of our times when crimes against man, society, and God are increasingly committed in the name of liberty and freedom of the individual to do absolutely what he chooses—whether it be in speech for communism, through actions which bring forth the terrorizing tide of juvenile delinquency, or the selection of new spouses at a rate that will ultimately be self-destructive of our civilization—would it not be much wiser for every State in the Nation as well as the Federal Government to turn their attention to the responsibilities and duties of men toward their fellow men, society, and God than to strive to establish liberties which are actually licenses?

The right-to-work laws, which are actually right-to-shirk laws, are economically unsound, socially schizophrenic, legally defenseless, and doubly immoral.

ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND

The right-to-work laws are economically unsound because they deprive the stockholders and management, employees and union of their individual and collective rights of choosing the most mutually efficient means of profitably operating their business according to the time-tested, traditional and legal principles of our free-enterprise, democratic-capitalistic system. The God-given duty and constitutional right to work for a family living, saving wage, which is far more fundamentally important than the right to work without belonging to a union, is nowhere proposed or held as a bar to the collective bargaining contract which does not provide for the family living, saving wage.

SOCIALLY SCHIZOPHRENIC [1]

The right-to-work laws are socially schizophrenic because they have lost contact with and any realistic understanding of the nature and environment of the legal collective bargaining realities which force and compel the stockholders, management, all employees, and the union to obey each and every clause and condition of the collective bargaining contract mutually agreed to by everyone coming under the contract.

The right-to-work laws have disintegrated the employee into the frustrating duality of an isolated economic individual, absolutely free to do his own will, while, at the same time, his legal and moral personality is absolutely bound by all the terms and conditions of the legal collective bargaining contract.

LEGALLY DEFENSELESS

The right-to-work laws are legally defenseless because:

1. They are contrary to the public policy of the United States, expressed by Chief Justice Taft, formulated into law by President Hoover, and found in the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts of encouraging the practices and procedures of collective bargaining as an effective process of increasing industrial production and peace.

2. As the Supreme Court of the United States said in the Hitchman Coal Co. case, "The cardinal error of the right-to-work laws lies in the assumption that the right (to work without belonging to a union) is so absolute that it may be exercised under any circumstances and without any qualifications; whereas, in truth, like other rights that exist in civilized society, it must always be exercised with reasonable regard for the conflicting rights of others."

3. The right-to-work laws unreasonably and arbitrarily make the right of the individual nonunion worker absolute and paramount to the equally basic and fundamental rights of possible more than a million stockholders of a company like American Telephone & Telegraph, for example, their management, more than half a million (A. T. & T.) employees, and their governmentally certified union to make the type of contract which they mutually agree will be the best to preserve the profitable operation of the firm for them, the public welfare and the common good.

[1] (Gr. schizein—to cleave, split; phren—mind, heart. A type of psychosis or mental disease characterized by loss of contact with environment and by disintegration of personality.)

DOUBLY IMMORAL

The right-to-work laws are doubly immoral because, under a mutually agreeable legal collective-bargaining contract (the only kind under which compulsion of a union-security contract may legally exist), the nonunion employee offends against both commutative and social justice.

COMMUTATIVE JUSTICE

The nonunion employee under a legal collective-bargaining contract offends against commutative justice by refusing to tender his proportional share of the expenses of the collective-bargaining agent—the union—which he legally elected and hired to improve his wages, hours, and conditions of work.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

The nonunion employee offends against social justice, the essence of which is to demand from each individual all that is necessary for the common good, by refusing to participate affirmatively in the legal processes of industrial democracy through collective bargaining by which, for good or evil, the wages, hours, and conditions of work for himself as well as the rest of the employees are determined. Since the nonunion employees cannot affirmatively vote in the industrial democracy, their nonparticipation may be the means by which substantial harm may come to the firm, public welfare, and common good.

The right-to-work laws logically deceive the American public into believing that these laws protect the American worker's constitutional right to work, where, when, and at any terms mutually agreeable to him and to his employer. Such "thorough competition in the goods market," says the Chamber of Commerce's Economic Intelligence Bulletin No. 76 for November of 1954, "is indispensable for the survival of capitalism, and probably of democracy * * *. The purpose of collective bargaining is to destroy individual bargaining, to create a labor monopoly."

The Supreme Court of the United States, along with Congress and other Federal courts, consistently condemn such a philosophy. In the 1944 J. I. Case decision, the Supreme Court said that "the very purpose of providing by (the National Labor Relations) statute for the collective agreement is to supersede the terms of separate agreements with terms which reflect the strength and bargaining power and serve the welfare of the group * * *. The workman is free, if he values his own bargaining position more than that of the group, to vote against representation; but the majority rules, and if it collectivizes the employment bargain, individual advantages or favors will generally in practice go in as a contribution to the collective result."

Such a "labor monopoly" of "collective bargaining," which necessarily "destroys individual bargaining," comes from the Taft-Hartley law, which specifically states that the "representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of employees, shall be the exclusive representative for all the employees in such a unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment." The Supreme Court, in effect, made the collective bargaining monopoly a duty of the certified union in the 1944 Draper case when it said that the union had "* * * the duty to protect equally the interests of the members of the craft (who are not members of the union) as the Constitution imposes upon the legislature to give equal protection to the interests of those for whom it legislates."

The absolute right of the individual worker to do as he pleases and to be free from the monopoly of the collective-bargaining agreement has no Federal basis. In the 1948 National Maritime Union case the United

States district court said that "this (monopoly of the majority), to be sure, was an abridgment of the minority's fundamental rights, as well as those of the employers, but the importance of the broad public purposes sought to be served (by the NLRA) justified the means employed."

"The purpose of the (R. L.) act," said the circuit court of appeals in the Steel case, "was not to guarantee to employees the right to do as they pleased but to guarantee to them the right of collective bargaining for the purpose of preserving industrial peace."

This absolute liberty of the employee to have freedom of choice and to do as he pleases with utter disregard of the will of the majority was clearly condemned by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Draper case when it said that "Congress has seen fit to clothe the bargaining representative with powers comparable to those possessed by a legislative body to create and restrict the rights of those whom it represents."

Since there is no Federal legal defense for the philosophy of absolute freedom of the individual worker, which the right-to-work defenders are trying to sell to the American public, it is logical to establish the basic motive behind the right-to-work employers. W. R. Brown, research director of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, writing in the Labor Law Journal of January 1953, said that "right-to-work laws are well worth considering in the search * * * for means of curbing the excessive powers of unions over individual workers."

Probably a franker statement was made by J. R. Morris in his Southern Economic Journal article, Compulsory Union Membership and Public Policy, copies of which are widely distributed by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., in which he said "the employer's basic motive in opposing compulsory union membership (and therefore advocating right-to-work laws) is, in essence, that most employers fear a strong union. Specifically, employers are concerned with efficiency, and they fear the closed-shop union security will derogate from this because of union control over the work force. Finally, most employers honestly seem to believe that compulsory union membership is undemocratic. Judging from past performance, however, a few management officials probably would regard this as convenient rhetoric."

The bitter battle fought for the destruction of unions waged in the name of the "right to work without belonging to a union" in the 1900–10 open shop and the 1919–29 American plan wars make the "undemocratic" charges of the right-to-work campaigners more than convenient rhetoric. Democracy, be it political or industrial, said Lincoln, "is government under God of, for, and by the people," and not government by an irresponsible minority of nonunion, nonstockholder, nonvoting citizens or people. The right-to-work laws, which deprive the stockholders and their management, employes and their union from jointly ruling their business, are contrary to the age-old principle of free men, which is that government, political or industrial, derive their just powers to govern from the consent of the governed.

LIBERTY AND DEMOCRACY

In Detroit I asked an employer the following question: "Is it not a denial of liberty and democracy to compel and force a worker to join a union as a condition of exercising his constitutional and God-given right to work—to earn a family-living-saving wage?"

Here is his astonishing answer:

He said: "It would be just as humorous for me to claim that a union security contract was a denial of liberty and democracy to a nonunion worker as it is for the Russian Communists to claim that their form of government is the only real free people's democratic government in the world."

I asked him to explain. He said: "In the United States under the Taft-Hartley law, once the stockholders, through management, and the employees, through their governmentally certified union, enter into a legally binding collective bargaining contract, the employer and all of his employees coming under the contract are bound to each and every term, condition, and clause in that contract.

It is no more unreasonable for the union to request that management include a union security clause in the contract so that all employees who receive the direct and primary benefits of the contract will, within 30 days, become legal members of the union, than it is for management to demand that all persons who wish to receive the direct and primary profit-income of the firm must join the stockholders' organization. Such contracts," he said, "are the very essence of liberty and freedom. They provide absolute freedom of choice. True to our national free enterprise heritage they provide a realistic opportunity for an individual to think for himself and to exercise his ability and responsibility to choose between alternatives of a wage or a profit income. No one is compelled or forced to become either an employee or a stockholder, but if anyone chooses to receive an income from wages or profits, or both, that person must also bind himself by all the legal terms offered by the collective bargaining or the stockholders' contract."

Foundations: Pro and Con

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rene Wormser, a noted attorney of New York, served as counsel of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundation during my chairmanship of that committee. During this investigation Mr. Wormser gained a unique insight into the inner workings of some of our larger foundations. After leaving the committee he continued to study the influence and power of these foundations, and he has now written an outstanding book on the subject. This book is a searching analysis of some of America's most powerful tax-exempt foundations, their actions as opposed to their stated purposes, the interlocking groups of men who run them, and their influence on the country.

I would like to include for the attention of my colleagues a very fine appraisal of Mr. Wormser's book, Foundations, Their Power and Influence, which appeared in a recent issue of Newsweek magazine. This review was made by Raymond Moley, and I feel it is an excellent evaluation of the book:

FOUNDATIONS, PRO AND CON

(By Raymond Moley)

For reasons easy to surmise, certain members of the New York and Washington press seem at the moment to have ignored a thoughtful, fair, and thoroughly documented book, Foundations, Their Power and Influence. Yet they wrote many columns a few years ago attacking two committees of the House which were investigating foundations.

The author, René Wormser of the New York bar, has given most of his 38 years' practice to a subject which lies at the root of foundations, estate dispositions, and planning, and his various books on the subject are respected and consulted. In this case, he has not only given commendation to the general usefulness of foundations such as those bearing the names of Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie, but has pointed out some of the unfortunate nature and consequences of some of their activities and grants.

Excluding the many which are merely means of tax avoidance, there are about 7,000 foundations, with aggregate assets of nearly $10 billion, concerned with specific fields of social, educational, and economic life. These institutions were born out of tax exemption and represent a great volume of wealth set aside from the sources of public revenues.

INTO THE UNKNOWABLE

The original contributions of the Rockefeller Foundation to medical science and public health make a bright page in history. Millions of lives have been spared and lengthened, and much of the misery attending the ills of the flesh has been spared us all.

But back in the 1920's a great diversion of interest took place—a diversion which was then bitterly opposed by some of the distinguished men who guided the elder Rockefeller. Social science, in all the ramifications of that word, began its vogue and spread the delusion that human relationships and human conduct, like physical substances and phenomena, were capable of exact empirical measurement.

To further this great adventure into the unknown, there were set up clearinghouses for the disposition of grants—project jobbers like the Social Science Research Council. Within these there developed an inner political machine, largely determining the objectives under which favored projects should operate. Conformity to the point of view of those in control qualified the donees. Sometimes patent political movements were supported, such as the League for Industrial Democracy (the Intercollegiate Socialist Society under a new name), and the Institute of Pacific Relations. The ideology of those who controlled the grants bent the minds of otherwise useful professors, and college teaching was greatly changed.

THE REMEDIES

When the Ford Foundation came along with its mammoth resources, H. Rowan Gaither and his advisers went almost the whole way for the new science, now known as behaviorism. Paul Hoffman and Robert Hutchins "sold" this with a mixed jargon drawn from hucksterism and sociology, with occasional medical terms wrenched from their proper place in true science. The big foundations assembled a great bureaucracy of philanthropoids who hatched projects and scattered them over the Nation.

Whenever I read of the present neglect of of the real sciences such as physics or when I see unkempt and starved hospitals, I think of this major cause of both tragic deficiencies.

Wormser wisely points out that the remedy for the foundation activities which he criticizes, is not in major legislation, but lies with the boards of directors of the foundations themselves. There should be directors who direct and not merely emboss the annual reports, who represent no conflicting interest between donee and donor, who serve fixed terms and are ineligible for reelection. Boards should put an end to "projectitis" and give grants without strings to responsible colleges and other beneficial institutions—a point of view which I know is held by many

college administrators. These institutions have their own established ways of testing and evaluating projects of their own. There should be much greater emphasis upon pure natural science. Finally, there should be continuous scrutiny and legitimate criticism by Congress and the Internal Revenue Service, the Nation's legal judges of the problems involved.

The Scientists and National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the current nuclear testing controversy revolves around deep-seated questions of national policy. One aspect of this question was discussed in a column last Sunday by Chalmers M. Roberts, diplomatic correspondent for the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. Roberts, in my opinion, has rendered a real service in sharpening the focus on this issue. His piece follows:

SCIENCE INVADES REALM OF POLITICS

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The big headlines last week were made by the President's decision, as evidenced by his Thursday speech, to stand up and fight the powerful congressional opponents to his Pentagon modernization proposal.

But it may very well be that that was not the really big news of the week at all.

For it also was the week of the scientists-in-politics: Oppenheimer, Teller, Bethe—three of the highest ranking names of the nuclear age. Each in his way had something to say on the great issue which prompted Mr. Eisenhower at long last to revamp the Pentagon; the issue of how the politicians shall deal with the world created by the scientists.

What occurred here last week was not yet the culmination of the scientists-in-politics but it was a historic way station. And it raises the most fundamental kind of national policy.

The day of the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Einstein wept. A sort of guilt complex soon swept much of the scientific community which had worked on the Manhattan project. This was reflected, in part, in the opposition by Oppenheimer and others to making the hydrogen bomb. It is present today in much of the scientists' opposition to continued nuclear testing.

Under the democratic system, of course, every man is entitled to his say. But it has not been just that simple with the scientists. Some even abandoned science for exhortation on scientific-political issues outside Government.

A number of leading scientists, especially Teller, Lawrence, and the late Mark M. Mills, remained in the Government where they became a sort of high priesthood to which the administration turned to back up its political conclusions on scientific matters; specifically in the case of the AEC-Pentagon opposition to halting nuclear testing.

Scientists, in fact, do not disagree substantially on the scientific facts involved in the arguments over radioactive fallout dangers or the possibilities of creating so-called clean small tactical nuclear weapons. But neither the scientific community nor the administration nor the nonscientists outside Government involved in the testing arguments have limited the scientists to scientific aspects of the issue.

This is a major reason why Senator SYMINGTON said last week after listening first to Teller and then to Bethe that "everybody's pretty well mixed up" on the testing and disarmament issue.

What has happened is that the scientists, to use their own word, have extrapolated political judgments from their own scientific knowledge. And different scientists have reached differing conclusions in the political realm. Yet each falls back on scientific facts to bolster his extrapolation.

Today the situation is so confused that it is time to reconsider the scientists' role in political debate. For it is a matter of political judgment, given the general agreement on scientific facts, whether testing should or should not go on. The issues involved are not just bone cancer and mutations but the security and the survival of the democracies. Scientific facts are vital; but the judgment must be political.

It is time to view the scientist for what he is: a man of conscience aware of certain scientific facts too little understood by nonscientists. But also, as Oppenheimer, Teller, and Bethe all demonstrated here last week, he is shocked to find on leaving his laboratory that the political world, the international scene, is not well ordered and lacks, say, the immutable laws of physics. Hence he begins to extrapolate.

If the administration would give the public more of the scientific facts it could make its own judgments. And the scientists could continue to have their say but in a more normal proportion to their scientific, rather than political, right to command the market place of ideas.

Death Takes Paul A. Dever: Leader of the Democratic Party in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, outside of Boston, Lawrence is the strongest Democratic city in Massachusetts.

We knew former Governor Paul A. Dever well, from his frequent visits to our community, and from his neighborly interest in our welfare.

Although he was not holding public office at the time of his death, he was the titular leader of the Democratic Party in the Commonwealth. No one could match his devotion to the party's principles and its programs; his skill in promoting organization and unity; and his ability as a fund raiser.

His success as Attorney General, and as Governor, is a matter of enduring public record.

Fewer people knew of his tremendous loyalty to the Democratic Party, which was an article of faith to him. He was not the political opportunist who calculates only what the party can do for him, personally. He worked hard for it, when his days of campaigning for elective office were past, because he believed that the Democratic Party was the instrument by which human needs are translated into Government programs.

In this he reflected the depth and sincerity of his generous spirit.

Even those who did not agree with him politically, respected his great loyalty to his beliefs.

In recognition of this quality, I ask for unanimous consent to reprint in the RECORD, the following editorial of April 12, 1958, from the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass.:

A COLORFUL DEMOCRATIC FIGURE

The sudden passing of former Governor Paul A. Dever removed from the Massachusetts Democratic Party's ranks one of the most dynamic leaders it had in years.

After the colorful career that he had during the 4 years he served as the Bay State's chief executive only the affliction of a heart condition moderated his numerous public appearances and utterances as related to his party's causes.

He had many friends in Lawrence, long a Democratic stronghold, and he made occasional public appearances here in the course of his lengthy political career which began when he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives back in 1928.

He was outspoken and full of energy. Being an orator of considerable repute, his defense of his convictions and actions if and when they became the objects of stormy criticism was pointed.

During his two administrations as governor he launched a number of construction programs. It could not be suggested that he sat on his hands and assumed a do-nothing attitude.

He contended that during the two terms that he served as governor, in no year had he spent the amounts which the legislature authorized by appropriation, and that at each year's end he had a substantial surplus in the general fund.

He emphasized that employment, industry, and business enjoyed unparalleled expansion, development, and prosperity during his administration.

Quite naturally, as politics go, his Republican adversaries disputed these claims.

It resulted in some of the warmest verbal explosions the Bay State had heard in generations.

The former governor's death, at the comparatively young age of 55, is a blow to the Democratic Party and its principles which he expounded and supported not only throughout Massachusetts but also on a national level on occasions.

Whatever failings he had—for all men in political life have faults—it could never be said that he was a man without courage and determination.

Resolution Opposing Curtailment of Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT J. DELLAY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, as an active member of the American Legion, I agree with the following resolution to oppose curtailment of veterans' benefits, which was unanimously adopted by the American Legion, Department of New Jersey's executive committee, on March 8, 1958, in Trenton, N. J., and submit the resolution for insertion in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD as a means of calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas the President of the United States, in a recent Executive communication, advocated the curtailment of veterans' benefits, such as veterans' non-service-connected pensions, for the purpose of economy to support the financial burden of the United States missile and defense programs; and

Whereas organized veterans have long advocated, assisted, and cooperated with our United States Defense Department, the Congress of the United States, etc., to insure our Nation's nationality security to become and remain the strongest free leader of nations in the world; and

Whereas organized veterans strongly believe that the curtailment of veterans benefits are not the economical answer to the financing of defense programs; and

Whereas the elderly veterans of our Nation at present are subsisting on meager pensions and small social security payments, and no definite solution has been arrived at towards the financial crisis of our elderly citizens nor towards their social, financial, physical, and emotional old-age problems; and

Whereas various Government economists have always brought their "guns" of false economy to bear upon veterans' benefits as their primary target; and

Whereas the curtailment of veterans' pensions would create an enormous increase in local, county, and State welfare rolls; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, assembled in regular executive committee meeting on March 8, 1958, in Trenton, N. J., That we respectfully urge our congressional Representative to oppose any curtailment of veterans' benefits.

WARREN R. DAVIES,
Department Commander.
MORRIS W. KUZBYT,
Department Adjutant.

TRENTON, N. J., *March 8, 1958.*

Not the Masters in Their Own Roundhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today, April 24, 1958, concerning the crisis in the railroads of our Nation:

SEA OF TROUBLES

It might sound ridiculous to say that if a swimmer is in trouble in dangerous water it doesn't do him much good to toss his an anchor. Yet, rack our brains as we might, no other comparison to the administration plan to help the troubled railroads seems as apt.

For the most part, the railroads are not in very good financial shape. Their equipment is in need of replacement. Their taxes—Federal and State and county and city—are enormous. Regulation by Federal and State agencies is so restrictive that railroads are not permitted to do the things they deem necessary to put their affairs in some kind of fiscal order and meet the intense competition from other forms of transportation. They cannot, for example, simply change their rates to meet rising costs without permission from this or that regulatory body. Nor can they end a service on a spur line without somebody else's say-so, no matter how few people the line serves or how much money the railroad loses.

It ought to be pretty clear that the trouble lies in the fact that the railroads are not masters in their own roundhouse. They are not free to follow sound business principles. They are struggling in a sea of restrictions, regulations and red tape and some of them aren't keeping their heads above water.

Into this sea of troubles Commerce Secretary Weeks tossed the anchor of even more Federal interference and control. His program would not, for example, end Interstate Commerce Commission regulation of rates but only revise them so as to permit more competition. It would not give railroads a free hand to pull off a losing train, but only give the Interstate Commerce Commission new jurisdiction over curtailment of money-losing services. While these proposals may help a little, they are still controls and they do not do the things necessary to allow the railroads to make money.

What the administration plan proposes, instead, is to guarantee loans to the railroads for $700 million and thus, through financing, further strengthen and broaden control by Government.

The railroads are discouraged by the plan, quite naturally. They had hoped for, among other forms of aid, some alleviation of the transportation excise taxes, which run 3 percent for freight and 10 percent for passenger fares. In his letter to Senator SMATHERS, chairman of a Senate Commerce Subcommittee which has been studying the plight of the rails, Secretary Weeks said he could not recommend repeal of transportation excise taxes, since such a suggestion should be part of an overall tax-revision program. As a matter of broad fiscal principle, the Commerce Secretary is unquestionably right. But it will puzzle more than the railroaders that the administration rejects a suggestion that might help the roads pay their own way and insists instead on lending them money. The net effect is inescapable; the administration helps lend the roads money to pay their taxes.

That, we submit, is not the way to get the roads in better financial state. A guaranty of $500 million for capital additions and facilities improvements, plus $200 million to guarantee part of the financing necessary to acquire up-to-date rolling stock, may appear helpful—and it may be temporarily helpful—but in the end it is only a one-way ticket to even more trouble. What happens when the $700 million is used up? And how does the Government expect the railroads to demonstrate that savings effected in 5 years through improvements will equal the loans the Government backs? And how does the Government expect railroads in trouble first to prove that loans are not available at reasonable terms through private banks in order to get the Government aid, and then to give "reasonable assurance" they will be able to repay the Government?

If the troubled railroads could do those things, they would not need the Government loans. And it is certainly not likely that, if the Government does get into railroading to the extent of $700 million, the railroads will ever be able to get their heads up. It will mean only further loans at later dates, more and more trouble, and, in the end, Government operation of the Nation's rails.

Maybe that is what some people want. But if it is not, then the sound way is to rescue the rails from their sea of Government controls. And you don't do that by throwing them the weight of even more Federal controls.

At the Bottom of the Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech, as revised, which was delivered at the 67th annual congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution on April 17, 1958:

Distinguished guests, my subject was "Have You a Pet Federal Aid Program?" After attending two of the sessions of the Daughters of the American Revolution Congress, and on further reflection, I know that most people have had their pet Government dole. They have received some of the corrupt proceeds that always come from any Government socialized project. I have learned, also, that you are all heartily ashamed of that, and that you intend to reform. So I am going to talk about why your resolutions, so carefully prepared, are headed for the bottom of the well when they arrive in Congress on Capitol Hill. Then I will propose a remedy and give you and your husbands and brothers and, above all, your sons a job to do.

Last month, one of the most distinguished leading manufacturers in this country came to see me as ranking Republican member on the Labor and Education Committee. He wanted five perfectly sound, greatly needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act that we have been trying to get since 1947.

I told him, "Why, don't you know that you haven't a ghost of a chance to pass any such laws? We haven't the votes. * * *"

He looked surprised.

Another man came in and said, "We have been working on a tax-reform bill for years. We must take this incredible load of Government off the backs of the American people."

Neither of these men seemed to know, and indeed very few of us know that in the last election we, and especially the businessmen, spent millions—we don't know how many millions—to elect a President of the United States.

But the AFL–CIO political action knew that they could not elect Mr. Stevenson, so they went to work to elect a Congress, and did it. * * *

Now we have, after 10 years of their organized political action this situation: At least 175 Members in the House of Representatives today owe their seats, wholly or partially, to the money and the work of the CIO–AFL and their allies. We now have 216 Congressmen and 45 Senators (that is, a working majority) who vote most of the time for the legislative programs of the Americans for Democratic Action. This is the front organization for labor bosses. This is the descendant of the Socialist Party in America, and the financial beneficiary of large sums from the CIO–AFL.

Free Enterprise, care of We, The People, put out a little pamphlet which you can get that gives the votes of all the Congressmen. The red votes are for the ADA propositions; the black marks are against them. It is remarkable how completely red some of our States have gone by the votes of their Congressmen. That is, they vote consistently for labor-socialist measures * * *.

Walter Reuther is not going to be president of the United States some time in the future as some fear. He does not need to be president. Labor bosses have already taken over, in critical areas, and are now dominating Congress. When the elections are over this fall, they will have, in all probability, 25 to 30 more members beholden to them, on the floor of the Houses of Congress. They will have been financed and selected and then elected by CIO–AFL. They expect to have no opposition by you or any other women's organizations or any business men's groups organized for political action.

* * * * *

How does the AFL–CIO political action and control by a labor-Socialist government in America affect you, the Daughters of the American Revolution?

It is perfectly obvious. You have passed certain important resolutions. * * * They will not receive the consideration that they deserve * * *. They represent the wisdom that resides in you, as delegates and officers. They are important and have been for years. I know of no organization whose judgment I respect more than the Daughters of the American Revolution. * * *

We have gotten to the point that such things as a billion dollar increase in Government lending authority is no longer socialism in the minds of most of our people. You know better. Your resolutions show that you know better and you must, above all, continue to meet, to discuss, and continue to tell America that our Government today is almost at the mercy of worldwide socialism. And that America too is Socialist in everything but name.

But you are prepared to see the Congress of the United States drop your resolutions to the bottom of a well.

* * * * *

Instead of reducing spending and taxes, and ending Government powerplants and irrigation projects, food subsidies, Government housing, vast and unprofitable Government lending and vast foreign aid, we get more and still more, and besides some 700 other Government projects.

Nearly all the people's petitions and resolutions are ignored. It's as useless to petition Congress today as it was for your ancestors to petition Parliament and King George in 1775.

Now what shall we do?

What we need to do now, my friends, is to imitate—to see to it that the great genius of organized American men and women—especially the businessmen—gets into the political battle. Their present organizations are the only forces in America that can possibly save us from an expansion of our present labor-socialist government.

Here is how labor

Mr. Meany says as is labor's big job." Top offic into political action. AFL–CIO is put in fighting trim.

Here is a little book: "How to Win" elections, the best book published.

Sixty-two percent of the labor press is devoted not to just talk, but to political and legislative action.

As you carry your resolutions back home to get some action of your own, drop by the CIO–AFL offices and get a copy of "How to Win." They sell it to their workers for 50 cents. They will charge you $3, but it's worth it.

Then go to the political boss in your county and say to him that you heard down in Washington that we are now designating candidates for Congress.

You'll find some young lawyer who would like to make the fight, but he has no money and no organization. If he runs he has to go out and get himself elected.

So, he doesn't run. Why should he?

He knows that he will be opposed by an organized political machine directed by extremely practical professional politicians who work for the leaders of organized labor. He knows that they have at their disposal more than 300,000 paid workers, in addition to millions of men and women who are so misled by our custom of misnaming socialism until they believe in it. They are dedicated to work against him.

The potential statesmen of tomorrow—they may be your sons—are staying out of politics today because they know that they alone cannot possibly win out against labor's political power. That must be your deep concern.

Call a meeting of all the people you know who believe in America and in what your ancestors fought and died for in those long-ago days.

Get the professionals who work for local conservative organizations. Get the paid secretaries of the local chamber of commerce, the local employers association, the medical society, the dental society, the bar associaciations, along with the elected officers of those organizations.

This local group can start now to develop the mechanics of political action.

This takes time. It takes planning. You will need professional help. You should be thinking about providing TV time, radio shows, getting together the money for newspaper ads, campaign literature, and direct mail to voters. Start holding rallies, picnics, coffee hours, and the other social activities which cement together people with a common objective. Provide the candidates with an opportunity to find out what you want your Congressman to be and see if the candidates measure up. Think about outdoor advertising, posters, buttons, bumper stickers on automobiles, match books, pencils. They all cost money, but they are the mechanics of politics.

You may be told that these activities are against the law.

The most recent court actions are that you, the DAR, or any other association or group, or corporation, can spend money in such activities for the purpose of informing members, customers, stockholders, suppliers, and so forth, of their views on public issues, and the effect on their affairs and of the election to office of candidates who share or oppose those views.

Such organizations may use any media of communication known to mankind for this purpose.

Do not, as a matter of law and as a matter of practical commonsense, go around endorsing candidates. Such endorsements, without more, are of utterly no value in a political campaign.

Your local group must do actual work in the election districts. You will need voting records of incumbent legislators, National, State and city councils. You will need information as to political spending by organized groups in your last elections. You will need authoritative discussions of the issues. You cannot rely solely on the news that comes out of Washington to give you the kind of information you need. Your local paper is more likely to give you the kind of information you need than the big city dailies. Furthermore, your local newspaper will look upon you as a potential advertiser.

All of this material is now available from public sources, from official reports, here in Washington. Steps are being taken now by several organizations to provide you with the kind of material which will give you the substance for political action.

Only the local people—you and you and you—can come up with the manpower and the money and the enthusiasm that will even begin to offset labor's political strength.

National organizations can, and God knows I hope they will, provide you with the material for you to use (as you best can decide) in selecting and electing to office the kind of men you want in office.

You, the DAR, cannot do it alone. You must persuade, demand, cajole all of the conservative organizations to lay aside their normal competitive instincts to engage in an organized, planned campaign that will encourage intelligent and conservative young people to go into public life. Many are now convinced that men of principles who believe in America and her former system of government are not wanted in public office. You must convince them otherwise.

Time is short. Labor leaders now have at their beck and call probably less than 2 million political workers out their total of 18 million dues payers. This relatively small number has been organized calculatingly in exactly the places where it will bring about the most far-reaching political results.

Your job is to offset that organized minority. You can improve upon my suggestions as to how to run a political campaign. For a mere man to even assume superiority in any area over women, with their inborn instinct—their motherhood instinct to preserve the race—is ridiculous.

How can you do nothing in this fight? If you go home and stay inside, you will be doing something. You will be doing precisely what Walter Reuther and those others whose activities bring joy to the hearts of world communism want and expect you to do.

Bob Welch, whose reputation you all know, tells me that there is only 1 danger which the Communists face today and only 1 thing they fear. That is, for the American people to be awakened sufficiently, too soon, to the very nature and methods and existence and progress of the Communist conspiracy itself.

By doing nothing you and you and you will have become another ally of world communism.

Dean Manion, an old and cherished friend of mine, calls my attention to a quotation from the Book of Proverbs:

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

What is the landmark? What must we do if we had the votes?

We can restore the Constitution, and reassert its provisions so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misinterpret it.

We can limit the power of Congress to tax, as it was limited until the 16th amendment.

We can take away—if the face of the Congress is changed—those things which the Federal Government is now doing which are immoral, unconstitutional, illegal, and outrageous.

We can once more set the free mind of America, the foundation, the creative, the atomic power of America, free America, further from the restrictions, the management of man over man, the compulsions, the propaganda, the deception, the unlimited, unconscionable power of government.

Almost 6 years ago Senator Taft and Candidate Eisenhower signed a manifesto of principles. This is what it says, in part:

"The greatest threat to liberty today is internal, from the constant growth of big government through the constantly increasing power and spending of the Federal Government. * * *"

God help us as we organize for the peaceful revolution to restore constitutional government in our land.

Walter Reuther's Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. J. B. Matthews, substituting for radio commentator Bob Siegrist on radio stations WLS and WGEZ, on Thursday, April 24, supplemented his broadcast of April 23 with additional material on Walter Reuther's background and philosophy.

Dr. Matthews has been personally acquainted with Mr. Reuther for many years and his observations of April 24 are as follows:

Walter and Victor Reuther came back to Detroit from the Soviet Union in the fall of 1935, having spent at least 18 months in the Communist utopia. One magazine says the Reuther boys went to Russia and "found out the ugly truth" for themselves. Such an assertion is apocryphal nonsense. There isn't a scintilla of evidence to support it.

The record leaves no doubt that the Reuther brothers went to Russia as Marxists and came away even more so. The pretense that they went and "found out the ugly truth" for themselves is an afterthought dictated by their interests as political adventurers.

When they reached Detroit late in 1935, the Reuthers went at once into the serious business of carving out careers for themselves in the unionizing of the automotive industry. But, that story should wait for a moment upon a revealing incident in the files of the Detroit Police Department.

Sergeant Harry Mikuliak had been in the Detroit Police Department some 15 years when, as a highly skilled investigator, he attended a meeting on May 3, 1937.

According to Sergeant Mikuliak's account, this meeting was held in an auditorium in downtown Detroit. The meeting was originally scheduled to be held in the Cass Technical High School, but permission had been denied by the representative of the board of education.

Anna Louise Strong, well-known Soviet propagandist, was the speaker at this meeting which was held to raise money for the Communist side of the Spanish civil war. The money-raiser, at this meeting, was none other than Walter Reuther. The amount which Reuther raised in cash that night was $522.67.

Walter knew Anna Louise Strong from his Soviet days. He knew her, as did everybody else who had ever heard her name, as a Soviet apologist.

Walter Reuther has not denied this collaboration with the Communists, and it occurred more than a year and a half after his return from Russia. Obviously, he cannot. It is a part of the public and police record of Detroit.

Whatever happens to the Reuther political ambitions along the way, he deserves a place in American history as the generalissimo of the sit-down strikes. His present position rests upon those acts of violence in which he collaborated to the fullest extent with the Communist Party of the United States.

Shortly after his return from the Soviet Union, Walter Reuther joined the insignificant little union in the automotive industry. In practically no time, he had achieved the presidency of the west side local of the auto union.

In 1935, France was swept by a wave of Communist-led sit-down strikes which completely paralyzed the economy of the country. In 1936–37, this Communist insurrectionary technique was introduced into the United States. The three Reuther brothers masterminded the sit-down strikes in the automotive industry, with Walter as the chief of staff. The Reuthers are still proud of this achievement.

The story of the sit-down strikes which the Reuther brothers led is a matter of public record.

Walter Reuther and his two brothers introduced this Communist strike technique at the Kelsey-Hayes wheel plant in Detroit. Of the 78 members of Walter's west side local more than half were employed at Kelsey-Hayes.

Walter called a strategy meeting at his home. Fifteen of his Kelsey-Hayes members attended. Walter had learned well the lesson of the Bolshevik revolution; namely, that small conspiratorial and determined nucleus is all that is necesary to deliver a successful revolutionary blow.

Two of the Walter's conspirators were carefully trained to pull the right switches at a given signal. A few others were stationed at strategic points and instructed to yell "strike" as soon as the switches were pulled and the assembly line ground to a halt. Victor Reuther was ready with a fiery speech. Walter was waiting at home by the telephone. Victor told the plant manager that only Walter could get the assembly line moving again, and gave the manager Walter's telephone number. Walter was sent for, and when he arrived he mounted a box to deliver his own fiery harangue.

That memorable day at the Kelsey-Hayes plant, Walter Reuther and his goons not only pulled the switches which stopped the assembly line; they also brought law and order to its knees. A civilized community surrendered to primitive violence.

The story was reenacted in plant after plant. In Flint, Mich., Reuther and his goons fought off the police by hurling nuts and bolts. They turned fire hoses upon the uniformed guardians of the community. They maufactured blackjacks inside the plant.

In the Saturday Evening Post, a few years ago, a reporter described the Reuther boys' activities in the Flint, Mich., insurrection as follows: "The redheaded Reuther brothers—Walter, Victor, and Roy—were everywhere, shouting encouragement from sound trucks, organizing defenses, helping to plan strategy and climbing through windows to make reassuring speeches to the strikers. No Communist Party member—and there were many of them in on the show—worked with more fiery zeal than the Reuthers."

It was well known at the time that the entire Communist apparatus of the State of Michigan was placed at Walter Reuther's disposal and that, without this assistance of the Kremlin's agents, the civil combustion would have been greatly reduced.

Most people have probably forgotten that the sitdown strikes in Michigan prompted MARTIN DIES to introduce his resolution which set up the congressional committee to investigate un-American propaganda and activities in the spring of 1938. As director of research for the Dies committee from 1939 to 1945, I added greatly to my knowledge of the pro-Communist activities of Walter Reuther.

I learned, for example, that the Communists had set up what they called the unity caucus in the autoworkers union. Sworn testimony before the Dies committee incorporated the following memorandum on the unity caucus: "There were present at this caucus Wyndham Mortimer, Ed Hall, Walter Reuther, and about 90 delegates to the convention who were actually Communist Party members. Also present were William Weinstone, Michigan secretary of the Communist Party; Jack Stachel, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party; Morris Childs, of Chicago, secretary of the Communist Party; Jack Johnstone, of Chicago, a member of the central committee; and Louis Budenz, a member of the staff of the Daily Worker."

In 1946, 10 years after the sitdown strikes, Walter Reuther ran for the presidency of the automobile workers union on an anti-Communist platform—and was elected by a narrow margin. Walter Reuther's first act, on the announcement of his election to the presidency of the automobile workers union, was to stand before the convention and make an offer of peace to the leader of the Communist faction whom he had just defeated. The Communist leader curtly declined Reuther's publicly proclaimed offer to collaborate with the Communists.

Periodically, Walter Reuther grabs the headlines by announcing a new Reuther plan. Two years ago, for example, he announced a gigantic plan for global socialism. Political Affairs, the most authoritative medium through which the Communist Party line of the moment is expounded, gave its highest praise for this recent Reuther program. The Communist publication said: "Reuther's two major points, taken together, provide for participation by the United States and the Soviet Union in a common effort to bring to the poverty-stricken peoples of the world the wherewithal for upgrading of their economies."

And how would Reuther attain this goal? The answer: "The United States should contribute 2 percent of its gross produce each year (about $8 billion this year) for the next 25 years into a world fund to provide economic and technical aid to less developed countries, whether alined with the United States or not. The program would be administered through the United Nations and multilateral agencies. United States aid would be made available at once through existing multilateral agencies, pending U. N. action on the creation of the world fund."

While Reuther's plans do not bear the Communist label, they are always socialistic in essence. Their adoption would take America step by step into a full-fledged Socialist economy. And, it must be remembered that the historic mission of socialism is so to destroy the national morale and so to disintegrate the national economy as to make it a pushover for communism.

Walter and Victor Reuther closed their famous letter to Melvin and Gladys Bishop with the words, "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America." The surest road to the sovietizing of the United States would be for the American people to follow Walter Reuther.

Israel Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. On this happy occasion I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to both the leaders and people of Israel for the magnificent progress they have made during the last decade and to express the hope, echoed

by all America, that the future may prove even more successful and prosperous.

Great changes have been wrought since that momentous day in 1948 when Israel first proclaimed her independence—changes which can only serve as a living memorial to the courage and fortitude of the Jewish people. In the space of 10 short years Israel has risen from the status of a new and struggling nation to that of a stable and mature state whose voice is listened to with respect in the councils of the world. In the troubled sea of the Middle East, Israel stands as an island of democracy and progress.

Nor has her domestic progress been any less startling. In spite of the fact that she has been offering blessed sanctuary to countless thousands of the unfortunate victims of World War II, Israel has, nevertheless, managed to provide a sound economic base for the future through intelligent agricultural and industrial planning. Vast building programs have provided both homes and schools for her growing population. Desert areas like the Negev have been made to bloom again through the application of modern methods of technology and irrigation to the cultivation of the soil. Governmental institutions have matured and have nurtured and protected the liberties of the individual through extremely trying times.

These tremendous achievements have not been accomplished without suffering and sacrifice, for Israel has had to contend with both active military hostility and economic boycott imposed by her neighbors. It is not surprising, however, that the same faith and courage which kept the precious idea of a national homeland alive for more than 2,000 years has been able to surmount all obstacles. Today Israel stands as a symbol to men striving for their independence all over the world—a symbol of what man can accomplish when sustained by a deep and abiding faith and dedicated to the principles of freedom and democracy.

Clearance Requirements Across the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the proposed action of the Fact Finding Committee of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, regarding the reduction of the minimum vertical clearance requirements below the present 80 feet across the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway, protests have been filed objecting to such action.

The American Boat Builders & Repairers Association, Inc., through its executive secretary, Jerome F. Healy, Jr., has filed such a protest on behalf of its members. This is a matter worthy of attention of all Members of Congress. The letter of protest follows:

AMERICAN BOAT BUILDERS & REPAIRERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1958.

FACT FINDING COMMITTEE, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Care of Col. Paul D. Troxler, Chairman, District Engineer,
Jacksonville, Fla.

GENTLEMEN: We represent over 100 small shipyards and sailmakers. You will note from our attached current membership list that they are located along the Atlantic seaboard.

We protest the proposed reduction of the minimum vertical clearance requirements below the present 80 feet across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway.

The proposal, if carried through, will seriously affect the economy of a large number of these yards and the towns where they are located and will add to the recession now rapidly spreading across the country. The reverberations will be felt by yards as far north as Maine, as we will show below.

How this proposal will affect a cross-section of our member yards:

Hartge Yacht Yard of Galesville, Md., now employs about a dozen people. About 20 of its customers use the Intracoastal Waterway. In addition, many others stop at this yard for repairs en route north. Most of these customers would be affected by the 55-foot clearance of bridges on this waterway, and would be unable to use the waterway. With a change in the route of its customers, this yard would be by-passed and lose the repair business of these vessels. It is the opinion of this yard that small yards, like itself, would be almost eliminated if such a proposal becomes a reality. A photostat copy of this yard's statements is attached.

Another yard, Manchester Yacht Sails, Inc., located at South Dartmouth, Mass., employing about 15 people, has approximately 25 customers sailing yachts and using the inland waterway en route to and from southern sailing areas. These customers advise the yard that the proposed 55-foot clearance would necessitate their sailing outside in the open ocean along the most dangerous parts of the Atlantic coast and in treacherout waters fraught with peril for their craft.

Barbour Boat Works, of New Bern, N. C., which has a payroll of about 50, is another member who feels that it will be affected by this proposal. Its letter is attached.

The Arnold C. Gay Yacht Yard, of Annapolis, Md., is another yard which has approximately 25 of its customers using the waterway and judges that it outfits another 25 for the same purpose. It is of the opinion that if these boats are unable to use the waterway, boatyards all along the way would be forced to close. Its statement is also attached.

This is but a cross section of the many yards which would be faced with the same problems in the event that this proposal is carried through.

E. Farnham Butler of the Mount Desert Yacht Yard located in Maine has heretofore written to you his opposition to the proposed plan setting forth his position in a similar vein.

Many yards of this association are located in small towns along the waterway and contribute substantally to the business economy of these towns. Making the waterway impassable for high-masted vessels would reroute these vessels with the resultant substantial loss of business currently enjoyed not only by these small yards but by the local townspeople such as suppliers, restaurants, and the like. This loss of business, in turn, would be reflected by an increase in the country's present growing unemployment rolls. Any step taken that would at this time contribute to unemployment is false economy. The wooden boat building and repair industry is hard pressed under normal conditions to retain its skilled workers. It consists of a large number of individual companies, each of which is within the category of small business. This industry deserves encouragement and stimulus and not obstruction and restraint, because it is claimed that some money can be saved when building bridges. Boat building and repairing skills are among the occupations listed in the United States Department of Labor's list of critical skills vital to national defense programs. These skills are found only in boat yards and the dissipation of such skills through failure to keep the boat building and repairing industry in full operation in time of peace would pose a serious threat in time of mobilization.

Complete statistics on the height of the masts of all boats using the Intracoastal Waterway, as your own research has undoubtedly revealed, are not available. Our investigation reveals that the Corps of Engineers, with the opportunity to gather this information as each boat using the Intracoastal Waterway passes its locks, did not commence to do this until March 5, 1958, although the same procedure has been used over the years for obtaining other information. We also understand that the United States Coast Guard lacks these figures. We point this out not in a critical vein, but as clear evidence that the 80-foot minimum clearance was so well established that no one was even concerned about mast height, and that boatowners and boatbuilders and others concerned had a right to rely on the long established minimum clearance and not to expect it to be arbitrarily reduced to suit the convenience of another group.

No pressing need for the proposed change has ben established. Alleged public economy in the construction and operation of bridges is the only argument presented in favor of lowering the clearance. Such an argument is far outweighed by the harm which will be occasioned by such an act to the business economy of our industry, and to the property life and limb of many boat owners who would be deprived of the use of the waterway.

There is no way to estimate the perils that would result from forcing high-masted vessels into the open sea. It can safely be presumed however that if these vessels are forced to travel north and south outside the safety of cruising in inland waters, men and boats would needlessly be exposed to stormy and treacherous Atlantic waters. The recent disappearance of Harvey Conover, the well-known yachtsman, together with his yacht and all on board is a most vivid illustration of the perils which must be considered in forcing the high-masted vessels into the open sea.

We submit that the advantages which a small group might realize in lowering the vertical clearance below the present 80 feet are far outweighed by the disadvantages which would follow in its path, and that no change should be made in the long established minimum vertical clearance of 80 feet.

Respectfully,

JEROME F. HEALY, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

Reds To Produce Atomic Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 22 regard-

ing plans of the Soviet Union to place a nuclear-powered aircraft in the skies by 1960. I believe it is important for the Members of the House to be aware of the tremendous progress which the Russians are making in the nuclear aircraft and nuclear rocket field, and of the threat which this poses to the United States, both from a military and psychological point of view.

As the Members of this body are well aware, my colleagues and I on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have for years pressed for a vigorous development program to insure that the United States achieve the first nuclear-powered aircraft. We have felt that America must be first to place a nuclear aircraft in the skies both from the point of view of the important military missions which such an aircraft can perform and, equally important, from the point of view of world confidence in America's scientific capability. The urgency for doing so has been underlined dramatically by the recent Soviet successes with their sputniks.

I am convinced from my own conversations with Russian scientists in Moscow last fall that the Soviets are well along in their atomic plane program and I believe that it is entirely reasonable to assume that the 1960 target date mentioned in the article is a correct one. For this reason I cannot but regret that the administration has seen fit to kill efforts last fall by the Air Force to accelerate our nuclear aircraft program and, more recently, that the Killian committee has delivered a crushing blow to these hopes after a cursory review of the program.

I hope, however, Mr. Speaker, that this Russian threat to the United States will help change the attiude of those who believe that we can conduct our nuclear aircraft program in a business-as-usual fashion, and that action will be taken immediately to restore funds to the program so that it can be pushed forward with all speed.

The article follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 22, 1958]

REDS TO PRODUCE ATOMIC PLANE, OFFICIAL SOVIET BOOKLET DECLARES

(By Phillip M. Swatek)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Russian science and engineering are on the verge of creating aircraft with atomic engines, a technical publication of the Soviet Defense Ministry says.

The booklet, just translated by the United States Air Force and made public here for the first time, declares the Communists want to fly a nuclear transport but that an atomic bomber with unlimited range would be of particular interest.

American imperialists, the Soviet authors say, have been working hard on a nuclear bomber to deliver bombs of enormous destructive power to any point on the earth's surface.

The Soviet Union has been compelled, in view of the military preparations of the capitalist countries, to develop armed forces capable of repulsing an attack by an aggressor at any time.

In the Russians' view, more than 10 United States aircraft engine manufacturers are working on atomic engines and reactors, including General Electric. Actually, GE is the only manufacturer working on the engine, though Pratt & Whitney has a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission for work on the reactor.

GE also is doing reactor development work for the AEC, and the Evendale (Cincinnati) plant is regarded as the nerve center of the entire United States program.

Authorities who have examined the booklet, published by the Russian military press last fall, and a volume filled with formulas and engineering diagrams, said today that on the basis of this evidence Russia apparently has at least as much theoretical knowledge in this field as the United States has.

Whether Russia actually is ahead and will fly an atomic aircraft before the United States just on the basis of this display of technical knowledge, authorities here will not say. They explain so much depends on Soviet ability to translate their plans into hardware and the pressure under which they are doing it.

No specific target date for the first Russian flight was mentioned in the book. The most authoritative estimate used here for the first Russian flight is 1960. The United States target date was given to the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee last winter as 1963.

Experts here were impressed with the attention given in the book to nuclear-powered turboprop engines. Most consideration in the United States program, in the past anyway, has been given to turbojet engines in order to provide a higher and faster bomber for the Air Force, which was putting up most of the money. Turboprops would have been better for a big transport plane, which would have been easier to develop than a high-performance bomber, but the Air Force hasn't been interested.

Because of the great weight required for radiation shielding, progress in developing a militarily-useful jet has been slow. Enthusiasm for the project fluctuated within the Air Force and last summer it appeared it might be cut back drastically.

These were dark days at Evendale. Then sputnik reestablished the value of being first and the nuclear-plane project was brought back for another look. Advocates of early flight in anything that would fly prevailed within the service. Last winter the Navy began aggressively pushing its turboprop seaplane project.

Studies still are being made by the Defense Department on the Navy project, but President Eisenhower decided last month not to pursue the Air Force program on a crash basis. If a switch in emphasis to the Navy turboprop project is made, most of the work still would be done at Evendale.

Authorities feel the Russians' interest in the turboprop concept, their charges that America wants the atom plane for war while the Russians want to fly a nuclear transport plane, give a pretty good hint at what they are doing.

The Russians admit in the book that they haven't solved the radiation-shield weight problem either, so, it is guessed, they decided to skip the more difficult jet project and concentrate on turboprops which are more efficient at low altitudes and subsonic speeds. Because turboprops were the best bet technically, they went ahead and developed their program to match—calling attention to the fact that the United States was developing its atom plane for war and they were developing theirs for peaceful purposes.

In the introduction of the book it is stated, "The ruling circles of the United States marked the beginning of the atomic age by the barbaric destruction of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, although there was no military necessity for this whatsoever."

In addition to the many engineering drawings and technical details, the Russian authors included in their volume some believe it or not facts, including the information that a nuclear plane could fly around the world and consume no more than 1 to 2 pounds of nuclear fuel.

The same flight with conventional engines would take 1,000 tons or more than 20 railway tank carloads of kerosene, they figure. Nuclear fuel, the Russians explain, contains approximately 2 million times as much energy per unit weight as does an equal unit weight of modern aircraft fuel.

Our Railroads Are in a Desperate Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story published in the Elmira (N. Y.) Advertiser on April 17, 1958. This story is in the form of questions and answers developed at a round-table discussion between newspapermen in Elmira and representatives of the railroad industry.

The newspapermen were Cove Hoover and W. Charles Barber, the Elmira Star-Gazette; Alan Gould, Jr., and Robert Clark, the Elmira Sunday Telegram; and Hillard Gordon, the Elmira Advertiser.

Railroad representatives were James M. Dean, Erie Railroad; William J. Noone, Pennsylvania Railroad; and Franklin B. Hoffman, chairman of the Railroad Community Committee.

The questions asked and the answers given to them so pointedly highlight the plight of our Nation's railroads that I thought Members of the Congress should have the advantage of reading these questions and answers:

Question. How in the world did the railroads get into their present financial predicament?

Mr. DEAN. There are several reasons. The railroads—the only form of passenger-freight transportation that must buy, build, maintain and pay taxes on its own right-of-way—are governed on Federal, State and local levels by an archaic system of laws and regulations that deny them the fundamental right of equal competition.

These laws were put on the books way back in the days when the railroads did have a virtual monopoly on transportation. Today while there is no longer any trace of monopoly, the same old laws are in use.

Actually, the railroads are the only true common carrier of both freight and passengers. They carry almost half of all intercity freight and about 35 percent of commercial passenger traffic.

Because they are legitimate common carriers, they must accept every type of freight, while their competitors may pick and choose just what they want to carry.

This has left the railroads in the position of being forced to haul the undesirable and oftentimes unprofitable freight, while their competitors grab off the lucrative business and do not have to worry about declining passenger business.

Question. How has inflation affected the railroads?

Mr. DEAN. Along with its other woes, the railroad industry, like every one else, has been caught in the inflationary squeeze. It has been confronted with steadily climbing labor and material costs, together with a reduction in the level of our economy.

Since November of last year, for example, wage rates of railroad workers have gone up 12 cents an hour.

This has resulted in a dangerous drop in railroad earnings and many roads are scraping the bottom of the barrel for money to meet expenses.

Unlike other businesses—perhaps like yours—the railroads cannot act immediately to cope with these rising costs.

Under obsolete regulations, they apply for freight and passenger rate increases to offset their losses, but by the time the slow legal machinery gets around to acting, it is far too late, and too often, the increases are sadly inadequate to cover the added costs.

Right here in New York State every railroad in the State loses money on its passenger business. For two railroads alone, the deficit last year was more than $100 million.

Question. The claim is made that railroads are losing money because of taxation. How badly are they hit?

Mr. DEAN. At the Federal, State and local levels, the railroads get it in the neck from the tax appraisers and there has been little, if any, relief despite the desperate situation in which the railroads find themselves.

As an example, the taxes last year on Grand Central Terminal and Pennsylvania Station in New York amounted to $13 million, even though both facilities are used exclusively for passenger trains.

In other words, while the passenger losses have been rising, ironically, so has the tax bill. Here is another shocking example. New York City taxes on the New York Central's Harlem River Bridge have jumped from $70,000 a year to $490,000 a year since 1954—an increase of 600 percent.

And while the railroads are reeling under the paralyzing burden of taxation and regulation, their competitors are enjoying a relative field day.

Question. We hear a lot about declining railroad passenger business. What has happened in this field?

Mr. NOONE. Much of it has gone to the railroads' subsidized competitors—the airlines, buses and private cars.

And millions of these subsidy dollars have come, ironically, from the huge taxes paid by the railroads on the facilities they have had to build and pay for themselves.

The airlines, for example, use airports and traffic-control systems built for them by public authorities. Millions have been spent right here in the Elmira area.

The taxes on these facilities—when they are any—are ridiculously low.

For example, the property in New York on which LaGuardia and Idlewild airports are built is assessed at $110 million. Not a dollar of tax is paid. Railroads, for this amount of property, would be paying a tax bill of $4,400,000 a year.

Billions of dollars in taxpayers' funds have gone into the construction of our mammoth system of throughways, expressways, highways, bridges and tunnels, which are used by buses and trucks as well as by automobiles.

These publicly sponsored and paid for projects have had a tremendous impact on the railroads. In the case of the New York State Thruway, which is close to us, the effect was dramatic.

As each section of the road was opened for use, there was a sharp corresponding drop in the passenger business of the parallel running New York Central Railroad.

Now with the Thruway completed, New York Central's business is down 40 percent under the pre-Thruway level.

When you come right down to brass tacks, we are losing money on just about every passenger train we run.

Question. Don't the railroads charge more—to other users, such as freight shippers—to offset losses in passenger service?

Mr. NOONE. In the past, the profit on the railroad freight operation was enough to offset these passenger income losses, but now we are in trouble there, too.

The obvious solution, of course, is to do more business and cut down on the losses, but here again we are up against a blank wall.

Railroad equipment has been wearing out, and we just can't get the money needed to replace it, or keep it in proper repair.

Ironically, to improve our earnings, we must have new equipment, but because our earnings are so poor, we cannot attract the investment capital needed to replace the equipment.

The return on railroad investment has dropped to a dangerously low point—a point at which we had to pass up dividends—and that means the investors are not willing to pour any more money into railroad stocks.

Question. What are the railroads doing about this situation?

Mr. NOONE. Well, we have tightened our belts until it hurts. Thousands of employees have been furloughed. Every possible economy has been made to conserve our dwindling supply of cash.

But frankly, we are scraping the bottom of the barrel.

Some roads have torn up track, closed and sold stations and freight houses, sold off real estate, and just about everything possible to raise the precious cash we need to keep operating from day to day.

Some railroads have been forced into self-cannibalism.

The New York Central, for example, has been forced to scrap hundreds of old cars, just to sell the metal and scrap material, in a desperate attempt to raise cash. This practice, obviously, is dangerous, but we are in a desperate situation.

Question. What role do the railroads play in our peacetime economy—and during times of national emergency?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In World War II the railroads carried 90 percent of all military freight and 97 percent of all organized military troop movements.

In Korea—and here I will quote General Van Fleet—"No other form of transportation, nor all other forms combined, could have done the job the railroads did."

As of this moment, however, because of their weakened condition, the railroads just couldn't do the job they did in World War II, if they were given an emergency call by the Government.

Their physical plants have been weakened, because they haven't had the money to maintain them properly, and there is no prospect at the moment of that situation improving.

Then, too, when the railroads are sick, so is the economy of the Nation. The railroads are the second biggest employer in the Nation and they are a tremendous purchasing force.

But they have had to cut their purchases, and that loss has been felt all across the Nation. They have had to lay off workers, and that has seriously impaired the economy.

Question. What then can be done to get the railroads back on the track, so to speak, and in a healthy condition?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The railroads desperately need relief from three oppressions—regulation, taxation and subsidy of the competitors.

The railroads do not want to be taken over by the Government—they want to remain a vigorous, free enterprise industry, progressing with the Nation's free economy, doing the vital job only they are equipped to do.

But they cannot fill this role, if they continue to be shackled by outmoded and obsolete regulations of the horse and buggy era.

They cannot live a free life if they are choked by excessive taxes which take away the dollars the railroads need to build themselves back up into a healthy industry.

They desperately need the basic American right to compete as a free segment of the economy.

Regulations in some form are, of course, necessary in all things.

But they should be fair and equitable and not force the railroads to lose money merely to help a competitor.

We feel that the railroads must not be permitted to perish into the limbo of Government ownership. That would be a dark day for the country.

We earnestly hope that Congress will study well the recommendations of the Smathers Committee and give the railroads the helping hand they need so urgently if they are to help themselves.

Duck Hill Has 16 FFA Members Who Earned Top Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in this time of real trouble on the farm, I take real pleasure in calling attention to the fine record of a school, a school instructor, and the outstanding record of a number of young farmers. It is a record which constitutes a real challenge.

The article follows:

DUCK HILL HAS 16 FFA MEMBERS WHO EARNED TOP DEGREE—RECORD FOR STATE COMES UNDER INSTRUCTOR TRAPP

(By Carl McIntire)

Duck Hill believes in its school producing good farmers through the vocational agriculture department—and believes in having those farmers stay at home to become a part of a thriving community.

That it succeeds is evidenced by the record established by the school's Future Farmers of America chapter, which numbers in its members the boys who are students in the vo-ag department. In the past 20 years there have been 16 boys from the chapter to earn the coveted American Farmer Degree, highest award that the National FFA Association may award to its members.

For most chapters, to have had 5 boys earning the degrees would be distinctive, but for 1 chapter in a comparatively small school to have 16 so honored is an outstanding achievement. Needless to say, there is no other school in the State to attain such a record.

Then consider the fact that all 16 American Farmers from Duck Hill are still farming in the Duck Hill area.

Undoubtedly this unique achievement must be credited to one man, the person who has been responsible for the training of the young fellows who gained national stature as student farmers and have gone on to make successes as adult agriculturists.

THERE 28 YEARS

He is B. M. Trapp, for 28 years the vocational agriculture instructor at Duck Hill High School.

He must be a good teacher, interested in his boys. The record indicates the fact.

We found he is also a very nice guy, still very much interested in the young fellows who have been in his classes for this more than a quarter of a century.

Trapp has kept pace with the boys who were in FFA chapters with him at Duck Hill. He can recite most of their achievements almost as well as they could themselves, he has that much pride in their successes. He can tell you, too, most of the things about their farming operations, because they keep in touch with him and still seek his advice.

With him and A. G. Shepherd, executive secretary of the Mississippi FFA, we visited 1 day this week with 3 of his former American Farmer degree winners.

One is a former State president of Mississippi's Future Farmers of America, D. R. Branch. Another is a former State reporter of the FFA, Elmo Branch, a brother of D. R. The third is Curtis Riley, the first American Farmer degree winner at Duck Hill.

SCHOOL HAS 19 OF 21 CHAMPIONS

Another achievement of the Duck Hill High School FFA chapter under Instructor B. M. Trapp is most unusual and is a record in the State, perhaps the Nation.

For 19 of the past 21 years Duck Hill has had the State championship FFA dairy products judging team—and the other 2 years the Duck Hill squad placed second.

HERE'S LIST OF DUCK HILL'S 16-PLUS AMERICAN FARMERS

A complete list of Duck Hill High School's FFA American farmer degree winners includes:

Billy Abel, now in partnership with his father in a livestock farm operation near Duck Hill.

Walter Abel, Jr., a merchant near Duck Hill, also operates a farm near there.

James Bowen, who owns and operates a farm 2 miles east of Duck Hill.

D. R. Branch farms near Duck Hill.

Elmo Branch farms near Duck Hill.

J. D. Branscome, graduate of State College, has farm south of Duck Hill, is in livestock business and lives in Grenada.

L. L. Branscome, Jr., farms with his father near Duck Hill and owns livestock sales at Batesville and Lexington.

Manley Hayward, now in armed service.

Charles Heath, graduate of Texas A. and M., a veterinarian at Winona, owns farm near Duck Hill where he keeps his herd of registered Angus.

Julian Kirk farms 7 miles east of Duck Hill.

S. S. Reeves, now in armed service.

Curtis Riley farms north of Duck Hill.

O. W. Scott, Jr., has an interest in farms near Duck Hill with his father, has herd of beef cattle, works as salesman.

Dalton Windham farms near Duck Hill and works part time in Grenada.

Ernest Windham farms near Duck Hill and works part time in Greneda.

E. B. Wray, Jr., farms 9 miles east of Duck Hill, has row crop and grade beef herd operation.

In addition, Mr. Trapp, the vocational-agriculture instructor, holds an honorary American farmer degree.

Where Does Liberty End and Protection Start?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about Ezra Taft Benson, the highly controversial Secretary of Agriculture. It is generally known that the Secretary starts all speeches and closes them with a plea that his policies have only one basic objective—lower prices for food and more liberty for the farmer. This editorial very clearly points out the difficulties of trying to put into practice such a policy.

I commend this editorial from the Goodland Daily News of Goodland. Situated on the high plains of Kansas, a geographical area of clear vision and cloudless skies, but at times some of these theories get a bit murky and smog-covered.

The editorial follows:

WHERE DOES LIBERTY END AND PROTECTION START?

"Doc" Benson, Secretary of Agriculture came up with such a curious prescription for these times you couldn't be expected to believe he originated it unless you read it in such a reliable place as herewith. Something has to be done, says the Secretary, because farmers are not responding to the "old prosperity pills" provided by present farm aid programs.

The main trouble with the farmers today is their cost of operation has risen $3 billion, $7 million in the last 7 years—a billion dollars more than their realized income. The Secretary points out the old price support program was written to cope with a depression, changed to help fight a war, revised again to meet the need of peace. It has been an expensive effort but it hasn't solved the farm problem.

The Secretary didn't mention it but he might have added the farm problem is so variable, complicated, huge, it never will be solved to the satisfaction of us all. But Benson has a program for the Nation's 22 million farm people, and he contends they are entitled to it. That's where the incredible part comes in, considering the regimentation most of us believe essential to controlled production which we are assured is essential to the farm program we have. Benson recommends these four freedoms:

More freedom to plant so farms can be operated efficiently.

More freedom to market so farm incomes can be increased.

More freedom to meet competition so markets can be expanded.

More freedom from government interference so farmers again may be independent and self-reliant.

Wonderful, wonderful. Benson's dimming popularity should take on added luster, in the fashion of applause accorded any loud expounder and champion of patriotism, motherhood, integrity, justice.

Few farmers would refuse any of the four freedoms. Most of them demand the last. But the belief persists that a few years out in the cold of depending on individual resources, while all about our complicated civilization was doling out unemployment checks and assured profits on armament contracts, would send men of the soil back to Congress for protection. Thus, Doc Benson, this is no time for snoozin' by the haystack, straw hat over your eyes, dreamin'.

Kansas wheat farmers have been essentially honest in the acreage allotment program over the years, according to William C. Farmer, United States district attorney for Kansas, whose duty is to prosecute if anyone seeks to defraud the Government on any farm program. Since the wheat allotment program was started his office has obtained judgment on more than 70 cases and has 20 pending. Most of the charges involve overplanting. Some cases are concerned with disputes between ASC committees and farmers over measurements. Considering the thousands of farmers who have operated under the Government program there has been only insignificant chiseling.

Florida Playing Vital Part in National Trend Southward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find an excellent summation of Florida's growing importance in the national picture in a recent column by Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr. It is entitled "Florida Playing Vital Part in National Trend Southward." It appeared in the Florida Times Union. I believe that it will be interesting to all the Members of Congress.

FLORIDA PLAYING VITAL PART IN NATIONAL TREND SOUTHWARD

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

Look up and not down; look forward and not back; look out and not in; and lend a hand.

Florida is playing a leading role in one of the most thrilling economic dramas—one of the most significant movements—ever staged in America.

Surface appearances which point up this fact are convincingly attested by facts assembled by the United States Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce and published by the latter Federal agency.

Statistics embodying the story of what is happening usually cover the entire South or the Southeast. They are broken down, however, to show the part each of the several States has in the dramatic trend of movement from the North to the South, and what the respective States are doing independent of that trend.

A look at the whole picture prompts thinking of the utmost significance to the American people in their confusion and dissatisfaction over the disruption of the long-standing status quo.

Conclusions are encouraged by mediations thus produced which augur well for a future that is not entirely unforeseeable.

Substance is given the southward trek by the news release from the office of Rufe B. Newman, Jr., manager of the Jacksonville Department of Commerce office showing the region as leading other regions in gain in motor-vehicle registrations, telephones in operation, and value of cattle on farms.

And the fact that it was second among all regions in rate of increased expenditures for plant and equipment, electric energy produced, retail sales, per capita personal income, industrial and commercial firms in operation, airline passenger transportation, value of commercial broilers produced, and cash farm income.

A phase of the trend thus depicted that is particularly interesting, and important from the national viewpoint, is the increase made in foreign trade through Florida ports and others of the Southeast.

Efforts to build up the country's foreign aid are being given almost as much attention as the defense program. It is stressed as a major weapon against the economic recession which is now plaguing America—and rightly so.

And while the talk goes on Florida ports are leading the region in foreign-trade development, with the exception of the giant, New Orleans.

A total of $3,766,900,000 worth of exports and imports passed through the ports of the region, composed of Florida, Mobile, New Orleans, and the Carolinas last year.

These figures represented an increase of $615,800,000 over 1956. All of the six customs districts shared in the gains in the total trade.

Florida's gain is especially noteworthy. In total trading the ports of this State registered a gain from $629.9 million to $792.7 million. These figures are more than double those of any of the other ports except New Orleans.

These regional port figures appear very small, of course, when they are compared with the dozen or so big ports of the country. But they show gains, which is a vital factor in the current situation in the United States.

And that word "situation" is filled with significant meaning at this time. It takes into consideration the waterfront racketeering in New York City, the aggravating nuisances maintained there and at others of the big ports by people who have much to do with getting ships in and out of docks.

It also includes the national trend of thought that is centering more and more upon the desirability of living in this section than elsewhere, the result of great numbers seeking refuge from the evils of loose-thinking reformers among the country's political and judicial leadership.

Examine whatever phase of the economy of Florida and her neighboring States you may, and you will find the conditions equally as favorable, some perhaps more so, as those prevailing with the ports. And it is interesting to note here that the Department of Commerce is doing an excellent job of translating Census Bureau facts into informative news articles on the subject.

Florida, for example, is building better highways at the rate of close to $100 million worth a year. Keeping pace therewith is the program of expanding educational facilities to include another expensive university setup at Tampa, and junior colleges within easy reach of all young people in every section.

Of all the progress that is to be noted, however, the churches take the lead. If spiritual development could be measured by the number and scope of new sanctuaries and church-educational buildings, Florida might quickly become the object of the whole religious world in recognition of the leadership here.

The fact of primary interest in the statewide evaluation, however, is that Florida is moving forward in population more than 4,000 persons a week, and otherwise in a way that acts like a magnet.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Beamer, John V., *Ind.* 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Byrne, Emmet P., *Ill.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio.* The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn.*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa.*
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William A., *Utah.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J.*
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md.*
Dies, Martin, *Tex.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa.* 3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.* 3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Myron V., *Kans.* 3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky.* 2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Hale, Robert, *Maine.* 2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind.* The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.* 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del.*
Hays, Brooks, *Ark.* 314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Heselton, John W., *Mass.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hill, William S., *Colo.* 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa.* 200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio.* The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.* 3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J.* 2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.* 1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.* The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn.*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak.* 112 Schotts Court NE.

Appendix

Texas Representative's Work Commended by Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Snooping," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, commending the work being done by an able and distinguished young Representative from Texas, my very good friend, the honorable JACK BROOKS, of the Second Congressional District of Texas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNOOPING

It is indeed, as Representative JACK BROOKS, of Texas, so indignantly put it, "a disgraceful, ethically reprehensible thing for a big, national firm to send detectives snooping into the personal life of a Government official with whom they must deal in business." Representative BROOKS was referring to the Freeport Sulphur Co. which, according to testimony, hired a special investigator a year ago to dig up hometown dirt on Ira D. Beynon, an official of the General Services Administration, who was being a somewhat stubborn negotiator.

The president of the Freeport Sulphur Co. sought to justify what his company had done on the very basis commonly employed in justification of the Government's personnel investigating techniques. "Any honorable man would have no objection whatever to being investigated," he declared grandiloquently. "Why Mr. Beynon should feel so damaged by having people ask questions about him, I don't understand." An explanation which may prove helpful was offered long ago by Thomas Erskine May in his Constitutional History of England:

"Next in importance to personal freedom is immunity from suspicion and jealous observation. Men may be without restraints upon their liberties; they may pass to and fro at pleasure; but if their steps are tracked by spies and informers, their words noted down for crimination, their associates watched as conspirators, who shall say that they are free?

"Nothing is more revolting to Englishmen than the espionage which forms part of the administrative system of continental despotism. It haunts men like an evil genius, chills their gayety, restrains their wit, casts a shadow over their friendships and blights their domestic hearth."

A Religious Leader's View of the Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I received a message from Father Peter Minwegen, O. M. I., of the Shrine of Our Lady of Sorrows, Rhineland, Mo., about the fundamental importance of preserving our family-operated farming system.

Father Minwegen warns that the present farm policies are destroying our family farms, and inexorably replacing them with a form of collective agriculture which he says is close kin to the collective farms of the communistic countries. This strikes me as an extremely significant point. Truly, there is more similarity between a farming system in which the work is done by laborers who are hired by the communistic state and one in which the workers are hired by a big coorporation than there is between either of them and the traditional family-sized farm owned by the family that does the work.

Father Minwegen's warning is clear and blunt. "The trend toward the large industrialized business farm is evident," he says. "Unless the wisdom of honest statesmen change the present course, this country will be a land of collective farms like Russia, with the difference that over there communism has used compulsion, while here the silent but irresistible power of capitalism will have achieved the same end."

Mr. President, this warning from a Catholic clergyman should be taken most seriously. I agree most emphatically with Father Minwegen that the collective farm is wrong. It is wrong not merely because it is communistic; it is wrong because it deprives people of their opportunity for dignity and individual integrity, whether it is a communistic collective or a corporation-owned collective. It behooves all of us to heed Father Minwegen's warning—which I have heard echoed by many religious thinkers of many denominations—and to take the action that is necessary to preserve and improve the opportunities of our farm families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Father Minwegen's statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that others can share his wise counsel.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: Speaking frequently in farmer communities and having lived among farmers many years, I have been asked the question: "Why is it that few Congressmen—if any at all—have the courage to come out openly and unequivocally in favor of the family farm? If in their legislative actions they did take a courageous stand in favor of the family-size farm it would be a great step toward the ultimate solution of the most vexing farm problem.

Here are my reasons for this statement.

The Secretary of Agriculture, E. T. Benson, recognizes farming only as an economic unit, producing food and fiber for the Nation. He is logical and consistent in favoring the mechanized industrial superfarm, because from his exclusive viewpoint of production it is more efficient than the small family farm. The superfarms grow and expand from year to year while the number of farmers and farms decreases. It sounds like cynical boasting, when we are told that the per capita income of the farmer has increased for everybody knows that when agricultural income is divided among fewer participants, the per capita share is larger.

The superfarm or business farm is in the field of production only for profit, or for no other purpose than making money, while the family farm seeks also to provide the means of existence.

The superfarm can survive, even become prosperous, on a return of 10 percent of his investment. The family-size farmer cannot make a living on 10 percent on his investment and his labor. It is not the small existence farm of the rural family, but the huge industrialized superfarm which creates the surpluses, forces down the market price and in the case of the Soil Bank and price supports reaps the real benefits. Even on a small margin he can make money, because of the large acreage. Thus he becomes the worst competitor and enemy of the family farm.

The average family farmer has not got the arable land to put into the Soil Bank. When he is notified that he has planted 16½ acres of wheat, while he was entitled only to 15, and that he has to plow under 1½ acres, if he wants to obtain price support and that this so-called parity-price support has dwindled down to almost nothing, he wonders how he can make a living. He is inclined to believe that the farm policy of the Government is more of a curse than a benefit to the small family farm. Congressmen ought to realize that the rural family is not only an economic unit engaged in agriculture, but also a social unit in the life of the Nation. Only when considered in this dual role can it become a source of blessings for the whole country.

If a choice is to be made between the superfarm and the family farm, there can be no

question which of the two ought to be preferred. It should not be considered unjust discrimination or favoritism if the laws of the land favored those who seek the means of existence, while engaged in providing food for the Nation, as against those who use agriculture only for the purpose of making money. Let us admit that it will be difficult to define a family-size farm. Taking into account the variety of farm products, which may be dairy, cattle, hogs, poultry, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, etc., it would be impossible to define it by the acreage, but it could be done on the basis of net income. Let us say, tentatively, a family farm is a farm that has a net annual income of less than $6,000.

Suppose for one moment that only such family farms enjoyed a modified Soil Bank and real parity price support, look at the revolutionary yet beneficious social and economic results:

1. It would discourage the expansion and the monopolistic tendencies of the superfarm.

2. It would reduce the surpluses to a minimum and with it the million-dollar-a-day storage fees for such surpluses.

3. The Soil Bank would not have to pay immense amounts for huge tracts of land that lie idle while an absentee landlord in a faraway metropolis harvests large profits by doing nothing.

4. It would give the family farmer the means of modernizing his farming methods and thus become more efficient.

5. It would keep the young people in the country instead of going to the city to swell the number of unemployed.

6. It would put sense into the policy of the Government, which is often contradictory in itself, defeating its own avowed purposes. At present the United States Government spends millions of dollars on soil conservation, irrigation, flood control, fertilizers, all sorts of local and Federal agencies to promote and stimulate agricultural production, and then spends untold millions again to restrict it.

7. The party that would come out in deeds, not in campaign promises only, might lose some campaign contributions, but would make up in votes from the desperate rural districts.

CONCLUSION

The trend toward the large industrialized business farm is evident. Unless the wisdom of honest statesmen change the present course, this country will be a land of collective farms, like Russia, with the difference that over there communism has used compulsion, while here the silent but irresistible power of capitalism will have achieved the same end.

If the policy of the past 20 years is continued, the family farm will be supplanted by an army of poor tenants, sharecroppers, and hired men, all working to concentrate more wealth in the hands of a few.

The honest politician who runs for office should let the voters know where he stands.

P. J. MINWEGEN, O. M. I.

RHINELAND, MO.

The Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on April 11, 1958, the Manchester Union Leader, of Manchester, N. H., published an editorial entitled "Tiffany Is Dead Wrong." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIFFANY IS DEAD WRONG

Despite the fact that both New Hampshire Senators are supporting Gordon M. Tiffany for the post of Staff Director of the new Civil Rights Commission, it is apparent to this newspaper that the latter's thinking on civil rights leaves much to be desired.

One would think, after the Little Rock debacle, that the folly of sending Federal troops into a sovereign State to force integration has been clearly established. And several outstanding legal authorities have pointed out the illegality of the President's action so vividly that proponents of Federal intervention will not even debate the issue any more.

But along comes Tiffany to announce that he still believes the use of force is permissible. During hearings of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on his nomination, Tiffany said he would not oppose the use of Federal troops to enforce school integration, "when necessary and as a last resort."

Apparently, the legality or illegality of the use of Federal troops is an issue that concerns Tiffany not at all.

New Hampshire would like to be proud of Tiffany's service on the Civil Rights Commission. Let us hope he changes his thinking on this issue between now and Senate ratification of his appointment.

Progress in Science and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is much evidence of a deep interest in the Congress and in the country in the matter of scientific progress. I am confident that all my colleagues are anxious to maintain a reasonable rate of progress in science and technology, but sometimes they do not find the proper means to bring this about. I call their attention to the letter which I ask to have printed in the RECORD. I believe it will give them valuable information on this subject. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1958.

DR. FRED COLE,
Academic Vice President,
Tulane University,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR DR. COLE: I venture to address you on a matter which, it seems to me, at least, affects Tulane University both as an institution of higher learning and as related to a problem which is of the utmost concern to the national interest.

In recent years leaders in education have been pointing out that while the American people excel in technology and applied science, they have done little to develop pure or theoretical science. In particular, the presidents of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of the California Institute of Technology have been active in voicing publicly their anxiety over this deficiency. Americans have performed miracles of applied science and extended its benefits to millions of citizens; but despite this admirable fact there has been little or no pure science developed in the United States. True, we have had J. Willard Gibbs, and we now have Linus Pauling; but we have not and we never have had any great theoretical scientists of the calibre of a Newton, a Darwin, an Einstein, or a Planck. But the problem was not generally recognized either as a real or as an acute one, until the Russians fired the two artificial satellites late last year, since when governmental official as well as many scientific authorities have changed what was a deep concern into a loud alarm. It has become painfully obvious that where no pure science exists, applied science must eventually suffer, because applied science is just what the term suggests: science which has been applied; and "science" here means "pure science."

Perhaps the distinction can be made clear by a definition of terms. "Science" can be defined as "the search for natural law," more specifically as "the search for those mathematically framed laws which are suggested by the examination of instrumentally discovered data below ordinary levels of analysts." "Pure science" is the traditional European term, "basic research" the recent American equivalent. "Applied science" is "the application to human problems of knowledge gained by the scientific method." "Technology" is applied science discovered through the method of trial-and-error at the level of ordinary experience. Now, the paradox is well understood in some quarters that before fruitful applications can be worked, the scientific knowledge involved must first be developed. Conic sections were discovered some 15 hundred years before their high applicability to engineering was known. Faraday discovered the principles underlying the dynamo in his wife's kitchen. When he presented the information to the Royal Society, he was asked of what use it was, and he is said to have replied, "Of what use is a new born baby?" Neither he nor anyone in his time could have foreseen the enormous size and number of the dynamos manufactured nowadays by a single company, say General Electric. There was a considerable lapse of time between his discovery, which was a piece of pure science or of basic research, and the lighting of our cities, which is an application of the highest utility. Again, relatively physics and quantum mechanics were discoveries made by Einstein and Planck in the search for pure scientific knowledge and without any thought of their possible practical results. Yet without them, atomic energy would never have been available. Two separate sets of scientists, with two distinct types of interest, are involved: ivory tower scientists, such as Einstein, to develop the knowledge of natural laws; and practical-minded scientists, such as Enrico Fermi and Edward Teller, to reduce the knowledge of natural laws to useful forms. We have specialized in the latter, and neglected the former almost altogether, with the result that we are in the predicament that everyone now recognizes, with the Russians threatening to take the lead in scientific developments.

It is true that pure and applied science now interact greatly to the benefit of both types of inquiry and research. But while pure and applied science aid each other and so have a common aim, they also have their separate aims. Things can only be properly related if they are first properly distinguished. And we cannot hope to make the proper arrangements between pure and applied science unless we have both of them to work with.

In the past we have depended upon Western Europe for pure science while we have

counted on ourselves to discover and utilize practices. Now, of course, there is no reason to take a nationalistic view of this division or to be chauvinistic about science. Science is by its very nature to some extent transcultural. For what we can learn about the regularities of behavior of phenomena do not, except in social matters, confine themselves to any one culture but must be true throughout the world. Thus if we could count upon Western Europe to continue to produce pure science in the future as it has in the past, it would mean that together with our splendid abilities at application, there would be no reason in particular to feel the need to cultivate pure science here. But is this an acceptable picture of the state of affairs? Given the condition of Europe today, it is more likely that wars of depletion and economic changes may retard or even prevent the kind of theoretical development in science we so urgently need. So it may devolve upon us to supply the deficiency in order that science itself may survive in the free world. If Western Europe has faltered, then we must produce pure as well as applied science—if only for practical purposes.

Strangely enough, the universities have fallen further behind in the development of pure science (or, if you prefer, of basic research) than have the industrial laboratories. Ordinarily one might suppose that the work would be neatly divided: The science departments in universities would be concerned primarily with pure science and the industrial laboratories, very appropriately, with applied science; but such is simply not the case. Among the few important developments in pure science in recent years, both information theory (Claude Shannon) and radio astronomy (Carl Jansky) have come out of the Bell Telephone Co. laboratories.

It might be useful to see how this has happened; for although we are more concerned with the future than we are with the past, we can take steps to correct the omission better if we know more clearly what has been responsible for it. Ours has been a pioneering society in which the practical problem always presented exigencies more importunate than important. We derived our theory from our practice, and put the practice first, not understanding the value to practice of the pursuit of pure theory for its own sake. Investment in pure theory is the way in which a society provides for its own future practice. We did not see fit to make an investment, and we have remained of such a mind until the Russian satellites drove home the penalty.

Such tendencies of emphasis and neglect as I have been endeavoring to describe do not come about by chance. I take it that the implicit philosophy of a society has a strong influence on the direction of that society's interests. Pragmatism as developed by by James was popular not because it introduced anything new but rather because it reflected, in abstract and succinct form, principles which everyone instictively believed already. What works is true James asserted, a sharp reversal of what his friend and mentor Peirce, the philosophical physicist, had said, that what is found to be true (according to the experimental method of science) will also work.

Pragmatism has been succeeded by logical positivism, a timid philosophy which points with pride to the scientific achievements while limiting the imaginative daring that has made science a success. In a well known study made in 1932, E. A. Burtt pointed out that behind every great scientific genius in the European tradition, there had stood the training in metaphysics which made possible the development of fruitful hypotheses by means of the controlled imagination. I have heard the same claim of the value of philosophy to science by such men as Carrel, Einstein, and other European scientists. In books and journal articles published in 1937 and after, I have pointed to the absence of pure science in the United States, and the danger to applied science which results. The failure of theoretical philosophy has accompanied and reinforced the neglect of theoretical science.

The purpose of this letter is not merely to point out a difficulty, however, but to suggest possible remedies. The difficulties are out in the open at last, but the remedies are not so obvious. Genius cannot be purchased at will, nor the scientific imagination developed in a hurry. Our problem may be stated as follows. In a problem which affects the whole Nation but which is primarily intellectual by nature, what can the universities contribute?

The first and most obvious answer suggested would be an earnest and deliberate effort to develop pure science. Applied science can be left to the industrial laboratories, whose business it is. Pure science, the search for abstract knowledge for its own sake, is peculiarly germane to the function of higher education. It is so recognized already in the humanities; it ought to be recognized equally by the sciences, just as it has been for centuries in European universities. Sciences departments ought to be urged to encourage pure over applied scientific pursuits.

The second and adjunctive step which could be taken in the university would be to promote courses in scientific method, in order to make clear the presuppositions, aims, and methods of the natural sciences. There could be undergraduate courses in the philosophy of science and, more particularly, in scientific method. In addition there could be faculty seminars devoted to these topics at a more advanced level. Cross-field courses, conducted by experts in scientific method and aided perhaps by illustrations furnished by teachers in the natural sciences: Physics, chemistry and biology, could be of immense service. We canot hope to develop pure science within the university unless our teaching staff and their students know what it is.

I trust you will not feel that in bringing up this topic I have exceeded my authority or that my motives are other than those indicated. If I can furnish any additional information in connection with this letter, I will be only too happy to try.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. FEIBLEMAN.

(A sample list of illustrative references: Edwin Arthur Burtt, The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science (London 1932, Kegan Paul); Bernard Jaffe, Outposts of Science (New York 1935, Simon & Schuster), p. xxi ff.; James Feibleman, Christianity, Communism, and the Ideal Society (London 1937, Allen & Unwin), ch. V; The Place of Science in Human Culture, Annals of Allergy for September–October 1954.)

How UAW Fights a Senator—And Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of this date, under the heading "How UAW Fights a Senator—And Why." The article has reference to the contest in Michigan and the opposition which is being raised to the distinguished Senator from that State [Mr. POTTER].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW UAW FIGHTS A SENATOR—AND WHY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Politics in Michigan offers a revealing case study of what a progressive Republican Senator is up against in an election in which the union leaders are implacably fighting him.

The candidate is the incumbent Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, who himself used to polish gears at Pontiac and who has a voting record which gives him a valid appeal to labor rank and file.

But the Michigan labor leaders, for reasons of their own, want no part of the liberal Republican war veteran. Their technique is to do everything in their power to make it impossible for him to put his case directly to the bulk of union membership.

The effect is to shield the union membership from an even-handed presentation of the campaign issues and, with minute exceptions, to prevent labor rallies from hearing candidates whom the leaders want to see defeated.

Here is what has been happening in recent days:

1. Senator POTTER was served with a "not welcome" notice after he had agreed to address a meeting to which he had been invited by the board of directors of the Federal credit union of the Ford Rouge plant employees. It had been all arranged. The date had been set. Mr. POTTER had accepted. Then the Senator got a telephone call from Detroit advising him that some officials of the union were displeased with the invitation and explaining that it would take his hosts off the spot if he did not appear. The credit union is a part of local 600, the biggest United Automobile Workers local with some 65,000 members.

HEARS PARTY ATTACKED

2. When it proved too embarrassing to erect a complete wall, without a single chink, between Senator POTTER and labor union membership, President Paul Silver, of the UAW Local 351, wrote a letter to the Senator openly questioning the sincerity of your professed desire to meet shop workers face to face, but inviting him to speak at a meeting. Mr. POTTER accepted immediately. The chairman introduced him with a 25-minute tirade against the Republican Party. Following the speech and question-and-answer period August Scholle, president of the Michigan AFL–CIO council, put on an act mimicking the Senator's speaking mannerisms and sarcastically attacking his views.

3. The UAW headquarters in Detroit is constantly pointing to the fact that Senator POTTER refuses to appear on a UAW radio-television program as evidence that the union is eager for Mr. POTTER to speak to their members and that it is the Senator who refuses. Senator POTTER'S view is that this is a fraud and a facade, that the UAW knows he will not appear on a radio-TV political program which he considers financed by a misuse of union dues and a violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

These events persuade Senator POTTER the UAW leaders want so badly to see him defeated that they are determined, so far as possible, to keep him from carrying his campaign directly to the UAW membership.

The puzzling question is: Why? Why should the union leadership be so intent upon shielding the union membership from hearing at their meetings both sides of the Senatorial campaign so that the members themselves could measure the merits of the candidates?

I can think of two reasons; perhaps there are others.

WILLIAMS BOOST SEEN

One is that UAW President Walter Reuther and his associates want to see Democratic Gov. Mennen Williams reelected for his sixth term by the largest possible majority to further his chances of getting the Presidential nomination in 1960.

The other is that Senator POTTER has such a sound pro-labor record—on current antirecession measures AFL–CIO officials in Washington scored him 75 to 85 percent on their side—that if he were allowed direct access to labor rank and file he might well win substantial labor support for himself and, as a byproduct, cut down Mr. Williams' vote for the governorship.

The massive opposition of union leadership to Senator POTTER may backfire as it did against Senator Taft in Ohio in 1950. Obviously Senator POTTER is not going to lie down and roll over.

Communities List Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I continue to receive letters from the executive officers of Wisconsin communities telling me their reactions to the Community Facilities Act of 1958, which was passed by the Senate recently.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letters I have received from the mayors of the cities of Cudahy, Kenosha, and Wausau in my State of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUDAHY, WIS., *April 18, 1958.*
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Select Committee on Small Business,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I have reviewed your proposed legislation designed to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (S. 3497). It is my understanding that the proposed legislation would authorize the extension of credit to assist in the provision of essential public works or facilities by States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions of States, where such credit is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms or conditions.

In common with most units of government the city of Cudahy has a large number of desirable public improvements that could be included in a public-works program. It would also be desirable to expand some of the public services of the city. A list of the desirable projects for the city of Cudahy together with an estimated cost of this work is attached to this letter for your information.

At the present time I do not feel that your proposed legislation would have any real benefit to the city of Cudahy. The city has in the past financed various improvements through the issuance of revenue bonds, general obligation bonds and through direct loans with various banks in Malwaukee County. The city has had no difficulty in raising money through these means at an interest rate comparable with what is proposed in your bill.

I believe that serious study should be made both in the Federal and State legislative bodies to deriving additional sources of revenue not only for the city of Cudahy but also including all municipalities. The expansion of the city of Cudahy and an ever increasing demand for improved public services has resulted in the city's expenses rising faster than its revenues. As expenses rise an ever increasing burden is placed upon the property owner. I believe that the elimination of the Federal excise tax would have beneficial effect on the purchasing power of this community.

Please be assured that the city of Cudahy and I will be most happy to cooperate with you at any time in the solution of our mutual problems.

Very truly yours,
VINCENT TOTKA,
Mayor.

Desirable public improvements

1. Lake Michigan water intake	$600,000
2. Incinerator	300,000
3. Elementary school	900,000
4. Addition to municipal garage	50,000
5. Extension of storm-sewer system	+2,000,000
6. Additional water-storage facilities	400,000
7. Addition to the high school	500,000
8. Off-street parking facilities	100,000
9. Street improvements and grade separations	1,000,000

KENOSHA, WIS., *April 18, 1958.*
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: The legislation you proposed, for the financing of a Federal program to aid and assist communities for the construction and planning of public-works projects, would greatly affect our community and enable it to provide necessary work and facilities.

The attached sheet lists projects which are needed by the city of Kenosha and have been scheduled for some time for construction, if and when funds are available.

Respectfully yours,
EUGENE R. HAMMOND,
Mayor.

PROPOSED PROJECTS

1. Construct storm-sewer outlets at Lake Michigan, $250,000.
2. Rebuild and reline sewers, $610,000.
3. Construct garage for meter shop and water department warehouse, $15,000.
4. Additions at sewage-treatment plant and secure property, $250,000.
5. Asphalt surface 5 miles of streets and rebuild curbing, $620,000.
6. Widen and pave 5 miles of urban designated streets, $3,650,000.
7. Construct storage building for street department and pave yard area, $75,000.
8. Construct 30 miles curb and gutter on unpaved streets, $650,000.
9. Widen and pave 30th Avenue from 52d Street to 75th Street, $365,000.
10. Widen and pave Roosevelt Road, $255,000.
11. Install new ornamental lighting system, $280,000.
12. Install street lights on Lincoln Road Boulevard, $20,000.
13. Construct new city hall and police station, $2,200,000.
14. Construct fire station, $200,000.
15. Construct additional dock warehouse, $200,000.
16. Construct steel sheeting in harbor area, $180,000.

WAUSAU, WIS., *April 14, 1958.*
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of March 29, 1958, with reference to the legislation that you are cosponsoring in the Senate to make low-interest loans available to local governments for public works projects.

In studying the Senate bill S. 3497 to which you referred, I feel that as far as the city of Wausau is concerned, that Wausau cannot gain too much by this legislation. The city itself is in a situation where they can go out on the market and issue bonds at approximately the same rate as this legislation offers at this time. Either way it is done; there is a direct obligation on the city to meet the payments.

However, I do think that this bill has some merits for some of the smaller municipalities or cities, that have a bond limitation to contend with and I believe these localities could gain some relief through this type of legislation. It would help these localities in that they may find themselves in a situation whereby they may have to request extension of time on interest and payments of these obligations, but where a city is in a situation where they can for the most part get money at approximately the same figure as quoted in your letter or perhaps a little better, there is no need for this type of legislation. But where localities are in such situation that their bond limits are restricted to the point where they have difficulty in going out to seek funds for public works, they could get relief through this type of help from the Federal Government.

I hope that this information will be of interest to you and to all those that are concerned in promoting public-work activity at this time.

Yours truly,
ARTHUR M. SMITH, *Mayor.*

Fine Work of the Committee on the Handicapped of the People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions it has been my pleasure to salute the various committees of the people-to-people program.

This is the program, as we recall, inaugurated by President Eisenhower, but carried on by private, voluntary groups throughout our land, in contact with their opposite numbers abroad.

There are few, if any, of these grand groups of leading men and women whom it gives me more pleasure to commend than the distinguished Americans who are contributing their time and talents to the work of the committee on the handicapped.

For, through this means, the people of the United States, outstanding citizens who have specialized in aiding our own handicapped, are extending the hand of friendship and help to individuals abroad, interested in this same goal. The hearts of men of good will will be touched by American efforts in this field

in as stirring a fashion as can be achieved in almost any other field.

I send to the desk a list of the Handicapped Committee's members together with other background information, forwarded at my request, by Mr. William P. McCahill, executive assistant of this committee of the people-to-people program.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET OF THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM, COMMITTEE FOR THE HANDICAPPED, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAJ. GEN. MELVIN J. MAAS, USMCR, RETIRED, CHAIRMAN

The committee for the handicapped was formed at the request of President Eisenhower as 1 of 41 people-to-people program committees. It has adopted the following three objectives:

1. Stimulate and facilitate by all available mediums a continuing exchange of information on techniques, treatments, devices, and procedures in rehabilitating crippled children and adults and in employing the handicapped of all nations. Such interchanges should include stimulation of counterpart organizations and activities in and between the United States and other countries.

2. Through all available mediums, including direct correspondence and other personal means, project abroad an understanding of United States activities for the handicapped to show that they are a natural outgrowth of the spiritual and moral character of the American people and an evidence of our respect for human dignity.

3. Utilize and strengthen existing programs of United States organizations relative to their interest in international programs for the handicapped.

The keynote to action was sounded by General Maas at the first meeting of the committee for the handicapped on December 5, 1956, when he told members:

"We have an opportunity to do something in the way of action that will demonstrate to the whole world the superior benefits of democracy, to show to the world that under democracy we care about people. Probably the greatest distinguishing characteristic between communism and democracy is the attitude toward people. Nowhere is the humanitarian attitude toward people better demonstrated than in what people do for their unfortunates, their handicapped, and our program in this country, of rehabilitation and the ultimate objective of rehabilitation—a suitable job for the man or woman who has been given vocational training, will certainly make a tremendous impression on the rest of the world, and certainly in the Asian and African world, where such large numbers of their people are physically handicapped, and where traditionally for centuries, nothing has been done for them."

The committee for the handicapped welcomes cooperation from all professional and volunteer workers in the fields of rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped, particularly those whose business or personal contacts make it possible for them to travel abroad.

COMMITTEE FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Chairman

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, chairman, President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Mr. William P. McCahill, assistant to the chairman, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Members

Graham Anthony, Veeder Root Corp., Hartford, Conn.

Leo Axlrod, Empire Furniture Factory and Rattan Works, 4118 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla.

M. Robert Barnett, executive director, American Foundation for the Blind, 15 West 16th Street, New York, N. Y.

Alfred Canel, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, Chamber of Commerce Building, Miami, Fla.

John A. DeChant, Public Relations, 425 13th Street, Washington, D. C.

George P. Delaney, international representative, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Henry H. Kessler, Kessler Institute, 53 Lincoln Park, Newark, N. J.

Boniface R. Maile, 3025 Cadillac Towers, Detroit, Mich.

Leonard W. Mayo, director, Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Ross T. McIntire, executive director, International College of Surgeons, 1516 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Laurence Melton, Melton Printing Co., 3920 Commerce Street, Dallas, Tex.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, associate editor, New York Times, 230 West 41st Street, New York, N. Y.

Harold Russell, 212 East Central Street, Natick, Mass.

Dr. Douglas Toffelmier, 426 17th Street, Oakland, Calif.

P. J. Trevethan, executive vice president, Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., 1229 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Henry Viscardi, Jr., president, Abilities, Incorporated, 59 Hempstead Gardens Drive, West Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y.

Hubert L. Will, Nelson, Boodell & Will, 105 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Donald V. Wilson, secretary general, International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, 701 First Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Observers

Miss Phyllis Francis, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Ralph Wright, International Labor Office, 917 15th Street, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Harold Williams, Specialist for Exceptional Children and Youth, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

John Lawyer, Office of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Sarah S. Dietrick, M. D., Director, Division of International Cooperation, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

OUR MISSION AND OUR ALLIES

(Address by William McCahill, executive assistant, handicapped committee, at civic committee luncheon of the people-to-people program)

The people-to-people program, although essentially one of individual contact, works best when properly organized and directed through groups and organizations which agree upon certain objectives and plans and then turn the execution of these mutually agreable missions to individuals like you and me.

The various autonomous committees of the people-to-people program movement have at least one common denominator, they are dealing with people. It is true that we are going about this program on more than 40 different highways, but at the end of each road is the man, woman or child in a faraway country.

There is an additional common denominator between our civil committee and the committee for the handicapped on which I also serve. Each of these individual human beings we mean to reach through various aspects of people-to-people program, belongs to some community organization. Man, being a social being, gathers himself into some kind of organized society no matter where he lives in this tired planet. Thus, there is a civic common denominator whereever men live.

At the same time, there is nothing more universal about human beings than the fact that regardless of creed, color or national origin, they all have the same human, destructible, physical attributes. Whatever the contient, the chemistry of the body is essentially the same. And, the resulting physical handicaps.

I could, if we had the time, probably draw a similar analogy between the civic committee or the handicapped committee (and most of our committees are handicapped one way or other) and the other people-to-people program groups which you have listed in your basic flyer. I shall not, of course, but I believe that it is important for us to remember that in almost every major thing in our lives, peoples of all countries have more similarities than they have differences. This is basic to our people-to-people approach.

After a year of experience with the committee for the handicapped and my first foreign visit this summer for 3 weeks in Europe (not counting an all-expenses-paid tour with the Marines in the Pacific during World War II) I have become more and more enthusiastic about this program on which the President has asked for help.

To those of you who have been doing the job for years through your town affiliation program, as well as to those who are involving yourself for the first time under the banners of the people-to-people program and the President's request, I believe that the most important ingredients you can put into this recipe of world understanding are enthusiasm, imagination, and initiative.

Many centuries ago, Christ told us that we must be either hot or cold and that the lukewarm he would spew out of his mouth. In our own time, Pope Pius XII has said that "it is no longer given to anyone to be mediocre."

In our people-to-people relations we cannot be lukewarm. In this vital program for world understanding and in the battle for men's minds, we cannot afford to be mediocre. This does not mean that we must turn this matter over to the people with I. Q.'s in the genius area. What it does mean is that given enthusiasm, imagination, and initiative, any of us can apply our God-given talents to this great crusade.

Our mission, scientifically stated (and I am no scientist), is to shoot around the world this missile of understanding and get it into orbit so that countless contacts between Americans and peoples of other lands will result in each of us having a better image of our overseas neighbors, neighbors whom we will find have more similarities and more common interests than they have differences or ideological clashes.

If I may presume to suggest one more ingredient of value in this menu which we are preparing, I would think that we might well flavor it at every stage with liberal amounts of humility.

The Sermon on the Mount promised an eternity of blessedness to the peacemakers. This people-to-people program gives all of us a fighting chance to start the world in the true direction of a lasting peace and peace is worth fighting for. If the peoples of the world want peace badly enough, as the President told us last year, their leaders will have to give it to them or be thrown out of office. And you mayors and community leaders know that enlightened public opinion has cleared up many a hopeless local situation.

So too with the world situation. We have a great mission, a real challenge. It is only worthy of our best and if we give it our honest best, making allowances for human failings, we shall get this missile of world understanding into orbit sooner than any of us may suspect.

We have two great allies on our side. In the natural order we have the President of the United States and on the supernatural side we have the God of Peace. How can we lose?

[From Performance, the Story of the Handicapped, issue for February 1957]

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED—A WORLDWIDE PROGRAM

(By Donald V. Wilson, secretary-general, International Society for the Welfare of Cripples)

There is increased interest in all parts of the world in establishing and improving rehabilitation services for the physically handicapped. Many international organizations, including the United Nations, the World Health Organization, and the International Labor Organization, are actively engaged in helping individuals and organizations to establish and improve their programs for training and employment of the handicapped. In addition to these large governmental organizations, there are many voluntary international groups that are participating in this global program. One of these is the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, which has for more than 30 years, been promoting the exchange of experience and technical knowledge so that a country in one part of the world may benefit from the work being done in another.

The International Society is a federation of national organizations in 31 countries which provide services for the rehabilitation and employment of handicapped children and adults. The society has consultative status with the United Nations and maintains official relations with the World Health Organization and other international governmental agencies. The services of the society are provided not only to the member organizations but also to individuals and associations in other countries where services for the handicapped have been established in recent years. Included among the society's services is a publication and translation program which facilitates the exchange of information between countries; and a large film library which contains film from many different countries portraying services for the disabled.

Many individuals and organizations in the United States have been active in the work of the International Society. The National Society for Crippled Children and Adults is the affiliated national organization. Dr. Henry H. Kessler is a member of the council of the International Society, and a former president. Dr. Howard A. Rusk currently serves as president.

THE PROBLEM OF EMPLOYMENT

It is becomingly increasingly evident that the most difficult and challenging phase of rehabilitation is to assist the handicapped person in securing employment that will enable him to function to his maximum ability. In may parts of the world, there has been an interest in the program of the President's Committee for the Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and a number of countries are planning to initiate similar efforts.

In the past, the United States has greatly benefited by the experiences of other countries which have been dealing with the problem of vocational rehabilitation for many years. As early as 1919, an International Conference on Rehabilitation was held in New York as a result of the interest of Mr. Jeremiah Milbank. One of the purposes of this congress was to enable persons from other countries to present their experience which would be useful in developing employment services for the handicapped in this country.

The United States can continue to benefit from what has been undertaken in other countries. For example, it is clear that there is a difference of philosophical viewpoint as to how employment of the handicapped can best be promoted. One group contends that this can be done most efficiently and equitably by legislation that makes it mandatory for all employers to hire a certain percentage of employees who are physically disabled. An opposing viewpoint is that such a quota system is not the best approach and that employers must first be convinced that employment of the disabled is indeed good business. The experience of such countries as the United Kingdom with its quota system has real value for those who are interested in these problems.

INTERNATIONAL RECOMMENDATION

The worldwide interest in the employment of the physically handicapped has been pointed up by the fact that the International Labour Organization, in 1955, adopted a recommendation concerning vocational rehabilitation of the disabled. This recommendation was adopted unanimously by the representatives of 70 countries, who had considered the subject over a period of more than 2 years. Because of the divergent viewpoints concerning the quota system, the following compromise statement was adopted:

"Wherever appropriate in the national circumstances, and consistent with national policy, the employment of disabled persons should be promoted by means such as—

"(a) The engagement by employers of a percentage of disabled persons under such arrangements as will avoid the displacement of nondisabled workers;

"(b) Reserving certain designated occupations for disabled persons;

"(c) Arranging that seriously disabled persons are given opportunities for employment or preference in certain occupations considered suitable for them;

"(d) Encouraging the creation and facilitating the operation of cooperatives or other similar enterprises managed by, or on behalf of, disabled persons."

The important part of this section of the recommendation is the words, "Wherever appropriate in the national circumstances," for it gives due recognition to the inherent differences between countries and encourages diversity of experiment.

In many heavily populated countries where the unemployment ratio is higher, the development of rehabilitation programs and employment opportunities is consequently more difficult. There is not the same economic urgency to hire the handicapped because of shortages of qualified labor. In many of these countries, however, there is a shortage of adequate skilled personnel, and a constantly increasing awareness that such skills should not be lost to the community and the Nation merely because the person suffers a physical disability. Although the economic factors are not as pressing in less developed countries as they are in North America and in Europe, there is, nevertheless, an increasing humanitarian recognition everywhere that all persons should be given an opportunity to be self-supporting and useful.

Because the United States has had extensive experience in this field, particularly during the past 10 or 15 years, people in other countries are eager to learn more about the progress of our programs here. In this area, the President's Committee has a real opportunity not only to serve the handicapped of this country but of sharing the results of its new experience with the rest of the world.

WORLD MEETINGS

A heightened interest in the problem of selective placement also stems from the seminar on this subject which was held in Stockholm in May 1955, with the collaboration of the World Veterans Federation, the International Labor Organization, and the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. During the International Conference on Social Work in Munich this past summer, a large study group considered the social aspects of rehabilitation. These and other international meetings provided the opportunity for many countries to exchange information and experiences, as well as stimulation of current efforts being made.

The Seventh World Congress on Rehabilitation which will be held by the International Society in London, from July 22-26, 1957, promises to be the most widely attended, comprehensive forum of its kind ever staged. This significant meeting will also give major attention to discussions of the social and vocational phases of the rehabilitative process. It will be developed broadly around the keynote, "Planning for Victory Over Disablement," and should engage the attention and personal participation of doctors, nurses, scientists, employment counselors, therapists, social workers, administrators, and other professional groups concerned with any of the interconnected problems of the disabled. The Congress will again also be the occasion for the presentation of three Albert Lasker awards for outstanding achievement of international significance in the development of services for the physically handicapped. For those who are interested in further details of this important forthcoming meeting, a preliminary program, outlining the day-to-day scope of general, special and sectional meetings, is available on request from the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, 701 First Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Defect in Present Excise Taxes on Automobiles and Automobile Parts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters from the Breaux Ballard Co., an automobile dealer in Louisville, Ky., which give the clearest and most comprehensive discussion which has been brought to my attention on the defect of the present excise taxes on automobiles and parts.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAUX BALLARD, CO.,
Louisville Ky., April 17, 1958.

Senator THURSTON B. MORTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR THURS: Enclosed little green sheets indicate the Federal excise taxes that are on Buicks, and I have marked the series. In addition there is a 10 percent tax on all the accessories which on a car fully equipped with automatic transmission, power brakes, power steering, etc., etc., makes an addition of $50 and upwards.

We have lost money every month this year and sales are not getting any better.

Buick itself lost money in the first quarter. I am convinced that every automobile division of General Motors, except possibly Chevrolet and Cadillac lost money the first quarter. (General Motors itself may have made money because of its other allied trades, but I am strictly speaking about Buick, Oldsmobile, Pontiac, etc.)

I would be willing to bet you and every Member of Congress any amount you want, that if these taxes were taken off I could double my sales in the next 30 days and would have to reemploy some of the people I have laid off, as well as raise some salaries we have cut.

The question, Mr. Anthony, is whether these added sales and profits would more than offset the loss of revenue for these taxes. In my opinion, it would.

A few days ago my sales manager and I went over approximately 150 appraisals which we have made in the past 60 days, and in over 75 percent of these we are between $100 and $300 off of what the customer was willing to pay. In checking back on these people they have not bought any automobile, but have simply decided to wait. You can obviously see what removing these excise taxes would mean. Dealers are going out of business like flies. I believe there are only three liquid dealers left in Frankfort, and in New Albany and Jeffersonville in the past 30 days 4 dealers have folded up, and I am sure the situation is far more serious than most people realize.

I am convinced these excise taxes must come off now, and because the automobile business is a big wheel in the economy, this should be the first priority of business and I don't mean 6 months from now, because the problem of moving the inventory before new models will be at hand and nothing will have been done to strengthen sales and production for this summer.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

BREAUX

G. Breaux Ballard, Jr.

Federal excise taxes on Buick automobiles

Series: SPECIAL	Tax
41	$197
43	205
46C	220
46R	200
48	193
49	228
49D	236
Series: CENTURY	
61	239
63	247
66C	264
66R	242
69	274
Series: SUPER	
53	271
56R	261
Series: ROADMASTER	
75	331
75C	332
75R	323
Series: LIMITED	
750	361
756	362
755	353

BREAUX BALLARD CO.,
Louisville, Ky., April 23, 1958.

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR THURSTON: Reference yours of April 21st: It is perfectly agreeable with me to put my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Below I am listing the excise taxes on a special 4-door hardtop, with more or less standard equipment. These, of course, are the direct excise taxes billed to us by the factory and have nothing to do with all the hidden taxes or transportation taxes, etc.:

Car	$205.00
Flight pitch dynaflow	20.63
Heater and defroster	5.25
Power steering	7.50
Radio	7.13
Instrument panel safety pad	1.44
Safety group	2.78
Windshield washer and wide-angle wiper	.98
Deluxe steering wheel	1.13
Easy eye glass	2.63
Air foam seat cushions	1.58
Power brakes	2.78
Accessory group	2.70
White-wall tires	4.13
Air-cooled aluminum brakes	1.39
State tax (3. percent)	90.64
License	5.00
Total	362.69

You will also note that when the State takes their 3 percent of the delivery price of the automobile, they are taking the 3 percent on all the above taxes. In other words, they are taxing a tax. If you are interested in the hundred's of dollars of other taxes on a car, I suggest that you contact the National Automobile Dealer's Association's office in Washington and they can give you the breakdown on all the hidden taxes such as the excise tax on the chrome, tires, glass, and other component parts.

There is no question, whatsoever, in my mind that the buyer's strike on automobiles is directly attributable to prices. We have people that for years have been buying new cars are now buying used cars, and as I pointed out in my other letter, eliminating these taxes would certainly double or more our volume. Further, yesterday we were trying to sell a woman one of our demonstrators and she made us an offer provided we would agree to refund her the excise taxes if Congress removed same. This, of course, we could not do, inasmuch as it is a demonstrator. This is merely to point out that the talk of reducing taxes is making the buyers quite conscious of it, and is in itself affecting sales.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

BREAUX

G. BREUX BALLARD, Jr.,
President.

Restrict Secrecy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the voices of the newspapers of the Nation are being heard in swelling chorus in favor of the bill which prevents Government agencies from using the old housekeeping bill passed by the First Congress to keep secret information which ought to be in the possession of the public.

In my State of Wisconsin the Janesville Daily Gazette, a newspaper with a proud record of 113 years of community service, has spoken out in favor of the principle of the bill which has passed the House of Representatives under the sponsorship of Representative Moss, and which is sponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "To Cut the Secrecy Knot," which appeared in the Janesville Daily Gazette on April 22, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

TO CUT THE SECRECY KNOT

Americans cannot act freely, cannot perform their duties as citizens, cannot preserve what they hold most dear as free citizens if they do not know and understand. They cannot know unless they have access to information. And there is a "hitch" that smothers freedom.

One basic "housekeeping" statute, 168 years old, is used by Government agencies and bureaus as a means or excuse for withholding information from the public to which the public is entitled.

To open the way for public access to information, now bottled up through this old law, the Moss Freedom of Information bill, H. R. 2767, has cleared the House Rules Committee and now is before Congress. It is a simple amendment that prohibits use of the old "housekeeping statute" by those agencies and bureaus to interfere with the public's right to know.

The Moss bill should be passed as it is without change. It has the endorsement of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the Inland Daily Press Association.

All newspapers have an interest in seeing the Moss bill passed. It would go far toward eliminating a lot of unnecessary and dangerous Government secrecy.

Interoceanic Canal Problem: Independent Congressional Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, over a period of many years, first in the House and more recently in the Senate, I have endeavored to secure, by means of a proposed Interoceanic Canals Commission—S. 611—a comprehensive and independent inquiry under congressional authorization of the entire question of interoceanic canals, with the objective of determining the future isthmian canal policy of the United States.

Thus, I note with considerable interest in the March 7, 1958, issue of the Panama Canal Review, the official publication of the Panama Canal Company, an account of the Isthmian Canal Consulting Board appointed by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries pursuant to House Resolution 149, which recently visited the isthmus. It is certainly to be hoped that this body will be able to render substantial services in the premises.

Because the article summarizes the professional records of the distinguished members of this group that ought to be better known and available for future reference, I ask unanimous consent that

the story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the subject article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CONSULTANTS FOR CONGRESS DUE HERE NEXT WEEK

The panel of consultants appointed by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to study Panama Canal transit facilities and other broad phases of the interoceanic canal problem will pay a 5-day visit to the Canal Zone this month.

The group, composed of six prominent members of the engineering profession in the United States, is scheduled to be here from next Tuesday through Saturday. A tentative schedule of activities prepared and submitted to the panel for its approval calls for a busy period. It includes visits to the principal Canal Zone installations, and the provision of much background material on canal operations, and other facets of the problem which is attracting national attention.

The consulting board was named last November by Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which handles canal legislative matters in the House of Representatives. In announcing the appointment, Chairman Bonner said that the special committee consultants are expected to review and reevaluate various proposals which have been made in the past as the result of studies on the isthmian canal problem.

"I feel that it is the urgent responsibility of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to be fully informed concerning the adequacy of the existing canal and the need for additional facilities either in the Canal Zone or at alternate locations in the Central American Isthmus," he stated.

The panel members, all of whom are expected to be here next week, are:

Francis S. Friel, of Philadelphia, president of the engineering firm of Albright & Friel in Philadelphia, and vice president of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, United States Army (retired), of Darien, Conn., formerly head of the Manhattan Project, and now a vice president of Remington-Rand, Inc.

Dr. S. C. Hollister, of Ithaca, N. Y., dean of engineering at Cornell University.

E. Sydney Randolph, of Baton Rouge, La., industrial engineer.

Hartley Rowe, of Boston, vice president of the United Fruit Co.

John E. Slater, of New York City, consulting engineer and senior partner of the firm of Coverdale & Colpitts in New York.

Mr. Rowe and Mr. Randolph are both well acquainted with the canal and its operations. Both were employed here for many years and both held responsible engineering positions with the organization.

Mr. Rowe came to the Isthmus in 1905 and was municipal (now maintenance) engineer when he left the organization in 1919. One of his first jobs with the Isthmian Canal Commission was the location, design, and construction of the masonry dam to provide the water supply for Panama City and zone towns on the Pacific side. During his 14 years here, he had charge of installing much of the electrical and municipal facilities for the canal and for the Army and Navy. Among the Army and Navy projects were France Field and the Coco Solo Submarine Base, for which he had charge of the design and construction.

Mr. Randolph also entered the canal service during the construction period and was continuously employed for almost 36 years before his retirement in March 1946. During this period he held many important engineering posts in the organization, including office engineer, designing engineer, and construction engineer. He was in charge of the design and later the construction of Madden Dam and powerplant. Later, as designing engineer, he was in charge of the early investigation and work on the third locks project.

Mr. Friel has had charge of all engineering work for his firm for the past 26 years. He specializes in numerous fields of engineering, among which are flood control, dams, powerplants, and industrial buildings, and various types of public works.

General Groves is best known for his work as head of the Manhattan project, during which he was in complete charge of the development and planning for the use of the atomic bomb. Among his many important assignments were as officer in charge of construction for the Quartermaster General during mobilization for World War II and as commanding general of the Armed Forces special weapons project for the Department of Defense after the close of the war. Since his retirement, in 1948, he has been associated with Remington Rand.

Dean Hollister has headed the College of Engineering at Cornell for 20 years. His specialties are municipal, structural, and flood-control projects. He has served on many important governmental and private commissions for engineering projects. One of his services to the United States Government was as a member of the Commision on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the Hoover Commission, from 1953 to 1955.

Mr. Slater specializes in transportation and marine engineering. In addition to serving as a member of the consulting engineering firm of Coverdale & Colpitts, he is president and director of the American Export Lines. He also has served 2 years as chairman of the board of the New York Shipbuilding Corp.

They are tentatively scheduled to meet Governor Potter Tuesday morning for a brief orientation. This will be followed by a management review and a description of bureau operations and later in the morning by a flight along the canal route. The afternoon will be largely devoted to a presentation and general discussion of the canal capacity problem, arranged by Lieutenant Governor Arnold.

Among the installations to be visited by the panel members will be locks, Gaillard Cut, and the construction project at Bend 1868, the dredging division, the LeTourneau towing devices at Gatun, Miraflores locks overhaul operations, and the marine control operations at the Balboa port captain's office

Proposed Educational Television Workshop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement that the Radio Corporation of America is to set up an educational television workshop. I wish to congratulate RCA on this progressive step, and I know it will be of interest to all in this country who believe in the necessity of improving our educational system.

In this connection I have also just received notice that the Ford Foundation has made a grant of $1.4 million to the John Hay Whitney Foundation to improve secondary-school teaching. This also is very encouraging. I ask unanimous consent to have this article also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RCA TO SET UP $100,000 EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION WORKSHOP TO DEVELOP AND DISSEMINATE NEW TECHNIQUES FOR NATION'S SCHOOLS—PRESIDENT BURNS TELLS CONVENTION OF NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION THAT UNIQUE PROJECT WILL BE UNDERTAKEN WITH NEW YORK UNIVERSITY—SAYS TV AND OTHER ELECTRONIC AIDS CAN EASE TEACHER SHORTAGE AND BRING MASSIVE UPGRADING OF EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., April 19.—The Radio Corporation of America will establish, in collaboration with New York Univerasity, a unique $100,000 educational television workshop to develop and disseminate the most effective television teaching techniques for the Nation's schools, President John L. Burns announced tonight.

Declaring that television and other electronic teaching aids can "bring about a massive upgrading of our educational standards," Mr. Burns told the annual dinner of the National School Boards Association convention here that RCA will set up the workshop at New York University. He said the company will also support a university professorship in educational TV at New York University to provide supervision for the workshop.

"The primary aim of this project," he said, "is to serve the public schools of the United States and to benefit all education. The workshop will bring together the best ideas of professional educators, responsible laymen in the education movement, broadcasters and experts in the graphic arts."

NEWS FROM THE FORD FOUNDATION

NEW YORK, April 23.—The Ford Foundation today announced a grant of $1.4 million to the John Hay Whitney Foundation to improve secondary-school teaching through expansion and development of the John Hay fellowships program over the next 2 years.

The expansion of the John Hay fellowships program will permit not only an increase in both the number of fellows and the institutions at which they may study but will alter the method of their selection and the objectives of the program.

Since 1952 the Whitney Foundation has provided fellowships for 20 secondary schoolteachers for humanistic study at Yale and Columbia. Under the new program, the number of fellows will be increased to a total of 150 in the academic years 1959–60 and 1960–61. The number of study centers will be enlarged to four or more. Selection of fellows will be made from school systems engaged in experiments directed especially at achieving the best utilization of unusually good teachers in secondary education.

These experiments, many of which have been supported in recent years by the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education, include the use of closed- and open-circuit television and of techniques for more efficient utilization of teaching talent, such as teacher aides, employment of college graduates as teaching assistants, redeployment of teachers according to variations in the size of classes, and the development of teaching teams.

By selecting a few fellows from each of these demonstration-school systems and by making summer workshops available to additional personnel, the Whitney program will help insure high quality in the handling of subject matter in the experimental programs and advance the development of teaching techniques that may be used elsewhere.

The grant will provide each fellow with his regular year's salary, travel expenses, and an average stipend of $700 for tuition and fees for 1 year of study.

Delay in Legislation on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, apropos of the debate in the Senate, this morning, relative to the delay in connection with the enactment of legislation on labor, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Delay in Legislation on Labor," written by George Todt, and published in the San Fernando Valley Times of April 21. In the article, Mr. Todt discusses in a very intelligent way his observations on this unusual phenomenon. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAY IN LEGISLATION ON LABOR

"Make use of time, let not advantage slip"—William Shakespeare, Venus and Adonis.

With incontrovertible evidence already uncovered concerning corruption, theft and un-American totalitarianism residing in certain unions, the public is asking increasingly why no remedial legislation is being passed in Congress at this time?

Certainly, it is not necessary to wait years into the future after another round of future Senate investigations before we commence to repair the damage which is already seen to be extant. Why isn't anything being accomplished along these lines? Who is holding back at this time? Why?

I asked these questions of San Fernando Valley Congressman JOE HOLT recently. JOE was kind enough to furnish me with a portion of the record to date concerning proposed labor propositions now wasting away in deep six.

"I thought you would be interested in what we are trying to do in the House," said JOE, "but the Democrats are blocking this legislation. The Republican record is clean."

This is not a new view among the GOP members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, incidentally. As far back as last February 26, they all addressed a mass letter of protest to the Democratic chairman of the committee. * * *

The letter is worth repeating, and is as follows:

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: President Eisenhower on January 23, 1958, transmitted to the Congress his recommendations for legislation in the labor-management field. He stated that action on the part of the Government was needed to protect the basic rights of the individual workers to maintain the basic integrity of trade unionism. The stated purpose of his program is to reassure the American public that:

"1. The funds which are set aside for the benefit of working men and women in health, welfare, and pension plans are accounted for.

"2. The moneys which are contributed by workers to union treasuries are being used solely to advance their welfare.

"3. Organizations in which working people associate together voluntarily to improve their status through collective action will be administered in such fashion as to reflect their will.

"4. The working people are more fully protected from dealings between representatives of labor and management which have the effect of preventing the full exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

"5. The public is protected against unfair labor and management practices within the collective-bargaining relationship which give rise to the exercise of coercive power by one as against the other, tending to impede the peaceful development of that relation, or which infringe the legitimate rights of innocent third parties.

"On January 30, 1958, the minority members (Republicans) of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations requested the chairman of that committee to schedule hearings on the proposals of the President. As yet, no action has been taken to assure that hearings will be had on the President's proposals.

"Accordingly, we, the minority members of the House Education and Labor Committee, respectfully request hearings to begin at once on the labor-management proposals made by the President. We further request that the hearings be so arranged that there will be ample time for Congress to take final legislative action on the entire program during this session."

This was signed by the 13 GOP members of the committee, including Congressman HOLT.

On March 3, House Minority Leader JOE MARTIN had this to say:

"Legislation to remedy labor-management conditions harmful to trade unionism is before Congress. It has been there since January. * * * There is almost unanimous agreement throughout the country * * * that legislative action is needed. Surely there are as many Democrats in Congress as aware of the need as Republicans. Yet day after day passes without action. No hearings nave been scheduled. No witnesses called. * * * We call on our Democratic colleagues, especially those in control of the committees involved, to take action in the name of good government. * * * Organized labor should join us in urging the Democrat-controlled Congress to take immediate action."

This really has the earmarks of a most unusual situation, doesn't it? Makes one wonder just how many of the boys on Capitol Hill the dear old AFL–CIO COPE political machine may have at its beck and call, what? Does this deplorable legislative inability to discipline powerful—and corrupt—labor bosses presage our drift into a Social Labor government soon? Is State Socialism just around the corner?

Arizona Scans Economic Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on yesterday I had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first of a series of articles which John C. Waugh, of the Christian Science Monitor, has written on the subject of the economic situation in Arizona. At the time I said I would request the printing of the other articles in the RECORD, in order to provide a little economic sunlight and bring a little cheer into the gloomy atmosphere of depression and recession which seems to be found in many of the other States of the Nation.

The second of the five articles on the dynamic changes which have been taking place in Arizona's economy since World War II is entitled "Arizona Scans Economic Tide." So that Members of the Senate may have something to be cheerful about economically, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA SCANS ECONOMIC TIDE
(By John C. Waugh)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—Attract people, add industry, stir well, and presto—a new economic concoction.

That is what booming Arizona has done. And it is finding the taste bittersweet.

Arizona is a major actor in the drama of growth that is being played all across the Southwest from New Mexico to California. The same patterns of change that earlier gripped California are tossing up new problems to Arizonans who only a decade ago would never have believed it could happen here.

In the years following World War II Arizona's population almost doubled from 616,000 to more than a million. About 35,000 new people each year flock into Arizona to live. To find jobs for all of them, Arizona turned to and is still turning to light industry and manufacturing.

Now the combination of the two—redoubled population and new industry—has sent the Arizona economic structure spinning off in new directions.

THREE C'S

As any old Arizona cowpuncher would tell you, "It just ain't the same old range." To this, the farmer, the miner, and everybody else, would probably say "Amen." Arizona is a portrait of dynamic change.

In a State where the economy has been dominated traditionally by the Three C's—copper, cattle, and cotton—the newly emerging economic strong man is light industry, led by electronics.

This is not to say that the Three C's are suddenly unimportant in this State. They are still pillars of the economy. In 1956 mining was still the biggest source of income, raking in $471 million. Manufacturing was second with $400 million. Agriculture, the tourist industry, and livestock were next in that order.

SETBACK FOR COPPER

But while manufacturing was on the upswing in 1957, the mining and cattle industries were running into trouble. And agriculture is losing some of its choicest Arizona acres to the flood tide of urbanization.

Here, briefly, is what is happening to Arizona's three traditional pillars of strength:

Copper, which has been king for decades, dropped in price during 1957 to well under 32 cents a pound, which is considered the rock bottom for the ductile metal. Foreign imports hit the industry hard, undercutting domestic prices and raising a clamor for Federal tariff protection. Rising production costs have also plagued Arizona mines.

Paradoxically, even as prices decline, the copper industry in Arizona continues to expand, primarily because of Federal encouragement.

The State still produces more than half of the Nation's copper. Even while prices were dipping, new mines were operating and old ones expanding. There are two relatively new mines in operation near Tucson. And Kennecott Copper Corp. is pushing a $40 million expansion of smelter and leeching operations in Ray, Ariz.

FARMLAND TRIMMED

Cattle, another traditional economic kingpin, was caught up in trouble during 1957

also. Hit by drought, cattlemen cut their Arizona herds in half. "For the first time in history," one leader complained, "we had more people in Arizona than we had cows."

Arizona agriculture, which cotton dominates, faces a problem that is plaguing the entire West. It is losing precious land.

One needs only to talk to Henry Shipley, assistant general manager of the Salt River irrigation project, to see what is happening. The Salt River project, world famous as a model irrigation system, once spread over 240,000 acres. It has lost 40,000 of these in 10 years to urban, industrial, and commercial development. Another 10,000 acres are expected to be sold and developed within the near future.

This is the most fertile and valuable farmland in all Arizona. It centers around Phoenix in Maricopa County, which is the State's fastest-growing area.

While such men as Mr. Shipley urge better planning and more foresight in an effort to save the fertile valleys for farming, leaders such as Ray W. Wilson, Phoenix city manager, are faced with the hard practical problems of providing for present and future city growth. This demands more and more urban development, almost all on fertile farmland.

URBANIZATION TIDE

The tide is clearly in the direction of increased urbanization of farm area. Arizona agricultural land, at a peak high of 1,300,000 acres in 1952, is expected to drop to 950,000 by 1970.

The simple fact is that it takes 3 to 4 acre-feet of water a year to raise crops while a housing development or a light industry on the same land would use only a third or half of that. This is the point that Arizona leaders drive home in their arguments for more urbanization.

Dr. L. W. Casaday, director of the bureau of business research at the University of Arizona in Tucson, reflects the dominant feeling in the State when he says that this increased urbanization of farmland is good.

"It is the highest and best use of our limited water resources," Dr. Casaday believes. "Let the food and fiber be raised where there is plenty of water."

Yet as farmland is shifting slowly, steadily to new uses, farm production in the State, blessed by the most modern methods, is increasing every year.

Of all the major underpinnings in the Arizona economic life today, manufacturing and tourism appear to be the youngest, the most vibrant, the fastest growing. They loom big in the Arizona future.

Whether they really constitute the major hope of the long-range future is still debatable.

The Coming Death of the Surface Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the latest issue of Look magazine contains a most interesting and far-sighted article entitled "The Coming Death of the Surface Navy."

The article provides additional justification for, and support for, a swift expansion of our submarine building activities as the most effective way to providing an effective, economical national defense. This is a theme which has been brought to the attention of the Senate many times before, and which must be repeated until its full implications are realized by everyone concerned.

The Nation must be awakened to the inevitable future of undersea craft. We must act now to make sure we lead the way into the future. If we fail to do so, we will face the consequences of being left in the backwater.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article from Look magazine printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMING DEATH OF THE SURFACE NAVY

(By Vice Adm. C. B. Momsen, U. S. Navy (retired), with Peter Maas)

On November 5, 1957, the Navy's last battleship was laid to rest. Her passing foreshadows the time when the surface Navy will be turned into obsolete hulks by submarines. This is no secret to the Russians. Right now, they are far ahead of us in submarines—further ahead than in sputniks. Even if they go to the moon, they can't wipe out Detroit or Pittsburgh or Washington from it. They can from their submarines.

The sudden ascent of submarines to sea supremacy is one of the most dramatic aspects of the atomic age. A decade ago, our carrier-conscious Navy was paying them scant heed. Now, the advent of nuclear power and missiles has helped make them the most potent warships ever devised.

The first of our own submarines of the future is already on shipyard ways at Groton, Conn. Her name is the *Skipjack*. When she takes to the water, she and her sisters will become true scourges of the sea. Although the performance expectations of these submarines are secret, I can say this much:

1. They will be able to outrun, outmaneuver and outfight any surface ships they meet. These deadly craft will be virtually free from detection, much less destruction, even with atomic depth charges.

2. Cruising submerged for indefinite periods off Eurasion shores, they will not have to surface even while firing the Navy's new 1,500-mile ballistic missile, the Polaris. In effect, they will give the Polaris intercontinental range against Soviet targets.

3. They will be our only weapons system immune to what I call the ABC horrors—atomic, bacteriological and chemical—of total war. If we ever need another Noah's ark to preserve the species, it will have to be a submarine.

Five years ago, submarines depended upon limited, carefully conserved battery charges for underwater propulsion. They were really surface ships that occasionally dipped below the waves.

The spectacular success of the atomic reactor aboard the *Nautilus* changed all this. Such a reactor does not require oxygen. For the first time, a submarine could stay submerged—regardless of speed—for long periods without air contact. But the *Nautilus* essentially was a nuclear laboratory, with her tremendous powerplant housed in a now antiquated hull, so the Navy built another submarine, the *Albacore*, designed solely for submerged speed. The stubby, blimplike *Albacore* surpassed every hope. She was the fastest, most maneuverable submarine in the world during the short speed bursts allowed by her conventional, comparatively weak power.

Combine the *Nautilus* and *Albacore*. Arm the result with missiles. What do we have? Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr., says it gives us a "system which approaches the ultimate as a weapon of deterrence and retaliation." The *Skipjack* is the first step.

What about the Russians?

Less than 10 years ago, Russia was a third-rate naval power. Today, the Soviet submarine force is the biggest ever put together by any nation in peacetime. The Russians have over 500 submarines in the water, nine times as many as the Germans had when they touched off World War II. Almost all of them are capable of carrying—and delivering—missiles. The Soviet Union has been adding to this huge fleet at the chilling rate of 75 subs a year.

Exact information on the latest Soviet submarines is fragmentary. But an enemy so aggressively committed to underseas warfare isn't puttering about with antique models. The Russians have now launched a 16,000-ton atomic icebreaker, the *Lenin*. This is warning enough. Soviet technology can put nuclear reactors in submarines just as easily. Such scientific skill has already handed us a defeat more important and greater than Pearl Harbor, says Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb.

I worry a great deal about the menace of the Soviet Union's submarines. We have some grim reminders of the deadly effectiveness of this weapon. The Germans, in 1914, almost strangled the Allies with primitive submarines. In World War II, with not much better submarines, they sent more than 13 million tons of shipping to the bottom, despite our highly touted aircraft, radar, and sonar detection network. Our own submarines, by the same token, ranged freely through the Pacific—bagging eight enemy carriers in the process and destroying much of the huge Japanese merchant fleet.

None of these lessons has been lost on Russia. Nor have they been lost on Adm. Jerauld Wright, the man charged with the defense of the Atlantic under NATO. He says: "I believe the Soviet Navy is designed, constructed, tailored, and trained to drive a steel wedge down the Atlantic and cut the lifeline between Europe and North America."

Red submarines present an even greater peril. For the past year, the Russians have been busy drawing up comprehensive radar charts of our coastline. With them, a Soviet submarine commander will be able to surface some 50 or 100 miles off the United States mainland, take a couple of radar fixes for position, and zero in his missiles with neat—and frightening—precision.

Simultaneous firings by the Red submarine fiet could level most of our major cities.

The Russians are also reported working on a missile, Comet II, similar to our Polaris, that can be launched from submerged submarines. Few areas in America will then be out of range.

In case we don't get the point, Nikita Khrushchev blandly boasts: "It is true that we are surrounded by American bases, but we have our rocket missiles, and our submarines can block American ports and shoot into the American interior. America's vital centers are just as vulnerable as NATO bases."

What if the Kremlin ever did unleash a submarine offensive against us? How could the Navy keep our ocean lifelines open against swarms of new Soviet submarines? How would it safeguard our cities in the event of sneak missile attack from the sea?

I believe that our continuing reliance on carriers must cease. We will have need for them in the limited-type wars we may have to fight to contain Russian expansion. But beyond this the day of carriers will soon be done. Building still more of them is senseless. They will provide the same fat prey for future submarines as every other surface ship on the ocean.

Even now our own submarine commanders are contemptuous of conventional anti-submarine-warfare (ASW) methods. ASW has made very little progress since the days of World War II. Against a submarine as modern as the *Skipjack* it will be practically worthless.

The modern submarine's highly sensitive sonar "eyes and ears" will be able to pick up the propeller racket of a passing carrier as far as 80 miles away. Once she determines her quarry's direction, she will race in for the kill. Scout planes won't be able to spot her, because she will remain deeply submerged. Radar, which cannot pass through water, will be equally futile. Surface sonar, effective against ordinary submarines, will be baffled. To destroy a submarine, surface ships must make and maintain contact. The modern submarine's sustained underwater speed will be too fast for the carrier and her escorts. She will hurl her acoustical homing torpedoes armed with nuclear warheads at nearly helpless targets.

One such submarine can do the damage of two dozen conventional types. A school of these deadly killers would wipe out any carrier task force or convoy that dared to leave port.

The lesson is clear. We must completely rewrite the textbooks on naval warfare. The entire Navy will have to go under water. That's where tomorrow's great sea battles will be fought and won. Otherwise they will be most assuredly lost.

Where do we start? First, let us look at our present submarine program. The Navy has 110 submarines in service, powered by diesel and battery engines, most of them dating back to World War II days. They are the last of the type we will have. Every new sub is designed for the nuclear Navy. Seventeen are now abuilding or authorized.

The first of our atomic submarines joined the fleet for operational duty this January. They are the *Skate* class. No more of this type will be constructed. They were laid down before the *Albacore's* hull design received official sanction. Besides that, their twin screws, a navigational aid on the surface where submarines used to spend most of their time, actually cut down on submerged speed.

The biggest submarine in the world, the 5,500-ton *Triton*, with double reactors churning out tremendous power, is currently being built. She is slated for roving radar picket service. It is my contention, however, that her chief mission—warning carrier task forces of impending enemy air strikes—is for wars we've already fought.

Orders also have been placed for three missile submarines.

The first true, high-speed submersible we will have is the *Skipjack*. Ironically, she closely resembles the *Holland*, the first underwater warship we added to the fleet over 58 years ago. Present schedules call for her delivery in 1960. The Navy is now so sure of the *Skipjack's* success that six more like her have been requested.

This program is clearly inadequate. As revolutionary as the *Skipjack* may be, she is only the beginning.

In this lag, the Navy itself has not been wholly blameless. I am certain, however, that our revamped defense effort will drastically step up submarine development. There have been an increasing number of calls, notably from Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, for a crash program of at least 100 atomic submarines. And just any submarines won't do. In tomorrow's kind of war, our submersibles will have to be ticketed for specific tasks the same way destroyers, cruisers, carriers, and other surface warships are today.

The Russians will always have one grave advantage over us. They can call the shot on the day they want war. We have to meet the threat of that every day. Our first sealine of defense is the tremendous deterrent power of the Navy's missile submarines. The subsonic, surface-to-shore missile Regulus I now is operational. Polaris, last of the ballistic-missile programs to get started, is finishing fast. We have solved top-secret problems involved in submerged launchings and in fixing exact underwater locations for accurate firing. A Polaris development missile has been tested in flight. Given enough funds, the Navy will get off a full-scale shot within months.

Logically, these missile submarines should be sufficient. But most wars don't begin logically. We must also be able to seek out and stop every Soviet submarine coming in to pitch nuclear missiles at the mainland. We could recover, perhaps, from a rupture in our ocean lifelines; we could not afford to lose the capacity to recover at all.

Antisubmarine warfare has thus far been conducted on an attrition basis. To decimate undersea raiders during World War II, we took calculated losses. In the future, we must strive for a 100 percent detect-and-kill record. The awesome destructive capability of a single enemy submarine precludes anything else.

In my opinion, this is the greatest menace to the United States today.

We can start countering it right now by setting up a chain of stationary underwater listening posts far out at sea. They will be small spheres, manned or unmanned, set at the best thermal depths for sound detection. Anchored to the bottom by a nearly weightless nylon line, they will have power to raise themselves to the surface. Packed with delicate sonar devices, they will be able to pick up any object approaching or passing between them. Data from them will be quickly relayed to a seaplane member of the team via radio. Directed by double and triple sonar fixes, the seaplane will be able to attack accurately with air-to-underwater missiles.

To back them up, we must give top priority to the development of antisubmarine submarines. The submarine killers will have to be as small as possible for tight maneuvering. They will require nuclear powerplants lighter than those in use. They will also need supplementary power for high-speed spurts when they close for the kill.

And let us not forget that we must always keep our vital sea lanes open. We are basically a great island nation. The Soviet Unon is not. Key materials are in limited supply here and have to be brought over vast ocean stretches to fufill industrial wants. In a war, some of the cargo, of course, could be transported by huge cargo-carrying planes. But the bulk of it would still have to travel by water.

How? Fantastic as it seems, it all will be moved under water. We will use synthetic rubber tanks blown up in elongated shapes to cut resistance to a minimum. The tanks will be able to carry anything from grain to heavy machinery. At a safe depth under water, they will be pulled across the Atlantic in 2 days by submerged atomic tugs, and protected by submarine-killer escorts ranging far ahead and on each side of them.

This is a bare minimum of what we must do. The possibilities in the 300 million cubic miles of the earth's oceans rival those of space travel. The day is not far off when submarines will be almost completely silent, and will travel at speeds of 60 knots or better and at great depths unheard-of a decade ago. How long before that is a reality? Certainly no longer—less, I believe—than the period it took us to move from 450-mile-an-hour *Mustang* fighters in World War II to ballistic missiles roaring 5,000 miles through space in 30 minutes.

By that time, in war, our entire Navy will have gone under water. And our surface ships will be all the way under—at the bottom.

World Peace Through World Law: Comments by National Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, world peace must come through world law. There is no other way. How to obtain world law is explored in detail in a recently published book, World Peace Through World Law, by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn.

Under a previous consent, I am including the following comments on this distinguished book by outstanding persons in the United States and the United Kingdom:

President Everett Case, Colgate University:

"Thomas à Kempis once remarked that 'all men desire peace, but very few desire the conditions requisite for peace.' Among these very few, the authors of this work have rendered a great public service in spelling out, for all to see, the nature of these requisites for our times.

"There is something immensely heartening, therefore, not only in the emergence of so challenging a book as World Peace Through World Law, but also in this fresh and compelling demonstration of what can be accomplished for the public good by the joint and voluntary enterprise of two private citizens whose abilities are matched only by their devotion.

"If our era is not to be the most destructive in human experience, it will have to be the most creative. Moreover, any free society which ceases to be creative, ceases to be. What Grenville Clark and Prof. Louis B. Sohn offer us in this book, then, is nothing less than a new lease on life. Whether we accept or reject the offer, we dare not ignore it.

"Let no one who professes a genuine concern for peace fail on any pretext to read and ponder their proposals. Rather let each who professes such concern read the brief but cogent introduction and then excuse himself, if he can, from pursuing the matter further."

United States Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania:

"Every politician interested in the survival of civilization will want to read this book. So will all others with the same objective. The book spells out in detail a carefully thought through, feasible plan for achieving world peace and disarmament in this generation. It points the way, through practical political action, to prevent the threatened destruction of most of mankind."

President John Sloan Dickey, Dartmouth College:

"For many years I have envied reviewers and others their certain judgments that this or that book is 'the most important since * * *.' 'Until' is an even more unlimited word than 'since'; but I am sure that all those who use this great work (and that's what it is) will hope that a more important book on the organization of a lawful international order is not written until something is done about the subject by statesmen. This book is one of those magnificent intellectual ventures into concreteness on which better answers for big problems are built. It makes me wish I were a talent scout for the Nobel peace prize."

Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, Supreme Court of the United States:

"War can no longer be relied on to solve international problems if civilization as we know it today is to survive. The United Nations as it now exists is of great value. Yet the world must have a stronger United Nations with new powers and new functions or other agencies that can seek political solutions of present and future problems. This book in specific language suggests an alternative. These concrete proposals should be earnestly considered. Any suggestion that might ensure world peace deserves attention. But this particular plan should receive special consideration and be read and debated because it is presented in specific rather than general terms and because its authors bear distinguished credentials."

Thomas K. Finletter, lawyer:

"The launching of the 2 Russian satellites has started a new era. Now, for the first time since the end of World War II, the people of the United States, and I think the same is true of our allies in Europe and of the peoples of Asia and Africa, have had their eyes opened as to the scientific-military revolution through which we are passing. The people of the United States have been ignorant of the facts of this revolution. The Russian satellites woke them up. But the sputniks exposed more than the facts about the military situation. They revealed the need for something new in all our foreign policy and particularly in the area of the control of modern weapons of war and of the search for peace.

"For over 12 years now, ever since the end of World War II, Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn have been studying the problem of peace. They reached the conclusion early that world peace can be achieved only through world law, a conviction which was stated recently by President Eisenhower. But instead of contenting themselves with generalities about this greatest of all subjects of the political world today, Messrs. Clark and Sohn proceeded to study what this meant. What was world law? Law might mean many things. It might be a philosophic concept, existing only in men's mind without institutions to support it. Or it might mean law in the sense that we think of it in our States and in the Federal Government, with institutions to make it real.

"Messers. Clark and Sohn being practical men as well as scholars, took the latter meaning and then proceeded to the gigantic task of defining in detail exactly what they meant by a world law which might be put into effect today, with the very practical result of preventing the world from blowing itself up with hydrogen bombs. As Grenville Clark says in the book: "Accordingly our proposals are advanced in the firm conviction that genuine peace through world law is now a practical prospect which practical men can work for with reasonable hopes." Here is the great point about this invaluable book. It is a practical proposal. It is something that man can realize right now if he will bring his reason to bear on the problem. This is the kind of solution for which so much of the world has been grasping. This is the kind of solution which those who are talking of disengagement in Germany and the Near East, of missile-free zones in Europe, of trial areas for an inspection system are striving for. This practical, tough-minded 500 pages of analysis is the first blueprint yet made which can give those who want not to have hydrogen war a practical beacon toward which they can direct their efforts.

"The proposal is for an amendment to the United Nations Charter and for substantial revisions of its structure and of its functions. Disarmament means what it says. Disarmament is to be complete, down to the levels needed for local policing. The arrangement is to be enforceable within the limited field of the prevention of war. The United Nations is to have a police force. World law against international violence is to be explicitly stated. World tribunals are to interpret and apply the world law. There is to be a taxing system which will assure that the UN will have the money to carry out its responsibilities. A world development authority is to be set up to create conditions in which peace can grow in the undeveloped areas. And so on. A draft of a new Charter of the United Nations and annexes describe the institutions under which this world law shall operate.

"This book is a landmark. It may become the text out of which will grow man's effort to use his reason to save him from destroying himself. Those who cannot envisage any departure from the present world of anarchy will find the book disturbing to their prejudgments. But those who believe that now, finally, man must recognize that war is out of hand and that international anarchy is no longer tolerable will find in this book the greatest intellectual contribution yet made to the cause of world peace.

"Messrs. Clark and Sohn lay much store by the practical nature of their proposal. And in this they are indeed right, with one proviso only. This proposal is practical if the governments of the world are in any proper degree responsive to the will of the peoples whom they represent. If the peoples of the world were to be consulted there is no question what their verdict would be. It is that this is a proposal which they want put into practice."

United States Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont:

"The proposals of this book constitute the one logical working out of the problems of disarmament and the peaceful world. Nothing else that has been done, suggested, or thought of, approaches it in thoroughness and intelligence.

"World peace through world law is the attainable objective. There are two things necessary to its attainment. One is a background of popular determination the world over. The other is practical negotiation. The educational process needs to be far more fully developed and more strongly supported. The negotiations need an intelligence, an imagination, and a determination which have not yet been shown."

Raymond B. Fosdick, lawyer:

"This book, written by two lawyers, Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, provides a comprehensive and systematic statement of the changes, article by article, which the authors believe should be made in the Charter of the United Nations if the world is to be saved from shipwreck. It represents years of research and consultation in the United States, in Europe and in Asia, and is the first detailed outline which I have seen of a world authority under worldwide law.

"The plan may not seem immediately practicable, but in the desperate condition which we face today we need to have spelled out to us the steps toward a larger unity which, whether we like it or not, we shall ultimately be forced to take. For we cannot go on as we are. Just as the Articles of Confederation before 1787 proved inadequate to meet the emerging problems, so the present Charter of the United Nations needs to be geared to the utterly new world with which technology has presented us since 1945.

"This is a gallant and highly intelligent attempt to point out the path into an inscrutable future. If it opens itself to the charge of idealism we can recall with profit one of Woodrow Wilson's last statements before he died: "The world is run by its ideals. Only the fool thinks otherwise.' "

Arthur L. Goodhart, master of University College, Oxford:

"It is a great thing to have presented in so powerful a way the case for civilization. Disarmament can only be maintained effectively if supreme power is placed in a body capable of enforcing the peace. This book states in a cogent and striking manner the problem which the world will have to solve if it is to escape from ultimate disaster."

Paul G. Hoffman, industrialist and public servant:

"World Peace Through World Law is a monumental work. Mr. Clark and Mr. Sohn are to be congratulated for having produced one of the truly important books of our time. It is important partly because the proposals are specific. I am sure they do not expect everyone to agree with everything they suggest; in fact, they make it clear that they do not. But they have given everyone who yearns for peace something that merits the most serious consideration."

Whitney North Seymour, lawyer:

"Every lawyer will be interested in this book. All of us recognize that the main problem of the modern world is to extend the rule of law everywhere. Most of us have felt that this is the one possible road to peace and to any prospect of ending the cold war. But there vagueness has set in; the necessary institutions have seemed painfully elusive. It is appropriate that Grenville Clark (with a distinguished collaborator), who once led the American bar to deep concern for individual freedom and then helped to lead the country to prepare to defeat Nazi tyranny, should now lay before us a detailed plan for saving the world from the nuclear war which would destroy civilization. The authors' proposals are bold, they make one gulp and conjure up many complications and difficulties, but they are far too carefully thought out to be disregarded. They do not pretend that they have all the answers or minimize the difficulties—but their pioneer work is worthy of the finest traditions of constructive professional thought."

Adlai E. Stevenson, lawyer:

"Certainly no one in the United States has given as much thought and scholarship to the legal basis of peace as Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn. And that is only one reason why the book which they have prepared is required reading for every thoughful student of man's most important business—peace."

Norman Thomas, writer and lecturer:

"The day when World Peace Through World Law is published will be a great landmark on mankind's road to peace. In it we have the definitive statement of the constructive conclusions reached by Messrs. Clark and Sohn after long years of study during which their tentative plans for peace through law have been laid before large numbers of men and women for comment and suggestion. In their completed plan lies, I am persuaded, mankind's best hope of escape from suicide as a result of our mad arms race which in this nuclear age can end only in annihilation.

"It seems to me axiomatic that if constructive fear of destruction by nuclear warfare does not lead to universal, controlled disarmament it will not in the madness of war lead to such self-control that every nation and its military will refrain from using the most destructive weapons then at its disposal.

"But disarmament, unless it is to be as futile as the nations' renunciation of war under the Kellogg-Briand Pact, requires a system of world law which to be effective in turn requires the existence of a representative international organization. The questions then arise: How much and what sort of law is necessary for effective disarmament and the maintenance of peace? How much and what sort of change should there be in the United Nations and its charter?

"The obsession of nation states with their sovereignty makes it important to answer these questions in minimum rather than maximum terms. To write an ideal constitution for a rational world would be an empty academic exercise. Our task is with what

may and must be done in time to avert catastrophe.

"And here the method followed by Messrs. Clark and Sohn is invaluable. Clause by clause they suggest necessary changes to the existing charter supporting each of them by clearly reasoned comment. It is hard to imagine an important question which they have not faced. The time has come when we must talk in terms of specific action, not in generalities. In this sort of fruitful discussion, World Peace Through World Law has given us extraordinary help and guidance."

James P. Warburg, author:

"If the world survives the present perilous period of transition from the era of the nation-state to the era of world organization, this book will be regarded by future historians as a milestone in human progress."

Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson), economist and writer:

"This is a time when men and women are becoming obscurely conscious that we cannot split the atom or conquer outer space without making some consequent adjustments to our basic institutions. Statesmen talk in general terms of sacrifices of sovereignty and the curtailment of some liberties to make greater ones more effective. We are growing aware that the total sovereign nation-state today is in some measure as anachronistic as a primitive tribal group. But all this confused sense of the necessity of change barely gets beyond the twilight zone of instinct or hunch.

"The immense value of World Peace Through World Law is that it confronts us with the concrete implications of our half-formed thoughts and helps us thereby to move forward to the clear light of understanding, decision and action. The proposals put forward by Mr. Clark and Dr. Sohn are not intended to be final or definitive, but they start from a definitive principle—that no nation today can be secure and prosperous save in a world community ruled by law. No one who has read these pages can ever again be confused on this basic point."

Leading Authority on Constitution Calls for Check on Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University, one of the Nation's leading authorities on constitutional law, wrote a letter to the New York Times discussing proposals to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

This letter inspired a forceful editorial in the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C., for March 30, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Leading Authority on Constitution Calls for Check on Supreme Court," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADING AUTHORITY ON CONSTITUTION CALLS FOR CHECK ON SUPREME COURT

Southern lawyers and laymen who believe it futile to protest the power seeking of the United States Supreme Court should heed the words of Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University. Professor Corwin is one of the Nation's great authorities on constitutional law.

In a letter to the New York Times March 16, Professor Corwin called for limitations on the Supreme Court. He opposes the Court-reform bill introduced in the Senate by Senator JENNER, Republican, of Indiana.

At the same time, Professor Corwin wrote: "The measure deals with a real problem which is recognized, for instance, by Judge Learned Hand in his Harvard lectures—that of keeping the Court out of legislative territory; and, I might add, out of executive territory, too."

The significance of this statement lies in who Professor Corwin is. He is one of the most widely published American writers on constitutional topics—a northerner who has access to many influential journals. Thus his statement should have considerable influence on liberal opinion.

Professor Corwin asserted, "There can be no doubt that on June 17 last the Court went on a virtual binge and thrust its nose into matters beyond its competence, with the result that (in my judgment at least) it should have aforesaid nose well tweaked."

He also asserted that the Supreme Court's holding in the Watkins case, "in which it claims the right to recast congressional resolutions authorizing committee investigations, is quite irresponsible and indefensible."

Professor Corwin asked this question: "What, then, is the remedy for this vicious nonsense?"

His reply to his own question is: "I would suggest a declaratory act of Congress assertive of the correct reading of the Constitution on the points involved."

In summary, Professor Corwin wrote that "the country needs protection against the aggressive tendency of the Court."

Professor Corwin's statement indicates that the excesses of the Supreme Court may result in changed national opinion and the passage fo corrective legislation. Southern Senators, who recognize the danger of judicial tyranny, should move to implement Professor Corwin's arguments.

On Arms Aid for United States Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an article entitled "On Arms Aid for United States Friends," which was written by Constantine Brown, appeared in the Washington Evening Star for April 16.

In this article Mr. Brown points out some surprising facts. We have armed the Yugoslav forces of Marshal Tito with modern equipment, but we neglected to do as well for the Republic of Korea. Thus, we seem to be more interested in arming a Communist nation than we are in arming a free nation which is living under the shadow of Communist aggression.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON ARMS AID FOR UNITED STATES FRIENDS—EQUIPMENT FOR EIGHT TITO DIVISIONS IS CONTRASTED TO NEGLECT OF ROK'S

(By Constantine Brown)

American military aid to Yugoslavia was terminated last month with the departure of the United States military mission headed by Maj. Gen. Mercer C. Walter. In the 10 years we afforded assistance to President Tito, American taxpayers' moneys provided Yugoslavia with the latest equipment for 8 out of its 28 divisions and some 80 percent of its modern air force. Gen. Walter is reported to have stated before his departure from Belgrade that the American weapons had strengthened the capacity of the Yugoslav forces and the training program increased their efficiency. The general added that the money spent in Yugoslavia was "in the best interests of the United States" and that "if need ever arises, I am sure they will fight and fight well."

The question in the minds of some of our allies whose weapons are not quite of the quality of those delivered to Marshal Tito's forces is, "Against whom will the Yugoslavs fight so well?"

According to highly reliable information this reporter has been able to gather recently abroad, there exists an agreement between the Soviet and the Yugoslav general staff which assigns to the Yugoslav army the role of moving into northern Italy in the event the Soviet Union decides to strike against the NATO powers.

The likelihood of a Soviet aggression against Western Europe is of course remote. Prime Minister Khrushchev and those advisers from whom he is taking counsel expect to neutralize our western allies. But it is significant that such a Soviet-Yugoslav secret agreement should have been reached. It was negotiated at the time that Marshal Zhukov still was a predominant figure in the Presidium.

Yugoslavia has never been seriously threatened by the U. S. S. R., even when Marshal Tito's arch enemy and former boss, Stalin, was alive. Since his death, Marshal Tito has become a strong supporter of all political moves of international communism.

By contrast, it is pointed out here, some of our loyal allies who are directly under the Red guns are being neglected in their armament. A typical instance is Korea. Last summer, after paragraph 14 of the armistice agreement forbidding the NATO forces to improve their equipment was canceled, President Eisenhower wrote a personal letter to President Rhee promising an early replacement of the obsolescent weapons with which the 21 ROK divisions are equipped.

In the last few months, the two American divisions in South Korea have received a quantity of modern firepower capable of using nuclear heads. But the ROK armies have received next to nothing. When inquiries are being made, why the delay to a formal promise on the part of our Chief Executive, the official answer is "They are in the pipeline (or in the channels)."

Those responsible for the delay whisper to inquiring legislators that it would be dangerous to our objective of peace in the Far East if the ROK Army were provided with the necessary hardware to fight a real war. President Rhee, they argue, is so anxious to bring about the unification of Korea that he may not hesitate to use force. His armies are exceptionally good and, given the necessary weapons, he may not hesitate to commit something rash. Hence the go-slow policy on the part of the dispatchers.

Military observers who are familiar with the situation in that area point out the dangers of this go-slow policy at a time when Moscow may want to create divergencies and brush fires. The North Korean Government

is a mere tool in the hands of the Chinese Communists and the Russians. Neither boss government would hesitate to order the North Koreans to move against their brethren in the south, as they did in 1950, if such a move were necessary to the Moscow-Peiping plans.

It is true that the Chinese Communist forces have been withdrawn across the Yalu River. But they are available at a moment's notice. Before this withdrawal was decided, the reorganized forces of North Korea received from the U. S. S. R. the latest types of tanks and firepower available in that country. Among these weapons were included a sizable number of heavy jet bombers capable of carrying bombs with nuclear heads and medium-range missiles.

Herein lies the danger of our delaying policies toward an ally of proved loyalty. There is no question that President Rhee fervently desires to unite the two portions of his country. So do his people, including the unfortunate Koreans who are forced to live under Communist and foreign domination. But it is highly doubtful that he would commit a rash action unless he felt he had America's support.

Our active allies at the Soviet Union's and China's underbelly—Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Free China, and Korea—are sometimes wondering what makes Washington tick. They see the administration eager to help those who are proved supporters of the foreign policies of international communism, while they themselves meet with temporizations and sometimes rebukes when their own interests are directly involved. They wonder why some American policymakers look with more suspicion on South Korea and Turkey than on Yugoslavia and India.

Address by Hon. Antoni N. Sadlak, of Connecticut, at the Men-of-Management Dinner, Waynesboro, Pa., April 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a most stimulating address delivered on Tuesday night in spacious Eagles Club Auditorium, Waynesboro, Pa., by my friend and colleague from Connecticut, the at-large Representative [Mr. SADLAK]. The audience consisted of more than 300 men at a dinner meeting of men of management under auspices of the Valley Branch, National Metal Trades Association, and the Waynesboro Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Grayson M. Stickell was the toastmaster and Rev. H. Clayton Moyer gave the invocation. It was a genuine pleasure to introduce the gentleman from Connecticut to constituents of my 18th Pennsylvania District.

The address follows:

TAX REFORM FOR A GROWING AMERICA

My distinguished colleague and friend and your outstanding Representative in the Congress, DICK SIMPSON, Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Moyer, and my fellow citizens, the warmth, cordiality, and graciousness of the introduction and its reception make me feel very happy to have undertaken the 2-hour auto ride to be your guest this evening. Each of you knows DICK SIMPSON better and longer than it has been my privilege, but I can better certify to his application to congressional duties and responsibilities, being privileged to serve with him on the Ways and Means Committee of which he is a skillful, experienced, and energetic legislator of whom all of you can be proud.

No other nation's people can ever hope to reach the degree of fairmindedness consistently displayed by Americans in taking stands on public issues. Unfortunately, however, the full effect of this great trait is sometimes seriously blunted—if not lost entirely—by a tendency to decide on issues along general rather than specific lines. A good example of this is in the area of tax reduction.

Those individuals who customarily take polls—both professional and amateur—have been telling us that soundings taken during the recent congressional recess for Easter indicate that public sentiment, in the main, does not favor immediate tax cut action. I use the phrase "tax cut" purposely because that, unfortunately, is the way the question was put, in most cases, to the rather small segment of the population covered by the polls.

Even if the results could be termed accurate—and this is doubtful—how, using such a broad and general term, could you expect anything but a negative answer? If you throw all tax action proposals into the same basket without explaining the difference between them and then ask, "Are you in favor of tax cuts?" you have prevented almost every possibility of an intelligent answer since there is no reasoning process involved.

On the other hand if the question includes the salient features of a tax reduction proposal and an adequate explanation as to how and why it would contribute importantly to the well-being of the the country, then it is almost certain that it will bring a far different and truer expression of opinion.

Yes, you can no more lump together all the tax proposals that have been introduced in the Congress or aired publicly, than you can couple Elvis Presley with a grand opera star, as singers, or a minor leaguer with Ted Williams, as ball players.

There is a great need, then, for a long, searching look at the type of tax action best adapted to meeting the pressing current as well as future needs of the country and I know of no better forum for such a discussion than this distinguished gathering of industrial and business men.

It would be a very great privilege to address you, in any circumstances, but I am doubly honored by the opportunity to talk cold, hard facts to you who deal in that commodity every day. In exploring the need for tax action, I am always most comfortable in so doing before gatherings such as this—because I feel that you know the problem at hand and can better appreciate what I have to say.

First, let us examine some of the devastating effects of our present individual and corporate-income-tax system. I know that they are familiar because you are probably confronted with them in some form or other practically every business day and not solely on April 15. Nevertheless, the devastating impact of the oppressing high rates—particularly the steep progression in the middle and high main brackets, cannot be overemphasized.

They can best be summed up as a disastrous triple play.

1. They smother individual and business enterprise by penalizing success.

2. They curtail, drastically, the flow of investment funds vital to business stability and growth by preventing the accumulation of adequate savings, the chief source of these funds.

3. They create strong inflationary pressures by forcing those unable to acquire equity capital into overuse of bank credit.

This, of course, is a strong accusation but it is a well-founded one that calls for immediate and constructive action to put a halt to a tax rate that is destroying the economy, in greater force, with each passing day.

Naturally, many will ask how, in view of the crippling tentacles of our tax system, were we able to achieve economic expansion from the end of World War II until the onset of the current recession? The answer, by now, is obvious. It can be summed up in one word—inflation. The myth of our so-called expansion was measured in terms of diluted dollars and bore little resemblance to genuine, hard-rock growth.

Corporate debt increased from $85 billion at the end of 1945 to $208 billion by the close of 1956. Where could you possibly get better proof of the critical shortage of equity capital? Borrowing skyrocketed because it was the only way that capital requirements could be satisfied.

Our economic situation today proves beyond the slightest shred of doubt that we can never hope for real business recovery and a return to solid, noninflationary growth without dealing, forthrightly and boldly, with the crucial need for reform of the income-tax rate structure.

You will notice I used the term "reform of the income-tax rate structure" instead of the generalized description of "tax cut." There is a reason for that. As I explained earlier we have got to get down to specifics if we are ever going to pierce the fog of doubt and confusion surrounding the entire tax issue.

Now it is sometimes embarrassing for a Congressman to engage in a public discussion of the merits of his own bill. This does not apply in this case, however, because the legislation I am going to talk about has become what could very well be called the "American taxpayers' bill," rather than the Sadlak-Herlong bill, as it is more familiarly known. But before I show you why this is so let me give you a brief explanation of the bill.

It is the first thoroughgoing program for the reform of the income-tax rate structure since the rates began their upward spiral some 26 years ago. The legislation provides for coordinated reductions, over a 5-year period, in all the progressive rates of individual tax, with the first bracket rate, of $2,000 or less of taxable income, being reduced from 20 to 15 percent. The top rates of tax would be brought down to 42 percent, the individual tax from its present top of 91 percent, and the corporate tax from its present top of 52 percent.

Let me cite just a few examples to give you a better idea of how the reform recommendations will work. At the end of the fifth year, the $4,000 to $6,000 bracket would be reduced from 26 to 17 percent; the $8,000 to $10,000 bracket from 34 to 19 percent; the $16,000 to $18,000 bracket from 43 to 19 percent; and the $20,000 to $22,000 bracket from 56 to 25 percent.

I am sure that some of you have been resorting to rapid mental calculations as to how you, as an individual, or your businesses, would be aided by the legislation's proposals. If so, you could come up with only one answer—you would be infinitely better off, to the point where virtually all of your monetary problems could well dissolve or certainly diminish. Well, all America would share in this improvement.

Before I go any farther, I want to make one thing crystal clear. This rate reform bill should not be viewed, solely, as an antirecession measure. As a matter of fact, I intro-

duced the bill 13 months ago—long before the start of the downswing and its beginning goes back even farther because many, many months of careful study went into its drafting. And, one of its finest advantages lies in this very fact. It was conceived in the relative serenity of a period of clear-thinking, in sharp contrast to the tax proposals born of the panic and near-hysteria which seem to have come about recently because of the present situation.

There is no question that the legislation I propose will contribute vitally to business recovery, but I would be pressing for its enactment, just as strongly, if there were no recession. I would do so because reform of the income tax rate structure is long, long, overdue and I firmly believe that if the bill had become law 3 years ago, we could very well have bypassed the business reversals now plaguing us. Put differently, the Sadlak-Herlong bill comprises preventative economic medicine, the kind that builds immunity to business slumps or, at any rate, provides the ability to climb out of them quickly.

You may feel that my estimation of the beneficial effects that the legislation would bring emanates from a sort of pride of authorship. That is far from the actual case, because my confidence in the measure has far-flung support. Soon after its introduction, my bill, H. R. 6452, was complimented when my distinguished colleague on the House Ways and Means Committee—Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR., a Florida Democrat—introduced an identical bill, H. R. 9119.

But the testimonial that was most gratifying to me came during the 24-day public hearing on the Ways and Means Committee which ended early in February. Since this committee is the tax-writing body of the House, it heard testimony on all the tax proposals—either those already under consideration or new recommendations made during the open sessions.

Of the 50 witnesses who addressed themselves to the need for rate reform, more than 40 gave their whole-hearted endorsement to the Sadlak-Herlong bills. These witnesses, it should be noted, were representative of every facet of our economic life. They appeared in behalf of organized groups of small, medium, and large business enterprises operating in all parts of the Nation. No other tax legislation even remotely approached the fine record achieved by the Sadlak-Herlong bills in searching public glare of the committee hearings.

It is, of course, extremely difficult to summarize the voluminous hearing record, and to capture the full effect of the protests against the punitive tax schedules that exist today, let alone the urgency of the voices that called for prompt rate reform. I feel, however, that the following points are truly reflective of what the legislation will mean to America. It would:

1. Spark a quick recovery from the present recession, both from the fact of immediate reductions and the certainty of continuing reductions.

2. Be rapidly translated into new and better job opportunities and a renewed advance in the American standard of living.

3. Provide more, rather than less revenue, for the Government as the Nation moved forward to increasing levels of production, employment, income and consumption.

4. Resolve the tax problem of small business at its source and open up opportunities for the beginning and development of business which cannot be managed under the existing tax structure.

5. Achieve all of these benefits with a lessening of inflationary pressures since moderate tax rates would permit a higher volume of business and individual savings making economic growth less dependent upon excessive credit expansion.

The approval accorded the bills has not, by any means, been confined to the Ways and Means Committee hearing room. More than 200 business, professional, industrial and civic organizations covering every area of the Nation have passed formal resolutions of endorsement. But probably the most overwhelming commendation has come from the press and national magazines of great influence. Over 500 newspapers have run editorials recommending passage of the measure and recently—in rapid succession the U. S. News & World Reports, the Saturday Evening Post and Fortune Magazine—among others—have carried editorials strongly urging passage of the Sadlak-Herlong bills.

It is not surprising then that the measure can qualify as the American taxpayer's document.

Please understand my purpose in citing these testimonials. It is not an attempt to build up my legislative importance. It is simply a means of convincing you that the sound and realistic provisions of the bill have stood the test of exacting evaluations.

I'll turn to other aspects of the bills which I have saved until now, for better emphasis of their importance. The forward scheduling of reductions can conceivably have a very strong restraining effect on Federal administrative procedures because the Bureau of the Budget and all executive departments will be put on advance notice of the income tax share of revenue expected for the budgetary year. This should prove a welcome and efficient brake to wild and undisciplined spending.

A unique feature of the bills allows for postponement, in certain circumstances, of the application of the reductions for up to 1 year. In this way, the needs for emergency military spending could be met without the necessity of going through the time-consuming and difficult process of revoking, and later reinstating, the legislation.

When we speak of military expenditures, we refer, naturally, to the threat posed by Russia. Even though her sputniks are gone from space, too many Americans are still gazing skyward, as if it embodied the only danger of a Soviet thrust. I submit that they had better concern themselves, as well, with Russia's astonishing economic progress.

According to competent informational sources, the Soviet industrial production has grown twice as fast as ours over the past 25 years and, in another decade, it should equal 50 percent of our own whereas it is only one-third now.

And, if you think that the Russians are not deadly serious about this race to catch us on the productive front, then I refer you to the boastful pronouncement made by Khrushchev, 3 months ago, when he had less power than he now has grabbed. He said:

"We declare war upon the United States in the peaceful field of trade. The threat to the United States is not in the intercontinental ballistic missile, but in the field of peaceful production. We do not need a war to insure the victory of socialism."

While we abhor the source of the appraisal, we cannot deny the logic. Unless our economy is bolstered, if it continues to falter, there is every danger that we could be brought to humiliating defeat in the very area where we have justly been the dominant nation for so many years—the field of production.

So it is that if the domestic reasons for enacting immediate tax rate reform are not compelling enough, then the dire need for winning the life-and-death economic struggle with the Soviets should provide a clinching argument—one that may be suicidal to ignore.

As practical businessmen, you will want to know about the revenue effect of the Sadlak-Herlong bills. It can be estimated at about $3 billion a year. In times of normal, economic growth, this would be more than satisfied by the historic average of a $4 billion annual increase in revenue collections.

We are off the normal growth pattern, of course, but even if the bills incurred temporary deficit financing, I am supremely confident—as are most of the supporters of the measure—that enactment of the bills would soon prove to be the most rewarding investment this country every made. It would give the business community the psychological, as well as the economic stimulus it so badly needs and once back on the track, with the tax roadblocks removed, we'll be able to steam ahead at full speed to the attainment of a state of prosperity that will eclipse any we have known in the past.

Every Congressman is understandably hesitant about adding to the mail of his fellow legislators in Washington, but I feel that the gravity of the tax problem facing the Nation makes it incumbent on me to depart from standard procedure. Therefore, if you believe in the efficacy of the Sadlak-Herlong bills—and I do not expect you to make up your minds until you have studied the provisions with greater care—then I suggest that you let your representatives in Washington know how you feel.

Contrary to general impression, it is my considered opinion that businessmen and individuals alike are far too reticent, sometimes even backward, in making known their views on national public issues. I firmly believe that it is not only your right to express yourself but that it is your duty to do so. Our only hope, in Washington, to reflect the real views of our constituents, is to hear from them in the period when their counsel will be most beneficial.

This is especially mandatory right now because you will be able to help slice through the generalities that are shrouding the real issues involved in the tax situation and expose the specifics—the heart of the matter—that will enable all Americans to take a knowledgeable and positive stand.

I know of no finer contribution that you could make. It will be a public service of the highest order for it will aid significantly in the achievement of a tax reform program best designed to reverse the downward business trend and restore solid, noninflationary economic growth.

Tariffs on Lead and Zinc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 25 issue of the Washington Post entitled "Boiling Metal" relating to recent finding by the Tariff Commission that the present tariffs on lead and zinc should be increased in order to afford adequate protection for the domestic industry.

Obviously, there is little likelihood that the Tariff Commission could have made any other finding but that the domestic industry is in distress.

The matter now is left up to the President of the United States. It is a

serious problem which confronts him, for if the recommendations of the Tariff Commission are adopted, such action will have a serious impact on the domestic economies of our friendly neighbors to the south, particularly Mexico and Peru. This will eventually have an adverse effect on our own economy as well.

The editorial points out a possible solution while at the same time recognizing the distress of our own domestic industries, by adopting a long-range approach to prevent any violent fluctuation of commodity prices in the world market.

I hope that serious consideration will be given to the adoption of such approach by stockpiling some of these items which are undoubtedly in great supply now but which may, in a short period of time, become in short supply. In this way the domestic industry can be protected, and at the same time the progress which has been made in promoting trade between the Latin American countries and the United States, as well as the implementation of our good-neighbor policy, can be substantially advanced. The adoption of this approach will also deal a lethal blow to the Communist economic offensive in the area. In our own self-interest this approach appears to be the only practical solution to the problem.

I highly commend the reading of this editorial to all the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOILING METAL

The Tariff Commission could scarcely have picked a less felicitous time for propounding intensified protectionist dogmas than it did in its proposals on lead and zinc which it handed down on Thursday. Members of the Commission seemed to disagree only as to whether the new tariffs on the metals should be merely harsh or altogether Draconian. The zealous Republican members urged application of the highest permissible rates of duty plus quota restrictions on imports. The Democrats were content to recommend reimposition of the high Smoot-Hawley levels of 1930. And this comes at a time when our neighbors are sensitive to the point of distraction over a mild increase in United States tariff schedules.

Only a week ago, President Carlos Ibanez, of Chile, canceled a long-planned state visit to Washington reportedly because of Chilean anger over an administration move to immediately reimpose import taxes on copper. And now the lead and zinc recommendations will inevitably invite similar exasperation in Canada, Mexico, and Peru, our chief suppliers in the hemisphere. Actually, the administration was in a difficult position in the case of the copper tax, and its position was not altogether unreasonable. But it was singularly inept to announce support of the tax a few short weeks before the temperamental 81-year-old President of Chile was scheduled to arrive. Here was an instance where better coordination might have averted a diplomatic slight from Chile that hurt the United States without helping Chile.

Fortunately, the lead and zinc proposals can still be headed off if Mr. Eisenhower rejects the Commission findings, as he has done before. Unquestionably the domestic minerals industry is in distress, and no administration could be indifferent to the plight of unemployed miners in Western States. But the remedy does not lie in making a shambles of this country's trade policy and in flinging dust in the eyes of neighbors.

One better long-rang approach would be to seek some kind of orderly way of preventing the violent fluctuation of commodity prices in the world market. Last week, Chile asked the United Nations to consider such an international plan for copper. Surely the proposal deserves sympathetic study. In the short run, it may be necessary to resort to further stockpiling or to other indirect subsidies to aid the domestic industry. This would be more acceptable than any policy which would seal off American ports, worsen hemispheric relations, and perhaps force our neighbors to turn in desperation to Communist markets.

Postmasters' Advocate and the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Postmasters' Advocate for April 1958 there is an excellent article entitled "Oregon." Mrs. Dorothy Ritchie of Tygh Valley, Oreg., and Hon. Neil Morfitt, of Astoria, Oreg., both postmasters in our State, provided the wealth of material that enabled the editors of this official publication of the National League of Postmasters to write this fine article. Appropriately, the piece discloses that the history of the Post Office Department contains some exciting chapters in connection with the early development of the Far West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON

The first United States post office west of the Rocky Mountains, was established in Oregon Territory, at Astoria, near the mouth of the Columbia River, on March 9, 1847. An office at Oregon City, near present-day Portland, was set up on March 29 in the same year. It was much later that the third office in the West was established, in November, 1848, at San Francisco, Calif.

When a person wanted to write a letter, he prepared a pen by whittling a goose quill; prepared a gallnut fluid and started. Done, he sealed the missive with flour paste and waited for some traveler, headed in the general direction he wanted his message to go, and requested a favor of taking it along. There was no postal service for the pioneers.

Big business arrived in Oregon ahead of the postal service, and of more than a handful of settlers. It established its own system, with John Reed, of the Pacific Fur Co., as the first mail messenger on record. In April 1812, Reed started from Astoria for New York overland. He carried dispatches for John Jacob Astor, telling of the Astor party's arrival at the mouth of the Columbia. Reed packed his provisions, rifle, and bedding along on horseback with the dispatches in a tin box. But the Indians around Celilo (now Wasco County) grew curious about the mysterious contents of the shiny box and attacked. They knocked Reed out and took his entire outfit. He abandoned the trip. The first regular transcontinental mail route, fostered by the fur interests, was between Fort Vancouver and eastern Canada. Beginning in 1813, mail carriers left Vancouver every March for Montreal and eastern points, returning the same year with messages from the New England coast. The route was popularly known as the "express" and was used by a few scattered traders, trappers, and hunters of the Oregon country. Mail was carried by canoe, along streams and lakes, packed over portage or on men's backs, across snowy mountain passes and arid plains, exposed to the danger of Indian raids, floods, and forest fires.

As more settlers arrived in the Oregon country, and anyone planned a trip outside the community, notice was given that messages, verbal or written, would be carried as a neighborly gesture. For some 20 years this sort of mail service was all Oregon had, for short or long distances, excepting occasionally by ship around the Horn. It often took more than a year to get an answer by letter, but settlers had learned to be patient.

About 1845, when Oregon's population had grown to between 5,000 and 6,000, the need for some organized postal service became acute. As a result, in December 1845, the provisional government set up its own post office department and appointed Col. William G. T'Vault as postmaster general, with headquarters at Oregon City. Rates were established at 15 cents for one sheet of writing paper carried not over 30 miles; 25 cents when carried not over 200 miles. Newspapers went at a flat rate of 4 cents each. Typical American free enterprise became interested, and the mail-carrying business boomed. Since there was no law prohibiting it, private routes sprang up parallel to those of the government, and after some months of real competition, faced with a deficit of $100, the provisional government's enterprise was abandoned.

As early as 1845 the Federal Government had made some effort toward establishing a mail route from the Atlantic coast by ship to the isthmus and up the Pacific coast, but nothing materialized. However, in 1847 when the first United States postage stamps appeared, J. M. Shively carried the first United States mail across the plains. Shively had arrived in Astoria in 1843, had taken a land claim in what is now the heart of the city, and in 1846 had gone back East on a visit. In the mail he carried West on his return, was an order from the Postmaster General in Washington, D. C., setting up a postal system in the Oregon country, appointing Col. Cornelius Gilliam as postal agent for the Pacific coast, and designating Astoria as the mail distributing point, with Oregon City as the second post office. Although he did not realize it, Shively also carried his own appointment as postmaster of Astoria. Colonel Gilliam made David Hill postmaster of Oregon City.

Shively established himself in a cabin that had just been built in Astoria by the Rev. Ezra Fisher, and the first Oregon letters went out from there. Rates at the first United States post office establishment in Oregon were 40 cents an ounce for letters between points on the Atlantic coast and in Pacific midwest. Mail came by water, some of it around the Horn, some by way of the Isthmus of Panama, up the coast to San Francisco and from there up the coast to Astoria. The first mail in regulation United States pouches came around the Horn on the bark *Sequin*, commanded by Capt. Z. C. Norton. The service was joyously welcomed, but soon, when boat arrivals became irregular, with mails few and far between, there was much dissatisfaction.

Meanwhile, in 1848, during the Indian troubles following the Whitman massacre, Colonel Gilliam was killed. So slow were the mails from the East that for months after his death dispatches from Washington continued to arrive for him. When the United States Post Office Department finally

learned of his passing, and had appointed his successor, the central mail distributing center facility for the Pacific coast had moved from Astoria to San Francisco, and that city became headquarters for the new postal agent. He had authority to appoint postmasters for the Oregon country, and these offices were filled and vacated frequently.

In August 1948, Oregon was admitted to the Union as a Territory and the United States Postmaster General decided on an adjustment of Oregon postal rates. Letters inside the Territory were to be carried 300 miles for 5 cents per half ounce, with newspapers 1 cent each. Outside-the-Territory newspapers had to pay 1½ cents each. Letters from the East, coming by water, kept the old rate of 40 cents an ounce.

Soon thereafter the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. of San Francisco, was given the contract for carrying the mails between that port and the Columbia River, but protests were frequent because of the slowness of the mails and their irregularity. In December 1849, Oregon's territorial delegate to Congress called on the Post Office Department in Washington in an attempt to improve mail service, but got little satisfaction.

As an example of the mail service of that day, the news of the admission of Oregon into the Union as a State on February 14, 1859, did not reach San Francisco until March 10, and it took the steamer *Brother Jonathan* 5 more days to bring the news to Oregon. When the report reached Oregon City, citizen Stephen Senter rode horseback to Salem with the tidings, spreading the information as he rode along.

Oregon's mail troubles were varied until 1883, when the Northern Pacific Railroad was completed across the continent, and when connections with San Francisco were established.

The State of Oregon, much of it still practically primeval, has its peculiar postal problems today. Contrasted with the metropolitan center around Portland, on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, is the vast terrain of mountains, forests, and wastelands. In some instances, service is almost like it was in the days of the Oregon Trail and the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

On star route 403009, Gold Beach to Agness, operation is 6 times a week from May 1 to October 31, and three times a week from November 1 to April 30. The distance is 32 miles up the famous Rogue River. The trip is made in specially constructed river boats, as shown in the accompanying picture. Special drive lines and ruders are necessary to cross the many riffles. Mail is carried to patrons along the way in the usual star route sacks. Fourteen families receive their mail in this manner. The Rogue River is the only access to this remote area from the coast.

A forest service road enters from the Powers area. The river boats carry passengers as well as mail. Some of their other duties are hauling freight, serving as an ambulance and similar necessary errands for the people in the Agness area.

Postmaster Joseph Omlin, Jr., is in charge of the Gold Beach office, and Luther Best is postmaster at Agness.

Oregon has a regional office of the Post Office Department, the office at Portland being fourth to be established in the decentralized program. Samuel G. Schwartz is Regional Director, assisted by King Cady, public relations; Robert L. Karr, operations manager; Tom Allen, training officer; John VanBuskirk, real estate officer; R. H. Pursifull, controller; Paul Beckey, accounting officer; Miller Bodell, transportation officer; Harry O. Clark, engineer; Frank Cole, personned officer; Earl Wignall, budget officer; and Arne Shelley, employment and placement officer.

Many of the better workers for the National League of Postmasters have come from among the Oregon postmasters. Although there are a few Oregon postmasters who have not yet joined the national league, most of them recognize the value of this organization to them individually and as a group, and it is expected that the others will soon affiliate and help share the responsibility as well as the benefits, at the very low membership fees.

Transportation Costs of the Nation's Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Transportation" which appeared in the National Association of Food Chains Bulletin under date of April 19, 1958.

The bulletin points out that transportation costs represent 16 percent of the family food dollar and that the annual cost of transporting the Nation's food reaches a figure equal to more than 30 percent of the amount received by the farmer for farm food products.

These statistics point out the necessity of Congress acting promptly to repeal the transportation excise taxes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION

Reduction of transportation costs is a major objective of food distributors because of the importance of transportation charges in food prices. United State Department of Agriculture figures show that transportation costs represent 16 percent of the family food dollar. The American Farm Bureau Federation reports that the annual cost of transporting the Nation's food reaches a figure equal to more than 30 percent of the sum received by the farmer for farm-food products. A specific example shows that 20 percent of the retail sale price of a can of California peaches sold in the Chicago market is made up of transportation charges.

Predictions in Washington are that some reduction in transportation costs may develop when the current temporary 3-percent transportation excise tax comes up for renewal action prior to its expiration date of June 1, 1958. This tax which was made effective as part of the Korean war emergency action will expire June 1 unless action to the contrary is taken by the Congress. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Foreign Commerce under the chairmanship of Senator SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, may recommend abolition of the transportation excise tax as a move to help the transportation system of the country. Any such recommendation presumably would be submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee where the tax will be considered in May. It is generally felt in Washington that there is more agreement on the proposal to cancel the 3-percent transportation excise tax than on most other issues. Many businessmen are reported to have expressed opinions on the subject to their Senators and Representatives. Others may wish to do so in the next 3 weeks.

Tenth Anniversary of Establishment of the State of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in honoring Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of its independence.

As an American I am proud of the fact that the United States was the first Nation to recognize the State of Israel immediately after it came into being, on May 14, 1948.

It is my firm conviction that the State of Israel is entitled to all the economic and moral aid and assistance which the United States can give to her. I sincerely believe that if we help the State of Israel in its development of democratic principles of government, we are not only helping the people of Israel, but we are making an everlasting friend and ally for the United States.

It was our country which did most to establish the young State of Israel. To me, Israel is a foothold of democracy in the Middle East. A strong Israel is important to the security and welfare of the United States. Israel is an important member in the group of free countries which must fight against the threat of totalitarianism. Just as we have aided other countries by the foreign assistance program, which the United States inaugurated, so must we aid Israel develop its natural resources, expand its agricultural and industrial economy, and increase its productive capacity and facilities. Of all the countries in the Middle East, the young State of Israel stands out clearly as the most dependable exponent of democracy. The people of Israel are ready to defend democracy. Israel has always supported the principles of the United Nations in every respect.

Israel is a little guy, fighting nature, fighting enemies and trying to do a great job. This little guy needs friends. He needs friends as America needed friends during the American Revolution. This little guy saw 6 million of his brothers and sisters wiped out by Hitler and the Nazis. I tell you my fellow Americans, it would be a poor kind of America who would not admire that little guy and who would not be cheering him on in his fight against such odds.

We must continue our American policy of friendship for the young State of Israel which the United States helped to create.

We must not permit the members of the Arab League, which hates Israel, to block the road of progress of the young, democratic State of Israel. There must

be peace between Israel and the Arab States in the Middle East. A strong Israel is important to the security and welfare of the United States. Israel is a bulwark against communism in the Middel East.

I hope and pray that the dynamic State of Israel will grow and prosper and that Israel will become and always be an economic, industrial, and military pillar for the free world in the Middle East.

Essential River Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members to an editorial in the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of April 1, 1958, relating to the urgent need for additional water storage projects in the Sacramento River Basin.

On February 24, 1958, I requested the House Committee on Public Works for a review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of pertinent reports on the Sacramento River and tributaries, California, with a view to determining of the plan of improvement for the river and Butte Basin should be modified at this time, particularly with respect to the proposed Table Mountain—Iron Canyon—project on the Sacramento, and possible supplemental storage on streams tributary to the Sacramento River between Shasta Dam and Red Bluff, Calif.

This proposed review action by the Corps of Engineers is concurred in by the California Water Commission, and the State of California Department of Water Resources.

As will be noted, the Sacramento Bee editorial corroborates the fact, again made obvious by recent critical floods, that Shasta Dam by itself cannot provide absolute flood control in the Sacramento Basin:

ESSENTIAL RIVER STUDY

The current rainy winter has shown the necessity of engineering studies looking toward additional water-storage projects in the Sacramento River Basin as called for in resolutions adopted in the California Legislature and pending in Congress.

Even with the outflow through Shasta Dam held to a minimum, the freshets on downstream tributaries created a flood condition on the Sacramento River which easily could have been disastrous to several communities.

Assemblywoman Pauline Davis, of Plumas County, obtained lower house adoption of a resolution requesting the State department of water resources to make studies of possible dams on several creeks between Red Bluff and Shasta Dam.

Both legislative houses approved a joint resolution by Senator Paul R. Byrne, of Butte County, calling upon the Army engineers to study possible flood-control projects in the same area.

And Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of the Second Mountain Valley District, has prepared a resolution for the House of Representatives Public Works Committee asking the Army engineers to pursue their studies of the Iron Canyon project and possible supplementary dams on the Pit and McCloud Rivers and Cottonwood, Stillwater, Cow, Battle, and other creeks tributary to the Sacramento.

Only too plainly Shasta Dam by itself cannot provide absolute flood control in the Sacramento Basin. Tributaries upstream and downstream also need to be controlled. And in several cases this can be done profitably as well as effectively through power generation.

Abandonment of Passenger Service Between Washington and New York by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 25 issue of the Washington Post, entitled "End of an Era."

This editorial relates to the abandonment of passenger service between Washington and New York on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

From a nostalgic point of view the editorial has a sad—a very sad ring. However, from a more realistic point of view there are three aspects which are, in my opinion, overlooked.

First, the abandonment of this service will add over 300 jobless to the unemployment rolls in the Washington area.

Second, this increase in unemployment will have a general adverse effect on our lagging economy, by causing an additional drain on unemployment and compensation rolls and loss of purchasing power in the community.

Third, Congress sooner or later will have to give serious consideration to the actuarial soundness of the Railroad Retirement Fund, which has been growing increasingly unsound because of the fact that fewer people are joining the rolls, and contributions to the fund by employees are diminishing as the years, days, and months roll on. Four hundred employees a month dropped from railroad payrolls over the past 5 years. At the same time obligations from the fund are increasing.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF AN ERA

The abandonment of passenger service between Washington and New York on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, which takes effect Sunday, is cause for more than a little nostalgia. It is symbolic of what is happening to American railroads—in part because of automobiles, turnpikes, and airline and bus competition, in part because of overly rigid regulation, in part because of inflexible labor practices and in part because of lack of imagination and unrealistic accounting practices which have led some railroad managements to blame perhaps too many of their woes on passenger service.

What will occasion more poignant memories than even the transition from steam to Diesel power is the fact that this is happening on a segment of the Nation's oldest major passenger-carrying railroad. The B&O is the line of the Tom Thumb, and it came to Washington 123 years ago. If it was not as fast to New York as its competitor, the Pennsylvania, it was certainly comfortable and friendly. The old-time Royal Blue and its predecessors, with their string of varnished parlor cars, coaches and diner, seemed an indestructible institution.

Although there was through passenger service from the Capital to New York for 95 years, the arrangement was never one for the utmost convenience. The B&O tracks extended only to Park Junction, Pa., whence the Reading was used to Bound Brook, N. J., whence in turn the Jersey Central lines reached to Jersey City. The lack of an entrance to New York City proper required a bus and ferry trip which was time-consuming, though a pleasant and wonderful way to show the family the Statue of Liberty and Lower Manhattan.

None of this means that the B&O will not continue to be a vigorous and important railroad. Freight service north will be continued; and the famed Capitol and National Limiteds, which used to come from New York, will now originate in Baltimore. The B&O will retain its commuter service between Washington and Baltimore, and its successful new RDCs, or rail Diesel cars, will continue to provide a daylight ride to Pittsburgh. But somehow, for those who love the romance and mystery of passenger trains and terminals, things won't be quite the same.

Visit to United States by Persons From Uncommitted Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, our young people have a lot of vision and good ideas. The optimism of youth and their confidence in our country is well expressed by a young friend of mine, Richard Kostelanetz, who attends Scarsdale, N. Y., High School. His letter, printed in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1958, advocates bringing more people from uncommitted nations to see the United States. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR BRINGING THE WORLD ON A TOUR OF AMERICA

TO THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

Most experts agree that Russia is slowly but surely catching up, if not surpassing us, in many fields.

Russia can launch earth satellites; the Kremlin can give financial and technical aid to numerous so-called uncommitted nations. Seemingly, the Soviets can match us in nearly every respect but one—the standard of living which our economic freedom has achieved. And most of the world's poor want, not a philosophy, but material goods to give them a happy life.

This can be the key in America's persuading the minds of the uncommitted nations' peoples, if not the stronghold behind the

Iron Curtain itself. With an appropriation of only a fraction of Uncle Sam's expenditures for foreign aid and defense—$1 billion—the people of the United States could give 1 million of the world's people a first-hand views of America's shores.

These ambassadors could be shown America as it really exists—its cities, farms and suburbs. Surely they will be impressed with the abundance of high quality food, the efficiency of the factories, the pleasures of mass communications like radio and television, and the quality of mass-produced inexpensive American consumer goods.

When they return to their native lands, the million ambassadors could honestly tell their people what they saw. In this persuading force Russia cannot even remotely compete. In what surer way could America's example of free capitalism be depicted to the world's destitute?

R. C. KOSTELANETZ.

SCARSDALE, N. Y.

George S. Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a copy of a resolution in memory of our late colleague, George S. Long, adopted by the DAV-Philians Social Security Organization, on March 26, 1958, at San Dionisio, Paranaque, Rizal, Republic of the Philippines. It is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE

"Whereas the DAV-Philian Social Security Organization has learned with profound regret of the death of the Honorable George S. Long, a Member of Congress from the State of Louisiana, United States of America, who was a sincere friend of this organization and of all the Filipino people; and

"Whereas the deceased was a most honest, courageous, and faithful public servant being ever mindful of the problems of the down-trodden and neglected peoples of the world, and

"Whereas he had joined with the DAV-Philians in a vigorous effort to help Filipino veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II and their survivors by introducing a bill, H. R. 8167, for their relief; and

"Whereas the members of this organization throughout the length and breadth of the Philippines were shocked and grieved to learn of his death: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the National Directorate of the DAV-Philians Social Security Organization in emergency meeting assembled*, That all officers and members of the organization shall, in pursuance of this resolution, manifest their sympathy and condolence to his widow, brothers, and other relatives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the members shall devote their prayers for the repose of his soul; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the widow of the Honorable George S. Long, and that a copy thereof be spread on the permanent records of the DAV-Philians Social Security Organization."

Adopted on this the 26th day of March 1958, at the DAV-Philians Camp at San Dionisio, Paranaque, Rizal, Republic of the Philippines.

SERVANDO L. MICLAT,
National Chairman.
PEDRO M. GUERRERO,
National Secretary.

Rivers, Harbors Bill Has Too Much Frosting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the President recently vetoed the river and harbor flood-control bill of 1958 because in his opinion it contained too many projects which had been inadequately surveyed by Government agencies such as the United States Army Engineers, the Budget Bureau, and the Secretary of the Army and because their recommendations on many projects were ignored by Congress.

The projects to which the President objected had a total value of about $350 million.

The projects to which he objected were 21 in number. There are about 145 projects in the bill to which he had no objection. He had to veto the entire bill, because of the objectionable projects in it, because he does not possess the power of item veto.

Congress can, if it wishes, be assured of a quick signature by the President if it will eliminate from the river and harbor flood-control bill the projects to which the President objects. Those wanting a river-and-harbor flood-control bill enacted into law this session can speedily accomplish that objective by urging passage of a clean bill containing all of the 145 projects to which there is no objection and deleting from that bill the 21 projects that are objectionable.

Concerning the veto of the river-and-harbor flood-control bill the distinguished and widely read columnist Doris Fleeson in her nationally circulated column has this to say:

RIVERS, HARBORS BILL HAS TOO MUCH FROSTING

WASHINGTON.—Any claim that the rivers and harbors bill vetoed by President Eisenhower is an antirecession measure is as phony as some of the projects listed in it.

Nor is it a fair test of the President's sentiments about Government spending to counteract the depression. The President must take responsibility for the big deficits such spending would entail. If he must accept deficits, he no doubt has other preferences about where to incur them which, in his view, would pay bigger dividends in jobs, political steam, and public confidence.

What the veto does call into question are the President's grasp of practical politics and his understanding of the development needs of the country.

There is so much logrolling in rivers and harbors legislation that the cynics tend to dismiss it merely as a congressional Christmas tree with something for everybody on it. This is true to a degree, but it is not the whole story.

MORE FROSTING

A rivers and harbors bill is the vehicle by which important, even essential, development of these prized natural resources is carried on. It emerges from Congress with some fancy frosting, but it also contains a lot of yeasty, nourishing dough in the figurative and colloquial sense of that word.

The problem for any President and responsible legislator is to get as much of the dough as possible and as little frosting.

President Eisenhower has met the problem since 1954 by vetoing two rivers and harbors bills approved by Congress, 1 in 1956 and 1 this week. This can be described as an act of political courage, since such bills naturally tend to come up in election years.

It also, in the view of many Congressmen, including Republicans, has a strong flavor of throwing the baby out with the bath. For example, flooded California has run out of authorizations in some of its river basins during the 4-year lapse in legislation.

NOT LIKELY

The President proposes that the worthy projects approved by Army engineers be put in a separate bill and the others sent to him one by one. This amounts to asking for the item veto and Congress is about as likely to give any President that as Harry Truman is to invite the Vice President to dinner.

Nor is it reasonable to expect that elected Members of Congress, especially in the House, will feel that the development of other constituencies are more important than their own. They can justly argue that if they so voted, the chances of their districts getting a new Congressman would be enhanced.

Nobody has ever pretended that the Democratic way was either cheap or superlatively efficient. Nor do Members of Congress, upon their ascension to their honored places lose the attributes common to the human race.

The President has not suggested a better way, which has a reasonable chance of success, to continue the developments which are desirable in the bills he vetoes. Conservationists are correspondingly downcast, and they come from both parties.

A conservation footnote to the 4-year lag in this field: The rivers of the Soviet Union which flow to the sea are greater than those here; the Soviets are engaged in 44 major starts on river projects and innumerable minor ones.

The Development of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post entitled "Fomento for Export."

The article points out the tremendous progress which Puerto Rico has made under the Commonwealth status. I highly commend its reading to the Members of the Senate, particularly those who seek some practical solution to the now uncertain status of the Territory of Hawaii:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOMENTO FOR EXPORT

In Puerto Rico, the Spanish word "fomento" brings up the many remarkable changes that have transformed the island commonwealth into a thriving industrial center. Fomento means development and the spirit it represents accounts for the upward surge in Puerto Rico's per capita income from $278 in 1950 to $443 in 1957, using current dollars as a measure. Is fomento suitable for export? Can other developing areas realistically profit from the experience of Puerto Rico in planning a program for swift economic growth? Many of the 5,000 representatives from 107 countries who have recently visited Puerto Rico may have wondered whether the Commonwealth's experience was a unique and imperfect model for the underdeveloped world.

A special staff report made by the National Planning Association provides a timely and thoughtful answer. According to Dr. William H. Stead, who prepared the study, there are no less than nine features of the fomento program which could apply to most other underdeveloped countries. Dr. Stead places special stress on the luring of private capital through attractive incentive programs as the key to large-scale development. Of course, Puerto Rico's free access to continental United States markets and its exemption from Federal taxes are major advantages for the island. But the Commonwealth's effective central planning and its ingenious system of incentives could be profitably duplicated in far corners of the globe. The NPA study again confirms what a wonderful asset the Puerto Rican experience is in a world where so many seek a democratic and effective fomento program of their own.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Tenth Anniversary of Independence of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the B'nai Israel Congregation, Washington, D. C., Friday evening, April 25, 1958, at a service commemorating the 10th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT MOMENT IN HISTORY

(Address by Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, before the B'nai Israel Congregation, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1958)

It is indeed an honor and a privilege, ladies and gentlemen, to be invited to address the B'nai Israel Congregation on such an occasion as the 10th anniversary of the establishment of a new nation in which you have such a vital interest. Many of you, I am sure, have relatives or dear friends in Israel. Many of you have toiled and sacrificed to help Israel become an established sovereign state and win acceptance as a full-fledged member of the community of nations. And I am sure that in expressing my own personal best wishes and hopes for the continued growth and development of Israel as a full-fledged nation, I am bespeaking the thoughts firmly fixed in the minds of all of you.

There is much justification, ladies and gentlemen, for comparing Israel's first decade of existence with the early days of our own United States of America. Both achieved their independence by struggle, by a pioneering determination to maintain that independence and freedom, by what a great wartime leader described graphically as "blood, sweat, and tears." It was exactly because of these common facets of origination, I am sure, that the United States so promptly reached out a helping hand 10 years ago, to give a lift to the them brandnew-nation of Israel, and has kept that hand busy with various forms of aid and assistance during the subsequent decade.

I personally visited the Holy Land in 1945, before it became the sovereign nation of Israel. Then, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, on an inspection tour of United States military installations, I made a special trip to what is now Israel. While in Tel Aviv I was impressed, during my too-brief stay, by the newness and cleanliness of that city, and by the energy and industry of the Jewish people who already were building it up in anticipation of the independence which they felt certain they would soon win. So, while I have never visited the independent nation of Israel, I have seen its lands and I have seen the devotion and energy of the people who now proudly call themselves Israelis.

My point in mentioning this is that even having visited the land, I still find it difficult to conjure in my own mind a mental image of the trials and tribulations and hardships which the Israeli people must have encountered in setting up their new nation, and in trying to create in it a stable government and a stable economy. The necessity for simultaneously defending its territory against incursion from neighboring countries most assuredly has not simplified those problems.

But if I have such difficulties, I know it is infinitely more difficult for those millions of Americans who never have had an opportunity to visit any part of Israel, to picture to themselves the proud struggle and fight of that country's people to solidify their independence and to improve their national status. I think perhaps that is one reason why our American policies to help Israel arouse some opposition within our own country. We know, from reading our own history books, that we needed help from other countries to win our battle for independence, and then to solidify our independent status. We should know that if we desire to see an independent Israel, as I am sure the preponderant majority of us do, we must, as an established leader of nations, give it an occasional helping hand.

There is another point of valid comparison between the United States and Israel. We Americans proudly call our country the melting pot of all nations. Our people have come from all parts of the world; perhaps not those of us who today are Americans, but certainly our ancestors did in years gone by. But if the United States has merited the melting-pot description, as it assuredly has, Israel assuredly merits the same description. Some of its people arrived originally as refugees from the barbaric terrorism of Hitlerism or of communism. Others came from other parts of Europe, from Africa, from the Middle East, from the United States and other parts of the Western Hemisphere. On a percentage basis, this migration has boosted Israel's population more in its 10 years of existence than any other comparable population growth in any nation in history.

When Israel became an independent nation on May 14, 1948, it had a population of 650,000. Today its population is slightly more than 2 million. Considering the barren, desolate character of its land at the start, it is truly amazing that Israel has been able to absorb this 200-percent growth in the relatively brief span of 10 years. And this in a land comprising slightly over 8,000 largely arid square miles—roughly the area of our State of Massachusetts, and about one-seventh the area of my own State of Iowa, which has a population of a little under 3 million people.

Against this background, and particularly in view of the important sums Israel has been compelled to spend to maintain her military defenses, it is to be expected that she would be experiencing economic difficulties. The surprising thing probably is that she is making such major strides toward a stable and self-sufficient economy. Israel still is existing to a major degree on goods and materials from other countries, but her own domestic production is increasing markedly and her exports are becoming an important factor in paying for the goods imported from other countries. Her exports in 1957, for instance, had a total value of $135 million, of which $20 million worth came to the United States. The figures may seem small by comparison with overall world trade figures; but they are very significant in the light of the fact that during the first few years of Israel's existence, her exports were almost nonexistent. She had nothing to export then; everything she could produce went to the use of her own people, and brandnew industries and trades had to be established to produce enough extra goods so that measurable quantities could be shipped abroad.

The country still has a long way to go but it is making important strides. Her $135 million of exports last year were only about one-third of the $404 million worth of materials she imported; but it was more than twice the $59 million value of her exports only 4 years earlier, in 1953. Also significant is the fact that Israel now is able to make a serious bid for many facets of our own American markets, having sent $20 million worth of goods to this country last year. There is good reason to believe that this figure will increase substantially this year.

Israel has boosted its agricultural production several times by irrigating what used to be desert wastelands and by introducing modern concepts of farming. It has introduced industry to its urban centers in the form of hundreds of small factories and plants producing a broad gamut of goods, outstripping its Arab neighbors in becoming the industrial center of the Middle East. Its production of electrical energy, for example, has more than quadrupled since 1949. All of this, of course, is why Israel's exports are becoming an important factor in her economy.

Israel's troubles and difficulties would have been bad enough, if they had involved only the economic problems created by establishing 2 million people in a land which previously had barely supported only a few hundred thousand. But these, as we all know, were only a small part of her troubles. Superimposed on top of them, was the problem of defending Israel itself against a ring of bitterly and openly hostile enemies who were admittedly bent on stamping out the new nation's existence; who sought to conquer it militarily, and, by refusing to have any trade or other relations, to kill it economically.

It was this violent antagonism of the Arab countries which not only threatened the very existence of Israel from the outset, but made things so extremely difficult for the free world nations, including the United States, which had sponsored Israel's freedom and were trying to help it gain international acceptance as an established sovereign state. For us, it created the problem of preventing a new and struggling nation from being overrun, but without alienating the Arab nations to the point where they would fall into the Communist camp by default. Blind and unreasoning hatred, such as was felt by some of the Arab countries, is difficult if not impossible to reason with; despite all our efforts that part of the Arab world which follows the dictatorial prejudices and vagaries of Egypt's Gamal Nasser still is as blindly unreasoning in its hatred for Israel as ever, and by now has fallen under Communist influence, although maintaining a pretense of independence.

The violence and terrorism which has been such an integral part of the growth of

Israel as a nation is, of course, nothing new to the Jewish people. Violence and terrorism have been part of their history through the centuries, even to modern times; thousands upon thousands of present Israelis, who have fought or aided innumerable battles in defense of their new homeland in the past 10 years, were brought up in the tradition of Polish ghettos, of pogroms, of fiendish Nazi tortures. Establishment of a Jewish state in the Holy Land long had been a dream of millions of Zionists around the world who hoped to escape such violences; but the opposition was strong, the path toward its creation was studded with obstacles. Not until that historic day in May of 1948 was the dream of a Jewish state to become reality—and then it was a reality in which violence still could not be avoided.

In the April 1958, issue of the Hadassah Newsletter, is an interesting article by Cecil Roth, noted educator and historian and reader in Jewish studies at England's Oxford University, entitled "The State and World Jewry." One point made by Mr. Roth struck me particularly as most pertinent.

Before 1948, the article noted, there was a worldwide acceptance of the concept of a Jew as, and I quote Mr. Roth's article, "Intellectual, but unable to do things with his hands, unless it were with a needle; incapable of hard physical labor; and generally timid, unmilitary, and unsoldierlike." But in 1948, with the birth of the new nation, and I quote Mr. Roth again, "suddenly a new Jew forced himself on the attention of the western world; no less intellectual, perhaps, than before, but capable of and delighting in physical labor of the most exacting sort, and at the same time showing himself a superb fighting man." His characterization of the new Jew is so true. Only persons "capable of and delighting in physical labor of the most exacting sort" could have stuck it out in the nation and survived its initial years; any persons lacking those qualifications would have failed to survive, or would tossed in the towel and migrated on to other lands. For it was, in Israel, an era of toil and physical labor—hard, uncompromising, sweat-producing physical labor of the most exacting sort. As for the fighting qualities of the Israeli people, no one any longer can doubt them in the least. Whenever any nation with a population of only 2 million persons of all ages and conditions, can hold at bay and instill deathly fear in a surrounding ring of antagonistic neighbors whose populations total many, many times that number, none can doubt the fighting qualities and love of homeland of the 2 million. And it should be noted that Israel's heaviest defensive fighting occurred during its first year of being, when its population totalled less than 1 million people, not the 2 million of today, which makes the accomplishment even more notable.

There are those who decry these military accomplishments of the fledgling State of Israel, on grounds they demonstrate its aggressive nature. This argument I cannot accept. Had Israel not been willing to take up the gauntlet thrown down by its neighbors, and defend its people and its land against open hostility, I am confident there would have been no Israel today. There have been occasions when, I think, all of us would admit that the attitude of the Government of Israel has bordered on the truculent, perhaps on the obdurate. But I wonder what any American would have done under comparable circumstances. Again, it is difficult for persons living in this country to conceive of the difficult situation of those living in Israel. But if I may be permitted a flight of fancy, just suppose that Canada and Mexico were bigger, and more powerful on paper, at least, than the United States, and suppose that, in this imaginary case, Canada and Mexico openly proclaimed their hatred for the United States, and made known their intention of destroying the United States. Such a circumstance, of course, is sheer fantacy, and could never happen other than in a fanciful, hypothetical case. But hypothetical as it may be, if such a thing were to happen, I am sure we in the United States would become fully as truculent and obdurate in our attitude toward our neighbors, as Israel is today toward its neighbors.

The 5,000 Israelis who gave their lives in fighting to defend their new homeland during its first year of existence were imbued with the same love of country and deep desire for independent freedom as were our own American forefathers who gave their lives to prevent another foreign power from reestablishing its dominion over our American lands. It is that same love of country and yearning for independent freedom, that has caused leaders of the Israel Government to maintain an always-prepared, ready-for-anything attitude toward its Arab neighbors.

Israel, of course, has had its hotheads and its terrorists, such as those who a few days after the country had attained its independence, slew the United Nations mediator for Palestine, Count Folke Bernadotte; but those hotheads and terrorists are only a small minority, and their extravagances are as distasteful to the responsible leaders of Israel as they are to the rest of the peace-loving world. And those leaders, I am sure, desire peace and amity with their fellowman as earnestly and as deeply as do we who are convinced that the most effective way to maintain peace in this troubled world is to keep ourselves armed and strong enough to fight off any communist aggression.

No discussion of Israel and its first 10 years would be complete without at least a word of tribute to the dogged determination, the perseverance, and the indomitable courage of the valiant leaders who helped to bring about its establishment as a nation and who have played major parts in steering it through the hazardous path of its first decade. Foremost in the public eye, undoubtedly, was the gallant Chaim Weizmann, the Russian-born British research chemist who as early as 1917 was instrumental in persuading the British Government proclaim the famous Balfour Declaration, setting forth that country's objective of having Palestine established as a national home for the Jewish people, and who lived not only to see his dream of an Israel nation become reality but to become its first President. Nor can any historian overlook the scholarly, venerable David Ben Gurion, who like Weizmann was born in Russia but as a young man migrated directly to Palestine—the Ben Gurion, now 71, who as Prime Minister, has charted Israel's courses ever since it became a nation, save for one brief period of retirement. There are many others who also should be mentioned, for their contributions both before and since Israel's establishment. Most of you perhaps are more familiar with their names and their achievements than I; suffice it to say that without their contributions, Israel today might not be.

Israel is highly deserving of the good will and support our country has extended, and of the encouragement it has received from our people. I am sure the preponderant majority of Americans would join me in predicting, for Israel, a bright and permanent future and the early attainment of its goal of a real position of power and influence in the family of nations.

Feeder Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the Easter adjournment, when the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines was holding its quarterly regional meeting, in Las Vegas, Nev., a member of my committee, the distinguished Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, addressed the association on the timely subject of the successful operation of the Nation's local service and territorial airlines.

It was most fitting that on the day of the Senator's speech, Friday April 11, the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, James R. Durfee, announced the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to approve its first guaranteed loan to a local service airline, Bonanza Air Lines, Inc. The guaranteed loan bill, which was introduced by the distinguished Chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and was passed during the first session, guarantees the use of new, postwar, turbojet airplanes for these small airlines at a time when financing is otherwise most difficult.

Because I believe that the address made by my colleague is so timely and definitive of the finanical problems of this industry, and that it will be of great interest to all the Members of the Senate, I ask ananimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech which the distinguished Senator from Nevada made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUCCESSFUL OPERATION OF LOCAL SERVICE AND TERRITORIAL AIRLINES

(Address by Senator BIBLE before Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, Las Vegas, Nev., April 11, 1958)

It was a little over a year ago when I first heard of the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, now familiarly known as ALTA. As you know alta in Spanish means high, which is altogether fitting for an industry that has given height additional meaning, particularly in the last decade of the 20th century. But as you gentlemen well know, an airline—and particularly a local one—needs more than height to operate successfully.

With this thought in mind, I would like at the beginning of my remarks to dispel a popular misconception that the local airlines are the happy beneficiaries of huge Government subsidies. Only a cursory look at the financial picture of the members of your association will reveal that the small airlines, rather than enjoying great largess from a Government Santa Claus, have in fact found the path to solvency strewn with all sorts of obstacles.

While the service you provided showed tremendous gains from 1946 through 1956, it is astonishing to note that the local serv-

ice carriers together had an income during that 11-year period of only $1,850,000—and 9 of the 13 local service carriers accumulated deficits of $2,192,000.

The total income of $1,850,000, however, doesn't give the true picture—because 3 out of the 13 carriers received $1,701,000 of that amount—or 92 percent, while the remaining 10 carriers divided up the remaining 8 percent. It is also noteworthy to point out that during this 11-year period the 13 carriers realized a rate of return of only 1.43 percent on their investment.

Thus it will be seen that the claim sometimes heard that the Civil Aeronautics Board "guarantees" the local service carriers a return of 8 percent on their investment is without foundation in fact. There are 2 factors which prevent the realization of an 8-percent return:

1. If the Board's rate is established for a future, or closed period, the actual operational experience may turn out to be substantially different from that forecast by the Board; and

2. If the Board's rate determination, including its theoretical rate of return, is made for a past, or open period, the Board makes arbitrary determinations of what the carrier's expense levels should have been, thus substituting its own hindsight for the carrier's business judgment, which is necessary based upon facts at hand at the time of the decision.

The Government has never paid one dollar of subsidy for the private benefit of a local service carrier or its stockholders. On the contrary, the sole purpose of subsidy is to benefit the public, and that policy is so spelled out in the Civil Aeronautics Act.

In a recent decision, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, commented on this aspect in the following terms:

"The objective of the Congress is plain. It is the maintenance and continued development of air transportation to the extent and of the quality required for the national commerce, postal service, and defense. The objective is on a grand scale. It is for the public interest. It is vital. The words used are important, because they depict with clarity a congressional policy. Moreover, the payment is to enable such air carrier to maintain and continue the development of air transportation. Congress did not put the responsibility for development of an air transportation system wholly upon Government agencies. In this statute the Congress sought to utilize the abilities and capacities of the private air carriers. The purpose of the compensation is to enable the carriers to maintain and continue the development."

The court continued, and I quote, "The need which the statute seeks to meet is not the need of the carrier for funds for its own private purposes, for its own operation or profit. It is the need of the carrier for funds to enable such carrier to carry on for the purposes depicted by the Congress in the interest of the Nation."

If responsible Members of Congress take a sympathetic view of the plight of the local service airlines it is only the natural reaction born of a desire to be fair. It is my own view that our Government has, on many occasions, dragged its feet, in considering affirmative steps to assist these airlines in remaining aloft in a financial climate that is not perpetually socked in.

Without in any way wishing to deprecate a policy of neighborliness to our foreign friends, it does seem appropriate to point out, however, that the United States Export-Import Bank has, since its founding in 1934 to March of this year, extended loans to foreign airlines, for the purchase of airplanes in this country, the staggering total of $154,645,000. This undoubtedly is good business and sound policy, but I cannot help but reflect that if similar generosity had been bestowed upon our local carriers there would today be not only profits but, miracles of miracles, actual dividends.

This is not a case of charity beginning at home, because the local service airlines do not want a handout; they want only the opportunity to provide optimum service with the reasonable expectation of a return on their investment.

The great social and economic strides made by America's smaller communities in recent years can be traced in large measure to the advent of feeder airlines. This convenient, speedy method of transportation broke the back of isolation which had been thrust upon these cities in former years.

Dedicated to and specializing in service to the smaller communities of the Nation, these carriers have opened new industrial vistas which have contributed greatly to a continuing growth and development. This ready accessibility of air travel has encouraged a decentralization of industry from the big metropolitan centers to the outlying areas. Your airlines have tied these small communities to their major trading centers and at the same time have brought about a broader based economy that benefits everyone.

Although these airlines have more than a decade of solid achievement behind them, I believe that the real development of local air service lies ahead, provided the necessary stimulus is provided on the national level. It is my hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will continue to lend encouragement and support to the industry and will examine and reexamine the needs of the smaller communities for air transportation. There should be no faltering until the ultimate goal is reached—and that goal is a nationwide network of airlines dedicated to local service.

In striving toward this objective, it should be made crystal clear that the airlines are going to need continual financial assistance during the period of expansion and introduction of new equipment to replace those old, dependable—but certainly outmoded—DC-3's.

In the future, it is my hope and I know that it is your hope, that this investment will result in service to a network of small communities by small carriers who are not dependent upon Government support.

The prospects for this eventual situation are based on two facts:

1. The local service carriers will be able to acquire aircraft with lower seat-mile cost and greater passenger attractiveness, and

2. The estimated revenue increases with more efficient equipment offer every promise of reducing subsidy requirements at least after the initial stages of operation, together with a further liberalization of operating restrictions.

A frontal attack on the three road blocks to profitable operation—lack of modern equipment, and unrealistic route structure, and a Jenny-type rate of return method—will make the difference betwen harrowing operations and smoothly performing efficiency.

Congress has taken a forward step in passing legislation to allow air carriers to reinvest gains derived from the sale of flight equipment in the purchase of new equipment to meet the pressing needs of the times. As you men know, under previous decisions and regulations of the CAB, a subsidized carrier faced the dismal prospect of having any capital gains, realized from the sale of equipment, applied as an offset to reduce the subsidy to which it was otherwise entitled. Certainly such an inflexible and unjust rule could only work to the detriment of the carriers and to the general public as well. With passage of this remedial legislation by both Houses of Congress, it appears that another hurdle has been removed from the path of aviation progress.

When I learned of ALTA's founding in February of 1957, my first thought was to wonder if there was justification for another airline association in Washington. But it was not long before I realized that you had an important mission to fill, and as a starter you undertook the support of the Government guaranty loan legislation. I would like to take this means of congratulating you as an association, and Col. Joe Adams as your executive director, for the splendid manner in which you presented your case in behalf of that bill. As acting subcommittee chairman in the Senate, I heard several of you testify. I asked many questions as I wanted to develop a complete record. It was that record—comprising mainly of your testimony—that gave momentum to the bill on its way to final passage.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, as you know, had proposed that legislation and it is to be commended for the vigor with which it supported its enactment—despite unfavorable reports from the Departments of Commerce and Treasury, submitted under the blessing of the Bureau of the Budget. I can only add the hope that the CAB will continue in a policy of enlightenment to foster sound economic conditions throughout your industry.

Chairman Durfee has stated that the local service airlines need the boost of continued appropriations of subsidies, and he is as right as rain. It is certainly a grim paradox that despite a subsidy of more than one-third of total operating revenues, net losses are still the order of the day.

There are no easy answers to the problem, but there is a course of action that can lead to an eventual solution. This will require the teamwork of the administration, the Congress, the CAB, and each and every local service carrier.

Congress has given official recognition to the Nation's policy on civil aviation in a concurrent resolution which I introduced during this session. The resolution takes note of the 20th anniversary of enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, one of the sponsors being my predecessor, the late Senator Pat McCarran, who was known as the father of civil aviation. The resolution comends both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration for their sound stewardship of the act and its objectives, and urges adherence to policies which will enable civil aviation to solve its present economic and technical problems and assure the public of the benefits of a strong air transport system and civil aviation industry.

The general public should be the prime consideration in any legislation designed to strengthen the airlines industry. If you people are hamstrung by capricious regulations, if you are prohibited from operating profitably. The public will suffer in being denied the kind of service to which it is entitled and expects.

So I say to you in conclusion: set your sights to the goal ahead, continue your good work of providing the best possible service, state your case clearly and forcefully on a solid basis of facts—and it will pay off richly in terms of a more understanding Government, greater operating efficiency, a sound route structure, and—most important—a self-supporting industry.

Thank you.

Foreign Policy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my attention was just recently called to an impressive address entitled "Foreign Policy in the Space Age," delivered by

Edgar R. Baker, managing director of Time-Life International at the 21st Chicago World Trade Conference. In view of the serious issues of world trade and foreign aid soon to confront the Congress, I believe Mr. Baker's address has a fitting message for all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that the address referred to above be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY IN THE SPACE AGE

(Address by Edgar R. Baker, managing director, Time-Life International, New York, at the 21st Chicago World Trade Conference)

I feel deeply privileged to have been invited to address the 21st World Trade Conference this evening. And my pleasure is only slightly lessened by the imposing subject that has been assigned to me.

Earlier this week I attended the White House-sponsored meeting in Washington on the foreign aspects of United States national security. Mr. Eric Johnston and his colleagues provided those of us who were delegates with working papers. On page 1 there appeared a map which made its one and only point dramatically: Chicago is now on America's frontmost line as its most exposed major city—4,600 air miles from Moscow, 9 hours by today's jets, 5 hours by tomorrow's.

Such is one meaning and measure of the space age.

One meaning? Yes—and perhaps the least significant—for the battle for the world will not be fought with bullets or their 20th century electronic cousins, nor will it take place in outer space. Its weapons will be words and dollars and its battleground the villages and cities of Asia, the Middle East and Africa. Lenin's famous doctrine still stands: "The road to Paris lies through Peking and Calcutta"—and not through frontal military attack on the citadels of western power.

I submit to you that we live in an age of military stalemate and that it is the contest of ideas and ideals—the struggle for undecided minds—that will be decisive in the years of our lives.

The German military historian, Clausewitz, gave us the classic definition of war as "a mere continuation of policy by other means," but in a less known passage he went on to say, "the political design is the objective, while war is the means and the means can never be thought of apart from the objective."

War as a planned instrument of national policy has become obsolete, is indeed perhaps as remote today as it has been at any period since man first learned to attack his neighbors in an organized group with weapons more complicated than his own hands. I should add—but only parenthetically—that war may always come through a chain of accidental circumstances, through a local military situation in which both sides became so committed in terms of face and prestige that there could be no backing down; but it is another sign of these stalemated times that the Soviets will be at the most extreme pains to see to it that this kind of situation does not come into existence.

There ought to be no mystery as to why the threat of war has receded into the background. The principal deterrent lies in what Dean Acheson has so aptly described as "mutual terror." War has ceased to be a means to the end of a political design and has become instead a Frankenstein so overwhelming that its use in all likelihood would destroy the design itself.

There are other reasons also for believing that the Communist world, even while its ultimate objective of world conquest remains unchanged, will not and cannot risk military force as the way to that end. First there is the confirmation of Communist doctrine, not merely in the world of Lenin but also in those of his disciple, Khrushchev. After the launching of Sputnik his first challenge to the West was in the terms of peaceable economic competition and more recently he elaborated to an American visitor to the Kremlin: "We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade * * * We will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

It behooves us to listen carefully: This time the voice of Moscow is speaking the truth.

And then there is the not inconsiderable fact that the elite of the Communist world—the party members—have themselves acquired too substantial a material stake to risk its destruction in a single blinding flash. The introduction of the profit motive and the growth of inequality in income in the Soviet Union are too familiar to need comment. Suffice it to say that the Communist world too has developed its substantial property owners with large vested interests in the "peaceable" continuation of the present system.

And there are other deterrents that reach beyond the fear of their own destruction or the gospel of their own teachings.

There is the fact that without war they are winning the world. Not hands down, but winning. Not spectacularly, but steadily in geographical and in ideological penetration. With each passing year the erosion within the free world moves a step further and the domain of the Communist world grows larger. In these circumstances there is no incentive to war, or for that matter to negotiate or to compromise except as it preserves the time and provides the money to continue their nonmilitary aggression.

And yet we are without peace or at best in a very hot peace in which we must expect indefinitely to be engaged on three different fronts.

On the first of these the weapons are threat and bluff, extortion and political blackmail. The latest case histories are the campaign launched against Turkey a few months ago and the messages to the Scandinavian countries, West Germany and other NATO powers designed to discourage their acceptance of United States rocket and missile bases. This is a game which we will never play well. Fortunately we need not play it well, or play it at all, provided our nerves and those of our allies are strong. And, to the everlasting credit of those that have been threatened, the nerves of all concerned have all been strong, buttressed by the shield of American power.

The second front lies in the field of information and propaganda. Here we are faring very badly, indeed. Here we have permitted ourselves to be hopelessly outmatched and outwitted by the consummate propaganda masters who live in the Kremlin. Here we have become so bemused that we have permitted the world to forget or not to understand our essential basic truth: That this democracy has brought more freedom and more of the good material things of life to more people for a longer period than any other political or economic system ever devised.

Here our problem has been well posed by a young Vietnamese girl who recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Post. The Post republished her letter on the front page wtih a plea to all its readers to contribute to the response to her questions. These are some of the questions that Miss Le-My asked:

Does America help us for friendly reasons or by its own interest?

Is it right that the policy of American Government is to assimilate all of the countries living under its help?

Will the Americans go home soon, or will they stay in Vietnam for 100 years?

Do the Americans know that President Diem is an American puppet, as most of the Vietnamese believe?

Do the American people know that 95 percent of the Vietnamese do not like them?

What do Americans think about the Vietnamese people? Do they consider us Negroes as in America?

It becomes evident in other parts of her letter that this young lady is friendly to America and that she herself knows some of the answers that we ourselves would like to have given. But if you find others of her questions as difficult to answer, as I do, and if you appreciate that she stands as a spokesman for countless millions of people in the newly sovereign nations, then you will understand with me how difficult is our task in this phase of the hot peace.

The tragedy of it all is that as recently as 10 years ago the United States was recognized by all of the colonial peoples as their great champion. It would be hard to find today an echo of this once proud reputation.

We shall be struggling, too, for an indefinite future on a vast economic front which stretches around half of the world. After years of dismissing Russian claims and activities as words without deeds even the State Department, even Mr. Dulles, now recognize that the Communist bloc has effectively launched a huge program of economic aid and assistance to the underdeveloped, uncommitted areas. Still comparatively small by the yardstick of what America has done in the past, the Russian effort already encompasses projects totaling nearly $2 billion in a dozen countries. "We are ready to help you as brother helps brother; tell us what you need, and we will send to the best of our capabilities, money in the form of loans or aid." This was the Soviet line at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Cairo last month, and with it was bracketed the appealing theme that the Russians welcome giving their assistance to state-owned enterprises, an adroit device both to trap the West on its emphasis on private enterprise and at the same time to build in the underdeveloped areas the state-owned, state-controlled economies where communism has its best chance for acceptance.

The questions which the non-Communist world will have put to it with increasing skill and increasing urgency in the years to come will concern the Russian motives in their political and ideological and economic programs. Does the Soviet Union plan to dominate the world by any means that seem promising so long as the risks are not excessive? And must the West maintain a position of military strength sufficient to make the risks seem excessive? The answer that the non-Communist world would give today is at once "yes," "no," and "maybe." Only in the Western Hemisphere is the answer an unqualified "yes"; only in North America and Latin America are overwhelming majorities convinced beyond reasonable doubt that world domination is the fixed end of Russian policy and that whatever moves may be made on the international chessboard are but steps in this direction. In Western Europe the answer adds up to a "maybe," with almost equal numbers on each side of the fence. This becomes particularly clear when debate revolves about specific issues such as the proposed summit meeting. All the evidence available to us indicates that large majorities in every western European country are in favor of such a conference and that substantial minorities believe that the Russians would come prepared to make important concessions.

In other areas of the world, in the areas where nearly two-thirds of the non-Commu-

nist peoples live, the answer to these questions is a ringing "no." In the uncommitted nations, great majorities have come to believe that Russia's expansion policy presents no greater threat to themselves or their neighbors than the military alliances and colonial vestigates of the United States and her allies.

This is the great threat to America and to all who believe as we do. Not the danger of push-button, hydrogen-fueled, guided-missile warfare, but the possibility that the nearly 1 billion people of the uncommitted nations, the nations in a hurry, with their minds still open as to a choice between one system and the other, with their peoples living at or beneath the subsistence level, with their revolution of rising expectations thwarted—that these nations and these peoples will be seduced or persuaded to shift the world balance of power which they now hold in their hands to the ideological, and thus eventually to the physical, support of the Communist doctrine and thus propel America to involuntary isolation.

This is the dilemma of foreign policy in the space age.

Surprisingly, there is now general agreement on this. The chorus of assent has become virtually a litany and as one of the earlier choristers, this is good music to hear, indeed. President Eisenhower's last state of the Union message gave equal importance to the need for us to remain militarily strong and to the need to assist our less privileged neighbors. In Washington on Tuesday, both Mr. Dulles and Governor Stevenson went further to give priority to the vital necessity of helping the peoples of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa to help themselves.

Regrettably, there are, as yet, no indications from Washington, from either the administration or from the Congress, that we are producing the new ideas and the new programs to match our new appreciation of the danger—and of the opportunity—before us.

I should like to present to you four proposals which, I submit, are a part of the minimum basic framework for the kind of foreign policy the United States requires to get successfully through the time of trial which lies ahead.

I would speak first of an intangible, an intangible without which all else that we may do is doomed in advance to almost certain failure.

This Nation needs to regain a sense of mission and high purpose in the formulation and execution of its foreign policy. This is the sobering responsibility of the people and of their elected and appointed representatives.

Through our history there have been many driving forces that have taken America and Americans into the world and all have had overtones of mission. The brave new worlds of Woodrow Wilson and the United Nations, the ebullient aggressiveness of Theodore Roosevelt, the Protestant and Catholic settlements in Africa and Asia, the "open door" in China—all of these premised an American role in the world based in large part upon nonmaterial considerations. In the Lend Lease Act with its doctrine of equality of sacrifice the United States laid down the most far-reaching concept of economic relations between countries the world has ever known. In the Marshall plan, which Winston Churchill called "the most unselfish act in the history of nations," America enlightened self-interest to the highest plane it has ever reached.

Today this sense of mission is gone. Our policy has become defensive and negative. Of course, we still want a better world and, of course, we still want peace and prosperity for all. But we do all too little to help others achieve those goals and we do that little so grudingly that our wine turns to vinegar in the mouths of those who drink it abroad. Some men have the gift of giving thousands and being loved; others can give millions and can win no affection. If there has been a single act of genuine human warmth in our foreign relations in the past 5 years, I cannot recall it.

We have become pessimists, too. We have permitted ourselves to become sufficiently intimidated by the growing strength and the steady fanaticism of our enemy that sometimes we seem to fear to trust ourselves or our policies in the crucible of a free contest.

We have been doctrinaire. One of our more pernicious doctrines was the idea that the great contribution that we may make to the world is a stable and flourishing economy at home. No one would argue the truth of this assertion. It is the use of it that leads to disaster. A balanced budget is not a foreign policy; it is hardly more than a fragment of a cornerstone. Now that Mr. Humphrey has retired with his haircurlers to Thomasville, Ga., we can at least hope for a more intelligent and constructive fiscal approach to the great problems of survival and salvation.

Three of the great forces at work in the newly sovereign nations are nationalism, statism and racism. All three are present in varying degrees in each of these countries. Each has a very high emotional content. In many instances we have appealed successfully to the heads of the peoples in these areas, almost never have we appealed to their hearts. To understand Africa, or the Middle East, or Asia without understanding their emotions is impossible. This we must do for it is simply not good enough to take friends where we find them. It is also necessary to make friends where they may not now exist or where the friendliness may be obscured by misunderstanding and mistrust. And this implies a sense of mission and noble purpose vigorous enough to transplant and implant our own image of the premises that men live by.

Secondly, I would propose that this country enunciate a bold, clear, easy-to-understand statement of the scope and extent of the resources that we will make available each year to help sustain the economic growth and strength of the underdeveloped areas. This contribution might well be set at a minimum figure equal to one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product. We should take the lead in urging our neighbors in the Western World to establish a similar yardstick for their own efforts and to join with us in a joint international program. In the case of the United States the annual investment would be two and a quarter billion dollars based on gross national product in 1957 and a pro rata contribution by the NATO powers would bring the total to $3½ billions, or approximately the maximum possible level of capital absorption under present economic conditions in the developing countries. These amounts should be entirely apart from whatever sums we spend for overseas military assistance or defense support programs. Likewise they should be in addition to disbursements made by the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank which are essentially normal banking loans carrying interest and requiring repayment.

Advances under this program might take the form either of outright gifts or of loans on easy repayment terms. Some of the nations which stand in the greatest need do not, as we know, wish to receive outright grants. All of the funds need not and would not represent a new burden for the American taxpayer. In the first place there is considerable scope for reducing the amounts spent on military assistance and a portion of these funds ought to be diverted to more worthwhile and beneficial long-term civilian purposes. When such diversions are added to the amount of our present economic assistance—approximately $700 million—we would already be well on the path to meeting the objective. If the objective seems ambitious or overly expensive, then let us remember how very little indeed we have done to assist the 700 million people who live in the 20 nations that have become sovereign since World War II. With the exception of a few nations—none of them large in population except Pakistan—with which we have close military alinement, our expenditures for development programs in these areas through the whole postwar period has been but $3½ billion, scarcely $5 per capita spread over 13 years.

It is essential to any such program that it be continuous and continuing although it does not follow that it need be indefinite. The nationalist goal of every one of these countries is to become self-financing in terms of their own domestic savings.

Indeed in the very long run it might well develop that a comparatively large preplanned American contribution at the outset would be less expensive in dollars than the hit-or-miss, put-out-the-latest-fire-first program we have been operating in recent years.

Next, we would do well by ourselves and by our friends—if we proceeded to sweep away the tariff walls which limit access to the American market. Some 4½ million Americans earn their livelihood from our export trade, many times the number that could conceivably be affected if this country should adopt complete free trade as its policy. The gains to America would be immense, the cost small.

And we would in all probability only be anticipating a course which will sooner or later be forced upon us by the pressure of events. The European Common Market is in being. The free-trade area which would link Britain, the rest of Europe and much of Africa to the Common Market is not now far away. It appears almost inevitable that most or all of the British Commonwealth and Empire will sooner or later ask de facto membership in the Common Market and free-trade area. At that point America is almost certain to conclude that its interests would best be served by applying for admission also so that we might then enjoy the same preferential benefits.

But why wait for the inevitable? Why not now take this giant step which would immeasurably add to our stature as a great, enlightened and respected partner in the world-trading community.

And finally if we mean what we say about our faith and confidence in the free-enterprise system and in the part that private business and private technology can play in building a better and more prosperous world, then we should adopt the administrative and legislative measures that would encourage private capital to venture in far greater volume into areas where the risk is great and the profit return uncertain.

No thinking person believes that the entire job of providing the capital needs of Africa, the Middle East and Asia can be done by private capital. There are too many roads and dams to be built, educational and sanitation facilities to be provided, communication systems to be constructed, too much infrastructure to be supplied—and nearly all of these are the natural province of government.

But there are already great areas of these economies in which pivate enterprise could operate effectively given the proper incentive and these areas will become even larger as basic public-work installations are completed and the groundwork is laid for a modern diversified economy.

The specific steps that can be taken are too familiar to require repeating here. They were outlined in detail by Vice President NIXON at the San Francisco Conference last October. We could, if anything, go even further. If the attraction of private capital to the underdeveloped areas is in the supreme national interest, then we could enact legislation completely exempting from United

States taxation all new investment in plant and in technology in these areas.

In all of these respects, it seems to me, the question is not what we can do but rather what we cannot do without. It sometimes happens, Henry Taylor said, that a man who would not hurt a fly would hurt a nation. With the best intentions in the world too many of our citizens and our representatives in Congress are unwittingly hurting a nation, this Nation, by failing to see clearly enough or soon enough how drastically our policies and our programs must change to meet the ever-changing facts of international life in this global age.

This year is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. This week he appears on the cover of Time magazine. And this day we Americans could have no better motto than these words of the rough rider:

"The world has set its face hopefully toward our Democracy, and, oh my fellow citizens, each one of you carries on your shoulders the burden of doing well for the sake of your own country and of seeing that this Nation does well for the sake of mankind."

Unveiling of Portrait of Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, at Georgia State Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some time ago the General Assembly of Georgia adopted a resolution providing for the painting of a picture of my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who is a former Governor of Georgia, and arranged to have the picture appropriately placed in the State capitol.

The exercises of the unveiling of the portrait were held on April 7 of this year. A large concourse of people, including friends and admirers of my colleague, were present. Remarks were made on that occasion by the Governor of Georgia, by the Lieutenant Governor of the State, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Georgia, and by the Honorable Roy V. Harris, of Augusta, Ga.

I have been unable to obtain a copy of the remarks of the governor, because they were not prepared. But I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Lieutenant Governor Ernest Vandiver; the speaker of the house of representatives, the Honorable Marvin E. Moate; and Mr. Harris may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF LT. GOV. ERNEST VANDIVER AT CEREMONIES UNVEILING PORTRAIT OF SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE HELD AT THE GEORGIA STATE CAPITOL ON APRIL 7, 1958

It is a genuine pleasure and a cherished privilege for me to preside here at a program called to honor one of the greatest Americans of this generation.

The man that we are honoring today, Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, United States Senator from Georgia, is truly a man of destiny. In 1957 he began a phase of service to his State and country which all of us are sure will be written in golden letters on the annals of our time.

Only recently he was with us, serving as governor of his State, during which time he made a record that will go down in the books as one of the greatest in the history of our State.

It is with a definite feeling of pride that I look back into the political battles of the last 3 decades and review the achievements of our guest today, and his illustrious father, the Honorable Eugene Talmadge, who was the only man ever to be elected 4 times to the governorship.

It was my honor in 1948 to serve as manager of the first campaign of HERMAN TALMADGE for governor and also to serve as a worker in his second campaign when he offered for the full 4-year term in 1950.

These victories gave HERMAN TALMADGE 6 years in office, the longest consecutive service ever given by a Governor of this State.

All of us recall the magnificent record of achievement HERMAN TALMADGE rolled up in those 6 years.

It was then, after these 6 years, that the people of Georgia could best see the shape of his greatness. It stood like a high column, reaching up through over half a decade, each year mortared tightly to the next by integrity, wisdom and unselfishness.

After 2 years in private life he reentered the political arena, ran for the office of United States Senator and was elected—carrying the majority vote in all of Georgia's 159 counties.

But in all his public services HERMAN TALMADGE'S greatest contribution to his people was his resolute and courageous fight launched to preserve the principles of segregation in the State.

As Governor his battle held the enemy at bay, and he has continued his fight since becoming our United States Senator. He and the senior Senator from Georgia have continued a leadership which has thus far saved Georgia and most of the South from her enemies.

Through the counsel and leadership the people of Georgia have received, they are united as never before in the battle to protect us from the attacks of outsiders and malcontents. That determined and dauntless leadership must be continued in the years to come.

Again, I say to you that it is a genuine pleasure and a signal honor to present to you at this time, the distinguished United States Senator from Georgia, the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE.

REMARKS OF HON. MARVIN E. MOATE, SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, Governor Griffin, Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Senator Talmadge, ladies and gentlemen, nothing said here today can add one bit of luster to the Talmadge name. It was placed high on the roll of great men by the raw courage and intelligence of the late, lamented Eugene Talmadge, who was elected Governor of Georgia for four times.

That same manner of forthrightness, courage, and ability, made known all over these United States by Eugene Talmadge, is now being emblazoned and embellished by the worthy son of a worthy sire.

The distinguished junior Senator was once a bit amazed—nonplused, might be the better word—early in his political career, by the then correct observation of an old friend of the family who said, "Herman, you are a chip off the old block." Herman smiled his most pleasant smile, but it faded somewhat when the old gentlemen completed his remarks thusly, "but you are a mighty small chip."

That observation might have been correct at that time, but Herman later proved himself a brass-bound, triple-plated, dyed-in-the-wool, full-size chip off the old block.

One sometimes wonders why any person in full possession of his faculties will sacrifice the peace and ease of ordinary life to enter the sometimes vicious and deadly contests in the political arena—from which no one has ever emerged a complete victor. Public ingratitude for a job well done has long been a byword all over the face of this earth.

Such was best expressed by a great Englishman, whose courage and firmness in England's darkest hour, saved his country from the ravages of the mighty military machine of Hitler. Yet the first opportunity the electorate had to express their appreciation for a good job well done—he was rejected by the very people whose lives and fortunes he had saved. It has been said that "a great man is he who meets triumph and disaster and treats these two imposters both the same."

It is evident to all that Churchill is a great man. After his political defeat, he charitably said that "the mark of a great people is the disrespect with which they treat their statesmen."

It is fitting and proper that this portrait of the Senator should be hung in the State capitol in company with his distinguished father. The next general assembly should provide for the hanging of a portrait of Mrs. Eugene Talmadge alongside her distinguished husband and son, both of whom have had such an important part in steering the Ship of State in the calm waters of reason and right.

If Senator TALMADGE were a resident of any State north of the Mason and Dixon Line, or if the fanatical fringe of humanity had not control of the party machinery of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, he would surely occupy the highest position in the gift of the people of the United States, and his star would shine with a brighter glitter than that of any five-star general.

On the real (basic, fundamental principles, which shape the destiny of this Nation, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE stands as firm as the rock on which the Christ told Peter he would build his Church.

When he was Governor there was no amalgamation of the races in Georgia, and such will not happen here as long as he and others maintain and continue their present course.

He has always stood firm on the Unit System which gives the rural areas a voice in the selection of candidates in the primaries.

Contrary to the ceaseless propaganda against the unit system, it is responsible in a large measure for the lack of metropolitan political bosses and machines, as well as crime-ridden government in Georgia. As long as the unit system is continued, no city political boss, with an enormous illiterate and ill-qualified bloc vote at his beck and call, can hope to be Governor of Georgia contrary to the majority wishes of the other 158 counties.

Those who seek to destroy the unit system for selfish purposes, very carefully compare the worth of one vote in Echols or Quitman County, compared with that of votes in Fulton County.

That same unholy crew is just as careful not to mention that such a system is one of the basic fundamentals on which this great Nation was founded. For example, the State of Nevada has only a population of 180,000, yet Nevada has two United States Senators. The State of New York has a population of 16 million, yet New York has only two United States Senators, the same as Nevada, the smallest State in the Union. Therefore, according to the idiotic reasoning of those who oppose the unit system in Georgia, one vote in Nevada is worth 90 votes in New York.

Senator TALMADGE has had the courage to speak his convictions in language any one can understand, of the senseless folly of the burdened taxpayers of the United States buying Cadillacs for potentates of foreign countries who revel in a more luxurious and dissolute life than the richest in America.

It is fitting and proper that this portrait

be hung while Senator TALMADGE is among the living—and may he live to see many, many more summers. But one cannot forget that Holy Writ teaches than man born of woman is of but few days and full of trouble.

When all the world was at the feet of Julius Ceasar—in the midst of a magnificent triumph accorded him by the citizens of the great Roman empire—it is told that he instructed a slave to run by the side of his chariot and repeat constantly these words: "Caesar, remember that you are mortal."

I am proud to call HERMAN TALMADGE my friend.

I am proud to have called his father my friend.

All Georgians are proud of HERMAN TALMADGE because HERMAN TALMADGE is proud to be a Georgian.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF ROY V. HARRIS, AUGUSTA, GA., ATTORNEY, AT CEREMONIES UNVEILING PORTRAIT OF SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE, STATE CAPITOL, ATLANTA, GA., ON APRIL 7, 1958

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to unveil a portrait of HERMAN TALMADGE in the State Capitol alongside the portrait of his famous father.

The Legislature of Georgia, by an appropriate resolution, has provided for this painting and for this ceremony.

In taking this action, the legislature desired to honor one of the greatest governors Georgia has ever had. During his administration, Georgia made more progress than it has made in any given 50-year period in her entire history.

In taking this action, the legislature desired to honor one of the greatest Senators Georgia has ever sent to the United States Senate.

But, the legislature had something in mind over and beyond the fact that HERMAN TALMADGE has made a great governor and a great Senator.

For over 10 years HERMAN TALMADGE has been the spokesman for Georgia.

He has been the voice of Georgia because he more nearly speaks the sentiments of the people of this State than any other one person. HERMAN TALMADGE more nearly represents the dreams, the ideals and the heartbeats of Georgians than any leader we have produced in a long time.

He is rapidly becoming the voice of the 40 million people of the South. For a long time, the people of the South have needed a voice compelling enough to unite the people behind a leader and it is my belief that HERMAN TALMADGE is bound to be that voice.

I say this because his sentiments are more in tune with the heartbeats of the people of the South than any of our other leaders.

HERMAN TALMADGE has never flinched in standing by the people of the South. He has stood for our way of life and for constitutional government and has never trimmed and has never wavered on any occasion.

It is not necessary for me to praise him to this audience. Instead, we need his services in a broader field and for that reason, I am going to nominate him as a candidate for President of the United States in 1960.

Shipping Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, over the years much has been said, pro and con, in Congress and out, with regard to the value of, and the need for, a privately owned commercial shipping fleet to carry the Nation's foreign commerce.

Some economy-minded editorial writers and businessmen, unmindful of the sad experiences of this Nation in two world wars, and unappreciative of the millions of dollars saved this Nation in the Korean conflict alone by reason of the fact that our available reserve-fleet vessels kept ocean freight rates from skyrocketing, are ever ready to urge reliance upon foreign fleets, because they are cheaper.

An editorial in the Journal of Commerce of Friday, April 11, comments favorably upon the announcement of a research project to be undertaken in the field of ocean shipping, under the auspices of the Committee of American Steamship Lines. I anticipate much of value from the undertaking, and congratulate both the Committee of American Steamship Lines and Northwestern University, whose transportation center will conduct this needed research project.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Journal of Commerce be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING RESEARCH

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

The announcement from Northwestern University that its transportation center will put the spotlight on United States-flag shipping in an attempt to evaluate its importance to the Nation's economy is welcome news and a constructive development.

This is one phase of the shipping problem that never has been fully and intelligently probed. This may come as a surprise to some in an age where market research and industry impact studies have been undertaken from time to time by most major segments of the business world.

Possibly one reason has been the complicated nature of the business since shipping is a service industry dealing with all other types of industries and subject to special problems of its own in the field of transportation such as United States Government foreign-trade policies and direct competition from foreign carriers.

Without minimizing the importance of a merchant marine for national-defense purposes, this has often been overstressed in the past at the expense of detailing the commercial value of a strong merchant fleet.

The new survey should go a long way toward spelling out by verse and chapter exactly where the commercial value of our shipping lies. There is little doubt in our minds that the real impact of shipping will come as a surprise to many people, some of whom are inclined to view our economy as starting and ending on the coastlines.

As Alexander Purdon, director of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, whose organization is supporting the center's research program, points out, "America's ability to wage a cold war on the economic front is just as important as its ability to fight an all-out or conventional war using military weapons."

The statement observes that, with only 6 percent of the world's population, ours is the world's greatest trading nation, and the American economy represents almost half the economic activity outside the Communist bloc.

What shipping contributes to maintaining and strengthening this economic position should make a highly informative study.

The Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on April 25, 1958, the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N. C., published an editorial entitled "America Needs No Platonic Guardians," which comments upon the all-too-frequent tendency of the Supreme Court to substitute the personal notions of its members for the law of the land. This editorial is worthy of the attention of every American who believes that courts should stick to their judicial knitting and leave the making of laws to legislative bodies.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA NEEDS NO PLATONIC GUARDIANS

Comments from the South about the wisdom of the United States Supreme Court are automatically suspect in learned circles of the North, but it is more difficult to brush aside serious criticism by men of the stature of Judge Learned Hand and Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University.

These two distinguished pillars of judicial wisdom have been sounding off lately in language which, at a minimum, should shock the 9 men in black.

Judge Hand goes back to the famed Brown school desegregation decision to make his most penetrating observations in a new book published by Harvard University Press—a series of lectures delivered at that institution in honor of Justice Holmes.

Judge Hand does not question the precedent of judicial review which, although not anticipated by the founding fathers, certainly was a necessary evolution. But he does step down hard on the lack of restraint manifest in the use of that concept. The high court, he feels, has become a "third legislative chamber," originating new law and usurping powers allotted to the legislative and executive branches of Government.

Specifically, Judge Hand cannot understand why the high Court, in the Brown decision, did not recognize the existence of section 3 of the 14th amendment "which offered an escape from intervening, for it empowers Congress to 'enforce' all the preceding sections 'by appropriate legislation.'"

This aspect of the 14th amendment has not been mentioned prominently, if at all, by the high Court.

Judge Hand observes:

"I cannot frame any definition that will explain when the Court will assume the role of a third legislative chamber and when it will limit its authority to keeping Congress and the States within their accredited authority. Nevetheless, I am quite clear that it has not abdicated its former function, as to which I hope that it may be regarded as permissible for me to say that I have never been able to understand on what basis it does or can rest except as a coup de main."

This is weighty judicial language, but it has an explicit meaning for men learned in the law, coming from one of the most distinguished judicial minds still in business today. Judge Hand does not offer vituperative criticism of the Court, now widely heard across the Nation on many subjects, some far removed from racial integration. But he does wryly note that "for myself it would

be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians, even if I knew how to choose them, which I assuredly do not."

This is mild language compared with the sharp criticism of Professor Corwin, of Princeton, widely known for his liberal views and once a candidate for the high Court in the time of Franklin Roosevelt. Professor Corwin writes in a letter to the New York Times:

"There can be no doubt that on June 17 last the Court went on a virtual binge and thrust its nose into matters beyond its competence, with the result that in my judgment at least it should have aforesaid nose well tweaked.

"Its holding in the Watkins case, in which it claims the right to recast congressional resolutions authorizing committee investigations, is quite irresponsible and indefensible, interfering as it does with the great primal power, as inheritance of the Mother of Parliaments, as Inquest of the Realm. * * *

"Equally irresponsible was the Court's holding in the Yates case on the same occasion. This practically repealed the Smith Act, although a year earlier the Court had held in the Nelson case, that the act repealed all State antisedition acts, the total results being to leave the country exposed to unjustifiable propaganda urging the right to revolution."

What is the remedy, Professor Corwin asks, for this vicious nonsense? It is not to enact a stupid, impractical curtailment on the Court's general powers, such as advocated by Senator JENNER'S dangerous bill. It is rather to pass, in Professor Corwin's judgment, "a declaratory act of Congress assertive of the correct reading of the Constitution on the points involved in the abovementioned cases."

Since Judge Hand and Professor Corwin have rendered these judgments, the Supreme Court has handed down yet another batch of significant opinions, some containing the most violently opposed viewpoints voiced on that august bench since Justice Jackson's feud with Justice Black in 1946. The Court is split by 5–4 margins, with confusing language and equally confusing logic.

It seems about time for the learned Justices to take another good look at some of the basic precepts of the Constitution under which they supposedly operate. Certainly, the Court should interpret the law, but it should learn judicial restraint, desisting from stepping into the realm of a third legislature or assuming the role of platonic guardians. This, as Judge Hand wisely observed, is not the role envisioned for the United States Supreme Court.

Pace-Setter Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pace-Setter HUMPHREY," which appears in the issue of the New Republic for April 28, 1958. The editorial heralds the vision and foresight, particularly in the realm of foreign affairs, of the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is one of the most eloquent and articulate persons in American public life today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACE-SETTER HUMPHREY

HUBERT HUMPHREY, who was once dismissed by a lady columnist as a "gliberal," is busily proving himself on issue after issue to be one of the most impressive Members of the United States Senate. In foreign affairs especially, he has become a pace setter for his party. He deserves particular praise for the persistent manner in which his Disarmament Subcommittee has brought out into the open for debate the crucial issue of whether or not a reliable detection system is possible in any ban on nuclear test explosions. Here, and elsewhere, HUMPHREY is identifying himself with controversies which are more often than not shunned by his colleagues as too risky politically.

Last week, he again noted that a China policy that accepts Communist China's existence is a prerequisite to disarmament. He reminded a TV audience that the Soviet Union staged a nuclear explosion in the 9-kiloton range within Chinese territory and argued that "if you are going to have a truly effective disarmament agreement of major proportions you must include within it Red China." For years he has advocated greater attention to India, and in his proposal for a $900 million loan program in 1958 and 1959 he did not duck the fact, as others have, that ample aid to India funds can come only through appropriations by Congress.

It was HUMPHREY who protested on the morning after the French raid on Sakiet-el-Youssef that United States Corsairs had been improperly used in violation of mutual security commitments. Since his visit to the Middle East in May 1957, it has been HUMPHREY who stressed the need for a Middle East economic development authority. And he is continually prodding the administration to use our agricultural surpluses on a larger scale as a means of assisting countries in the Middle East and Asia.

The Senator is perhaps best known for the pro-civil-rights stand which first placed him in the national spotlight at the 1948 Democratic Convention. To his own Minnesota constituents he may appear primarily as a fighter for retention of farm price supports and as a grimly earnest Cassandra who appears daily on the Senate floor to cite evidence that the recession is worse than the President will admit. He turned up last week as the chief advocate of pending humane slaughter legislation.

The Scandinavian Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in these troublous times, it is good news to know that the Scandinavian Nation continue to put accent on peace. One of the outstanding editorial commentators of the Midwest, Mr. George L. Peterson, of the Minneapolis Star, has written a very informative article on the Scandinavian political scene.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCANDINAVIAN NATIONS PUT ACCENT ON PEACE
(By George L. Peterson)

Is Scandinavia becoming neutralist in the cold war between East and West? That was the interpretation in some quarters after Norway and Denmark made it clear at the recent NATO meeting in Paris that they wanted no atomic stockpiles or missile-launching facilities on their territory.

Nikita Khrushchev indicated a similar interpretation a week ago in a message to Danish Premier H. C. Hansen praising Denmark and Norway for their opposition to new American weapons on their soil. He followed this message in a few days with a warning. He told a Stockholm newsman that Russia would not respect the neutrality of Sweden and Finland if missiles were launched against the Soviet Union from Denmark or Norway.

Premier Hansen, who serves as his own foreign minister, said in a New Year's broadcast to the nation: "Certain voices have been heard speaking of neutrality in connection with our stressing the need of negotiation and relaxation of tension. There is no basis for this. Our foreign policy, which is founded on our membership in the United Nations and NATO, is unchanged and unshaken. We have solemnly confirmed our responsibilities toward those two peace-loving international organizations."

After his return to Oslo from the Paris meeting, Norwegian Premier Einar Gerhardsen said that Norway's future stand on weapons bases "will necessarily depend on world developments. Not least will Soviet policy have a decisive influence on the defense policy of Norway and its NATO allies. If we are heading toward a period of international relaxation there will, of course, be no question of changing our policy of refusing admission of foreign forces on Norwegian territory, except in case of attack or when threatened with attack."

The Norwegian most closely associated with NATO has been Halvard Lange, Foreign Minister. He was 1 of the 3 wise men named in 1956 to chart future policies for NATO. He has championed the Organization at home, but the other members of the Social Democratic government haven't been as enthusiastic in their support of NATO as Lange. Nor has the public, though Lange himself is one of the most respected figures in public life.

Norway is a strong supporter of greater economic cooperation among the Scandinavian nations. Erik Brofuss, governor of the Bank of Norway, has been urging that a Nordic customs union be set up by Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Norway. The economic committee of the Nordic council, meeting in Sweden in November, recommended that a decision on the customs union be delayed until there was further discussion of the proposed European free-trade area.

Scandinavia as a whole entered 1958 with a number of economic misgivings. In Norway the gross national product gained 3.5 percent in 1957, about the same gain registered in each of the 5 preceding years. Private as well as government investment continued strong and there was virtually no unemployment. But at the end of the year prices were softening for important Norwegian exports and services—wood, pulp, and ocean-freight rates.

In Sweden the gross national product gained 3 percent in 1957, against a 2 percent gain in 1956. Industrial output began dropping in the last quarter of 1957 and unemployment increased. But the generally strong economic position of the country was shown by immigration figures—17,000 more persons moving into Sweden than were moving out. The arrivals came chiefly from other Scandinavian countries to fill job openings.

Denmark, which has one of the most tightly controlled economic programs in free Europe, kept prices and employment stable during 1957. But there was no improvement in industrial production. More labor troubles threaten in 1958. Finland, which also has been penalized by long and costly strikes in the last few years, is beset by new—or perhaps it is more proper to say continuing—financial problems. The Finnmark was devalued last year, exports increased and imports dropped. So the balance of trade situation improved considerably. But unemployment and inflation still are serious problems.

In Iceland, 1957 was marked by another increase in trade with Soviet Russia. Russian purchases from Iceland (mainly fish) totalled 156 million kronur (about $9 million) in 1955. Last year they were 220 million kronur. Russia was ready to buy even more Icelandic fish if this seafood had been available. Icelandic imports from Russia increased from 172 million kronur in 1955 to 260 million in 1957. Trade with the United States fell in the same period and this country now is second to the Soviet Union in both export and import business with Iceland. Some members of the Icelandic Government are urging even closer ties with the Soviet world.

Elsewhere in Scandinavia trade and other connections with the United States and the West remain strong. But the most evident note in Scandinavian foreign policy is the strong desire for peace. At what price that peace may be purchased is a question which Scandinavia seems to leave to other nations.

Transfer of American Vessels to Foreign Registry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as many Senators will recall, I have consistently opposed the policies of the Federal Maritime Administrator with regard to the transfer of vessels from United States registry to any of the so-called "runaway" foreign flags. Despite my opposition, such transfers have been authorized in large numbers during the past few years.

Now the shoe seems to be on the other foot. Owners who transferred are now petitioning to have their foreign-flag vessels redocumented under the American flag, because cargoes are scarce in the world market, and these owners see a better chance for survival under American registry, where the cargo-preference legislation offers assurance of opportunity to share in at least 50 percent of Government financed coal and grain shipments.

A timely and pertinent editorial, from the Journal of Commerce of recent date, points up this situation quite neatly. Entitled "The Wayward Fleet," it cites some facts that should be of real concern to the responsible executive department officials. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAYWARD FLEET
(By Edward P. Tastrom)

There is something rotten in Denmark, to quote from Hamlet, when ships can transfer away from American to foreign flag registry during hard times, and then blithely come back to American flag operation when the reverse of the coin shows.

Yet this is precisely what has been happening recently. Several ships in the United States tramp fleet were permitted to transfer to foreign flag operation a few years ago after industry representations were made in Washington that the tonnage available was excessive in the light of cargo offerings. The arrangement agreed upon permitted a United States tramp operator to transfer up to half his tonnage to a foreign flag, to secure the benefit of lower operating costs.

Now a different set of conditions prevails. Due to the workings of Public Law 480 providing for the disposal of surplus farm products abroad, and the requirement that 50 percent of such cargo be moved in American ships (if available), United States flag tramps today can command a far higher price than prevails in the world market for similar cargo.

Indicative of the price spread are some recent fixtures.

A number of United States flag tramps have obtained up to $10.15 per ton for moving coal from Hampton Roads to Spain in an aid program shipment, while foreign flag vessels have been appreciating less than $4 for comparable trips. Similarly, United States tramp tonnage has been chartered for approximately $17 per ton to move grain from the Gulf to Turkey. Foreign vessels have secured $6.20 for similar voyages.

Actually the law is costing the taxpayer money because of the way it is being operated. This provides for offsetting any cargo moved on foreign ships with cargo moved on similar type Americans. Thus, if a foreign tramp gets a P. L. 480 cargo, the next lot must move on an American tramp. The same rule applies to movement on liner services.

This has resulted in some weird developments. There are cases reported where ships on liner service, going out only partly loaded, have been unable to obtain aid cargo because a United States tramp ship under the offset arrangement had preference. Usually the rate paid the tramp ship was considerably higher than the liner service was ready to quote for the business. In one instance, reported from a reliable source, the tramp cargo moved at about $10 a ton more than the liner service quotation.

With the United States tramp fleet reduced to small numbers as aresult of foreign transfers, and with P. L. 480 shipments continuing at a high level, it is not hard to understand why some of those who "bowed out' 'a few years ago are now scurrying back.

The Maritime Administration evidently foresaw something like this happening, for it ultimately abandoned free transfers and required any owner desiring to go to foreign registry to agree to build an equivalent amount of American flag tonnage in a United States yard and also ruled that the transferred ship could not again be re-registered without MA consent.

Thus the barn door was finally closed and could be opened only if some tangible value in the way of support to American merchant shipping was to be offered.

Any system that permits the free flag transfer back and forth of shipping, in response to economic or other advantages as they arise, is not only unreasonable but makes a mockery of any nation's efforts to assist and encourage the development of its merchant marine.

The "Third Man" at the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article written by the able columnist, George Dixon, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 26, 1958, regarding Mr. Robert Gray, assistant to the President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "THIRD MAN" AT THE WHITE HOUSE
(By George Dixon)

So rapidly and unobtrusively that few outside Washington have yet grown aware of it, a 36-year-old college professor has become the "Third Man" at 1600 Pennsylvania ave. Robert Keith Gray has been elevated to a double role never entrusted to one man before. He not only screens all the White House patronage, but all of President Eisenhower's appointments.

His surname describes him. This prematurely-gray young man is listed only as a secretary. But he has six secretaries working for him. In an average 10-hour-a-day, 6-day week, they weed out as many as 600 seekers after Presidential favors, and more than 300 applicants for audiences with the President.

Only D. W. Eisenhower and Sherman Adams wield more power in the White House. Unless Ike or "Sherm the Firm" intervene, which is not often, no one gets to see either a job or the President without the blessing of the gray Mr. Gray.

Thomas E. Stephens has just been reappointed as the President's "appointments secretary," but Gray still has charge of the screening.

The ex-prof works like a beaver, even if a curious lady who lives across the street from him entertains other ideas. The young bachelor dwells alone in a tiny remodeled house at 1415 27th Street in Georgetown. Directly opposite, at 1412, lives Mrs. Susan Clegg.

A squib appeared in the paper the other day that a White House limousine calls for Mr. Gray every morning promptly at 7:15. Mrs. Clegg telephoned me, unsolicited, to set this important issue straight. She said the limousine called for her influencial neighbor at 7:15 all right, but that he seldom gets into it before 7:30.

For all his professional background, Gray has a delicate sense of humor. He informs friends he has a swimming pool in his garden and invites them to make use of it when the weather gets warmer. The "garden" is about 10 by 10 and the "swimming pool" is a small well, about four feet in diameter. Mr. Gray explains:

"It will hold about two very friendly people."

The "Third Man" has a remarkable history. After attending Columbia and Harvard he returned to his native city, Hastings, Nebr., as a teacher at Hastings College. After that he taught at Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., and went from there to the University of Southern California as a professor in business administration.

At the University of Southern California he conceived the unprofessorial notion that if he could teach business he could also practice it. He returned to Hastings, talked to some

moneyed friends into putting up cash, and ventured into the warehousing business. It mushroomed. Now he has 13 profitable warehouses in Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota.

One who observed his astounding success was Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, who also comes from Hastings. Seaton mentioned him to Ike, who mentioned him to Sherm, who induced Gray to take a furlough from warehousing and join the White House secretariat. Gray was assigned to assist Sherm with patronage, then put in charge of it, then—when Bernard Shanley quit as appointment secretary last November 5 to run for Senator from New Jersey—he was quietly handed Shanley's job too.

The Present Economic Adjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in recent months we have had many explanations and many prescriptions for the treatment of the so-called recession and economic conditions. We have heard in the Chamber as well as in committees the opinions, explanations, and other comments of experts, near experts, the great, the near great, and the not so great.

I believe the experience of the Senator from Nebraska, like that of his colleagues, in receiving various letters from time to time from ordinary businessmen, who have to deal with business problems as they find them, is perhaps very revealing and very helpful. I received such a letter yesterday from C. R. Thomas, of Fairbury, Nebr. Among other things he says with reference to his particular line of business is this:

> Our auto industry appears to be the worst hit. A bill to eliminate the excise tax on cars should be speedily introduced and either passed or killed, and preferably killed. The uncertainty of this tax is hurting the industry.

There are other thoughts equally as sound as this particular one, Mr. President, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> WESTERN AUTO ASSOCIATE STORE,
> *Fairbury, Nebr., April 23, 1958.*
> Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: The present economic adjustment came about through overproduction.
>
> Time, and time alone will cure it.
>
> Governmental tinkering with the economy may ease the pain temporarily, but is like giving a narcotic for a bellyache, when a dose of salts is needed.
>
> A tax cut, with increased defict spending, may be a palliative, but definitely is not a panacea, and furthermore, since savings accounts are increasing rapidly, it would appear that the individual's savings from lowered taxes would probably go into such accounts.
>
> On top of this, the man who has no income is the one who needs the help, and our most starry-eyed dreamer has a difficult case to prove that he would benefit, except by the most roundabout way.
>
> Our auto industry appears to be the worst hit. A bill to eliminate the excise tax on cars should be speedily introduced and either passed or killed, and preferably killed. The uncertainity of this tax is hurting the industry.
>
> Much of our trouble is psychological and while many people have spendable money they are hanging on to as much as possible, and waiting to see what will happen. Governmental handouts will crystallize their belief that we are in for some tough times. To be sure, we will have some adjustments to make, but unusual governmental spending will simply cause people to hold on to their cash with a fiercer grip.
>
> Yours,
>
> C. R. THOMAS.

Congress Is Getting Things Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, most of us had an opportunity, earlier this month, to spend a week or 10 days with our constituents. For me, it was an extremely useful and helpful experience.

The fine record of performance that has been achieved by Congress so far at this session, in large measure due to the diligent and aggressive leadership of both Houses of Congress, is widely appreciated and heralded in my State of Wisconsin.

In a recent editorial, Wisconsin's daily newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, paid a fine tribute to the performance of Congress. The Journal editorial, which is entitled "Congress Getting Things Done," begins as follows:

> If you meet your Congressman (Senator or Representative) at the plant gate, supermarket, or front door this week, you may wish to salute him with: "Nice job so far."

The Journal goes on to spell out just what is the record that justifies its pat on the back for Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> For, while you may disagree with some things that the 2d session of the 85th Congress has done since January, you must admit that it has worked hard and at an unusually fast pace. Usually Congress dawdles until after the Easter recess. This one hasn't. Some of its major work is finished and much of it is started.
>
> The work done list includes an emergency housing bill, special tax treatment for insurance companies, special defense construction measure, debt limit boost, establishment of committees to deal with outer space problems, and a price freeze on farm supports (vetoed by the President). On the way to becoming law are bills to speed highway building, raise postal pay and rates, and improve rivers and harbors.
>
> Committee hearings are well under way on foreign aid, reciprocal trade, presidential disability and unemployment compensation liberalization. Appropriation bills are much further advanced than at a comparable time in other sessions.
>
> Why the special sense of urgency this year? Congressional Quarterly, a Washington research agency, terms it "the triple threat of sputnik, recession and fall elections." One thing is certain: Worried Congressmen want to get home as soon as possible to start on their campaigns for reelection.

Economic Conditions in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several days ago I started submitting for inclusion in the RECORD articles written by John C. Waugh, of the Christian Science Monitor, and sent forward two. I suggested that I would present for printing one article a day for 5 days.

The articles show the phenomenal growth of the economy in my State of Arizona. They show the Southwest as one of the bright spots in the whole United States. In view of the continuing sounds of gloom from the opposite side of the aisle, and in a desire to be helpful to my colleagues, and give them a little cheer over the weekend, I decided to put the other three articles in the RECORD this morning. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, first, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Arizona Heralded as Industrial Oasis," from the Christian Science Monitor of February 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> ARIZONA HERALDED AS INDUSTRIAL OASIS
>
> (By John C. Waugh)
>
> PHOENIX, ARIZ.—Arizona is being hailed as a new industrial oasis.
>
> Almost out of nowhere, like a mirage, light industry and manufacturing have come to this chunk of the great American desert. In just a few short years manufacturing has become the State's big money winner.
>
> In 1956 it generated an annual income of some $400 million. When all the 1957 figures are in it is expected to soar beyond that.
>
> Ten years ago it accounted for only $117 million. Decidedly more substantial than a mirage, it now challenges mining as the State's chief economic bulwark.
>
> A decade ago most Arizonians would have considered this impossible. The State traditionally has had three economic favorites—mining, agriculture, and cattle.
>
> This does not mean that Arizona is suddenly an industrial state. It just isn't. Industry here is still in swaddling clothes. It doesn't dominate the economy. It just presides as temporary chairman. But its future looks as bright as the desert sun.
>
> FOOTLOOSE FIRMS WELCOME
>
> Arizona, experts agree, will never become a haven to heavy industry. It doesn't have the raw materials for this. It is too far from the major market places of the Nation and transportation is still too costly.

But such new industrial breeds as electronics—the light, footloose industries that produce low-bulk, high-value products—these are the light of Arizona's budding industrial life.

This State's romance with industry really began less than 10 years ago. People were beginning to swarm into the State in the great mass migration west following World War II.

Lewis Haas, alert, articulate manager of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, tells the story well.

INDUSTRY SOUGHT

"It became evident," Mr. Haas points out, "that we could not possibly support this burgeoning population with our traditional economies—agriculture and mining. These were apt suddenly to diminish. We couldn't control them. They couldn't be relied upon to offer any possibility for increased employment which a soaring population demands. So we turned to industry."

State and local groups began putting out welcome mats. And industry began to come. In the 10 years since 1947, 200 new factories have sprung up in Arizona, making available 25,000 new industrial jobs.

The State legislature eased several tight tax laws. Now, for instance, industry can store its in-transit products tax free in Arizona. This is turning Phoenix into a busy distribution center, not yet a major one, but a growing one.

Several farm machinery companies, for example, have located warehouses here and many Los Angeles firms have opened local branches in the area.

FUTURE SCANNED

Duncan McRuer, terminal manager of Watson Bros. Transportation Co., Inc., in Phoenix, believes Arizona's future as a distribution center lies in supplying small cities and towns, particularly in Arizona and California. Lying as it does in the shadow of Los Angeles, he hardly thinks that Phoenix will soon, if ever, become a major distribution hub.

Though Arizona's industrial boom is impressive it still lags behind the Nation generally.

"While the national average of persons employed in industry is 34 percent," Dr. L. W. Casaday points out, "Arizona's industrial employment is still under 20 percent. So, you see, we have a long way to go yet."

At the same time, Dr. Casaday, director of the Bureau of Business Research at the University of Arizona, in Tucson, indicates that mining in Arizona employs 6.5 percent of the workers. Mining nationally employs only 1.8 percent. This points up the continuing importance of Arizona's traditional economic foundations.

The Federal Government, together with a handful of major companies, has made Arizona what it industrially is today.

The largest single industrial employer in the State is the Air Force-owned Hughes Aircraft Co. plant in Tucson. It employs 4,700 persons and produces the air-to-air Falcon guided missile.

In 1954, the Army established its electronics proving ground at Fort Huachuca near Tucson. Even before that the electronics industry had begun moving into Arizona. Now, electronics is unquestionably Arizona's industrial pride and joy.

Motorola, Inc., now has three big electronics plants in Phoenix. General Electric has established its computer division here. Sperry-Rand Corp., Goodyear Aircraft Corp., and Kaiser Aircraft and Electronics Corp. all have converged on the Phoenix area.

SATELLITES ATTRACTED

These companies, in turn, have attracted and are attracting satellite industries. But, again, in perspective, even the electronics industry is comparatively small compared to that in other States.

"There is more total electronics activity in Camden, N. J., than we have in our entire State," notes Bernard Mergen, manager of the Arizona Development Board. "But remember, we started from nothing, and not long ago either."

Arizona industry still is tied heavily to defense and the Federal Government. Two of Motorola's three plants are involved in military electronics. If Fort Huachuca was to close its gates there would be trouble. But in this day of the big armament race, this is considered highly unlikely.

LAYOFF MADE NEWS

Tucson is so industrially dependent on the military that when Hughes Aircraft laid off 700 workers late in 1957 it became 1 of the 10 top local news stories of the year.

Arizona does face industrial problems. A solid industrial future calls for wider diversity and less dependence on the Government. Arizona's two queen cities, Phoenix and Tucson, both are pushing in this direction, with Phoenix enjoying considerably more success so far than Tucson.

Mr. Mergen and his development group are deeply anxious that industry move into the smaller Arizona towns, many of which have been industrially bypassed in the "boom."

But industrial development of this State is moving steadily forward. The oasis is growing industrially greener every day.

Technical Assistance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an interesting article entitled "U. N. 'No Strings' Aid Plan makes Daily Global Gains," written by J. Avery Joyce, recently was published in Labor's Daily.

The article justly appraises the initiative of the United Nations and the international labor organizations in technical assistance programs being conducted in many of the underdeveloped countries of Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. "NO STRINGS" AID PLAN MAKES DAILY GLOBAL GAINS

(By J. Avery Joyce)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—Throughout the 19th century, while the main energies of the United States were being devoted to the opening up and consolidation of its own west, the frontiers of the British Empire were being pushed deeper and deeper into the backward areas of Africa and Asia. Belgium, France, Holland, Portugal, and, later, Germany, were also in the race for new territories and new markets, though the lion's share throughout was obviously Britain's.

The general pattern was everywhere the same. Not only the surplus cash of Europe, but the brains and skills of Europe's engineers and technicians, administrators and organizers went into the global enterprise.

The balance sheet of empire, both commercial and military, has been drawn up and appraised many times. Yet today, the radically different background of world relationships which has emerged during the 2d half of the 20th century has not impinged on the antiquated minds of those political leaders and national legislators who still envisage the rest of mankind as pawns or dupes in the dangerous and outmoded game of promoting rival economic or strategic empires. It was Einstein who declared shortly before his death: "The advent of the atom has changed everything but our modes of thinking."

Fortunately for human survival, however, another pattern is slowly making itself felt across the earth. The basic moral issue which challenges men of good will today is whether they are seeking to split the world still further by devising rival schemes of so-called foreign aid—which are becoming more and more suspect everywhere—or to bring the world together by backing the cooperative enterprises which the ever-expanding agencies of the United Nations are promoting for the world commonweal, irrespective of race or creed, politics, or ideology.

In fact, a new type of "U. N. man" is coming into the world picture—whether by origin American or European, Asian or African—a type of man whom other peoples welcome and respect as a friend and partner, as a coworker and world servant, a man who comes to them openly and honestly, without strings, and who represents not the selfish interests or dubious defense policies of some foreign government, but the solidarity and oneness of the human race.

Hardly a day passes without fresh and tangible evidence coming to hand of how this new international pattern is succeeding in country after country. But for the U. N. and its specialized agencies, these emergent lands would have no alternative than to succumb, sooner or later, to the mutually hostile and disruptive dollar and ruble imperialisms which now threaten them from both West and East, under whatever altruistic guise they masquerade.

Take the important question—very important indeed to the economy of many Asian countries, still in the early stages of independence—of the growth of cooperatives and of handicrafts. Here the International Labor Organization has already blocked both Communist penetration and capitalist exploitation by providing essential assistance in the development of new industries, in Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya, and the Philippines. It also did much in 1957 to develop and improve techniques in small-scale and handicrafts industries in Afghanistan, Ceylon, and Thailand.

WORK IN BANGKOK

In Afghanistan, for example, hand-loom weaving experts are now training skilled weavers to operate small village shops as demonstration and extension units, so that existing rural weaving crafts may be converted into a modern and more productive hand-loom industry. In Ceylon another expert has just completed the first phase of his work on a power-loom weaving project to serve as a model for other parts of the island, and a second export has been requested by the Government. Other exports are now in Ceylon assisting in the development of the coconut fiber industry.

In Bangkok, an ILO specialist is helping to improve designing and marketing of crafts in general and, in particular, bronze and silverware, wood carving, lacquerware, earthenware, and paper-umbrella manufacture. Another expert advises the government on development of a mechanical-cordage-processing industry. A third expert is applying new technique in design of lacquerware products. Two handicrafts experts are also participating in activities at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's Fundamental Education Center in Ubol, Thailand. Their work will show its results for many years to come.

The undertakings in this field are going ahead so well that the ILO is preparing a handbook describing techniques of organization and management in small-scale industries, designed primarily for use as a training manual in underdeveloped countries, but which will soon be in use in many countries all over the world. This is the kind of dignified aid these countries need.

Productivity is, of course, the foundation of any sound national economy. So the ILO has sent its productivity experts to work closely with the governments in India, Ceylon, Hong Kong, and Pakistan. Requests for demonstration projects in improvement of productivity have also just been received from Burma, Malaya, and Thailand. In fact, it is as much as the ILO can do to keep up with the increasing demands being made upon it—and on so ridiculously small a global budget, i. e., under $10 million for the current year. Less than Brooklyn is paying for repairs to its racing stadium. The facts speak for themselves.

In India, for instance, ILO experts are now assisting the National Productivity Center in Bombay in its training programs. In Calcutta, last year, a project for engineering industries obtained the participation of nine firms; in the Coimbatroe area, a training project was undertaken for the textile industry; and, in Madras, 300 persons participated in six courses. One of the ILO experts concentrated his efforts during 1957 on helping to improve productivity in workshops of government transport services.

And so this story of the triumph of genuine mutual aid could be repeated over and over again.

How different is this kind of cooperative world from the fragmentated world of our grandfathers? None of the pernicious drives or incentives of old-style empire building are to be found here—drives and incentives which, by their very nature, led to the two world wars, and which, if not eradicated in time, will assuredly lead to the inglorious end of our one world.

Can it be that, at this moment of gravest peril, the common people of the West and the East alike will see the light? Will proclaim the peacemakers, instead of the warmakers? Will follow the men of faith, and not the men of fear?

Administration Is Dragging Its Feet on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of our most fundamental and deep-seated national problems is that of providing equal rights for all our citizens, without discrimination on account of race, religion, color, or politics.

The assurance and practice of equal civil rights for all citizens is important for many far-reaching reasons:

It is, first of all, the God-given right of every individual to be given equal status before the law.

Second, it is the right of the Nation to expect from every citizen the full potential contribution he can make to its security, its economic strength and progress, its cultural standing and achievements, and its political processes. No citizen who is the victim of discrimination can achieve his full potential value to our national interest. Discrimination results in a waste of talent, spirit, and energy—assets that our country cannot afford to lose.

Third, it is absolutely essential to our moral standing before the people of the rest of the world.

It is now more than half a year since Congress enacted the historic civil-rights bill of 1957. That bill left a great deal to be desired. I wish it had gone much farther in protecting the rights of all citizens. But it was a tremendous step ahead. It was a fine and promising start. It was a forward step that can make tremendous progress inevitable—and quickly.

Unfortunately, the benefits that could be achieved through this new civil-rights law are being frittered away by inaction. President Eisenhower exhibited none of the diligence and energy that were displayed by Congress, in the exercise of his responsibility to appoint the Commission members and its staff director. Unfortunately, now that that has been done, the appointment of the latter has run into unfortunate delay, in connection with Senate confirmation of the nomination.

This matter is very well explained and discussed in an editorial which recently was published in the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS STILL INACTIVE AFTER 7 MONTHS

The much heralded Commission on Civil Rights still is in no position to do the job for which it was named—and 7 of the 24 months it has to work have passed.

At the moment it is the Senate which is holding up the show. Gordon M. Tiffany, named staff director of the Commission by President Eisenhower, has been approved by a Senate judiciary subcommittee. But the Senate went home for its long Easter vacation without acting on Tiffany. As a result he has an unofficial position and can't organize a staff.

This is only one of a long series of delays. President Eisenhower showed little urgency in naming the Commission or a staff director. When the first Chairman picked by the President declined to serve, there was a long wait before a new Chairman was named.

The tragedy is that vital time is being lost at a period when the Commission should be doing its major work if it is to have a report ready by September 9, 1959. The main job of the Commisison is to investigate the right to vote. There will be only one nationwide election during the Commission's life—and that is the congressional election this coming fall. Voters are registering for that election in many States right now. Alabama will hold its primary next month.

Without a staff or an official director, the Commission can do little but sit on its hands. Certainly it can do no fieldwork—and it is down in the voting precincts and the local registration offices where most of its work must be done.

It was considered quite an administration triumph to get the civil-rights bill passed. It's a shame to see an opportunity for constructive guaranties of civil rights slip past because of lack of urgency and inaction.

Resolution for Benson's Resignation Based Upon Sound Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the resolution that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and I submitted in this body, urging this Senate to declare it to be the sense of the Senate that Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson should resign, is a resolution based upon sound precedent.

In the Texas Observer, issue of April 25, 1958, an independent-liberal weekly newspaper published in Austin, Tex., there is a list of some of the successful precedents for such resolution. In each of the three cases listed there, of the Secretary of Interior in President Taft's Cabinet, the Secretary of the Navy (Teapot Dome Secretary) in President Coolidge's Cabinet, and the Secretary of the Treasury in President Hoover's Cabinet, the Cabinet officer did resign before the Senate could act.

The farmers of this country deserve a new Secretary of Agriculture now.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the article "Ralph versus Benson: Precedents" from the April 25, 1958, issue of the Texas Observer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RALPH VERSUS BENSON: PRECEDENTS

WASHINGTON.—When Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH (with Wisconsin's WILLIAM PROXMIRE) asked the Senate to resolve that President Eisenhower should ask for the resignation of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson, he was following successful precedents.

In 1911, after charges had been brought against Interior Secretary Richard Ballinger (of the Taft Cabinet), a Senator introduced a resolution declaring that there was evidence to show Ballinger was "not deserving of public confidence and that he should not longer be retained." The Senate took no action on the resolution, but soon thereafter President Taft accepted Ballinger's resignation.

In 1924, after the Teapot Dome scandal broke into public view, Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, offered a resolution saying: "It is the sense of the United States Senate that the President of the United States immediately request the resignation of Edwin Denby as Secretary of the Navy." The Senate agreed to this resolution.

President Calvin Coolidge bridled, saying "no official recognition can be given to the passage of the Senate resolution relative to their opinion concerning members of the Cabinet." However, a few days later, Denby resigned and Coolidge accepted the action.

In 1928, Senator Cousens of Michigan offered a resolution with 9 condemnatory clauses and this language: "It is the sense of the Senate that Andrew W. Mellon should resign as Secretary of the Treasury." This resolution was buried in the Banking and Currency Committee.

But it was not long before President Hoover appointed Mellon ambassador to Great Britain.

The Yarborough resolution, offered last week, listed 16 reasons why Benson should resign. Among other things, YARBOROUGH said Benson had "incited dissension, created ill will, and stirred up economic civil war between producer groups of different commodities." He said Benson had carried out a propaganda campaign to turn consumers against farmers and farmers against union labor. He said Benson has tried to force REA cooperatives to allow private power interests to operate their plants and wanted private power companies cut in on Government loans to REA's for generating and transmission facilities. Benson also, said YARBOROUGH, wants to wreck the rural telephone co-ops, the FHA, and the family farm.

The resolution was attacked in the Senate by Republican EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and in Texas by a 1957 YARBOROUGH opponent for the Senate—Atorney Thad Hutcheson, of Houston.

Growth Challenges Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we in Arizona are really grateful to my colleagues in this body and our colleagues in the other House who daily rise and profess that there are depressions in their States. We are grateful to them because as industry in those States hear speakers from their States, or read what they say, they quickly turn to the Southwest to look for a place where people are not afraid, where people are not looking to the Government for help, where people grab their own bootstraps and pull real hard. As a result our people have contributed to the greatest economic growth in the whole United States.

In fact, as was shown by an article I had printed in the RECORD the other day, we have had the greatest first quarter in the history of Arizona, from an economic standpoint. In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD another article, entitled "Growth Challenges Arizona," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on February 21, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH CHALLENGES ARIZONA

(By John C. Waugh)

(Some of the problems confronting a mining and agricultural area like Arizona when industrialization begins to mushroom and population soars are discussed in the fourth article of this series.)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—Growth has brought to Arizona new residents, new potential, and new problems.

The new residents number 35,000 a year. The new potential is industry. The problems are plentiful.

What is happening in Arizona is by now a familiar phenomenon in the American West. It has been happening and is happening in California. It is happening to a lesser degree in New Mexico and Nevada and throughout the Southwest. To see Arizona grow is to see the direction in which the entire area is moving and the problems that bestride its course.

Experts expect to see Arizona's population grow to 2 million by 1975, maybe even to 3 million. They see an unlimited industrial potential now that light industries, such as electronics and textiles, have established a foothold here.

There is an old story in Arizona that when you first sink a well into the ground you don't have to drill very far to strike water. But soon you must dig deeper. Then deeper. And therein lies a problem.

Water is gold in Arizona. Leading Arizonans believe there is enough water in the State to take care of nearly unlimited light industrial and urban growth. This is considered particularly true as water-thrifty urbanization spreads out more and more into the waterlapping farmlands.

This is happening at a rapid rate around Phoenix where Arizona is doing most of its growing.

WATER SHORTAGES NOTED

Many smaller towns, however, such as Flagstaff, which is the booming railhead for the new Glen Canyon Dam construction, have serious underground water shortages. Throughout the State generally the water table is steadily dropping.

The real water crisis is taking place down on the farm. Arizona currently is caught up in a desperate court fight with California over 3.8 million acre-feet of Colorado River water, which it says it must have if the State is to save its agriculture. Agriculture has been and still is one of the foundations of the Arizona economy.

In growing, Arizona has bumped up against money problems. People close to industry in the State insist that there is not nearly enough local capital to take care of all their needs.

CAPITAL NEEDED

"Arizona would grow 25 percent faster than she is right now," one leader insists, "if industry could get all the capital it wanted from Arizona banks. As it is now, we have to go out of State to borrow most of our money."

Bankers admit that in any boom there is bound to be a shortage of capital. "We can't advance unlimited money," one banker points out. "We have a legal loan limit. But we think we have been able to keep pace pretty well."

Arizona banks are indeed flourishing. The Valley National Bank and the First National Bank of Arizona have branches all over the State. The Valley National is the largest banking system in the Rocky Mountain region. And the First National has doubled in size in only 6 years. In the last 6 months of 1957 its deposits alone jumped to $51 million.

GROWTH CENTERED IN CITIES

Arizona's greatest growth has been centered around its two largest cities, Phoenix and Tucson, Maricopa County, dominated by Phoenix, has been absorbing half of the State's total population boom.

This has posed great civic problems. Phoenix is a picture of a city in dynamic motion. Headed by an energetic young mayor, Jack Williams, it has been planning far ahead. In July 1957, the Phoenix electorate passed a whopping bond issue of $70 million for long-range capital improvement. "This still has people gasping for breath," says one Phoenician.

City officials here think the clear-cut passage of the huge bond issue reflects the confidence the people have in the future of Phoenix. It decidedly reflects a basic change in the thinking and attitude of Arizonians.

"In 1950," says Ray W. Wilson, city manager of Phoenix, "we couldn't have passed a $10 million bond issue, let alone 1 for $70 million."

TUCSON LAGS

Tucson has lagged behind Phoenix in many ways, as most Arizona leaders see it. But Tucson city officials now are mapping a $41 million development program which, if passed, would be tantamount to Phoenix's own $70 million plans. Tucson's central business district blossomed spectacularly during 1957 with a multimillion-dollar building program.

Change sticks out all over in Arizona. Where once the economy rested between two basic pillars, mining and agriculture, it now is in better balance, resting with one heavy foot on light industry. Where 10 years ago lizards crawled under droopy mesquite in the outskirts of Phoenix and Tucson, there now are modern shopping centers.

If there is any unbalance left in Arizona, aside from that naturally formed by an exploding population, it is industrial overreliance upon the Federal Government and its military effort. But Arizonians are actually aware of this unbalance and are taking steps to set it aright.

SPECULATION SOARS

A land boom has sent land speculation soaring almost out of hand, particularly around Phoenix and Tucson. The State land department frankly admits that it faces a grave problem in trying to properly conserve the State's land and mineral resources and utilize them to the best advantage in the onrush of rapid growth. An oil and gas boom is threatening to break out any day on State land. This would foster new, frantic problems.

There still remains the problem in Arizona of spreading the wealth that growth is bringing. Phoenix and Tucson have been the principal beneficiaries and are bursting at the seams. For them there appears to be no end of growth in sight. Other smaller cities, notably Yuma, Flagstaff, and Prescott, also are booming. But other Arizona towns still sit in the traditional desert quiet, relatively unruffled.

Two Arizona counties, Mohave and Yavapai, actually have declined in population over the past few years.

Arizonians frankly admit that if they are going to be fat and prosperous they would like to be fat and prosperous all over.

Regulation of Roadside Advertising in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the able junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has brought to my attention a very interesting article in the Christian Science Monitor of April 22, 1958, which describes the manner in which the names of candidates in presidential elections in Mexico are brought to the attention of the electorate by signs painted on mountain peaks throughout the country. The article points out that 25-foot high letters painted on canyon walls, white rocks laid out in the form of letters on forested slopes, or whitewashed signs on stones along river banks take the place of election billboards south of the border.

This amusing story, written for the Monitor by Marion Wilhelm, was of dual interest to me because of my long-standing legislative efforts both in the field of billboard control, and in the field of the control of election campaign methods.

I have often stated that the use of billboards by political candidates in an election is not likely to be very informative

to the voters, and I thus have not used election billboards in my own campaigns. Mexico has been deserving of much credit and emulation as one of the countries that has reserved its highways in the open country from the billboard blight; but I regret that, through the Christian Science Monitor, the campaign managers of our political candidates will now have learned of the resourceful techniques adopted by their Mexican counterparts to get along without election billboards. Now that, with the powerful assistance of the able Senator from South Dakota, we have succeeded in enacting at least a modest step toward billboard regulation along our own cross-country highways, I would be dismayed if this were to lead to the transfer of campaign messages to our own hillsides, mountain crags or forest slopes.

Nevertheless, I am indebted to my colleague from South Dakota in bringing this dismaying prospect to my attention, and in spite of my misgivings about giving it circulation, I ask unanimous consent that the amusing article from the Christian Science Monitor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO CANDIDATE NEVER OUT OF SIGHT

(By Marion Wilhelm)

MEXICO CITY.—What's in the name of a politician? In Mexico, it is the other way around—what's the name on?

If it is on the mountain tops, it is almost certain he is going to be President.

The name on the mountain peaks in this presidential election year is López Mateos-Adolfo, and Mexican politicians have spent millions of pesos putting it there, not to mention on virtually every adobe wall, thatched roof, and field rock visible from a highway.

By July 6, election day, López Mateos or ALM will be household jargon everywhere across the Republic, even if the house is a mud hut perched on an isolated cliff.

IN MOST REMOTE SPOTS

The Indian working his vertical cornfield in the precipitous highlands can look out across the lonely ridges of the Sierra Madres and see the name painted in white letters 25 feet high on the sheer wall of a canyon.

He might run across woodchoppers laying out glistening white rocks in a sloping pine forest. In the jungle, chicle gatherers find the name slashed on tree trunks or whitewashed on stones along riverbanks.

From modern highways crisscrossing the mountains and valleys, the gigantic signs make counting cows and burros (also plentiful) an outmoded time passer.

BEWILDERING DISPLAY

On a 70-mile trip through wild mountains north of Mexico City, the writer counted well over 200 testimonials to the presidential candidate—"Pueblo de Hidalgo con López Mateos," "Mujeres de Hidalgo con ALM," "Mineros del Estado con don Adolfo," "Maestros con López," "Campesinos pro López," "Los Otomi con López," people, women, miners, teachers, farm workers, Otomi Indians of Hidalgo State all with Señor López Mateos.

The candidate, until 3 months ago virtually unknown to the mass of Mexicans, can even see his name from the air as he flies around the country to campaign.

Teh extraordinary mountain-painting campaign, which changes names every 6 years with the Presidential succession, is accomplished almost entirely without billboards. Except within city or village limits, billboards are not allowed in Mexico.

Most of the paint—white for mountains and fields, red or black for roadside walls—flows freely from business, labor, or government groups and bigwigs and lesser fry looking for jobs and other favors from the powerful political party which has won every presidential election in Mexico since the revolution.

Why does the Partido Revolucionario Institucional bother? As a bewildered tourist said after motoring down from the border, "If that's some kind of new soft drink they're selling, I'd sure like to buy stock in the company."

Did This Really Happen in the United States of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, concern has been expressed over the recent incident concerning the deportation of William Heikkila under circumstances that were unfortunately reminiscent of practices in Communist and Fascist countries.

It is true that subsequent information about this case has done much to explain if not to vindicate the action of the United States Immigration Service officials. But nothing can erase the bad flavor which their clumsy and heavy-handed treatment of this case has left with us—and unfortunately with too many of the other people of the world.

There is one most basic and fundamental difference between our American way of life, which we share with other free peoples, and the way of the totalitarian dictatorships, whether they be Communist or Fascist or any other kind of absolutism. That difference is that our system is a system of law and equal treatment for all under the law. Regardless of the merits or the standing of the individual who is accused, regardless of how loathesome his acts may be, how dangerous he may be to our life and property and national security, he must be fully protected in his right to due process of law.

This fundamental distinction between the American way and the way of tyrants is splendidly portrayed in editorials from three great Wisconsin newspapers—the Capital Times, of Madison; the Milwaukee Journal, and the Milwaukee Sentinel. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have these editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

THIS ISN'T RUSSIA

The decision by the immigration service to bring William Heikkila back from Finland was the least it had to do. It doesn't allay one bit of the alarm that must be felt over the kidnap deportation in the first place, which the service still claims was legal.

Who Heikkila is isn't important. He happens to be an admitted ex-Communist, born in Finland while his naturalized American parents were visiting there, never naturalized himself. The Government has been trying to deport him for 11 years, and finally won an oral decision April 3. The formal order had yet to be drafted and approved, with a hearing set May 2.

On April 18 a West Coast immigration functionary got impatient, had Heikkila nabbed off the street and spirited to Canada by air. Heikkila's attorney immediately got a court order to bring him back, but his captors took him on to Finland anyway. The failure promptly to respect that order is the only error the service admits.

But how about the gestapolike seizure without due process, with absolutely no authority to show for it, with no formal deportation order yet issued, much less in hand? That can't be waived aside as a technicality, on an assumption that the order was sure to follow. It is not for police—or immigration officers—to take legal process into their own hands, and mold it to their convenience—in Russia, yes, but not here.

Irksome and even senseless as some legal technicalities may seem, they are vital to be observed when a man's rights and liberty are at stake—and we stress, it could be any man's rights and liberty. The Justice Department (of which the Immigration Service is a part) must repudiate the whole affair, kidnapping and all, and give assurance—shocking as it is to find need for it in America—that it will not countenance terrorism in its ranks.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

DID THIS REALLY HAPPEN IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

This happened in the United States of America in the year of 1958:

A man by the name of William Heikkila was leaving his place of employment in San Francisco when officers of the United States Immigration Service seized him. Without giving him a chance to set his affairs in order, to pick up a change of clothes or say goodbye to his wife, he was hustled across the Canadian border, put aboard a plane and deported to Finland.

Mr. Heikkila is the child of naturalized American citizens. He came to this country when he was 2½ months old. In the depression years of the 1930's he allegedly joined the Communist Party. For 11 years the Immigration Service has been trying to deport him and has been stopped in the courts.

So the Immigration Service, going further than even the Russian secret police would dare to go, took the law into its own hands.

It matters not that the Immigration Service has admitted its error and that Heikkila will be brought back to San Francisco. That such a thing could happen in the land of the free is horrifying.

As Federal Judge Edward P. Murphy of San Francisco said:

"This smacks of the Gestapo, rack and thumbscrew."

The officials responsible for this should be among the unemployed immediately.

It should be noted that the administration under which this appalling treatment of a defenseless person occurred is the same old one that yawns away revelations of corruption, influence peddling and looting of the public domain. The men responsible for the moral atmosphere in Washington today fit naturally into the role of those who abducted Mr. Heikkila.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of April 25, 1958]

AS WE SEE IT: BUNGLED

The highhanded procedures followed in the deportation case against William Heikkila, a native of Finland but nearly a lifetime resident of the United States, stirred up a king-sized sense of outrage in this country.

When the Immigration Service arrogated unto itself the final disposition of a matter still pending in the Federal courts, it was making its own law and was doing a bungled job of it.

In the ordinary course of events, the Heikkila case would have attracted little interest and less sympathy. He has had admitted Communist affiliations. He has lived nearly half a century in the United States without becoming a citizen. The judgment of the Immigration Service that the country would be well rid of him has not been lightly arrived at and cannot be lightly dismissed.

But when immigration officers seized him on a San Francisco street and spirited him out of the country, without notice to his wife or attorney, with less than $2 in his pockets, and with not even a change of clothing, offense was given to the sense of justice of people who never before heard of William Heikkila and who normally would care nothing about him.

People totally without sympathy with communism hate to see human beings pushed around and the American people particularly hate the pursuit of Gestapo police tactics against anybody, including aliens and Communists.

The only good thing in this deplorable matter is that the Immigration Service was quick to reverse itself and was big enough to do so. But the country is still interested in knowing how and why such a stupid thing was done in the first place and a congressional investigation into the whole affair is strongly indicated.

History of Coast and Geodetic Activities in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Arctic Club of Seattle, Wash., on March 7, 1958, honored the United States Department of Commerce Coast and Geodetic Society and its representatives at its traditional Alaska-night dinner.

The program for this event contained an excellent history of Coast and Geodetic Survey activities in Alaska, prepared by Read Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director, and Capt. Emil H. Kirsch, Seattle district officer, United States Department of Commerce Coast and Geodetic Survey, which I request be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY ACTIVITIES IN ALASKA

EARLY HISTORY

Explorations in Alaska in the 18th and 19th centuries held the interest of adventurous explorers of two continents. The French, Spaniards, English, and Russians all sent expeditions to this great coastal area of the North American Continent. American seamen and trappers pushed northwestward primarily in pursuit of all kinds of fur-bearing animals. The lucrative fur trade also sent the Russians across the Urals and Siberia into the present Alaskan Territory, which at that time was called Russian America. These early explorers gathered considerable information about the coastline and areas along the navigable rivers.

Prior to 1725, the year of Vitus Bering's first expedition, this portion of the American Continent was a blank space on our maps. After 1725 dim outlines began to appear in this blank space, and maps containing some detail were gradually developed. It was not until Bering's return from his second expedition to America, in the fall of 1741, that the fog-shrouded Aleutian Islands were discovered. The exploration and mapping of the coastline of Alaska by the Russians continued throughout the period of their occupation and was supplemented by information obtained from English, French, and Spanish explorers. The earliest significant contribution by the United States was made by the North Pacific expedition in 1855.

UNITED STATES ACQUISITION

The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in Alaska began with its purchase from the Russians in 1867. At that time no accurate surveys were available and the Russian charts were made up of crude sketches giving only a general idea of the configuration of the coast and harbors. During the first 20 years or so of our ownership of the Territory, survey work was confined to selected localities chiefly for the purpose of tying together various sketches made by the early explorers.

In the summer of 1867 George Davidson, an assistant in the Coast Survey, accompanied by three men made an extensive cruise of Alaskan waters in Revenue cutter *Lincoln*. This party made numerous observations and as a result of the summer's cruise charts were prepared of Sitka Harbor, St. Paul Harbor, Kodiak Island, and Captain's Bay on Unalaska Island. The first two coast pilots of Alaska were published by the Coast Survey between 1869 and 1883. From the year 1867 to 1882 the Survey compiled and published numerous charts of Alaskan waters, based principally on the earlier surveys made by the United States Navy and English, Russian, French, and Portuguese explorers. Much of the early fieldwork was utilized to tie in some of these fragmentary and scattered exploratory surveys in order that nautical charts could be published for the principal waterways of the inland passage.

The first continuous survey work by the Coast Survey was started in 1882 when the steamer *Hassler* was sent north under the command of Lt. Comdr. H. E. Nichols. The steamer *Patterson* was assigned to Alaskan waters in 1882, and for the next 15 years fieldwork consisted mainly of charting only those channels and harbors used by the Navy and the very limited commercial shipping.

THE GOLD RUSH

In 1898 the rush to Alaska by way of both the Lynn Canal and the Bering Sea resulted in such an increase in commercial activity that the demand for surveys in this area became imperative. Although motivated primarily by the feverish search for gold, which had been discovered near Juneau and in the Klondike, other factors soon entered the picture, making for an unprecedented commercial boom throughout most of the Territory. Copper deposits were discovered in various remote regions; the salmon industry was developed; and the Alaskan Railroad was started.

During this period Coast and Geodetic Survey operations in Alaska were greatly expanded and from the years 1900 to 1915 nautical charts of the area were produced in rapidly increasing quantities. These charts served to meet the urgent requirements of the greatly expanded sea travel to Alaska brought on by the lure of the golden sands of Nome.

CHARTING THE ALEUTIANS

Surveys of the Aleutian Islands were first undertaken in 1901, when the Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Pathfinder*, assisted by the *McArthur*, was assigned to survey the principal passes through the islands which were used by commercial vessels going to Nome and St. Michael. Accurate topographic surveys of the islands were made showing their relation to each other, but the surveys of the water areas were of a reconnaissance nature. From 1901 to 1925 fragmentary information was furnished from time to time by the United States Navy, United States Fish Commission, and the United States Coast Guard. In April 1925, a Coast and Geodetic survey reconnaissance party composed of 2 officers and 2 men was organized to determine the feasibility of making comprehensive surveys of the Aleutians. This party was equipped with radio-longitude apparatus, magnetic instruments, a theodolite, a tide gage and level, and general hydrographic and topographic instruments. They sailed from Seattle, Wash., on the 15th of April on the Coast Guard cutter *Haida*, arriving at Unalaska on April 26.

From April 26 to September 23, 10 islands, including Attu, and 17 bays were visited using Coast Guard cutters, local schooners, and commercial steamers for transportation. Reconnaissance surveys were made at each stop as weather permitted. From the 1st of May to the 1st of September only 6 nights were clear enough to permit astronomic observations. When the reconnaissance party returned to Seattle they submitted a recommendation to the effect that present commercial demands in the Aleutian Islands would not justify the heavy outlay of time and expense which would be required to accomplish a comprehensive survey of that area. Little was it realized at the time that in less than 20 years this chain of islands was destined to play a vital role in the strategic defense of North America.

Because of the increase in commercial shipping in southeast and central Alaska between 1925 and 1933, most of the activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were concentrated in that area, and it was not until the spring of 1934 that comprehensive surveys were undertaken in the Aleutian Islands by the ships *Discoverer* and *Surveyor*. Work on this project was started in the vicinity of Unimak Pass, which extends 900 miles from the Alaskan coast almost to Siberia.

SURVEYING IN ALASKA, 1920–40

During this period the Coast and Geodetic Survey continued operations in Alaska to provide navigation charts of the Territory's 34,000 statute miles of tidal shoreline. The survey fleet operating during the early years usually numbered six or more vessels. General small-scale charts were prepared for practically all of Alaska's coastline, with special attention given to the complicated channels and small bays of southeastern Alaska from Dixon's Entrance to Cape Fairweather. Nautical charts were produced from the surveys of Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet, Bristol Bay, and Norton Sound. Both triangulation and hydrographic surveying were undertaken on Kodiak Island and the south shore of the Alaska Peninsula.

As travel increased to Alaska, wire-drag surveys were made of the main waterways of southeastern Alaska and the principal harbors used by ocean-borne commerce. From these surveys, large-scale nautical charts were prepared and published for the rapidly expanding maritime traffic. Triangulation was extended in a continuous unbroken line from Dixon's Entrance through southeastern Alaska, around the north shore of the Gulf of Alaska into Cook Inlet, Shelikof Straits, and south shore of the Alaska Peninsula to Unimak.

WORLD WAR II

Most of the normal operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in Alaska were sharply curtailed during World War II. Survey ships were assigned to naval operations and personnel were either transferred to the armed services or used directly on wartime mapping and charting activities.

The *Oceanographer*, *Hydrographer*, and the *Pathfinder* became official ships of the United

States Navy. Armed for combat, they were engaged in specialized military surveying operations. The *Pathfinder* made an enviable record while on two surveying missions in the southwest Pacific. For her excellent work in furthering the war effort, the ship received commendations from Admirals Nimitz, Kincaid, and Halsey. The *Hydrographer* led the fleet of Navy ships when they entered Attu for one of the most decisive battles fought in the Aleutians.

The *Explorer*, the *Surveyor*, the *Derickson*, the *E. Lester Jones*, and the *Patton*, all of which had seen extensive Alaskan duty, were placed at the disposal of the Commander of Naval Operations in Alaska. All of these ships were deployed in the same Alaskan waters where they had operated during peacetime, and made significant contributions to our national defense.

POSTWAR AND PRESENT ACTIVITIES

Triangulation of Pacific coast controlled surveys with those of Alaska was undertaken during the early years of World War II and completed in 1945, thus establishing a coordinated network of continental triangulation based on the North American Datum adopted in 1927. There was an urgent demand for large-scale topographic maps for use in planning adequate defense installations in Alaska, and accurate geodetic surveys had to be made before mapping could get underway. This accelerated program for establishing geodetic surveys in Alaska resulted in 3 or 4 field parties being sent to Alaska each year through 1955.

Most of the work has been done during the short summer season, but the most rigorous part of the project, the extension of control along the north Arctic coast from Point Hope to Demarcation Point, was done during the winter months. Tractor-drawn sled trains carried men and supplies across the frozen, barren tundra-covered lowlands adjacent to the Arctic coast. In former years transportation was by water, packhorse, dog sled, or on foot. Nowadays men and supplies are moved by cat train, cub plane, and helicopter. The cost of operation has multiplied many times, but the area covered by the survey operations has kept pace, so that the unit cost is no different today than it was 30 or 50 years ago.

The arc of triangulation of the Arctic coast of Alaska from Point Barrow to Demarcation Point on the Alaskan-Canadian boundary was finally closed during the summer of 1953. This arduous task along the last unsurveyed coast of the United States required almost a decade of intensive work by field engineers of the Bureau's Arctic party. Great ingenuity, technical ability and courage were displayed by members of the party, consisting of about 80 officers and men, including observers, computers, engineers, electronic experts, and mechanics. Recently a spur has been extended up the Colville River to Umiat, which was ultimately carried along a north-south axis and connected with the main Alaskan control south of Brooks Range. Additional arcs westward of the Colville River arc were surveyed in 1955.

The nine-lens camera developed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey is particularly adapted to surveys in the Aleutian Islands and along the western and northern coasts of Alaska where the establishment of control is an expensive and hazardous undertaking. The area covered by a nine-lens photograph is 16 times greater than that of a single-lens photograph, and adequate mapping can therefore be accomplished with one-fourth the number of control stations. The Coast and Geodetic Survey is responsible for topographic mapping of the Aleutians west of 165°, to be accomplished in conjunction with its nautical charting and geodetic work. These maps are required for military and civil use, and will become an integral part of the National Topographic Series.

Surveying operations in Alaska have required special planning and coordination, in keeping with the overall objective of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to extend basic surveys along the coastal waters and into the interior. The more accessible areas have been surveyed in considerable detail, but rigorous work is in prospect for future seasons in remote areas characterized by difficult terrain and dangerous coastlines. The rapid expansion of coastwise and transpacific commercial shipping has given new emphasis to the programing for the great task that lies ahead. The requirements of the Armed Forces in preparing for national defense have added further impetus to the expansion of surveys in Alaska.

Concurrent with the greatly expanded postwar geodetic work, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has increased hydrographic survey operations, particularly in the Aleutian Islands, Prince William Sound, along the south shore of the Alaska Peninsula, Bristol Bay, and the Bering Sea. Modern survey ships assigned to the Alaskan work since the war include the *Explorer*, *Pathfinder*, *E. Lester Jones*, *Pioneer*, *Patton*, and the *Derickson*. Offshore hydrograph work has been greatly expedited by the use of the electronic position indicator (EPI), an adaptation of war-developed shoran.

The detailed shoreline of Alaska measures 34,000 statute miles and borders on three major bodies of water—the Pacific Ocean, the Bering Sea, and the Arctic Ocean. Our tidal program, therefore, is of great importance. Precise knowledge of the rise and fall of the tide is essential not only for vertical control of surveying and mapping operations, but also for marine navigation, for engineering projects associated with the development of coastal property, and for studies of changes in the level of the sea. Our tidal operations have been greatly expanded and, in addition to the maintenance of existing stations, many new stations have been established. Observations thus obtained make it possible to predict the time and height of tides in all of the harbors of Alaska.

GEOMAGNETISM AND SEISMOLOGY

Although not so widely known as the Bureau's work of surveying the charting in Alaska, our geomagnetic activities in that region are considered invaluable to basic research in this highly specialized scientific discipline. Alaska is partially situated in the auroral zone, an area of highly geomagnetic activity, and 3 of the Bureau's 7 permanent observatories are located there—at College, Sitka, and Point Barrow. In these observatories the strength, direction, and changes of the earth's magnetic field are measured and recorded continuously. After these field data have been processed and evaluated they are available for incorporation in magnetic charts and for distribution to other scientific institutions.

As the principal American operator in geomagnetism for the International Geophysical Year, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has established an elaborate network of temporary observatories in Alaska. One outstanding installation, of particular interest in scientific circles, is the Nelson Differential Magnetograph in operation at College. This highly complex series of instruments was developed within the Bureau for the purpose of comparing the variations in the magnetic field as recorded simultaneously at three different locations. The geomagnetic data obtained from this installation and our other Alaskan observatories represents a significant contribution to the International Geophysical Year.

Of the 4 stations making up the Seismic Sea Wave Warning System, one is located at Sitka and another at College. These are operated in conjunction with our magnetic observatories. When an earthquake occurs off the shores of the Aleutians, and there is danger of a disastrous wave striking the Hawaiian Islands or the west coast of the United States, an alert is immediately sent out from the stations in Alaska to the other stations making up the warning network. An alarm is flashed as rapidly as possible to areas likely to be affected. This warning service from Alaska protects the lives and property of Americans thousands of miles away, and has on many occasions saved communities from the sudden disaster of seismic sea waves.

Arizona Plans Big as Boom Rolls On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is becoming very obvious, as we listen to the sounds of depression, that the only place the depression is really in effect is in States in which Walter Reuther has unions. We in Arizona have unions, but our unions are sensibly run. They do not make demands upon management which they know management cannot fulfill. So union leaders pay attention to the work of running a union. Therefore, the union members in Arizona are well off. Our leaders in Arizona are more concerned with wages and hours than they are in control of a political party. So our unions are well off, as is all of Arizona, as evidenced by another article which was published in the Christian Science Monitor on February 24, 1958, entitled "Arizona Plans Big as Boom Rolls On," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA PLANS BIG AS BOOM ROLLS ON

(By John C. Waugh)

(Dynamic changes that come with industrialization of a long-standing mining and agricultural area point up need for judicious planning which is discussed in the fifth and final article of this series on Arizona and its postwar economy.)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—"The trouble is," complained Mayor Jack Williams, "I just can't plan big enough."

"None of us can," replied Banker George V. Christie. "The important thing is to plan well."

Thus, neatly epitomized in a brief luncheon encounter between the mayor of Phoenix and a prominent vice president of the First National Bank of Arizona, are the two major challenges facing the Nation's youngest State:

Plan big and plan well.

Arizona stands in the full gale of a boom that is sweeping the American West. From a population of 616,000 in 1946, it has grown to one of more than a million. Lured by a climate literally bursting with sun, new people are pouring into the State at the rate of about 35,000 a year. Arizona is 1 of the 2 fastest growing States in the Nation.

New industries and new developments are coming in, filling and pushing out into areas around Tucson, that were once desert.

STATE AT CROSSROAD

The boom has rolled on virtually unchecked since the end of World War II. Now Arizona finds itself at a critical crossroad.

It must ask itself where it is going.

"This," says Lewis Haas, "is a $64,000 question."

It will fall to leaders like Mr. Haas, manager of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, to supply the answer.

He has one: "We are not at all interested in catapulting toward an undisclosed end," Mr. Haas insists. He drives to the core of Arizona thinking when he says that "Arizona must be selective."

Mr. Haas means that when Arizona attracts new industry it must attract the right industries—light, high-value, low-bulk industries—which draw and employ high-salaried, high-class people.

This, in view of Mr. Haas and undoubtedly in the view of Mr. Christie, Mr. Williams, and others, as well, means good, careful, future planning. Up to now, Arizona, Mr. Haas admits, has been long on attraction and somewhat short on planning.

POPULATION CHALLENGE

The immediate challenge as outlined by Mr. Haas is to effectively absorb a burgeoning population and all the industry and change it brings and still keep Arizona a place of beauty and a place of utility. And quite importantly, Mr. Haas holds, Arizona must maintain its traditional, informal way of life.

Nor is that all. All the mundane problems that plague the booming West from Los Angeles to Albuquerque, N. Mex., are magnified here. There is the problem of educating the exploding population, planning sewers and utilities, providing housing, solving transportation problems—in short, growing up right.

Major cities in Arizona are scrambling to meet these problems. Some, notably Phoenix, have shown that they already are beginning to think big.

A look ahead to 1975 sees Arizona having at least a million more people than it has today. That is about double the present population.

This means all sorts of things. It means that 200,000 more jobs must be hewn out in the Arizona economy. It means that more industry is bound to come in. It means that the boom that is changing Arizona so fast will, if anything, accelerate.

ARIZONA'S ROLE GROWS

As Arizona grows, its role in the West grows with it. About 35 trucklines now empty into and out of Arizona. Two new nonstop flights—one to Salt Lake City, the other to Denver—have opened up new northern trade areas. The State is an important railhead for the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe Railroads.

Arizonians see their State becoming at the same time more independent and yet more important as a regional trading area and a strong hinterland for the west coast.

Manufacturing and tourism are the new economic prodigies of this State. Both are in comparative infancy and being assiduously groomed to grow.

Electronics looms as the industry of the future. It is the type of industry the State is searching for and getting. Textiles is another industry Arizona would like to see more of. Garment factories recently have opened in Casa Grande, Mesa, and Glendale.

CLIMATE BIG ATTRACTION

Climate, of course, is Arizona's ace in the hole.

Time and again major electronics firms such as Motorola, Inc., and General Electric have found that, given a choice, something like 100 out of 101 engineers would rather live in Arizona than anywhere else.

Evidence of the Arizona desire to maintain the traditional way of life is seen in the way it makes room for industry. Motorola's two big plants out on McDowell road in Phoenix are ultramodern, eye-pleasing buildings set in the middle of growing residential areas. Arizona aims to assimilate industry, not isolate it. The great industrial complexes of the East are unknown here and probably will always remain so.

The flavor that still pervades the State is that of the free-and-easy West. Stetsoned cowmen wearing black boots still clomp down the busy Phoenix sidewalks.

This pleases the Arizona eye. It is undoubtedly a good omen to men like Lewis Haas, to whom the Arizona way of life is so important. It shows that the State, at least so far, has been able to lasso a boom without losing its Stetson.

Anatomy of Recession—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the first obligation this Government owes the people of America in this economic slump is a clear-eyed, straightforward examination of the economic facts of life in America. What economic measures the Federal Government should adopt, indeed, whether the Federal Government should adopt any economic measures at all, should depend on the economic facts.

One of the most dangerous aspects of this slump is the unfortunate tendency for many leading Americans who should know better to attempt to talk our way out of our economic difficulties by putting the rosiest possible construction on the facts of economic life.

A flagrant example of this kind of futile bootstrap hoisting is the argument that has been made for many weeks now that the economy is working its way into a healthier situation because American industry is reducing its inventories. The point of this theory of course is that this reduction in inventories is certain to result in the near future in an upsurge in the economy as depleted inventories are replenished.

That this picture of an economy in which inventories are on the verge of replenishment is a totally false picture is pointed out brilliantly in an article by Mr. B. D. Nossiter in the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Nossiter makes the crucial point that while it is true that inventories have been falling steadily in recent months, the important fact is that they have been falling less rapidly than sales. Inventories are only significant in relation to sales. Mr. Nossiter points out that the inventory-sales ratio, far from improving over the past several months, has been getting steadily and dramatically worse. Inventories have been getting bigger in relation to sales. There is more of a tendency, not less for businessmen to curtail their buying now, because their inventories have become bigger, in relation to the one significant guideline which directs the American businessmen's increase or decrease of inventories.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Nossiter be inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANATOMY OF RECESSION—V
(By B. D. Nossiter)

RATIO OF INVENTORY CUTS TO SALES DISTURBING

The speed at which businessmen have been slashing their inventories has inspired some of the belief that the recession is touching bottom. But a telltale relationship—that between inventories and sales—is shaking the confidence of some economists.

In the first 2 months of this year, inventories were reduced at almost a $9-billion yearly rate. This was more than triple the cutbacks in the final quarter of 1957. It meant that firms were both producing less and sharply trimming orders to their suppliers.

The faster these stocks of goods on hand dwindle, the optimists reason, the sooner the process must stop, or at least slow down.

But if a businessman's sales are dropping faster than he is drawing down his inventories, he will try to quicken the pace of stock cuts.

Sales shrinking faster

Unpublished Commerce Department figures show that this has been happening. Despite the liquidation of inventories, sales have shrunk at a faster rate.

This shows up in inventory-sales ratios, numbers that play a decisive role in determining production and purchasing. This ratio is the value of inventories at the end of a month divided by that month's sales. The bigger this number, the greater is the impetus for more inventory reductions.

For example, a manufacturer sells $5 million widgets in January and has $10 million worth in his warehouse at the month's end. His inventory-sales ratio is 2. The next month, he holds down purchasing and production to shave his stock to $9 million. But if he sold only $3 million, his ratio has increased to 3. This will spur him to deeper inventory cuts.

For all business this ratio of stocks to sales was 1.66 in January. But in February, it rose to 1.72. A year earlier it was only 1.56. In manufacturing, where the heaviest stock cuts were made, the stock-sales ratio, at 1.79 in February 1957, was 2.01 in January and 2.05 in February this year.

Difficulty in hard goods

Hard-goods manufacturers have had the most trouble pulling inventories down to a happier relationship with sales.

For every big industry grouping in durable goods the ratios grew between January and February and were well above a year ago. For the group as a whole, the ratio increased from 2.09 in February 1957 to 2.42 in January and 2.52 in February.

Here's how these stock-sales ratios expanded in the same periods for some industries: Primary metals, 1.66, 2.19, 2.43; electrical machinery, 2.15, 2.36, 2.40; motor vehicles, 1.39, 1.74, 1.79; stone, clay, and glass, 1.53, 1.95, 2.14.

For soft-goods makers the inventory sales number was unchanged in the early 1958 months, although it was higher than a year ago. Textiles, oil, chemicals, and rubber suffered the biggest rises over the year; food and tobacco manufacturers worked their ratios down.

Durable-goods gains

At both wholesale and retail, durable-goods sellers accounted for all of the February worsening in inventory sales relationships. The wholesale ratio grew from 1.11 in February 1957 to 1.18 in January and 1.20 in February this year. At retail, the figures were 1.47, 1.46, and 1.51.

Retail food stores gained sales faster than stocks. But auto dealers' ratios jumped from 1.30 to 1.55 to 1.75. Smaller increases showed up in furniture and appliance outlets and the lumber, hardware, and building-materials group.

The striking difference between all soft- and hard-goods lines—lumping manufacturing, wholesale, and retail together—appears in this comparison: Over the year the durable-goods ratio worsened by 22 percent; for nondurables, less than 3 percent.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued on welfare funds disclosure bill, reaching debate limitation agreement thereon.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 6621–6635

Bills Introduced: 3 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3710–3712. Pages 6621

Welfare Funds Disclosure: Senate continued its consideration of S. 2888, to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension plans, rejecting by 28 yeas to 53 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Knowland amendment barring from collective bargaining any union that does not admit to membership on same terms and conditions all employees it seeks to represent in an appropriate unit, with exception of members of subversive organizations.

Senate reached unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate beginning Monday, April 28, at conclusion of morning business, as follows: 1 hour, equally divided, on any amendment, motion, or appeal (except motion to table); only those amendments may be considered which have heretofore been submitted as intended to be proposed and which were ordered to lie on table and be printed, and then only when proposed by actual authors thereof; and 3 hours, equally divided, on passage of bill.

Pending at adjournment was amendment by Senator Smith (New Jersey) adding a new section on voting in representation elections by employees on strike, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. Pages 6635–6664

Program for Monday: Senate adjourned at 5:11 p. m. until 11 a. m. Monday, April 28, when it will continue, under debate-limitation agreement, on S. 2888, welfare funds disclosure. Pages 6664, 6666

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 28, at 12 o'clock noon (District Day, no business scheduled).

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Appendix

New Jersey Takes Lead in Broadening Educational Program of Teachers' Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey State Board of Education is taking steps to broaden the educational program of New Jersey's 6 teachers' colleges, and even last year declared that "recent changes in the curriculums of the teachers' colleges have made their eventual transition to multipurpose colleges possible and perhaps inevitable." At that time the board recommended further curriculum changes to include more courses offered in general colleges.

This change and the necessary enlargement of the facilities at the six colleges would, I think, be the ideal solution to what many educators say is one of New Jersey's chief school problems: the shortage of general colleges in the State. This shortage forces many of New Jersey's students to go to other States to complete their education.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed also by something Adlai E. Stevenson told some 10,000 teachers at the convention of the Florida Education Association recently. He said that if the Nation's schools have become too soft and have put too much emphasis on the frills, it is only because the people have brought it about by their own way of life. The New York Times reported that he said, "We put the no-shift automobile ahead of abolishing the two-shift school."

Mr. Stevenson recommended that Congress set up a joint committee on education and a council of educational advisers to the President, and require an annual report by the President on the status of education. These are excellent suggestions and, if carried out, would make a decisive contribution to education in this country.

I include here 2 articles from the Courier-Post of Camden, N. J., and 2 articles from the New York Times:

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of April 24, 1958]

COLLEGES IN PROCESS OF CHANGE

New Jersey's six teachers' colleges are no longer to be known as such.

By order of the State board of education they will simply be called "State colleges" from now on.

The change, for the present, is merely in the interest of simplification. State Education Commissioner Raubinger says the new names do not reflect a change in the principal function of the colleges, that of preparing teachers. At this time admissions will continue to be limited to applicants with this purpose.

Yet the name change probably does forecast a more drastic change to come in the near future, when the function of the six colleges will no longer be limited to schooling new teachers. Last year the State board said that "recent change sin the curriculums of the teachers' colleges have made their eventual transition to multipurpose colleges possible and perhaps inevitable." The board recommended further curriculum changes to include more courses offered in general colleges.

If the teachers' colleges do become general colleges, it will be in keeping with the trend of the times. Strictly teachers' colleges are disappearing all over the Nation. They aren't exactly closing their doors. Rather, they are opening them to other students besides those who expect to make teaching their career.

Early in the century there were more than 300 teachers' colleges in the United States, and they comprised one-third of all institutions of higher learning. Now there are only about 100, and they are only one-twentieth of all the colleges.

Missouri and Colorado are two States that have recently changed the names of their teachers' colleges and remodeled them into general, liberal arts colleges.

Only 23 percent of all new elementary school teachers and only 18.4 percent of new high school teachers now come from teachers' colleges, a recent survey by the National Education Association showed. Dr. Ray C. Maul, assistant research director for the NEA, says, "There's a growing realization today that the effective preparation of teachers depends on broad general education."

An unnamed eastern educator was recently quoted by the Wall Street Journal as saying, "Teachers colleges have done a remarkable amount of harm to United States education, and it's wonderful to see them fade away." He said they have overemphasized methodology at the expense of regular academic subjects, produced a generation of undereducated teachers, and also discouraged many able persons from entering the profession.

While the specialized teachers colleges are fading out, liberal arts colleges are taking up the slack.

"Many liberal arts institutions now are rediscovering teacher education after having completely defaulted in this area for many years," says Dr. Philip H. Coombs, secretary and research director of the Fund for the Advancement of Education. "At the same time, teachers' colleges are in the process of becoming general colleges. Thus, a new synthesis is emerging—one which will enormously improve the caliber of teaching in the United States."

If these men are right, we can view the metamorphosis of the teachers colleges without alarm. What is more to the point, so far as New Jersey is concerned, is the fact that if and when the teacher colleges are transformed into general colleges it will probably be a great deal easier to get additional funds for them.

A bond issue of $76½ million for the teachers college and for various divisions of Rutgers has been proposed this year, but its prospects are dim. A year or two from now, if the teacher colleges become liberal arts colleges, the public might be induced rather easily to accept it.

The change, and the necessary enlargement of the six colleges facilities that would follow, might be the ideal solution to what many educators say is one of the State's chief school problems. That is the shortage of general colleges in New Jersey, forcing many students to go to other States to complete their education.

Though there is debate over how great this problem is, there is no doubt it exists. Conversion of the teacher colleges, together with adequate funds to follow through, could not only give the State all the college facilities its own students need, but enable it to invite others to come here.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of April 19, 1958]

NEW JERSEY EDUCATORS: COLLEGE HEADS LASH CRITICS OF TEACHERS

MONTCLAIR, April 19.— The presidents of New Jersey's six State teachers colleges have teed off on critics of teacher education who charge there is too much emphasis on how-to-teach courses and not enough of what to teach.

The presidents, meeting at Monclair College Friday, said in a statement: "Teacher education today is placing more emphasis than ever on scholarship and on the liberal arts."

"On the other hand," the statement continued, "it seems unwise and dangerous in these days to suggest that children be taught by teachers who do not have the benefit of current scientific information on how children think and learn, and how knowledge can best be presented."

REPLY TO SERIES

The statement came in reply to a series of articles in a national magazine which attacked teacher education for being too much concerned with education courses, and too little interested in other courses.

The statement said "this certainly is not true." It was signed by Michael B. Gilligan, president of Jersey City State College; Dr. Thomas E. Robinson, of Glassboro State College; Dr. E. deAlton Partridge, of Montclair State College; Dr. Eugene G. Wilkins of Newark State College; Dr. Marion E. Shea, of Paterson State College, and Edwin L. Martin, of Trenton State College.

"The trend in our colleges has steadily been toward more liberal arts education for teachers, with greater emphasis on the subjects they will teach," the presidents said.

MORE GENERAL EDUCATION

"That is the trend in almost all professional training, including medicine, engineering, law and journalism. Whenever preparation has been lengthened, it has usually been for more general education, not for the addition of how-to courses.

"Teachers educated in our colleges use at least two-thirds of their time for general education, and take as many courses in their major subjects as a liberal arts college would require.

"Within the limits of time available, our present teachers colleges achieve a reasonable balance betwen professional preparation, a broad education and thorough knowledge of one or more specialized fields which our students expect to teach."

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1958]

EDUCATION PUT FIRST IN STEVENSON PLEA

MIAMI BEACH, April 24.—Adlai E. Stevenson said tonight that education must have priority over all other civilian wants if the Nation was to survive the East-West struggle.

The former Democratic presidential candidate urged Congress to make a declaration of national education policy as it did—for the economy—in the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. Stevenson told some 10,000 teachers at the convention of the Florida Education Association that education and employment are on the same level as far as national interest is concerned, both as to the number of persons affected and the long-term character of the issues presented.

Mr. Stevenson also recommended that Congress set up a joint congressional committee on education and a council of educational advisers to the President, and require an annual report by the President on the status of education.

If the Nation's schools, he said, have become too soft and have put too much emphasis on the frills, it is only because the people have brought it about by their own way of life.

"We put the no-shift automobile ahead of abolishing the two-shift school," he said.

He also said that the Nation had put too much emphasis on the bricks and the mortar of education rather than on the human side.

[From the New York Times of April 18, 1958]

EDUCATORS REPLY TO SCHOOL CRITICS—SPEAKERS AT MIAMI PARLEY CHALLENGE CHARGES THAT UNITED STATES SYSTEM DECLINES

(By Leonard Buder)

MIAMI BEACH, April 17.—The Nation's schools, which have come under mounting criticism in recent months, received strong support today at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association.

While acknowledging weaknesses that must be corrected, several speakers asserted that schools were far better than criticisms had indicated. Some took issue with charges that American schools were inferior to those in other countries.

A strong defense of American schooling came from Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, Federal Commissioner of Education. He said "Our best schools are unsurpassed anywhere in the world," but admitted that "unfortunately, we have poor schools, too."

CHALLENGES CRITICS

He challenged a criticism that fundamentals have been thrown overboard or rejected in American schools.

"Most boys and girls are learning the three R's and a great deal more," he said. "Tests made in various parts of the country show that students today rank better in many subjects than did their predecessors," he added.

"In the last 30 years, he added, public high school enrollment in general science, biology, chemistry, physics and basic mathematics courses has increased 74 percent, compared with an enrollment rise of 75.8 percent.

"Such facts certainly do not seem to bear out the charges of a radical decline in attention to the basic courses," he commented.

Everett N. Luce, association president, called on school board members to exercise leadership in developing understanding and support for the democratic concept of universal public education.

If they fail to do so, he warned, many critics of education now being heard may poison the progress we have made over 200 years in developing the best system of education for a democratic nation.

Regarding recent comparisons of American and Soviet education, Mr. Luce, said: "Why should we even for a moment consider an educational system that is designed to meet the needs of the State, not the individual?"

School boards must not overlook the need for improvements, he advised. He cited a general need "to toughen up the academic work and not be afraid to allow students to face the challenge of failure."

A message of greeting from President Eisenhower was read to the convention. The President said "our national security depends upon a strong and democratic system of universal public education."

More than 3,500 educators are attending the conference, which ends Saturday.

Self-Styled Educational Experts Blame Our Schools for All Our Political and Military Failures in the Missile and Satellite Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since the Soviet Union launched an earth satellite last October, the Nation has been deluged with suggestions for revising American education. Somehow, self-styled educational experts in all parts of the country have concluded that the political and military failures which caused us to lose our superiority in the missile and satellite field should be blamed on the American school system.

Operating on this assumption, it has been suggested that a crash program of scientific education would close the gap that may exist between American missile prowess and Soviet achievements. Dr. Anne Hoppock, assistant director of elementary education, is one of those clear voices that has been raised against these dangerous assumptions. She has very wisely pointed out the dangers of any sudden departure from America's traditional concept of educating the whole man. Dr. Hoppock has very justly taken issue with those who would blame America's teachers and students for the failure of political and military leadership. I urge the Members to read her very fine address, delivered on March 26, 1958, before the National Department of Elementary School Principals in Philadelphia, Pa. I include her fine speech here as part of my remarks:

NO TIME FOR PANIC

(By Anne Hoppock, assistant director, elementary education, New Jersey State Department of Education, national department of elementary school principals, Philadelphia, Pa., March 26, 1958)

My topic is No Time for Panic. Now it may be no time for it, but we've had it. When sputnik soared into space and in a glare of publicity the first Vanguard fell, something unpleasantly like panic resulted. In a public beating of breasts and a bering of souls we expressed our fear and hurt pride to the world. Then came the inevitable scurry to place blame. Actually Russia's first in satellite launching did not result from lacks in our school system nor from strengths in the Soviet school system. But something had to be blamed and the public school was the safest scapegoat. A report on education in the Soviet Union was issued, widely misinterpreted, and overnight Russian education, this prime instrument for the preservation of totalitarianism, was hailed for its quality. Over a nationwide hookup, from the highest office in the land, came the suggestions that parents and board members in every community investigate their schools.

Now the people who prior to sputnik, had been damning public education, moved in from the wings to the center of the stage. They show little concern that our children are housed in basements and firehouses, jammed into overcrowded classrooms, operating on double or triple shifts, taught by undertrained and underpaid teachers. They just hold forth eloquently about the failure in education and the failure of the schools. They're right on hand with advice, and don't charge a cent for it. Lay it on, make it tough, speed it up, cut out the nonsense, stop fooling around with social adjustment, close the carnival, return to the basic subjects, segregate the potential leaders from the dolts and ditchdiggers. Particularly intensify the teaching of mathematics and science. Departmentalize the elementary school in order to train budding mathematicians and scientists. Pay mathematics and science teachers more. Put millions into scholarships and subsidies. Standardize the 48-State-school systems by means of a nationwide system of examinations. Take education out of the hands of professional educators, rants that crusading history professor, and put it under the direction of a national commission of physicists, chemists, mathematicians (and, of course, historians). Occasionally the proposals meet head on. Some accuse us of gearing teaching to the average and neglecting individuals. At the same time our friends in the Ford Foundation spend millions to show that masses of children crowded into an auditorium with plenty of TV monitors, can all be fed, electronically, exactly the same fare at the same time.

How shocking in this age of science to find how many presidents of universities, scientists, historians, admirals, novelists, news analysts are behaving so unscientifically. Without reference to the science of human development and learning, without firsthand knowledge of what goes on in public schools today, with inaccurate data, in short, without valid evidence, these self-appointed advisers make their sweeping generalizations.

One must assume that some who destructively attack our schools are careless or misinformed rather than deliberately destructive. We cannot afford to overlook the fact that some public statements are deliberately distorted by those who refuse to use the facts. The shameless telecast at the Alhambra High School with its silly emphasis on coeducational cooking is a case in point.

In this regard, let me call your attention to the strange similarity in the attacks on the schools which appear with remarkable regularity in the "big" media. It can hardly be an accident that the line is the same on many nationwide telecasts, in Time, Life, the U. S. News & World Report, in the elaborate brochures of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, and in the testimony of special pleaders in Washington. No less strange is the complete absence, during the past 3 years, of viewpoints which run counter to this line.

This is no grassroots movement. Those of us who make it our business to find what parents—all of the parents—are thinking, know that the vast majority of them believe in their schools. Sometimes they are critical and sometimes they are justified. But, in the main, they want the same broad, soundly based education for their children that the best of our profession wants. One wonders

how long they can keep a balanced point of view in the face of this widespread campaign to destroy their faith in the public schools.

LET'S TAKE A STAND

This brings me to the theme of this afternoon's meeting. No Time for Panic. I believe it is no exaggeration to say that a battle is being fought which will determine the course of elementary education for many years ahead. If this battle is lost, and with it the gains we have made during the past half century, it will not be because the majority of parents are convinced by the critics. It will be becaues we in the profession temporize and compromise, because we give up and give in. It will be because we abdicate the professional responsibility that has been assigned to us.

So I say to us all—now is the time to rally our forces and take a stand. Let's take a stand—in our professional organizations, at home in company with the teachers and the parents of the children, through available channels of communication with all the people of the community.

Our schools have not failed. Tell the people that they are being deceived when they are told that the schools have failed. Tell them that our American public schools are the best in the world. Our schools serve more children longer than schools anywhere in the world. Educators from the far corners of the earth come to study our educational system and seek our help in improving their own. Our schools have helped weld this Nation into a united people free of rigid class barriers. They have produced an amazing level of literacy. They have helped make possible our high standards of living, our advances in science including such lifesaving "firsts" as sulfa drugs and Salk vaccine. They have had much to do with keeping alive in America the sturdy spirit of freedom. Tell the people that much remains to be done (and always will) to discharge well that subtle, complicated, holy task of helping young human beings to grow and learn. But alert them to the danger that the critics, in their zeal to reform, may destroy; that the crusade to remake may force our schools down dreary blind alleys of wasted effort.

I have been saying, let's rally our forces and take a stand. In taking a stand, we have solid ground under our feet. I suggest that this solid ground consists in the purposes of the American elementary school, in our tested knowledge about growth and learning, and in what we know about how schools improve. In the time I have left, I shall discuss the stand I believe we can take in the light of these three—the purposes of the school, knowledge of growth and learning, and the intelligent processes of school improvement.

WHAT ARE OUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS FOR?

First, let's review the purpose of the elementary school in America. Now, when we are urged to ride off at full gallop in several directions, we'd better ask where we should be going. What do we believe to be the compelling purpose, the unique role, of the elementary school?

When I say "believe" I mean believe passionately with a sense of personal commitment so strong that it guides our decisions and determines our courses of action. I mean a commitment so strong that it helps us to take an unpopular stand. I do not refer here to those high sounding statements of purpose which are enunciated in speeches and then sold out when the going gets hard. I am talking about deep convictions which are so strongly rooted in our philosophy of living that integrity requires us to live by them.

As for me, I believe that the purpose of the elementary school is to help every child—every child—to be at the age he is, the best person he is capable of becoming. It is to help the children to live now and in the future as intelligent, contributing, democratic citizens of a nation belonging to a family of nations. There's nothing new in this. Perhaps it sounds a little trite. Perhaps it looks a little shopworn. But I implore you, if it does, pick it up and rub off the tarnish of lipservice and neglect and see it for what it is. It is democracy's charge to our schools, based upon the Judaeo-Christian concept of the uniqueness and preciousness of each human life, and the essential brotherhood of man.

Holding to this belief regarding the basic purpose of elementary education, we can surely take a stand.

ALL CHILDREN ARE WORTH EDUCATING

We can deny that some children are more worth educating than other children on the assumption that they will make a greater return to society. We can insist that our resources of time, effort and money to be used to provide quality in education for every child. We can point out that all children have gifts, all have a right to develop them, and that the gifts of all are needed to give balance and richness to our communities and our Nation.

LEADERSHIP IN A DEMOCRACY

Holding this belief regarding the purpose of the elementary school we can repudiate the idea of educating an intellectual elite to lead the unqualified masses. In this country we do not seek leadership by a qualified elite over the masses of the unqualified. Leadership of the kind we desire does not reside in a few. It is found in many human activities in humble as well as in high places. Remarkable intelligence or outstanding academic achievement alone does not assure that a person will become an effective leader of other people. Other qualifications are important, among them the ability to communicate with, and be sensitive to the needs of all the people concerned. Certainly it is reasonable to suppose that leadership of the kind valued in a democracy cannot be developed if those who are to learn it are separated from the group in which it is to be exercised. Burton Fowler, in a speech at the Harvard summer session last summer, talked about values to be sought in educating children of unusual intelligence.

In our eager quest for gifted pupils, I hope we shall not overlook the fact that a gifted pupil is also a giving pupil. According to my definition, character is caring intelligently for other people and I cannot attach much importance to an intellectual who is devoid of character; nor can I conceive of character without social responsibility. I am sure that in the main it is true that we have failed to challenge the ability of many of our intellectually ablest pupils, but let us not make the mistake of thinking that such rare birds are going to be trapped solely by hard work, I. Q.'s and examinations. In striving for excellence in the academic achievement of our superior students, I see no reason why we should throw overboard the balance of values, the new and richer curriculums for which we have been striving for the past half century. Let us not make the gifted student another one of those fads, for which American education is supposed to be famous. Experimentation should not be stifled by extermination. The Quaker use of concerns means exactly this, caring intelligently about a condition, a need, or even an idea that may involve human welfare.

Bonaro Overstreet has expressed such a concept in beautiful simplicity. "I do not ask of any man alive that he know all the answers. I only ask a great caring—an honest and humble caring about what happens to human beings and their hopes. And that I ask as much of myself as any other. Help us to make sure that no individual is ever forgotten. That is my prayer for the students we call superior."

THE STATE FOR THE CHILDREN

If we hold to the central purpose of elementary education, we can certainly resist a trend which we might label the children for the State. The admiration expressed in some quarters for Russian education, for example, see last week's Life magazine, is alarming. An educational program designed to help each child develop his gifts will help make our Nation strong. But when we approach educational planning from the standpoint of the good of the State rather than of the individual, we are moving toward totalitarianism. We are moving in this direction when we "toughen up" and "speed up" the program beyond the readiness of the children involved. Education for the state in Russia is reputed to be speeded up and tough. But at what price? For example, of every 1,000 first graders for whom schools are available, only 125 survive to complete the 10-year school. This is a mortality of rate more than 87 percent. It's time to paraphrase a famous phrase and say, "What is good for the children is good for America." We must not offer up our young, like lambs for the sacrifice, on the altars of our national pride.

The basic purpose of elementary education says to us: Keep and strengthen the elementary school as the workshop, the laboratory of democracy. Keep its curriculum broad based, so that gifts of many kinds can reach fruition. See the wide range of differences within it not as a necessary evil, a thing to eliminate by testing and sorting and segregating, but as a most important educational resource. Here is the elementary school the Nation provides its most intensive and widespread opportunity for children of different backgrounds and abilities to respect, appreciate and help one another. Here a cross section of the community's children learns to formulate common purposes and plans, to use many kinds and levels of contributions in carrying out the plans, and to share satisfaction in the outcomes they have achieved together. Our democracy is rich and strong because of the diversity within its unity. Rather than narrowing the range of differences in classrooms in order to get what looks like efficiency in teaching we might better think, as some of us do, how to broaden the range of differences in age, backgrounds, and kinds of abilities in order to achieve better the purposes of education in a democracy.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT GROWTH AND LEARNING?

Second, let's take a look at what we know about children and learning, from research and from years of living with children in the elementary school.

We know a great deal about children and learning. We may not know as much history as the historian, or as much science as the scientist or as much mathematics as the mathematicians. But we know, or should know, more than any one else in our communities about how children develop and learn and the kind of learning environment they need.

There is an assumption being assiduously promoted in some circles that educators are quacks and crackpots, that modern practices in education are a result of ignorance and prejudice. You who are students of education, keeping abreast of research in human growth and learning and in allied fields, know that we do not have to apologize and defend the change and growth that has steadily taken place in our good elementary schools. These changes are based upon the slow, steady accumulation of knowledge, growing from research and experimental study.

TIME TO GROW

For one thing, we know that children, in moving from birth to adulthood, go through an orderly, predictable pattern of growth

and development, that this takes its foreordained time, and that it cannot be speeded up. Man's inventive genius has resulted in some fantastic changes but it has not so far changed the facts of human development. Children still must have time to grow. We push and drive them at their peril and ours. No national emergency justifies the exploitation of children.

When we apply the "time to grow" concept, we have a basis for taking a stand. We can resist moves to rob children of their childhood. We can look critically at proposals to enter intellectually able children in school earlier than other children, to deny them the creative experiences of the kindergarten in order to get them into symbols and abstractions, to hurry them into high school and college earlier. We can say that the elementary school is not a preparatory school for the high school. We can resist pressure to move high-school subjects down into the elementary school so as to allow the college to move its subjects down into the high school.

Education must help children assimilate the culture. Large bodies of knowledge and skill are developing in some fields. But no good purpose is served in forcing upon young children large doses of subject matter or drill of a kind they cannot understand and use.

We must tell our people what this means. For example, we can lead them to question foreign language teaching in the elmentary school in communities where children have no opportunity to use a second language and can learn it only as a kind of trick or game.

We can tell our people that science was introduced into the elementary curriculum 75 years ago and that in good elementary schools children were exploring their natural and physical environment long before sputnik went into orbit. But the elementary school isn't the place to train scientists. We can pass on Glen Blough's good advice which is, in effect, "Let's not worry about keeping up with the Russians. Let's just keep up with the children."

Time to grow and time to live. We adults sometimes seem like the rabbit in Alice in Wonderland, hurrying madly along crying, "I'm late, I'm late." How can we harmonize the shocking incidence of mental illness and heart disease, our stomach ulcers, and our tranquillizers with pressures to drive the children, expressed in demands—"speed it up, toughen it up, pile on the homework, less play—throw out the frills. We and the parents of the children must remember the importance of time to grow and time to live.

TEACHING ISN'T TELLING AND TESTING

We know other significant facts about children and learning. We know that learning is goal seeking. We know that learning takes place in many active ways. We know that real learning is learning to act. We know that a child learns best when he is helped to see himself as worthy, valued, loved. We know that the teacher-child relationship is crucial. We know that when teachers are able to employ sound principles of learning, great power to learn is released. Knowing these things we deplore the fact that in some schools, teaching is still perceived as pouring in, that the curriculum still consists of Slavish adherence to textbooks and workbooks, that individual needs are neglected, and that a premium is placed upon the passive following of directions all day long.

Those of us whose knowledge of learning impel us to operate elementary schools as purposeful, active, reality based, friendly communities of children are appalled by so-called experiments to introduce mass methods of teaching—by telling—as represented by television teaching.

A TALKING PICTURE OF A TEACHER

I spent 2 days recently in a county where teaching by TV, financed by the Fund for the Advancement of Education and equipped by the electronics industry, is in its second year. I sat in classrooms from the first grade through high school and watched teaching by telling in reading, number, social studies, and art in the elementary school, core in the 8th grade and geometry in the 10th grade. I saw passive, and frequently apathetic children, total dependence upon the lecture method, classroom teachers playing a minor and ineffective role, in the junior and senior high school large numbers of children herded together with TV monitors spotted about the place. More pitiful than anything else was the inactivity of the children. They watched and listened. In the communication arts, they spoke not a word; in the graphic arts, they were given models to copy. The TV teachers asked all the questions and answered them; they made all the plans and carried them out; they created all the demonstration materials and demonstrated them. In short, they robbed the children of all opportunities to learn through active participation.

We were told that outstanding teachers had been chosen to become TV teachers. If so, one can hypothesize that good classroom teachers do not necessarily become good TV teachers for never have I seen poor teaching so widely disseminated at such great expenditure of time and money. It was tragic to see these TV teachers working so hard in their studio vacuums, not able to see how children were responding, not able to adapt to individual needs, hopefully shooting their arrows of pedagogy into the air.

Although this particular project has received much favorable publicity, we were told that after 1½ years of operation, plans for evaluation are still to be formulated. Evaluation by qualified persons should be forthcoming. I do not believe that we can assume that evaluation by the electronics industry is either informed or wholly disinterested. Until there is evidence to the contrary, I think we can take a stand that no talking picture of a teacher, no flickering shadow on a screen, can take the place of a good teacher working with a reasonable number of children in a well-equipped classroom.

We have yet to face up to the question of what television can do that a teacher cannot do, or that the available wealth of films, records, trips, and other audio visual aids cannot do. Probably, television has a unique role. But I, for one, am convinced that it cannot be used to solve the teacher shortage without doing serious damage to our schools. And let us not assume that such mass methods as TV and teacher aids are necessary to solve the teacher shortage. There will be enough teachers when we make teaching sufficiently attractive.

We have been talking about using what we know about teaching and learning.

HOW WASTEFUL NOT TO USE WHAT WE KNOW

Why repeat the mistakes of the past?

Take for example, the demand for more homework. Research evidence shows that there is no significant relationship between time spent in home study and pupils progress and achievement.

Take the proposal to departmentalize the elementary school in order to employ specialists in science and mathematics. We went through this at the beginning of the century. On the basis of this experience we have moved away from departmentalization in the elemntary school, a trend which has reached into the high school. Study of the research shows that departmentalization has not been proved to be superior at any level of the public school system.

Take ability grouping which is now being promoted as a way of meeting individual needs, particularly of bright children. Ability grouping was a fetish from 1920 to 1935. We have been moving steadily away from ability grouping in the elementary school. There is no adequate research evidence to support ability grouping and some evidence to show it is least effective for bright children.

Take testing. We seem about to go all out for systemwide, statewide, nationwide testing. During the scientific movement, we learned a great deal about the use and misuse of tests. We know now that tests can be useful to a teacher or a school staff as one of many ways of assessing status and need. We know that indiscriminate use of tests limits the curriculum to the narrow range of what tests can measure and promotes memorizing, cramming, and teaching by telling and testing. We know the damage to children in the misuse of tests. For example one board of education, spurred on by a report on acceleration from the Ford Foundation, issued a directive that group tests of intelligence should be administered and all children of a given I. Q. and beyond should be accelerated a year.

HOW DO SCHOOLS IMPROVE?

Third, let's look at what we know about how schools improve.

Let's be clear about the need for school improvement. No school is perfect. No school stays good unless it is continually in the process of improving. Some schools are poor. The question is, How do we make them better? How do we build instead of tearing down? What are the lines along which we must move?

WE HAVE TO SPEND MORE MONEY

Let's say again for the record, we have to spend money. We know that many children will continue to be sold short in this country until we build more classrooms, reduce class size, purchase more learning materials, educate more teachers, bring teachers' salaries to a level where good people can be recruited. A Federal program designed only to shore up mathematics and science at the secondary and college level is like putting a fancy roof on the barn while the foundation crumbles.

THE STAFF LEADS IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Money is necessary but in itself it will not produce good education. School improvement requires professional know-how. We are becoming aware that the individual school is the basic unit of curriculum improvement and that the principal and the staff, with the help of the children and the parents, are the prime improvers. Thus the curriculum of the school is developed to meet the particular needs of the children and the neighborhood.

This concept of a school-created, continuously improving curriculum requires us all—teachers and principals, and others involved—to perfect new skills. We must learn the processes of on-the-job curriculum improvement—to study the status and needs of children; to identify points at which the curriculum needs strengthening; to select, test, and evaluate procedures leading to improved learning. Because curriculum improvement is a cooperative process we must learn satisfying, productive ways of working together.

Evaluation is important in this process of school improvement. I hope we can learn to use it increasingly well as an integral part of curriculum planning. Let's not be pushed into using it just to show the critics we're not as bad as they say we are. For if we do we will be missing evaluation as it has been misused in the past. The consisted in reducing the complex personal elements of teaching and learning to a checklist, used once over lightly by a visiting committee to arrive at rating of good, poor, or terrible. This kind of evaluation is operation dead end.

An intelligent, reasoned process of curriculum improvement takes time as well as professional know-how. Crash programs may be appropriate for missile production, but not for teaching children. Nor, to mix a metaphor, can we stir up a curriculum as

we would a cake, with an extra cup of homework or science or discipline to get the quantity or flavor demanded by the public before next week.

A FINAL WORD

Someone has said that the greatest danger of our times is the danger of losing our humanness. I take this to mean that we are in danger of becoming diminished in stature as reasoning creating, self-respecting, loving, difference-making, human beings. Life is becoming increasingly impersonal. Many people work at jobs which make little demand upon their intelligence and creativeness. As leisure increases so do temptations to use leisure in the passive consumption of other people's products. Through mass media we are told what to think and encouraged to be just like the Joneses only more more so.

We live daily with situations which shame and threaten our humanness—food surpluses spoiling while famine stalks the earth, the frustrating conditions which produce juvenile crime, the southern Little Rocks and northern Levittowns. And who among us is not filled with despair to think that our most urgent goal seems to be to make more, and more deadly weapons than our cold-war enemy? Having poured into this goal fabulous resources of money and brains, diverting them from humane uses, what do we have? Only weapons so horrible that we dare not use them lest we reduce our world to a radioactive ash heap.

Leonard Wibberley, author of Take Me to Your President, wrote about the threat to our humanness in a syndicated column called the Challenge of Outer Space.

"I do not doubt for a moment that, within the decade, mankind will invade the moon. But what concerns me is the kind of man who first disturbs with his ponderous feet the dust of the lunar landscape. Will he be merely a highly trained calculating machine, putting his trust in his knowledge of science and mathematics or will be be in addition to this, a rounded human being, skilled in technicalities as he must be, but conscious of and humble before, the great questions of creation, of life's miracle and death's mystery? Will he take with him but a few volumes of scientific works with which to ward off the black cold of spacial solitude? Or will he carry with him that love of beauty, which is love of truth, which is love of God, which is the foundation stone of civilization?"

Let's go home from here dedicated to the proposition that we will do no good for our children by moving in what I can think of only as a dehumanizing direction. This dehumanizing trend is represented for me by such words as segregation, departmentalization, acceleration, standardization, regimentation, automation.

Let's go home resolved to make our elementary schools a place where each child counts for something where he respects himself and finds himself, where he develops some compelling interests, where he begins to see himself as his brother's keeper, where he learns to live values which will help him find his way in this time of value conflicts. Don't segregate him; bring him into closer human sympathy with his fellows. Don't departmentalize and fragment; help him to experience the wholeness of learning and living. Don't accelerate; give him time to explore his world in depth and breadth, to think with and feel with and use the content of his curriculum. Above all don't automate, for this is the way to produce a terrible travesty of the thinking, creating, contributing human beings we want our children to become.

Let's go home with a renewed determination to exercise leadership in the interests of children, even if this means living dangerously. No battle for democracy is more crucial than this one to keep the elementary school a place where democracy lives and, with each new generation, renews itself.

Mostly Sweat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for 30 or 40 years now, the Arizona Republican, one of the leading daily newspapers in Arizona, has been holding a pioneer's reunion for those who came to Arizona before 1890. This year they were addressed by Mr. Bert Fireman, who not only is one of the State's leading newspaper reporters, but also is recognized as being one of the outstanding historians of the Southwest.

At the meeting, Mr. Fireman addressed the pioneers of Arizona on the subject Mostly Sweat. He recalled to their minds that what it took to build the West was not the six-shooter, not the drunken cowboy in the saloon, not the honky-tonk girl at the honky-tonk piano, but God-fearing people who were honest and who believed in work.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fireman's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSTLY SWEAT

(Remarks of Bert Fireman at Arizona Pioneers Reunion, Phoenix, Ariz., April 12, 1958)

Mr. President and pioneers, I warmly appreciate the invitation I received to speak to the pioneers reunion this year. It is my first appearance at one of these delightful gatherings. Until Senator GOLDWATER explained to you how he happened to attend the first reunion, I was not clear myself how I happened to stay away all these 34 years. BARRY explained that your first reunion was held at Riverside Park and that he went there to go swimming at the opening of the swimming season. There is the difference between the Senator and myself. He was a city boy and probably had the dime it cost to go swimming in those days. I was a country boy living out in the boondocks, so I missed your reunion. I went swimming in one of our irrigation canals.

I am sorry that I am not eligible for membership in your association. I came to Arizona when I was 4 years old, but I can say that I have grown up with our State. I refuse to accept the idea that anybody who has been here 5 years and already has a $10,000 mortgage on record is a pioneer. I prefer the idea that the real pioneers of Arizona are those who lived here before coolers were invented, and were hardy and sturdy enough to survive those really hot years. Anybody who slept in his backyard because the house was an oven—and I'm sure that includes everybody in this audience—knows exactly what I mean.

Those of you who came to Arizona before 1890 or were born here don't have to explain or worry about your qualifications as pioneers, as I do. I feel sorry for anybody, however, who has to listen to young squirts like me talk about pioneer days.

My mention of days when summers were really hot around here—before science and refrigeration changed them for the better—brings me to the title I have been chosen for this little discussion with you, "Mostly Sweat."

Most of the progress Arizona has made was due to the sweat of the explorers, the trappers, prospectors, soldiers, cowmen, railroaders, farmers, merchants, and others who built it. Lately, the tourists who have been coming here in increasing numbers to enjoy our winter sun have made their contribution along this same line, for they come to enjoy a good sweat under the sun while snow and ice covers their homes in less-favored areas.

Let us begin this discussion with an examination of Arizona history, to see if the facts of our development bear out my theory that mostly sweat built Arizona.

We can start with Captain Alarcon, who in 1540 led an expedition that sailed up the west coast of Mexico to the Colorado River. His purpose was to accompany Coronado's expedition that was moving overland in search of the fabled Seven Cities of Cibola. Alarcon's ships carried supplies for Coronado's men and were supposed to carry back the treasure that the Conquistadores believed would be found in Arizona. They were to be disappointed, but nevertheless in the summer of 1540 Alarcon reported that he found the native Indians of Arizona carrying little scrapers to wipe the abundant sweat off their bodies. And they sweated aplenty as they willingly helped to pull Alarcon's boat up the Colorado River. From descriptions and distances given it appears that they went as far as Ehrenberg. Failing to make contact with Coronado, they turned back.

Father Kino—that greatest of the missionaries in our history—came 151 years later. He used no word as inelegant as sweat in his diaries and journals, but accounts of his travels make it plain that sweat and scratches from cactus were part of the burden he patiently bore in bringing Christian salvation to the Pima and Papago Indians who welcomed him to the deserts of southern Arizona.

Seventy-five years later Father Garces explored along the Colorado River, visited the Hopi Indians in northern Arizona, and built a mission at Yuma. He extended the good works started by Father Kino in building the original Mission of San Xavier del Bac, near Tucson. Then he died a martyr's death on the Colorado. There was sweat on the good padre's brow as he carried the light of Christendom to far corners of Arizona.

James Ohio Pattie and his father trapped the Gila and San Francisco Rivers for beaver soon after 1825. For a while they lingered among the hospitable natives at Yuma. They found beaver hunting hard work. They sweated for every pelt taken, and they were in a cold sweat most of the time for fear the Apaches might take their pelts or scalps, even though scalping was not an Apache characteristic.

Old Bill Williams came soon afterward. This most romantic of Arizona's mountain men and guides sweated in his buckskins as he trapped the streams of Arizona and stole horses down in Sonora. His profuse sweat made his buckskins oily, dirty, and smelly, but it did not reduce the importance to Arizona of his early explorations.

In 1846 the Mormon battalion crossed Arizona in the most remarkable military march in American history. I am sure that proud descendants of those foot-weary, sweating volunteers are in this gathering today, and they have every right to be proud of the battalion's accomplishments. It was faith, courage, determination, hope for a better life for their families and for their people, the Mormons, but still mostly sweat that sustained them on that magnificent march across the desert to help in the conquest of California.

The road they built during their march, which came to be called Cooke's Road, was followed by the Argonauts in the gold rush that followed soon afterward. And what do the accounts of those early journeys made by the gold seekers tell us? Did they have Indian troubles? Yes, some; but only a few. Hundreds of wagons passed safely for every one that suffered from Indian raids. This was in the period before the Apaches were aroused to hatred of Americans. It was a dry journey, the roadway often moistened only by the sweat of the struggling travelers. They sweat to lead or drive their oxen. They sweat to cross deserts and ford such streams as there were. They sweat to find and cut feed for their animals. They sweat to hunt food to supplement the rations they carried. They sweat to fix their wagons and sweat to follow the trail to the next precious waterhole.

The Civil War followed in a few years. Troops were withdrawn from Arizona to New Mexico to meet a Confederate drive toward Colorado. For the first time Indian outbreaks became a major issue in Arizona. Slaughter and strife followed the Apaches' mistaken notion that they had driven the whites from Arizona. Killings were frequent. Travelers, miners, and settlers died in the relentless flood of Apache attacks. But a few pioneers stuck it out. Pete Kitchen was outstanding among these. He stuck to his farm on Potrero Creek down in the Santa Cruz River although his Opata Indians had to stand guard around the clock and carried rifles on their plows. Meanwhile Charles D. Poston hurried to Washington to lay the problem of Indian uprisings before President Lincoln and the Congress, and he succeeded in obtaining Territorial designation for Arizona.

The Joseph Walker party came into Arizona exploring for riches. They had a few brushes with Indians, but most of their effort was devoted to hunting for gold, building cabins, finding food, finding water, digging in the Hassayampa River and Lynx Creek for pay dirt. Their lot was mostly a matter of weary toil and sweat, and most of them failed to make fortunes.

The Territorial party arrived in Arizona and soon Prescott was being built. More sweat. Those early settlers of Prescott and the pioneer farmers in the Verde Valley had Indian troubles of increasing intensity. They found that the Indians would attack them while they were busy with the hard work it took to win the wilderness. The Indians would attack while they were cutting timber, plowing, digging ditches, mining—while the white man was sweating.

A string of military posts was established across Arizona to protect the settlers. Ask the old soldiers among you about the romance of a soldier's life on the frontier. Yes, a few of them saw Geronimo and Victorio. Some even fired at hostiles sometime or other during their service. But during the long years of the Indian wars thousands of soldiers were stationed in Arizona who never fired a gun in anger. A soldier's life was mostly drudgery. It was a matter of endless patrols, of cutting hay, shoeing horses, hunting lost mules, building posts, standing watch, and always sweating it out until that happy day when his discharge would come through.

Then followed the days of the big cattle spreads, of mining development, of permanent setlement in the farming valleys, of railroad and highway building. All these things meant more sweat for the pioneers.

This was a harsh land. It was hot, dry, and roadless. The Indian danger always existed, but actually it was a lesser difficulty than the endless struggle against the elements. It was a life of work and toil and sweat that was required to win homes in the West.

The miners single-jacked into rich ledges and many poor ones.

Woodcutters scrambled over rugged hills to cut down forests to feed the boilers at mines and the stoves in homes.

Watercarriers hauled water on the backs of burros or built pipelines or flumes to bring water from mountain springs to towns and mills.

The teamsters' and hostlers' life was not an easy one with long wagons hauling supplies or ore. The necessities of life had to be imported from California or from as far as Guaymas in Mexico by pioneers like Senator GOLDWATER's grandfather.

The Upper Gila Valley was first occupied by charcoalmakers engaged to cut mesquite trees and burn charcoal for the smelters at Clifton.

The Salt River Valley was settled by the Swilling party to raise grain, sweet potatoes, and vegetables for the soldiers at Camp McDowell and the new thriving mining camp built up around the Vulture Mine near Wickenburg.

The dambuilders toiled in sand and mud, hauling willows and rocks to rebuild the crude brush dams that spring floods destroyed.

The farmer fought sand, gophers, and jackrabbits.

Cowboys had to overcome drought, disease, and long distances to market stock as well as outlaws and Indians. Ask any cowboy among you—and there are a great many in your ranks; ask him if he spent more time digging postholes and stringing barbed wire (or bob wire, as he probably calls it) and treating sick and cut cattle than he did at rodeos in town or in twanging a guitar. He'll tell you the truth—a cowboy's life was hard work, lots of sweat.

The homesteader, the farmer's wife, the merchant, laborer, sanjero, miner, miller, roadbuilder, teamster, woodcutter soldier, cowboy—these are the men and women who built Arizona—and they did it mostly with sweat.

Now for a moment let's look at the terrible thing Hollywood and TV have done in distorting the history of the West.

Today Gunsmoke, Tombstone, 26 Men, Sheriff of Cochise, and Wyatt Earp are among the most popular cowboy shows that are seen and heard on every television set. They have displaced Hopalong Cassidy, Lone Ranger, and Cisco Kid, which were the favorites a very short time ago.

The change has been mostly in the titles, not in the plots. There has been little change in the ugly, unjustified misrepresentation of true western life contained in such shows. The plots are still trite, distorted, and misleading. They do a great disservice to the true history of the West.

These plots are always about the same. There is a good man and a bad man. Usually the good man rides a white horse or wears a white hat. The bad man by the same standard must wear a black hat or ride a black horse, and if he doesn't do that he simply doesn't shave.

These TV cowboy movies constantly abuse the facts with that old malarkey about the sheepmen and the cattlemen being at war. They say that sheep and cattle won't drink at the same waterhole. How absurd. Your Vice President Lou Charlebois, sitting here on the stage, told me just a little while ago that he has been running sheep and cattle on the same range for 50 years.

Usually the villian is represented as a banker, a merchant, or the sheriff, as characters who generally were respected and honored in Arizona for their important part in the community life. Whether they are deliberately subversive or just plain stupid I don't know, but the Hollywood hacks who write these shows and produce them seem to ignore the basic, truthful facts of western history.

Now, I do not deny that such things happened in isolated cases. There have been many exciting, romantic, and humorous episodes in the colorful history of our State. I do not even object to these narrations so long as they are done truthfully, honestly, and with reasonable and proper explanation that violence and bloodshed were not approved and were never condoned in pioneer Arizona. Most of our people have always been law abiding.

I might remind you that much of the basic colonization work in Arizona was undertaken by two great religious groups, as church-supported action. Both the Catholic and the Mormon churches have always stood for decent things in family and community life. Their good work should not be so grossly misrepresented. It is a criminal distortion.

Hollywood writers have many warped views of history.

By glorifying badmen, they set a bad example for our young people.

They corrupt children's sense of true historical values.

They encourage gunplay by overemphasizing its importance and frequency. In the last year here in Arizona more than a dozen persons shot themselves and required hospital care by practicing the kind of quick-draw nonsense that is played up in movies and TV shows.

They give the impression that violence was the everyday pattern of life in the West rather than the acts of hoodlums, gangsters, underworld characters—and that the actions of this small group was not approved by the vast majority of the population.

They don't tell you that two churches were built in Tombstone the same year as the fight at the O. K. Corral.

They don't tell you that Wyatt Earp owned a gambling joint and lived with a lady of the night while posing as a pious disciple of law and order.

They don't tell you that most of the men in Arizona and in Tombstone even, in the eighties, didn't carry guns—except to shoot rattlesnakes, hunt for food, and if cowboys to kill some critter that might have broken a leg. In fact, much of the Tombstone trouble was caused by the very local ordinance that prohibited the carrying of firearms in the town. That was the direct cause of the fight between the Earp crowd and the Clanton boys.

They don't tell you that the good people of Arizona despised the likes of Curly Bill, Blackjack Ketchum, Johnny Ringo, and Pearl Hart.

They don't tell you that the Ten Commandments, good citizenship, church membership, charity toward those who were unfortunate, that family ties, and love of country were the solid principles upon which Arizona was won from the wilderness and became prosperous.

I must tell you what I believe about Arizona history.

I believe a callus on the palm of an unknown woodcutter was more important in Arizona's development than a notch on Wyatt Earp's gun.

I believe the shovel was a lot more important than the six-gun.

I believe the church was more important than the gambling hall.

I believe that an immigrant's wagon being ferried across the Colorado River on the trail from Utah to Arizona was more important than a stagecoach robbery anywhere.

I believe the tiny wisp of smoke from a prospector's fire on the desert was more important to Arizona's development than all the gunsmoke at the O. K. Corral.

And I believe that when BARRY GOLDWATER's grandfather opened a sack of beans because some miner was hungry, that was more important than when another "bucket of blood" opened on Whisky Row in Prescott or Brewery Gulch in Bisbee.

I am convinced that the true values of American life have not changeed through the years although there are marked differ-

ences in the particular obstacles and problems faced at different times.

Americans still seek opportunity. That's why pioneers came West 175 years ago, and that's why lots of people are still coming out to Arizona to live today.

Americans still love their homes, their families, and their country. That's why you and your parents fought for a place under the sun. That's why you stood up against Indian dangers, against bad men, and why you so willingly fought when you were needed in the Armed Forces in our Nation's war against external enemies. That's why your grandsons are in uniform.

Americans still believe in private initiative and private enterprise. That's why rugged pioneer types went into remote corners of Arizona, despite dangers and a harsh nature, to face the challenge that each man finds within himself. This is a challenge to stand on his own feet, to make his own way, to find his own destiny. This is the true pioneer spirit, but it is a spirit I am sad to say some of our people have lost in seeking the paternalism of government instead of opportunity to better themselves.

Americans have supreme faith in the principles and freedoms that have been sustained in the West and demonstrated so remarkably by pioneers.

I wish the movies and TV shows would present this side of western history.

I salute you for coming here for these delightful gatherings with your old friends, and I grieve with you that each year there are fewer who can return. I salute you for listening to me so patiently, for your long life, for your contribution to Arizona's development, and mostly for the sweat you contributed as your part of our State's splendid pioneer heritage.

Sputniks Versus Economiks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. It is my sincere conviction that if the underdeveloped countries are to realize the benefits of modern science and technology and improve their standards of living, they must develop private enterprise patterned along the lines of our own highly productive economy. Many people forget that the United States was an underdeveloped country but a few generations ago.

While there are many proposals constantly before the Congress to appropriate funds through public agencies, the advancement of the underdeveloped countries requires techniques which only private enterprise can bring. One of the most significant actions our Government has taken was the approval of United States participation in the International Finance Corporation. It is a unique agency in that it supports private enterprise efforts throughout the world. It has been unusually successful under the inspired guidance of Robert L. Garner, its president.

Mr. Garner believes:

That the United States Government could properly give a substantial impetus to the export of our private enterprise, if it would accept that this is a vital factor in the national welfare and security:

1. A positive policy to encourage investment abroad by American business and capital.

2. Development of tax incentives—a more effective stimulant than guaranties.

3. Farm support of the rights of American business operating abroad.

4. Restraint in giving financial aid to governmental enterprises in the fields suitable for private business.

Mr. Garner showed how we can further enhance the role of private enterprise in economic development in an address delivered at the Fourth Annual National Military Industrial Conference at Chicago on February 18 of this year. I ask unanimous consent that his address entitled "Sputniks Versus Economiks" may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPUTNIKS VERSUS ECONOMIKS

(By Robert L. Garner, president, International Finance Corp.)

The launching of the sputniks into outer space obviously represents another major breakthrough in this accelerating scientific age.

It is a dramatic demonstration of man's infinite capacity in the area of physical matter.

What it will mean—in military, political and scientific terms—is being appraised or guessed at by others far more competent than I.

MAN STILL EARTHBOUND

However, I am confident that it does not mean escape from the basic facts of life and the problems inherent in human nature, in man's emotions, character, hopes and fears, and in the necessity to earn our bread if we are to eat it. Not on the moon or in stellar space will we get away from the principles of nature, of morals and ethics, of economics.

Long before sputnik, scientific advances had far outstripped man's progress in political, social and economic organization, in self-knowledge and discipline, in wisdom and judgment. Now as he spreads his range beyond his own planet, man needs ever increasing strength and wisdom to manage the awesome powers he has created.

This is one of the challenges of sputniks.

Another challenge comes because this and other parallel triumphs of science are in the hands of the Russian Communists, and thus available for their hostile purpose.

THE OPPOSING CREEDS

It is never time wasted to review the nature of the Communist challenge.

Communism holds that since science can change the material world, it can change human nature. Put another way, communism asserts that a free individual is no match for the problems of today, and that man is only free when he relinquishes his self-identity to the state. Thus Communist society is to produce a superhuman being.

Communists believe that they alone understand the laws governing society, and that this knowledge gives them the power and right to change all society and all human nature and to control them both.

Communists realize that they cannot succeed in this purpose until all economic, political and social systems that deviate from their own have been destroyed.

This is their creed.

Set against it, a creed appropriate for us has been well stated by Dr. Albert Schweitzer.

"Man's ability to be a pioneer of progress, that is, to understand what civilization is and to work for it, depends on his being a thinker and upon his being free. He must be the former if he is to be capable of comprehending his ideals and putting them into shape. He must be free in order to be in a position to launch his ideals out into the general life * * * material and spiritual freedom are closely bound up with one another. Civilization presupposes free men, for only by free men can it be thought out and brought to realization."

Thus two opposed and mutually exclusive ways of life confront each other—and the struggle embraces every physical, intellectual and moral activity.

The men and organizations who have been responsible for this series of military industrial conferences have shown full awareness of the all-inclusive nature of the conflict and of the need for mobilizing all our effective forces, public and private.

The particular role of commerce and industry in this struggle is being discussed here from a variety of viewpoints. I have been requested to talk about some of the factors external to our country which affect business and how business may affect and influence them.

Our inescapable concern for what happens beyond our shores rests first on the fact that the threat to our security comes from abroad through Russian communism. We must therefore concern ourselves with the rest of the world.

BUSINESS AND THE HOME BASE

But since we need a secure home base and internal strength as a first essential, I wish to make a few comments on one aspect of the role of business at home.

I deeply believe in the vigor and creative power of competitive free private enterprise. It is the economic expression of the freedom of men to struggle, to achieve, to capitalize their individual capacities and talents. It gives play to the competitive spirit, which induces the maximum endeavor. It is consonant with and equal to the other great freedoms, which can only endure along with it.

It has been inherent in our traditions and accomplishments. As developed in this country the system of private business has, more than any other economic system, multiplied production and divided the benefits widely among the people.

But like every other type of activity it has its faults and shortcomings.

I would say that perhaps its most obvious failing under present conditions is its too narrow view of its functions and its responsibilities.

By instinct and tradition the businessman concentrates his life on his own job and his own business—his output, his sales, his balance sheet and profits for the current year. He generally finds little time for the longer future and for attention to the political and social trends, which he does not see as immediately impinging on his operations. This attitude is understandable, but is it adequate for today?

The successful businessman has been forced to recognize that technical changes are rushing upon him and has accepted the necessity of looking far forward and through research and development preparing for what is ahead.

But few of them are taking equal account of the changes taking place which bear heavily on the very survival of the system of private capitalism.

Business has not accepted and acted upon the responsibility to take a lead in preserving and strengthening the foundations on which our type of free enterprise rests.

Business has not effectively explained and sold to the American people what it is and how it operates; what part it has played in

the life of the Nation; and the unique benefits it has produced for our people as a whole.

While producing and selling its individual products, it has permitted the radicals, the doubters, those lured by the glib professions of socialism and statism of various forms, to sell their ideas largely unopposed.

The result—Americans by and large take for granted the benefits our system has produced, but for lack of understanding allow the termites to eat away at its underpinnings.

And now that it is clear that communism centers its fire on the United States—and in large part because this country represents the most successful example of capitalism—it becomes doubly a matter of self-preservation that business shall devote major efforts to rally the forces of public opinion more solidly in support of this essential sector of our freedom.

Perhaps business needs in its organization a vice president for American ideas—to devise effective means of presenting the free enterprise system in layman's language—to its employees, in its communities and into the educational system—and to give support to others who are engaged in similar endeavor.

But words contrary to deeds lack conviction and business must live as well as proclaim its virtues and faith. The businessman who runs to government for special favors for protection against legitimate competition and who tries to stand on the feet of government instead of his own, can well do more hurt to the system by which he lives than can its enemies.

BUSINESS IN A DEVELOPING WORLD

If American business can see the vital issues now involved and accept the job of meeting them squarely at home, it might also be aware of similar implications to its future in developments abroad.

The concept of a secure fortress America, standing alone in a hostile world, and merely guarding our territory agaisnt foreign threat, is recognized as no longer a feasible basis for military planning.

Strategically we have been forced into attempting to organize collective forces around the world. Such success as has been achieved in this has depended upon the confidence of our allies in our sustaining strength. Recent developments have no doubt shaken this confidence, and it is obviously vital that we demonstrate our ability to maintain at least a military stalemate with the Russians on land, at sea, and in both the near and distant reaches of space.

But increasingly we need to seek other than military means to strengthen and unify all the forces which may potentially be on our side.

It is clear that the Communists have recognized that the less-developed countries, with the greatest reserves of raw materials and some 1,250,000,000 people, are crucial in the future balance of power, and they are concentrating their utmost efforts in diplomacy, propaganda, trade, credits, and arms to gain influence over them.

We cannot escape the necessity of giving equal importance to developments in these areas, and to the means by which we may affect them to our mutual benefit.

For it is not realistic to envision that we can be secure economically, or in the maintenance of our political freedom and our way of life, if we should be surrounded by a world which has yielded through nonviolent pressures to Communist control of physical resources or has become convert to its ideology.

It is obvious that maintenance of the vitality and strength of our economy—a basic foundation of our power—is an essential factor in our influence abroad, both with our friends and our enemies.

The intangible qualities of firmness, calm in the face of danger and confidence in ourselves will, of course, be of inestimable weight in making our influence felt.

TO THE OFFENSIVE

But beyond these necessities, we need positive programs, not merely defensive countermeasures. I shall make some comments regarding policies and actions in the economic field wherein I believe we can achieve tangible long-range benefits.

Great programs of Government aid have not succeeded widely in winning steadfast friends or stalwart military allies. We have learned that we cannot sway peoples' ideas, loyalties, and interests with money alone. Nor has financial assistance succeeded in the less developed countries in producing conditions of economic progress and political and social stability, which are the best inoculants against communism.

Our attempts to sell the concepts of freedom and democracy, and the fact that they have enabled us to prosper greatly, have not sufficiently convinced these peoples that they should adopt our ways of life. Apparently these appeals are too vague, too far removed from their traditions and habits, so they cannot instinctively relate these things to themselves.

I have over the past decade been attempting to evaluate the factors which are most likely to fortify peoples against the blandishments or threats of communism.

Here and there religion, whether of Christ or Mohammed or Buddha, will set up some barrier; in a few countries long contact with the Russian bear makes them wary. Elsewhere strong nationalism and fear of all foreign influence plays its part, but little of the underdeveloped world has ever experienced Russian rule, only western domination. People tend to shun the aversion known; to ignore the unfamiliar peril.

So I conclude that for a solid and enduring resistance to communism to be built up in the developing countries, we must look most hopefully to creating conditions where more and more people have a decent economic stake in the present and opportunities for the future.

Such conditions can only be based on economic growth, through which there will be more and better jobs, offering a chance for the willing and able to improve themselves, to develop a satisfactory standard of living, to acquire property, to own a business—in other words, building up a middle class, which gives solidity to a society. There need be fields of endeavor opening up in which those of special abilities can find outlets for their diverse talents and ambitions, and for capital to find profitable employment and make its contribution to progress.

I am convinced that these conditions can most likely be created through development of private business—the sort of dynamic force to which we have given play in this country. This aspect of freedom, its meaning and its results, can be made tangible and evident to other peoples.

And it is in aiding to the spread abroad of such a free enterprise system that I see for American business an opportunity—and also a responsibility—which can contribute to our national interests and security.

On grounds of profitability there are the new economic frontiers with resources and markets to be developed. They contain minerals and other products which increasingly we must have to feed into our industries. Our enterprises need to develop the new customers which by the millions are potential in these growing countries. In all ages the frontiers have offered high rewards for the bold and imaginative, with risks aplenty it is true. Americans have always been ready to take such risks and on balance have reaped good harvests, and the spirit of pioneering is still in our blood.

Added to these purely economic interests, American business should realize the wider significance in terms of our national interests, which can result from its operations overseas.

Good business planted and spread among the peoples of the great frontiers can do more to cement them to our ideals, to identify their needs and interests with ours in the fight against communism than can actions and money of governments.

Recently a visitor from a Latin American country put it to me this way, "Governments come and go, the people remain." Aid to governments is too often based on immediate political objectives which do not contribute to sound economic growth. The flow of private experience and capital is much more likely to build on people and produce more dynamic and lasting results.

Through the spread of private business we can spearhead an offensive against communism, in place of trying to counterpunch against its blows.

Last year at this conference I suggested that the United States Government could properly give a substantial impetus to the export of our private enterprise, if it would accept that this is a vital factor in the national welfare and security. I shall briefly outline them:

1. A positive policy to encourage investment abroad by American business and capital.

2. Development of tax incentives—a more effective stimulant than guaranties.

3. Firm support of the rights of American business operating abroad.

4. Restraint in giving financial aid to governmental enterprises in the fields suitable for private business.

We can continue to hope that our Government will get around to doing these things.

But let us be thankful that American business retains the freedom to take the initiative in throwing its weight, its vitality and its creative talents into the struggle to maintain the integrity of its foundations at home and to help build up abroad interests which will be on our side in the contest with communism.

In closing, I will illustrate two extremes of points of view which are not uncommon with regard to the problems which I have been discussing.

An important businessman, head of a great and profitable company whose products all come from overseas to be marketed in this country, remarked recently to a friend of mine, "I can't understand why Bob Garner and his associates in IFC and the World Bank waste their efforts in trying to develop these foreign countries. They will never get their money back. My company operates abroad on a straightforward business basis, we buy and sell and make a profit—and that's that."

Very simple, very direct, very much in line with traditional business thinking. But if Communists get a grip on the countries which supply the goods of this man's trade, he will have no business. And, as he knows, they have not been idle in his territory. It may be that in ignoring the broader issues he is not being as hardheaded and practical as he thinks.

Another viewpoint was expressed in a letter I recently received. The writer, also in business, asked why I spend my time in promoting the development of private enterprise in the less developed countries, when the overwhelming problem is to prevent war, which would destroy us all. That is the job I should be working at.

My reply was that I know of nothing I can do more useful in preventing war, or the equally dreadful prospect of a Communist-dominated world, than what I and my associates are attempting in IFC—to help spread the benefits of sound private business.

As sputniks represent a breakthrough in science, so we need a breakthrough in the area of economic development. I propose

that this can best be attained through directing to the task the intelligence, drive, and power of American private enterprise.

This is a weapon of which we, not the Communists have command.

Alaska Statehood and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter expressing the Wildlife Institute's concern that there is not an adequate safeguard in the Alaska statehood bill for the protection of our wildlife resources.

I am seeking to get the Congress to meet that objection; and, since the statehood bill should come to the floor very shortly, I take this means of urgently soliciting the cooperation and support of my colleagues on behalf of an amendment to accomplish this purpose.

The letter follows:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1958.
The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: In reply to your telephone inquiry, the conservationists definitely do not think that the Alaska statehood bills pending before the House Rules Committee contain adequate safeguards for the future management of the invaluable fish and wildlife resources of the Territory. In fact, under the publicly denounced Alaska Senate bill 30, which became a law last year without the Governor's signature, the stage is set for complete domination of the new fish and game commission by the commercial interests and resource users immediately upon statehood.

Let there be no misunderstanding concerning the position of the conservation organizations. They do not think that it is within their purview to take a stand on the matter of statehood; nor have they ever asked that the administration of the resources be retained by the Federal Government for a period of 5 or 10 years. As explained over the telephone, the conservationists have made it clear that the administration of those resources can go to the new State immediately upon positive assurance that the interest of the general public is protected by the adoption of an equitable system.

There obviously is some objection to that portion of the proposed amendment suggested by certain conservationists which would require Congress to approve the certification of the Secretary of the Interior. That objection could be overcome by the following, which would satisfy the many people who are insisting upon a protective amendment:

"*Provided*, That the administration and management of the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska shall be retained by the Federal Government under existing laws until the 1st day of the first calendar year following the expiration of 90 legislative days after the Secretary of the Interior certifies to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of said resources in the broad national interest."

Congressman PELLY, the millions of conservationists in Alaska and in all of the States are indebted to you for working so tirelessly to protect the life-sustaining resources and basic economy of Alaska and the Nation. They must rely upon you and the other conservation-minded Members of Congress to see that proper safeguards are included in any statehood legislation.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.

The Unemployment Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Saturday morning's Washington Post. This editorial states succinctly what I have maintained all along: First, that the current recession and the failure of the unemployment insurance system to meet the problems caused by it necessitate quick action by the Congress. Second, that this action should not merely be a response to an immediate need but should embody permanent improvements in the unemployment insurance system.

Mr. President, the Congress will have a great opportunity when the unemployment compensation legislation comes before it. I hope that the Senate will be able to consider this legislation in the very near future.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate further to expound the serious deterioration which has occurred in the unemployment insurance system. Since last September, almost 1 million jobless workers have exhausted unemployment benefits. In January, the number exhausting benefits was 147,000; in March the monthly rate had jumped to 191,000. We can expect another tremendous increase during the month of April, and I am afraid that a similar situation will obtain in the following months.

As I have pointed out to the Senate on previous occasions, the benefit levels in many States are far below that which reasonable men would agree is necessary to keep a family going when the breadwinner, through no fault of his own, is unemployed. I submit that if the Senate does not act at this session of Congress to solve the emergency problem caused by the current unemployment crisis and simultaneously make permanent improvements in benefit levels and duration of benefits, so as to forestall this kind of crisis in the future, it will have failed America's working men and women.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 26, 1958]

INSTEAD OF A DOLE

If Congress is prepared to break down the historic patterns of the unemployment compensation system in the fashion proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee, why does it not then consider some much-needed permanent improvements? We had felt that the justification for the comparatively timid emergency measure proposed in this field by the administration was that it would not arouse the opposition of diehard States-righters and thus had a fair chance of swift enactment. But the House committee offers a program that completely ignores not only State responsibilities for the financing of unemployment benefits but also State standards of eligibility and of amount and duration of assistance.

The President reportedly is prepared to veto the House committee's measure because of its disregard for State standards. But the more serious objection to it is that the projected special Federal assistance to all jobless persons, even though temporary, would not be linked to Federal or State payments into the unemployment compensation system. This is what makes the House bill a dole.

The President's plan involves repayment by the States of special Federal unemployment help geared to State standards. We have doubted that it would work quickly enough to provide the additional floor under consumer income which the present economic situation requires. We have also wished that the glaring inadequacies in coverage and in duration and amount of benefits could be permanently remedied at this time by the adoption of uniform standards for unemployment benefits.

Nearly any type of aid for the unemployed would be better suited to the spotty nature of the present economic difficulty than most other antirecession measures. The House committee proposal, like the President's more modest plan, regrettably does not address itself to the basic inadequacies and inconsistencies of the State benefit system. Unsatisfactory as it is, the House proposal would be better than nothing; and the President will want to take a close look at the alternative before deciding resolutely on a veto.

Congress could avoid this dilemma, however, by more constructive action in the first instance. If it can enact the proposed House bill, surely it can do something better. Legislators ought to concentrate on a bolder measure of permanent improvements in the unemployment compensation system—but a measure that retains the traditional insurance concept, with payments by employers to sustain the costs.

Curbing Supreme Court Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Curbing Supreme Court Powers," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURBING SUPREME COURT POWERS—ISSUE HELD REACTION TO JUSTICES' VIEW OF FUNCTION, NOT INSTITUTION ITSELF

(By David Lawrence)

Will the Supreme Court of the United States be required to return to its original

role—to serve solely as a judicial institution? Will a majority of the present Justices give up their evident determination to change the Court into a third legislative chamber?

The fight in Congress at the moment centers on a move to enact legislation which would spell out in detail the limits of the Supreme Court's authority to pass upon certain kinds of cases.

Congress, under the Constitution, may by law specify to a certain extent what type of cases the Supreme Court may consider for decision. Many observers think none of the pending bills will be adopted at this session. But the fight is only beginning. Many groups of citizens throughout the Nation are taking up the issue because it is felt that public opinion has not yet been alerted to the usurpation practiced by the present Court.

An effort is being made by critics of the pending legislation to imply that the Court, as an institution, is under fire. On the contrary, it is the activity of those who have perverted the Court's original purposes and judicial functions which has brought on the controversy of today.

When as eminent a man in Congress as the veteran from Wyoming, Democratic Senator O'Mahoney, asks that every judge be required to swear specifically in his oath that he will not participate in any decisions that "knowingly alter the Constitution"—a procedure which a Senate subcommittee now requires before confirming new judges—it indicates a belief that something is wrong with the attitude of the present Justices toward the Constitution. Their decisions apparently reflect a feeling that they may sit on the bench for life and legislate without regard to constitutional precepts of the past.

Senator O'MAHONEY, it will be recalled, was one of the leaders in the crusade against the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's effort to influence the decisions of the Supreme Court by appointing six extra Justices who, it was assumed, would decide cases as he wanted them decided. The Wyoming Senator was in the forefront of that movement against usurpation, and he is logically concerned with the usurpation of power by the Court itself today.

Unfortunately too many people have been misled into believing that the sole criticism of the Court now is due to the fact that it disregarded law and precedent in deciding the desegregation cases on psychological rather than on legal grounds. Putting aside these cases, however, there are many other decisions of a far-reaching nature which, if unreversed either by Congress or the people, will make the Supreme Court a "third legislative chamber." This, by the way, is the phrase used by Judge Learned Hand, the distinguished judge, now in retirement, who formerly sat on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in New York and won a nationwide reputation for the soundness of his judicial decisions. In a series of lectures at the Harvard Law School, he recently exposed the erratic trend in the Supreme Court decisions of today.

The present Supreme Court has ignored the Constitution in many cases. Though the Constitution, for instance, says that Congress and the judiciary are coordinate and independent institutions, the Supreme Court has undertaken to tell congressional committees what subjects they may investigate and what questions are pertinent to an inquiry—as if there were any limit on the right of Congress to get information on which to base laws or new amendments to the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has also told the States they cannot decide who shall or shall not be admitted to practice law or how to set up tests of qualifications of experience and character before issuing a license to an applicant.

The Supreme Court has undertaken, moreover, to hamper police officers in interrogating persons accused of crime and to interfere with prompt efforts at finding the guilty persons. Confessed rapists and murderers have recently been released by order of the Supreme Court because the police didn't formally arraign a suspect within a short time after he was picked up. Police officers claim they need time to sift the innocent from the guilty.

The Supreme Court has given professed Communists a break by declaring that Congress has no right to say by law that persons joining organizations which advocate the overthrow of our Government may be punished. The Court says, in effect, it must be proved that the individual Communist has engaged in specific action aimed at the immediate overthrow of Government. He can preach treason but can be prosecuted only if treason is successful in its effect on other persons.

These are but a few of the aberrations of the present Court. The country has not yet waked up to the dangers of the Court's unprecedented rulings. The pending bills designed to limit or restrict the jurisdiction of the Court constitute the beginning of a prolonged battle to stop the usurpation of legislative power by the present Supreme Court. It may take years to win the fight, but the struggle will increase in intensity as the public learns what's at stake.

It is not the Court as an institution, but the mistaken attitude of a majority of the Justices as to what the Court has a right to do, which is the basis for the growing demand that the powers of the present Court be curbed. It's not the proper use, but the abuse, of the judicial function which is at issue.

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Talmadge Plan," from the April 25, 1958, issue of the Savannah Morning News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TALMADGE PLAN

By what no doubt amounts to no more than a pleasant coincidence, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE has proposed a farm program which embraces several of the points recently propounded by the Morning News.

In brief, Senator TALMADGE would do away with all price-support loans and acreage controls, and set the farmers free to plant as they please and sell their products on the open market.

Then, as a substitute for present price-support loans, the Senator's plan would bolster farm income by direct payments to growers of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, with this reimbursement covering the difference between open market prices and a parity level to be set at either 90 or 100 percent of fair earning power.

Since there is no sentiment whatsoever in Congress for ending the subsidies paid either directly or indirectly to other industries, agriculture cannot be expected to go it alone and Government aid must be continued.

But certainly the farmer should be freed of the bureaucratic controls which dictate the crops he may plant and the amount of them, and the Talmadge plan would do this.

The Senator is also confident that his proposal would cost less than the present program, with payments being restricted to the individual farmer's share of the domestic market for his crop. There would be no subsidy on products sold for export.

At 90 percent of parity, Senator TALMADGE estimates his plan would cost a maximum of $1,644 million a year, while at 100 percent of parity the cost would be a top of $1,806,400,000. The savings to taxpayers over the present support loan scheme would be between 2 and 3 billion dollars a year.

The farm problem has had Congress in a cold sweat since the end of the Korean war, but aside from the Soil Bank program devised by Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, no new remedy has been advanced. Now a Georgian who knows farmers and their difficulties has presented an idea which reinstates the principle of freedom, and it is to be hoped that it is substituted for the current subsidy, which has been justly condemned by Senator TALMADGE as a miserable failure.

Permanent Status for Hungarian Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the heart of America responded to the heroic fight for freedom waged by Hungarian patriots against their Soviet oppressors in the fall of 1956. Unfortunately, there was not a great deal that we could do to help. But we did welcome refugees from Hungary. We took them into our communities, and many of them have come to be as much at home in this land of immigrants as people who have been here all their lives.

Now we have a chance to regularize the status of our refugee friends by allowing them to become permanent residents and eventually American citizens. I believe that such a step should be taken and should have overwhelming support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Welcome Confirmed," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for April 26, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME CONFIRMED

The welcome extended by this country to the refugees who came here after the heroic Hungarian uprising of 1956 was a warm one; but it was incomplete. The refugees were admitted on parole, as an emergency device. This meant that they had no permanent status, could not become citizens and were subject to deportation at any time. Now, happily, the House Judiciary Committee has given its approval at last to a bill authorizing them to become permanent residents and eventually, if they wish, citizens of the United States. We congratulate the committee—and, in particular, Representative FRANCIS WALTER who last year opposed regu-

larization of the refugees' position—for moving this needed measure forward.

The Hungarian refugees, some 32,000 in number, came here in flight from Communist oppression and in search of freedom. Obviously they cannot return to the land of their birth, now under the heel of the Red army. They deserved the welcome accorded them as refugees; and now, as immigrants, they deserve the hospitality of what has come to be, for most of them, their adopted land. They are of the stuff that built America both physically and spiritually. We hope that Congress will act promptly to complete a measure dictated alike by justice and by generosity.

Rockefeller Bros. Fund Panel Recommendations on the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note the enthusiastic reaction in Washington and elsewhere in the Nation for the exceedingly constructive recommendations which were made last week by the Rockefeller Bros. Fund report on the United States economy.

Important as its tax suggestions, in particular, are, they should not lessen our appreciation of the overall breadth and depth of all the other suggestions in the study, for the report is a strong and stimulating exposition of America's overall economic future, of the intended growth of our economy in terms of real increases in the gross national product, in productivity, and in standards of living.

The very concept of reports from the Rockefeller Bros. Fund is to be applauded, because here are private individuals serving in the best possible way in a public-spirited capacity.

One may not agree with all of the recommendations made by the panel. The very nature of the broad recommendations almost inevitably results in dissent on the part of experts, especially in so highly complicated a field as America's tax system. Nevertheless, one cannot but admire these civic-minded men and women for devoting their efforts so long and so well to these objectives. The Rockefeller brothers themselves are to be congratulated, as are all members of the panel.

I, for one, was particularly impressed that one of the recommendations was for a thorough overhaul, from top to bottom, of our tax system. This is a recommendation which I have long recommended, particularly through the Wiley bill for a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial praising the report; it is from the Wednesday, April 23, issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

As an indication of the expert background of the members of the panel—and, of course, this report, like any other, is no better than the caliber of those who help to write it—I include a summary, from the New York Times, which sets forth the affiliation of each of the distinguished panel members. Mr. President, it is good to read the judgment and findings of such able persons. Many of them have lived lives of adventure in fields of development in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that these two items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPTIMISTIC CHALLENGING REPORT ON THE ECONOMY

It would be unfortunate if the Rockefeller Bros. Fund report on the American economy were considered only another plan for countering the current recession with a tax cut.

The report does make recommendations for dealing with the present business decline. But it goes much further than that. It lays down a broad program for America's economic and social future, geared to even greater economic growth than the Nation has experienced in the recent past.

The spirit of the report is optimistic and challenging. It holds, that by our own efforts, as individuals and through Government, we can master economic forces, rather than be the victims of them. It voices faith in the dyanmism of free enterprise, yet it concedes to government the important role of creating a climate to make growth possible.

The panel which spent a year's time preparing the report was not made up of starry-eyed dreamers. Heading it was Thomas B. McCabe, president of the Scott Paper Co. and a former chairman of the Federal Reserve System's board of governors. Other members included Devereaux C. Josephs, board chairman of the New York Life Insurance Co.; William F. Butler, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Arthur F. Burns, former economic adviser of President Eisenhower, along with Anna Rosenberg, wartime assistance secretary of defense for manpower; Eugene Rostow, dean of the Yale law school, and Lester B. Granger, executive director of the National Urban League.

These and other panel members did not agree on all the recommendations. They were in general accord, however, on major proposals and goals. And basic to all is that the economy needs to be expanded in the next 10 years at a rate of 5 percent a year rather than at the 4 percent rate of the last 10 years.

One senses from the report that the panel looks upon the recession as something to be ended quickly so that the Nation can get back on the road of economic growth. The recession cures it recommends are an immediate Federal tax reduction, public works that can be quickly begun and quickly finished, better bargains and new products from businessmen, easier credit, temporary Federal unemployment insurance supplements.

The recommendations for the more distant future are even more challenging and far ranging. They include a thorough tax overhaul (with emphasis on capital accumulation for expansion), stimulation of competition, a farm program that makes sense, a single Department of Transportation, more vigorous urban-renewal activity by all levels of government.

Specifically, the report recommends doubling the expenditures for education, social insurance, and health in the next 10 years. It also points out that the economic growth it envisions would finance the defense expansion which another Rockefeller Brothers Fund panel recently recommended.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund has no official standing, and recommendations of the panel are not going to be accepted as doctrine by any private or public agency. The report should be of immense value, though, as a stimulant to economic thought and, perhaps, to economic action.

THE ROCKEFELLER PANEL

Following are the members of the Rockefeller brothers' fund panel that prepared the report on the economy:

Thomas B. McCabe, president, Scott Paper Co., and former chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; chairman.

Arthur F. Burns, president, the National Bureau of Economic Research and professor of economics, Columbia University.

William F. Butler, vice president, economic research department, the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Lowell T. Coggeshall, dean of the division of biological sciences, University of Chicago, former special assistant for health and medical affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; president Association of American Medical Colleges, and president, American Cancer Society.

J. Norman Efferson, professor of agricultural economics, and dean, College of Agriculture, Louisiana State University.

Lester B. Granger, executive director, National Urban League, Inc.

Devereaux C. Josephs, chairman, New York Life Insurance Co.

Dexter M. Keezer, vice president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. and director of economics department.

Franklin A. Lindsay, consultant, McKinsey & Co., Inc.

Joseph A. Livingston, financial editor, the Philadelphia Bulletin; former economist, Business Week and War Production Board.

Stacy May, economist.

Roswell B. Perkins, Debevoise, Plimpton & McLean; former Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Anna M. Rosenberg, public and industrial relations consultant; former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel.

Eugene Rostow, dean, Yale University Law School.

J. Cameron Thomson, chairman of the board, Northwest Bancorporation.

Frazar B. Wilde, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Bayles A. Manning, associate professor of law, Yale University; secretary.

Plight of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Plight of the Railroads: A National Crisis," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 24, 1958. I commend this to the attention of every Senator, because it is a very comprehensive editorial, which points out the urgent need of the Congress taking some immediate action with respect to the railroads.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

an article entitled "The Railroad Problem," written by George E. Sokolsky, an emient columnist, and published in the Washington Post of today; also a thoughtful and thought-provoking editorial entitled "First Aid for the Rails," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, April 26, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF THE RAILROADS: A NATIONAL CRISIS

No other single national asset is more vital to the security and the future growth of the United States than its 221,000 miles of railroads, the largest system in the world.

Were enemy paratroopers dropped to destroy it, the Army would be called out to prevent it.

Nevertheless, it is now being destroyed, just as effectively as if paratroopers were demolishing it:

Its roadbeds are not being adequately maintained because most railroads are losing money and their plight grows worse.

Its antiquated rolling stock is not being replaced and modernized nearly fast enough.

Although the country is growing by leaps and bounds, rail passenger service is being constantly decreased. Service, which could be vastly improved with speedy, modern equipment, instead is deteriorating. Much of the equipment now in use ought to be junked.

Why has this situation come about? There are many reasons:

Railroads operate under a system of regulation created when they were a monopoly, when 77 percent of all goods moved by rail. This regulation system is obsolete. Far from being a monopoly, railroads have already been outstripped by trucks ($11 billions of revenues in 1956 to $8.7 billions for railroads) and their other chief competitors (pipelines and barges) are growing at much faster rates.

The United States has no real national transportation policy, but only a hodgepodge of overlapping or conflicting policies (CAB for air, Maritime Commission for Water, ICC for trucks and buses). Railroads are forbidden to merge, or to own competing services. Their rates are frozen.

They are saddled with wartime excise taxes (10 percent on passengers and 3 percent on freight) which are discriminatory.

They maintain needless duplications of facilities, parallel trackage, etc., which an efficient integration would consolidate. The outmoded monopoly philosophy of regulation prevents this.

It is high time the Nation got "cracking" to create a modern transportation system which keeps pace with the growth of the country. If not we will shortly be in the position of strangling ourselves and our economy.

Tuesday, Secretary of Commerce Weeks sent Congress a program for railroads which would be of great help if adopted. He asks up to $500 million in short-term loans to help the railroads modernize their facilities, and up to $200 million for new freight cars. He seeks authority for the ICC to curtail money-losing passenger and commuter service in interstate commerce. He seeks to eliminate unfair competition from private truckers, and from agricultural truckers who are exempt from regulation.

All this is needed.

But much more is needed.

What is needed, above all, is the creation of a national transportation policy. Here are some of the urgent needs for such a policy:

It should combine all the regulatory agencies into a single Department of Transportation.

The entire concept of regulation should be changed. Instead of being based on the obsoleted concept of monopoly, it should be aimed at creating the maximum possible growth and efficiency.

Mergers, instead of being forbidden, should be encouraged. Transcontinental rail networks, east-west and north-south, should be encouraged, integrating many needless duplications of facilities.

Railroads should be allowed, as in Canada, to engage in other forms of transportation. For example, much of the long-distance truck hauling could be done more efficiently by loading the trucks themselves onto flatcars, using tractors only for delivery at the other end. Instead of trying to compete with barges at less than cost, railroads should be able to transfer cars to barges where water is the most economic route.

A genuine, national transportation policy would take as its basic concept the fact that Government must take whatever steps are necessary to maintain modern, efficient rail transport. Other nations do it by government ownership (and many of them have done it with Marshall plan funds). If the United States can spend billions on getting into outer space, surely it can afford an adequate system of getting from city to city.

Three concepts are necessary:

Federal funds—which go into building airports, highways for trucks, and dredging rivers for barges—must also maintain railroad rights-of-way as vital to national defense. The investment can be recaptured through ton-mile or other taxes. But it must be assumed as a national necessity.

A revolving fund of capital must be created to provide the modern passenger and freight equipment necessary to keep abreast of national growth. Such advances could be repaid by railroads on a long-term, low-interest basis.

To keep commuter service from breaking down, quasi-public transportation authorities, with power of tax exemption, should be encouraged to take over such services, leasing existing trackage from private carriers (the New York Central has advocated this).

To repeat—America cannot let its rail transport system fall apart.

To do so is a form of national sabotage.

An adequate railway system is absolutely indispensable, as World War II proved, to national defense.

Without it, a growing nation faces economic strangulation.

Let's quit strangling ourselves.

Let's put the railroads on the track—on new tracks, with new wheels.

THE RAILROAD PROBLEM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The President's proposal to aid the railroads by a $700 million loan, with certain other alleviations of their difficulties, is, of course, a makeshift, emergency solution to a pressing problem. The railroads have been kept in such a noncompetitive bondage by the Interstate Commerce Commission that they are today, so far as passenger services are concerned, outpriced in competition with airplanes, buses, private automobiles, etc. Because wages and prices on the railroads are absolutely controlled, as are all the terms of employment and the methods of operations, no railroad in the United States has been able to operate on a business basis, certainly since World War I when the Government took over the railroads. In a word, the railroads have not been free to meet progress and they show it. True, they have substituted the diesel for the locomotive, but that has not solved any great fundamental problem.

The air services usually enjoy terminal facilities which are paid for out of public funds. On the other hand, the railroads have to maintain all their facilities at their own expense. It is true that many railroads received enormous concessions when they were started, but that was long ago and does not affect the present situation at all. A railroad has to maintain a costly right-of-way, a more costly roadbed. The airlines fly in the free heavens and the protective services (beams, etc.) are maintained by the Government of the United States out of taxes. Buses and trucks use public roads, paid for by the taxpayer and maintained and kept in repair by the taxpayer. These advantages have grown up as new means of transportation developed and no important steps have been taken to permit the railroads to keep themselves in a competitive position. In fact, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was established to keep the railroads competitive, has actually served to make them noncompetitive and bureaucratic. A new idea usually finds desert soil in this enterprise because so many authorities have to be consulted and it takes them so long to reach a decision.

The railroads are still valuable in wartime; they are absolutely essential for the mass movements of men and materials and could not be abandoned on the assumption that the alternate means of communications will serve.

Therefore, what is most needed is an overall study of the entire transportation system of the Nation by some capable body such as Herbert Hoover developed in his various task forces. The object would be to analyze the position as it is today; to equate values; to produce more equity among the different means of transportation; to make public inequities in taxation and offer some solution concerning them; to disclose hidden as well as public subsidies for all transportation services; and, on the whole, to make sure that our means of moving human beings and goods are not antiquated and obsolescent and bound by redtape and senility.

On a recent train trip from New York to Miami Beach and back, our train consisted of cars of varying vintages, so that passengers, paying the same fare, enjoyed unequal facilities. This is absurd in any business. I rode in a Rock Island pullman which the Florida East Coast Railway had not bothered to paint over to look like its own equipment. Returning to New York, we came in more than 2 hours late, although the weather was excellent.

If the railroads wish to give up first-class travel, they should make an announcement to that effect. Otherwise they are accepting additional fare without providing customary additional services.

All this needs to be studied, impartially, with a view toward restoring the primary means of transportation of the country.

FIRST AID FOR THE RAILS

There probably is no economic magic by which all the troubles of the railroad industry could be eliminated and its good health restored and assured. In recent years, the transport industry has become increasingly competitive and subject to entirely new economic factors. Air and highway carriers have skimmed off most of the potentially profitable passenger travel while a certain percentage of freight hauling that once was largely monopolized by the rails likewise has been diverted to other carriers. In addition, as Secretary of Commerce Weeks wrote to the Senate transportation subcommittee, there have been some ill-advised practices of management and some harmful, long-standing governmental policies. His recommendations for congressional action are directed at correcting some of the latter as well as offering some near-term financial assistance.

In the latter category, the Secretary has proposed that the Government guarantee a $500-million loan program by which the railroads could borrow for capital improvements other than rolling stock, and a $200-million loan program for purchase of freight

cars. In the area of Government policies, Mr. Weeks recommended that rate-making standards be revised, that the Interstate Commerce Commission be given enlarged jurisdiction over curtailment of services, that restrictions be tightened against marginal "private carriers" and that there be clarification of the "agricultural exemption" provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The most significant omission from the administration proposals—and the one most disappointing to the railroads—was the hoped-for recommendation that current excise taxes be lifted or at least modified.

The Senate subcommitte has been studying the railroad problem for several months and has, in fact, considered favorably the type of aid proposed by Secretary Weeks. Chairman SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, describes the recommendations as sensible and constructive and said the subcommittee will report soon. While some persuasive arguments have been made for lifting the excise-tax burden—and the administration does not preclude that possibility in the course of a general tax revision—it may be wiser to go on at once with the less controversial remedies and to give the rails the benefit of first aid as quickly as possible.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as part of its own 50th year of publication, the Progressive magazine has featured in its issue of May, 1958, the 25th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority

Approximately, the leading article has been written by the illustrious senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], whose name is indelibly associated not only with good works in the field of human health and care, but also with the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority. LISTER HILL is the only surviving member of either the Senate or the House who also served on the Conference Committee, which produced the final version of the TVA legislation in 1933, a quarter of a century ago.

The title of the article in the special TVA issue of the Progressive by the senior Senator from Alabama is "TVA—Democracy in Action." Because LISTER HILL's article is so informative, so thorough, so lacking in extreme statements or political partisanship—all characteristics of our good friend, Senator HILL, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA—DEMOCRACY IN ACTION
(By Senator LISTER HILL)

I

Twenty-five years have passed since the historic legislation creating TVA was enacted, and a new generation of Americans has grown to maturity. A generation is time enough to test the truth of an idea and the strength of a concept. It is also time enough for people to forget what life was like before that concept was built into our Nation's life.

An anniversary is a time for remembrance and for recognition. It is a time for reappraisal. For me TVA's arrival at the quarter century mark is a moment of special poignance, and of peculiar obligation. My obligation to remember and to reappraise is a deep and personal one, for I was one of the sponsors of the legislation which created TVA, and of all the members of the Conference Committee appointed to adjust the differences between the two Houses in 1933, I am the only one who is today a member of the Congress, I am the only one who has had the privilege of participating year by year in legislation affecting TVA, first from my seat as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, later as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Alone of all the witnesses when the President signed the act in 1933, I have seen the dreams we wrote into the statute become reality. Dreams of a better future, of a widening economic opportunity for the people, and faith that a new kind of agency of government could help to provide it—all these are captured in the charter we wrote for TVA.

This is a good time to tell the new generation why TVA was established, and what it has accomplished. Once more a troubled world is reminded that vision is required lest the people perish, and that the great imperative of government is to offer hospitality to dreams and then to find ways to translate them into effective works. It is a good time to give to every American a sense of pride in the vitality and the strength of TVA, and to explain, if we can, why this Agency has been able to survive attacks and neglect, why it continues today valiantly planning for the future, its spirit unbroken, facing its relentless adversaries with courage, faithful to the vision written in its statute.

It is important for the new generation to know that this dream of the unified development of all the resources of a great river basin for the people's benefit was not born out of sectional interest nor parochial concern. It was born because statesmen from the Great Plains, from the mountain West, and the industrial East, saw this Nation as one and indivisible, and knew that the country they loved and served would be strong only as each region grew in strength. The great and indomitable George Norris, of Nebraska, was the leader in the Congress. A valiant band worked with him. TVA is shaped in their image, indelibly marked with their integrity, their moral purpose, and their vision of a Federal program which would never forget the people for whom it was enacted. Its survival, its growth, its strength today is their memorial.

Let me remind this new generation what life was like in the region when TVA was created. There was a great river, its tributaries rising high in the mountains of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. It flowed south through the foothills of Tennessee, turned west to meander across the sun-baked fields of Alabama and of Mississippi, swung northward to meet the Ohio in Kentucky, then to join the mighty Mississippi on its course to the gulf. It was a moody and inconstant river, changing from season to season, an angry flood in spring and winter, a sluggish trickle in summer and autumn when shoals and sandbars held it almost useless for navigation. In flood and in drought, racing or heavy with summer's langour, in every season the river was dark with the precious cargo it carried—the fertile soil of the valley, to be wasted in the sea.

II

For generations that soil, the priceless heritage of the people, had washed away. This was an agricultural area, one of the oldest in the Nation, an area of small farms, growing the cash crops for which the climate was ideal but which left no cover to protect the ground as it lay, bare and unfrozen, helpless against the pelting winter rains. Once majestic forests had been denuded, a sacrifice to avarice, to ignorance, and to hunger. So the rains were unimpeded. They took the soil to the river, and the river carried it to the sea, and every year the brown scars of erosion grew wider and deeper over the landscape. Every year more farms were abandoned. Every year fewer jobs became available, and the youth of the land was exported along with the soil and the timber. Every year the people had less hope and less faith in the future. In 1933 the people of this region had an average income of only 45 percent of the national average, in spite of the wealth of resources with which nature had endowed it.

This was the region before TVA. This was the problem facing the Congress. And a heritage from World War I provided an opportunity. Then, when German submarines had halted the shipments of nitrates from Chile, the Government had built facilities for munitions production at Muscle Shoals in northern Alabama, and construction of a dam across the Tennessee was begun to supply the power required for operation of the nitrate plants. The war was over before the project was completed, and Congress had to decide what to do with the idle properties. The general assumption was that the properties were surplus to the Government's requirements, and should be sold. To most people the question before Congress in the early twenties was relatively simple—how to dispose of the properties most advantageously.

In the beginning only a few men had the vision to see that the properties were not surplus to the needs of the Government at all, that they were an asset which could provide the beginning of a new approach to an old problem. The fight, first to keep those properties in the hands of the Government, and then to devise a method to promote their effective use, went on for more than a decade. I came to Congress in the midst of that debate, and I shall be forever grateful that I have had a part in this great struggle throughout my whole career in public service. Twice bills to provide for Government operation of the properties at Muscle Shoals were adopted by the Congress. Twice they received a presidential veto. It was not until 1933, under the dynamic leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that the statute creating TVA was approved by Congress, the properties at Muscle Shoals were turned over to the new agency, and the President who had expanded the scope of the original proposals with his vision and his dreams signed the enabling legislation. A great concept started along the road to realization.

Twenty-five years have passed since that day. Today the Tennessee River is no longer a menace and a problem. It has been put to work for the people. A series of majestic dams has transformed it. Now a chain of lovely lakes; its bars and shoals have vanished, and commerce moves in stately sequence over a modern water highway. Last year more than 2 billion ton-miles of freight was carried on the river, in contrast to less than 33 million ton-miles which moved, mostly in short hauls, in 1933. Grain comes down from the upper Mississippi; oil and sulfur move up from the gulf; automobiles, trucks, steel, and coal are carried for unloading at thriving river ports on the Tennessee. From the Great Lakes to the gulf the products of other regions come to new markets in this valley, and the river serves the people.

The new generation has grown accustomed to the interregional exchange of goods. And

it is spared the terror of floods. Today the people know that, when the rains come and the water rushes down in angry torrents, the same dams which control the river to create a navigation channel will stand watch through all the days and all the nights of peril, silent guardians of their safety. This is the only United States river so controlled; the only river where, under a single management, a whole system of dams and reservoirs can be mobilized in harmony to protect the people and their property.

The new generation has never known what it was like before TVA, how anxious watchers gathered on the river's banks, how desperate families moved their household goods to the hills. They do not know how often this uncertain river held the lives and health and well-being of the people in jeopardy.

The new generation does not know what life was like before transmission towers rose high from the valleys and mountains to carry the lines that bring to the people power generated at these multipurpose dams and in gigantic modern steam plants built by TVA. It was a different kind of region then. In 1933 there were only 225,000 residential electricity consumers in the entire area where power from TVA now reaches more than 1,300,000 domestic consumers, and they used small amounts of electricity in their homes and almost none at all on their farms. Only 3 percent of the farms, just a few near towns or cotton gins, were connected for electric service. All over the region the countryside was dark at twilight. Today more than 95 percent of the farms use electricity in their homes and in their barns.

The river is serving the people throughout its length today because of the act of Congress which created TVA. That is not all. The forest resource is coming back, the cycle of devastation reversed. Since TVA began, almost half a billion pine seedlings have been planted and are growing to maturity. Slowly the scars of erosion are healing. Where acres were brown and barren, now pastures lie green beneath the sun and the landscape is more beautiful, the land more productive.

III

Today this region has started the long road back to robust strength and abundant productivity. This is a record for every American to view with pride. There is nothing like it anywhere. This is the record which profoundly moves me as I recall the day when TVA began. This is the record which makes me salute the management of TVA on this anniversary. For in this region their performance has outstripped our dreams. This does not often happen. Every legislator grows weary with awareness of great concepts which grow meager in execution, of noble ideas corrupted in administration. TVA is different. The new generation should find out why. I cannot give a simple answer, but I believe that part of the magic lies in the kind of statute Congress drafted. We did a better job than we knew.

We were uncertain, as we strove to create this new agency to deal with old problems. Reluctant rivers had been improved for navigation from the beginning of the Nation. The problem of vanishing resources had been with us a long time. But always rivers and resources, problems and opportunities had been considered piecemeal. In TVA we tried something new and bold. The heart of the great concept lies in the fact that for the first time in the history of Federal legislation Congress accepted the unity of nature. In this one river basin the interrelationship of land and water, of trees and pastures, of men and nature, received statutory recognition. This was a more startling innovation than it sounds. For then and now the traditional organization of the Federal establishments divides responsibility for the resources of a river and its basin among a dozen bureaus and departments, each with a single purpose, a different head, working under separate statutes. We gave TVA responsibility to inaugurate a total program committed to the full development of all Nature's resources for all the people.

At the same time we tried to build a bulwark against the steady tide of centralization. Even then we knew too many decisions were made in Washington on the basis of papers and reports; too much was decided by remote control. The experts were too far from the problems, the administrators too far from the people. So we told the Board of TVA to make its headquarters in the region, close to the work to be undertaken. We made it an independent agency, corporate in form, removed as far as possible from centralized control in Washington. We gave the power of decision to the men in the field.

We wanted TVA to be efficient, and we accepted the basic principle of modern management, still rarely recognized in Government. We gave authority commensurate with responsibility and we determined to judge by results. By law we freed the agency from the rigidities of the classified civil service. We told the Board to select its own employees, but barred for all time political considerations in appointments. We authorized the Board to buy or condemn the land and the equipment required in its program, and to sell whatever proved to be surplus. They could enter into contracts, and sue and be sued.

All those characteristics have proved to be essential—the unified approach, the location in the region, the accountability which is the counterpart of independence, the stern rejection of political manipulation. All have been vital to TVA's success. But greater than any one of those, I believe, is the fact that somehow the overriding purpose of the statute was clear on every page. It was clear in the legislative history of more than a dozen years. These administrative innovations were not to be ends in themselves, nor were the projects and the programs they would facilitate be objectives in themselves. Every undertaking was seen as a means to widen the economic opportunity and promote the well-being of the people. That is of course the ultimate objective of every Government program, but the purpose for which projects are built is too often obscured by the projects themselves. Construction becomes an end in itself. Somehow, in some way, some ingredient in the formula we devised for TVA has kept the overriding purpose sharp and clear. Every report from TVA reveals it. It is clear every time a witness from TVA testifies before a committee of the Congress. It accounts for the notable efficiency and the high morale of the staff of TVA. They never forget the purpose of their labor.

It was an act of faith when, after so many years of effort, Congress placed the destiny of this new agency in the hands of the three men chosen for the Board. That faith proved to be contagious, and early in its history TVA took the steps which have made the people of the region a part of the great program. It mobilized their energies for a total assault on the forces of resource devastation. It was an act of faith in the people when TVA rejected such alluring proposals as the recommended purchase of great tracts of forest land, all abused and some abandoned, in order that a gigantic program of reforestation might be inaugurated on Government-owned land. It was an act of faith when TVA declined to begin the acquisition of vast acreage of worn-out crop land that it might be devoted unhampered by the need to support farm families, to experimentation in the application of the new fertilizers to be produced at Muscle Shoals. It chose the slower, the harder way. TVA determined that the people who in the period of their private ownership become trustees of the Nation's resources should themselves take part in the program.

A new epoch in Federal administration began. The experts got out of their offices, away from their papers. They went to the people, and the people joined them in a great demonstration program. Farmers joined and showed their neighbors what would happen to the land and to their incomes as they began to use the new kinds of fertilizers produced by TVA as tools to change the management of their farms. Owners of woodlots and forest joined. Slowly the demonstrations spread over the Valley and farther—demonstrations in tree planting, in selective cutting, in sawmill operations; demonstrations in fertilizer use, in new farming practices, in the development of recreational areas.

Today the average income of the people has risen from 45 percent to 63 percent of the national average. There are more jobs for the new generation. There are jobs in cheese factories and in poultry processing plants because the land has been turned from soil-exhausting to soil-conserving crops. There are jobs in the forests products industries, 50,000 of them, because tall trees stand on land that was barren in 1933, and the people plant and they plan for a stronger forest resource in the future, investing their private funds in their faith. Last year alone new private investment in wood-using industries in the valley reached a total of more than $43 million.

There are new kinds of jobs in new manufacturing establishments. There are jobs because of the development of the magnificent recreational resource which has already attracted private investment of more than $60 million, as TVA has divested itself of area after area, and turned over to the people, for public and private development, the land adjacent to the beautiful man-made lakes. In this region, as nowhere else, the people have participated in a Federal program inaugurated to promote their well-being. They have taken risks. They have had faith. They have shared the dream.

The people have had a major part in the development of the great regional power system. With the exception of direct sales to agencies of the United States and a few large industries, TVA is a wholesaler of power. Today 151 distribution systems with a total investment of almost $600 million deliver the power to the consumer. All are locally owned and managed, two privately owned, the rest rural cooperatives or municipal systems. In contracts with TVA these distributors agree to charge the rates established to promote abundant use, and to dispose of revenues in such a way as to achieve the objectives in the statute. In the beginning their participation in the program was an act of faith, too, for when TVA's resale rates were announced in 1933 no one knew what revenues those rates would provide. The experts of the private companies serving the area said the people would not use the power the dams would produce. The people of this region have proved them wrong. The high use, low rate pricing policies which the private power companies had been too timid to risk turned out to be sound. At low rates, the volume of sales did rise, and increased revenues resulted. It was a demonstration that the public interest could be served without the financial ruin predicted by the private power companies.

IV

I am proud when I survey the financial record of TVA. My colleagues of 1933 would be proud if they could know that from the beginning, revenues from power sales have covered all the costs of operation, including depreciation, and in addition have provided

for the Government, the owner, a return which has averaged 4 percent on the investment. I am proud to know that over $400 million from proceeds has been reinvested in the system, enhancing the Government's investment without requiring appropriation, and that $240 million has been paid to the Treasury in cash. But I am proud that TVA has never forgotten why it was created. It was created to serve the people, all the people of the United States, to demonstrate what happens to a region and to a power supplier when power is used as a tool to develop the economy of a region, to raise the standard of living of the people.

TVA was not conceived as a military project. But today TVA is in the forefront in the development of atomic weapons, missiles, vital light metals, and new chemicals. Almost three-fourths of TVA's power output goes to defense and defense-related industries. More than half—a staggering 30 billion kilowatt hours in 1957—goes to the Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah. These plants alone use twice as much electricity as New York City, and more than is used by all the homes, businesses, and industries in each of 41 States.

The triumph of TVA is not recorded in the excellent financial reports, or in its contributions to the Nation's defense. It is recorded in the homes and farms of the region—in the installation of stoves and washing machines, refrigerators and freezers, milking machines, pumps, water systems, and hay driers. It is recorded in the increased use of electricity by the people, not only in the region it serves but all over the Nation. The symbol of TVA is not a balance sheet, no matter how impressive. The symbol of TVA is revealed when the lights go on at nightfall all over the region. They shine from barns, and kitchens, and parlors, deep in the coves and high on the hillsides.

When President Roosevelt sent his special message to the Congress urging prompt enactment of the TVA legislation, he said, "If we are successful here we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders." We have been successful here. While we have not yet marched on to the creation of other valley authorities, we are moving step by step in the improvement of Federal administration of resource development. TVA has had an important impact on other Federal programs. I hear echoes of TVA when plans are now submitted to the Congress on a river basin basis, when coordinating committees are established in the field as the central agencies of Government and try to achieve the shadow of the unified appproach without the substance. I see a trace of TVA when the potential recreational value to the people is included in the benefits expected to be realized from construction of new Federal projects, and small watersheds are brought to our attention.

I note with satisfaction improvement in the land-purchasing procedures of some Federal agencies as they adapt TVA experience to their requirements. I am aware of better personnel practices as a result of TVA's development of its independent merit system, and I see modest efforts to follow its pioneering in the adoption of effective and honest procedures of collective bargaining. I see the results of TVA's achievements when I read the advertisements of the fertilizer companies, as they begin to provide the farmer with new and better plant food for his land. I find it in the lowered rates for electricity charged by private companies today.

The spirit of TVA echoes around the world. I heard the echo from India, from Iran, from Uganda, and from Wales. Everywhere, as freemen plan their future, they know their destiny depends upon the effective development of all of nature's resources for the benefit of all the people. To them, TVA is a pace setter and a symbol of hope. Its past is open for examination and for analysis. Its future lies in the hands of the new generation.

Impact of the Recession on the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there was published in yesterday's New York Times an article entitled "United States Recession: Its Impact on the World." A portion of the article had to do with the suffering of the people of Latin American by virtue of the economic depression which the United States is experiencing.

I hope that before we take up the foreign aid program Senators will acquaint themselves with conditions in Latin America, and learn how those conditions are worsening by reason of the depression, which we are suffering in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RECESSION: ITS IMPACT ON THE WORLD

The economic recession in the United States which began about 9 months ago has been watched with anxiety by foreign countries. New York Times correspondents were asked to assess its effects abroad. Their reports indicate that its primary impact has been on countries that supply large amounts of raw materials. To date, industrialized nations have not been seriously affected, but there is fear that a prolonged depression, cutting imports by both the United States and the raw materials countries, would in turn affect the manufacturing nations. The correspondents' reports follow.

LATIN AMERICA SUFFERS

RIO DE JANEIRO, April 26.—Relying on the export of commodities for the bulk of its income, South America for the most part is deep in economic crisis in a backwash of the United States recession.

Because of the decline in prices that began last year and the drop in demand in the North for a number of commodities produced on this continent, many Latin American Republics have run out of hard currencies. The consequent lessening of the capacity to import and the imposing of import controls have in turn raised the cost of the foreign goods that are vital to South America. The inflationary nightmare is more pronounced than ever.

As an example of currency depreciation due to insufficient exports, Brazil's cruzeiro was quoted at the end of this week at 126 to the United States dollar compared with 69, 9 months ago, and everything points to a continuing downtrend. Chile and Peru, which are primarily producers of nonferrous metals, are receiving a double impact; not only are their overseas sales decreasing in value and volume, but the United States, anxious to protect its own mining industry, is threatening them with increased customs duties that could knock much of the Chilean and Peruvian copper, lead, and zinc off the market.

So great is the dependence on the exporting of commodities that no domestic measures can make a serious dent in the crisis. Most of the governments are looking to Washington for some form of aid so that economic crises do not deteriorate into social and political troubles.

The Soviet Union, taking advantage of the situation, has indicated that it may try to move into the picture by promising to take South American commodities in exchange for Soviet equipment and other goods. In the face of present difficulties, there is a growing receptivity toward such possible deals.

Remarks of Harry A. Bullis on Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, made some introductory remarks as chairman of the morning plenary session of the National Conference of Organizations on International Trade Policy, at Washington, D. C., on March 27, 1958. I think they were timely and appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CANNOT AFFORD NOT TO HAVE A TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM NOW

(By Harry A. Bullis)

(One of the country's leading businessmen stresses essentiality of reciprocal trade to well-being of all our major economic sectors and cruciality to our foreign policy in introducing the case for continuation of our reciprocal trade agreements program. Mr. Bullis denies present recession offers any oppositional grounds since it is largely concentrated in durable goods production where we are especially efficient, and where we have our important export power.)

The reciprocal trade agreements program of the United States has now more than become of age. The law was passed and approved initially on June 30, 1934. Agreements made under it have now been in effect for more than 21 years. The program has served the interests of our people very well.

In these uncertain times, which are marked with difficulties in securing true world peace, the nations of the free world should bear in mind Benjamin Franklin's admonition that they "had better hang together, or they will hang separately." We, in the United States, do not have the margin of strength which can allow us to be indifferent to the needs of our allies. Rather, we must strengthen and enlarge all trade and economic bonds that may bind us together more firmly. History has amply demonstrated that the destinies of nations follow the course of trade.

CRUCIALITY TO FOREIGN POLICY

Thus our reciprocal trade agreements program is a crucial matter. It has become a cornerstone in our foreign policy. It is our evidence that we intend to work, united and devotedly with the free world, to develop a margin of economic strength over the Communist world. We cannot go it alone, nor can our allies prosper without us.

In the years since the mid-1930's, we have accomplished a great deal with our foreign trade policy. Taking the period since the

end of World War II, we have increased our imports from about $6 billion to almost $16 billion. Similarly our exports have increased because, as the record shows, when other countries are able to sell more of their products in the United States, they buy that much, and more, from us.

ESSENTIALLY TO OUR ECONOMY

It is my conviction that a renewal of the Trade Agreements Act for a period of at least 5 years is essential to the wellbeing of all major sectors of our economic life. To that end, it must contain sufficient authority for tariff reduction, so that meaningful negotiations with other countries will be possible. Furthermore, I am convinced that not only is a continuance of this reciprocal trade program essential to each of these sectors, but that without it, our total economy will suffer in its capacity for growth.

There are those who will say that extension of the act must be opposed because of the present economic recession. However, the present recession is largely concentrated in durable goods production where we are especially efficient and where we have our important export power. Therefore, in this period, the continuance of our foreign-trade program becomes particularly urgent. While our general exports have fallen to some degree in recent months, we are fortunate that our business dip has not yet been more seriously reflected in the economies of our trading partners abroad.

We need only look back to the period following the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930 to realize that restricting our imports in a period of recession makes certain the spread of recession around the world. We all know what that implies for our exports.

CANNOT AFFORD NOT TO PASS BILL

We need this Trade Agreement Act because we need our exports, particularly now. We should fight to the limit any claims from any quarter that we cannot afford a trade agreements program in a period such as this. The fact is that we cannot afford not to have a trade agreements program now.

In our consideration of a forgein-trade policy in the total national interest, we have proposed a discussion of that policy in terms of its effect on the major sectors of American economic life. We know that the value of a trade policy to the Nation is the sum of its values to each part of the economy. We shall deal specifically with the reciprocal-trade program as the principal expression of our trade policy and as its operating instrument. We shall look at it from the point of view of agriculture, of industry, of the consumer, of the effect on our total domestic employment, and finally, examine its relation to foreign investment.

There Will Be No Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the address of the Vice President of the United States, at the annual dinner of the Bureau of Advertising, American Newspaper Publishers Association, given in New York on the evening of April 24, 1958, analyzes this Nation's position today in a sound and sensible way. Every citizen should read it and give careful thought to the statements contained in it. Under leave to extend my remarks, it is herewith recorded in the Appendix of the RECORD:

In recent months Mr. Khrushchev has thrown down a bold and boisterous challenge to the United States in the area in which we have considered ourselves unbeatable—the productivity of our economy. He has said:

"We declare war on you in the peaceful field of trade.

"You are not being threatened with ICBM's but with peaceful competition in consumer goods.

"We will prove the superiority of our economic system over yours.

"Your grandchildren in America will live under socialism."

And just 3 days ago in Moscow, in speaking to the American Ambassador of the Soviet Union's economic achievements, he said, "Look out, Mr. Thompson, we are stepping on your tail."

This statement would seem to be a presumptuous boast when we consider that the United States today produces almost three times as much as the Soviet Union. But these sobering facts must be kept in mind:

The Soviet economy has made formidable strides in the first 40 years of the U. S. S. R.

The Soviet economy is growing faster than ours.

The Soviet Union, because of its autocratic control over its people, can concentrate its lower productive capacity in those areas of the world struggle which will best serve its objective of world domination.

Finally, we must recognize that economic competition between the free world and the Communist world may well decide the world conflict.

The position we must take, therefore, is clear.

We are well ahead of the Soviet Union economically today.

But the only way to stay ahead is to move ahead.

We cannot afford to stand still.

Our Nation's security requires that the American economy produce as efficiently and as abundantly as possible.

In this context let us examine the characteristics of the current economic downturn in the United States and the actions which may be justified to reverse it.

Let us first dispose of two fallacious appraisals of our present economic situation.

To those who claim that we are headed for a great depression, the answer is that the present economic downturn is under no circumstances comparable in character to the depression of the 1930's.

In 1929 literally millions of people were dealing with inflated and imaginary values.

The economy then did not have the cushioning effect of certain social welfare laws and monetary policies which are available today.

We can state this one conclusion categorically. There will be no depression in the United States. This is true both because of the basic strength of our economy and because it is backstopped by the determination of the national administration to use every proper governmental action to stop a prolonged recession and to help stimulate early resumption of a high rate of economic activity.

Mr. Khrushchev's claim that our economic downturn is proof of the inherent weakness of a free economy is another conclusion which will not stand examination.

A normal economic system, just like a normal human body, does not and should not run at full speed at all the time.

There are times when it must slow down so that needed changes can be made and bad habits and faulty practices corrected.

If these needed changes are made, the system will be stronger at the end of the corrective period than before it began.

In examining the characteristics of the present slowdown we find that it is a result of some normal shifts in the economy, plus some bad habits that got out of hand in recent years.

Let us look at one development which can be characterized as a normal shift.

We emerged from World War II with a great many wornout plants, too small for our growing population, and obsolete in terms of current technology.

There was a rush to expand and modernize.

As a result, in many cases, capacity has outrun current demand.

The inevitable consequence has been, therefore, a slowing of business investments in new plants.

Such changes as this are normal. They reflect change and growth in a free economy. They give us no cause for concern.

But there are factors which contributed to the downswing which stem from evils which should be corrected. If they are not corrected, our economy will not be strong enough to meet the challenge presented by the Communist world.

In this category we must place inflation at the top of the list.

Inflation robs the aged of their savings.

It is an automatic pay cut for those on fixed salaries.

It is a tax on life insurance policies.

It leads to consumer resistance and rebellion.

It would be a mistake to try to stimulate economic activity without also trying to cure inflation. Otherwise, in the action we take to combat our present troubles, we are simply buying more trouble later on.

A related evil is the cost-price squeeze on business. While business profits were relatively good on the whole last year, a disturbing note was that many firms reported higher volume and lower earnings.

There was talk of profitless prosperity.

This type of squeeze usually leads to postponement of planned business expansion.

It means that something is radically wrong when, with all of our new plants and processes, costs go up rather than down.

When we examine the reasons for skyrocketing costs, we discover a third major weakness which contributed to the present economic downturn.

We have been getting soft in a period of easy sales. Many businesses have enjoyed a seller's market for 15 or 20 years.

That means that almost an entire generation has not known the discipline of persuasive selling and adequate service. We have become a nation of order takers, rather than salesmen.

The same can be said of our work habits. The current joke about substituting a work break for a coffee break was not just conjured out of thin air.

Wage increases not based on increase in productivity became the rule rather than the exception. Consequently, even with all of our improved plants and modern processes, productivity did not rise as expected, and in some instances even declined.

This brings us then to the problem at hand. What should Government policy be with respect to the present recession?

We should not interfere with normal change. But we must help to correct the evils of inflation, profitless prosperity, and low productivity. The correction of these evils will be a powerful stimulus both for business investment and consuming buying.

We must, however, be vigilant in distinguishing between normal changes and corrections and the spiraling downswing that feeds on itself. If there are substantial signs that a decline may snowball, then Government must step in and stimulate the economy.

But normal corrective action is the preferred choice; massive intervention should be used only as a last resort.

Let us examine the actions the Government has taken up to this time in the light of these principles.

We have recognized that changes in our economy are inevitable, but that human suffering which may occur as a result of such changes should be alleviated as much as possible.

That is why the administration has asked the Congress to provide Federal aid to the States in extending the coverage of unemployment compensation where the benefit period has expired.

We have accelerated normal Government spending for those things we need, and we have directed that spending where possible into areas where economic dislocation has had its greatest effect.

We have expanded the supply of credit, having in mind the necessity for caution because of the continuing threat of inflation.

We hope that these actions will be all that will be required to give the economy the help it needs. There are substantial indications that this may be the case.

I realize that there are some traditional economists who contend that under no circumstances should the Government do more than it has. They say that we should let the economy go through the wringer if necessary so that it can rid itself of its unhealthy characteristics.

But let us recognize once and for all that the time is past in the United States when the Federal Government can stand by and allow a recession to be prolonged or to deepen into depression without decisive Government action.

Since the days of the great depression, the Government has developed a vast capacity in many areas to break a slide and to stimulate the economy. We no longer accept the finality of the operation of blindly cruel economic forces where millions would be left without work, without the ability to feed, house, and clothe their families.

In addition to the human and economic costs involved in such a situation, there are international costs which almost exceed comprehension.

When the editors from many of the great newspapers abroad visited Washington last week, one of the questions asked most often was whether we were going to have a depression in the United States and what the prospects for recovery were.

Every time the United States economy suffers even a slight shock there are reverberations in the economies of free nations throughout the world.

A major or prolonged downturn in the United States would have catastrophic effects on not only our own country but on our friends abroad.

The greatest gainers from such an event would be Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts in the Kremlin.

This brings us to what further action by the Federal Government might be considered if necessary to stimulate an economic recovery.

Two courses are generally debated—a massive new Federal spending program, and a tax cut.

I believe that there is no question but that the use of massive spending for new Federal activities to combat the current recession should be rejected.

Acceleration of spending on existing programs can have the relatively quick effect the economy needs at this time. But by the time spending on the massive new programs which are being urged as antirecession measures began to make itself felt, the economy would already be on the way to recovery on its own, and the new spending would only contribute to more inflation.

Another objection to new spending programs is that they would have an inevitable tendency to make Government larger and stronger, and private enterprise smaller and weaker. It is significant to note that in the Senate alone 9 bills labeled as antirecession measures call for $38 billion in new spending over the next 5 years.

As the President put it very bluntly when I was discussing the problem with him last week, the recession should not be used as an excuse for adopting massive new spending programs of the type that would give little, if any, stimulation to the economy at this time.

Such programs should be approved only if they meet the test of qualifying as a proper function of the Federal Government.

We must also be on guard against what appear to be relatively small new programs, because by nibbling away we will eventually find we have ballooned our way into a massive spending program. That is why the President's veto of the pork-barrel rivers and harbors bill was justified, and why similar bills of that type should receive the same treatment. A spending binge now can only lead to a hangover of debt and inflation later.

This leaves us with the other alternative—the tax cut.

As I have stated previously, I believe that, if further action should be required to stop the downturn and stimulate an upturn, a tax cut, rather than spending, is the fastest, the best, and surest method to accomplish this result.

However, a tax cut will not do the job unless it is the right kind. It must be designed to put money in the hands of investors and job creators, as well as consumers.

It will not do the job if it is used simply to provide a popular political handout in an election year. It can succeed in its purpose only if it is designed to stimulate more production and more jobs for the American people.

In considering what further action the Government should properly take to stimulate the economy, we must bear in mind some fundamental principles:

If the economy can come through the present downturn without additional massive Government intervention on either the tax front or the spending front, this would be desirable because of the inevitable deficit that either of such actions would bring.

Our objective must be for our economy to be stronger when it comes out of the present situation than when it went in.

Too great reliance on the crutch of Government support will leave the economy with the same weaknesses at the end of the recession as it had at the beginning.

We must not act in a way which appears to solve our present problem but which undermines our future growth.

There is too much of a tendency in some business quarters to say let the Government bail out the economy.

Government can help but the primary responsibility for recovery must be assumed by American business and labor, and the other vital forces which make up the private sector of the American economy. As Dr. Arthur Burns said in Chicago last month, "There is nothing wrong with our economy that could not be corrected by vigorous business enterprise."

What is the responsibility of business in the present situation?

We have heard a great deal of talk lately in which the American people are urged to buy. This is sound, but a necessary counterpart for such a program is that American business must recognize that this is a buyer's market and act accordingly. New products, increased advertising, lower prices can have a dramatic effect on consumer psychology.

In this connection, I was interested to note that several publishers to whom I talked in Washington observed that their national advertising was down as much as 40 percent in the first quarter, while their local advertising has held up reasonably well.

I can think of no more shortsighted action than this on the part of national advertisers.

The very people who have most at stake in the survival of our free economy should be betting on its growth rather than hedging on its possible failure.

America's labor leaders also have a great responsibility in the present situation.

The labor leader has a responsibility to fight for the best interests of labor union members.

Obviously union members would like to have higher wages.

But they also want jobs.

When higher costs price their product out of the market, they are out of a job.

Wage increases which are not based on increased productivity mean higher prices, lower sales, and fewer jobs for union members.

A round of this type of wage increases would inevitably have a depressing effect on the economy at this time.

The restraint I ask is in no sense antiunion.

On the contrary, what we need is a return to the wage policies that have been traditional in the American labor movement. The pattern of spectacular competitive wage increases leading inevitably to higher prices is relatively new in American labor. It arose after 1946 because of special postwar conditions.

It is time to return now to the healthier, sounder approach which made American labor the greatest trade union movement in the world.

Let us return now to our basic premise.

The American economy is sound.

The practices which are bad should be corrected.

The Government stands by to cushion a downturn and to stimulate an upturn but always with the primary responsibility for maintaining the sound dollar which is the only foundation on which real economic progress can be based.

I would not want to conclude my remarks without a word of faith.

We hear much today of the great strength of the Soviet Union. I have never been one to discount this strength. It would be fatal to underestimate it. But in recognizing the threat of the Communist revolution, let us not forget the promise of the American revolution.

Those who have doubts as to the dynamic strength of the American revolution need only look beyond our great accomplishments in the past to some of the new economic frontiers we have before us.

It has been estimated that in the next 10 years America needs to spend:

Twenty billion dollars for electric power.

Twenty-two billion dollars for hospitals.

Thirty-one billion dollars for public and private schools.

The almost astronomical amount of $250 billion for residential and nonresidential construction and urban renewal.

To meet these domestic needs, together with the increasing costs of our programs for national security, we should set as our goal not the present rate of growth of our economy of 3 percent but the higher rate of 5 percent recommended by the Rockefeller report. This would project an increase in our gross national product from $434 billion today to $707 billion in 1967.

This goal to some may seem unrealistic.

It will never be achieved if we adopt a stand-pat, status-quo attitude toward our economy.

It will never be attained if we wrap it in a socialistic straitjacket.

It will be achieved if we face the future with vision, determined to tap all of the great resources which are at our disposal.

Government must play a substantial part in achieving these goals.

Our tax system must be revised so that it will encourage rather than curb new initiative, ingenuity, enterprise, and energy.

Small business must be encouraged and stimulated so that it can continue its invaluable service of pumping new blood and new ideas into our free enterprise system.

We must recognize and develop the full potential of millions of our fellow citizens who are now denied adequate opportunity for education and employment because of their minority position.

We must follow the President's leadership in developing a new program for agriculture rather than adopting the unworkable political approach of freezing America's farmers in an obsolete rigid system which can only lead to a dreary cycle of surpluses, controls, and depressed farm income.

We must have vision to develop an enlightened and far-reaching program for foreign trade if we are to have adequate markets for the increasing production of our growing economy.

But recognizing as we do that Government has its part to play, we must never forget one fundamental principle: What distinguishes the American Revolution from the Communist revolution is that we believe the most productive source of national progress is private rather than Government enterprise.

All of our Government policies must, therefore, be designed to encourage and stimulate individual Americans to make their maximum contributions to the realization of the Nation's potential. This can be done only in a climate of freedom of enterprise.

We have no doubt whatever as to the soundness and resiliency of our free enterprise system. As in the past, we expect to come out of the present recession with a stronger and more robust economy which will exceed in production the historic records made during the past 5 years.

Our answer to Mr. Khrushchev then is that we accept his challenge for economic competition, confident of the outcome where free men are pitted against slaves.

But in the great tradition of our own American Revolution, we hasten to add that the American dream is not to conquer the world but to defend the right of any people to be independent of foreign domination; not to enslave men but to free them.

We challenge the Communist world to compete not only in the economic sphere but in justice, in mercy, in kindliness, in respect for the things of the spirit, in real concern for the welfare of the poor and the unfortunate of the earth.

We offer total peaceful competition with supreme faith and confidence that we shall win.

Arnold Palmer Paid Tribute at Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to commend Arnold Palmer on his recent victory in the field of professional golf. My home district is very proud of this young man from Latrobe, Pa. He has earned a national reputation for proficiency in the game of golf and for clean, upright, truly American sportsmanship. It has been my pleasure to watch this young man move up from his high school days in Latrobe to receive the highest honors in this field of endeavor.

Along with my personal congratulations, I also add to the RECORD the following editorial from the Greensburg Tribune-Review of April 19, which emanates from the county seat of my district:

ARNOLD PALMER PAID TRIBUTE AT RECEPTION—LATROBE COUNTRY CLUB HONORS MASTERS WINNER

Arnold Palmer, of Latrobe, one of golfdom's great stars, was honored last night at a reception at the Latrobe Country Club. His father, M. J. "Deacon" Palmer, is golf pro at the club.

The husky 28-year-old golf star just recently captured the famed masters golf tournament in August, Ga. His earnings following that great victory soared his total to the top in professional golf, $19,833.33.

The Latrobe Country Club, where Palmer was feted last night is a familiar spot to Arnie since he grew up in Latrobe and has since built a home for his family just adjacent to the golf course.

Last evening's reception and dinner were attended by many of the members of the country club who are lifelong friends of Palmer and who represent most of the industry and civic organizations in Latrobe.

The proud businessmen and civic leaders of the borough shifted Palmer from titleholder to shareholder by making him a shareholder in some of the town's largest industries.

M. W. Saxman, president of Latrobe Steel Co., said, as he presented Palmer and his wife with shares of Latrobe Steel stock, "Arnie has been a great ambassador of good will for our community and for the industries of Latrobe. We want him to know that we appreciate, not only his mastery in golf, but his wonderful sportsmanship and consideration off the course as well."

Other heads of industry who made presentations of shares of stock to Palmer were: J. P. Gill, president of Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co., and J. M. Underwood, president of Vulcan Mold & Iron Co.

H. S. Saxman, president of the club and longtime friend and adviser to Palmer, presented, on behalf of the Latrobe Country Club members, shares of stock in Wilson & Co., owners of Wilson Sporting Goods Equipment Co., whom Palmer represents.

The masters' winner, in talking to the Tribune-Review last night, said that he had not entered the Kentucky Derby Open, which is now being played, due to other commitments, but has entered the famous "tournament of champions" field that starts Thursday at Las Vegas, Nev.

This article, I am sure, testifies the high esteem held for Arnie by our citizens.

President Garcia of the Philippines Will Be a Most Welcome Visitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the press has announced the forthcoming state visit of the Honorable Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines, on the invitation of the President of the United States. He is to be in Washington on June 17 and will be the guest of our Government.

I am sure our people are happy to know that President Garcia has accepted our President's invitation and that we will have the opportunity to extend to him our country's hospitality. I have no doubt that he will receive a warm and cordial welcome as the recognized leader of a brave and valued ally in the Pacific.

Such is the unique relationship between the United States and the Philippines that a state visit such as that of President Garcia assumes an importance we cannot fail to recognize. Not only because politically our country and the Philippines were united for more than 40 years, but also because of the record of loyalty to freedom and democracy of the Filipino people since their independence, a visit by the head of state of that nation deserves our special attention.

We have received the leaders of many nations, and have been glad to welcome them and hope we have strengthened our friendships. We will with great pleasure receive in June this year the representative of a people that stood by us in our darkest hour during the Second World War, a nation that never wavered in its loyalty to our ideals, a people that never hid its colors and always proclaimed courageously its stand for democracy and freedom. He comes as a real friend and associate.

What has also won our abiding admiration and respect is the consistent stand of the Filipinos against communism. They have fought it with a determination that is an example not only for the free world but especially for the uncommitted in that part of the globe. And their leader, whom it will be our privilege to receive as our honored guest in June, Preisdent Garcia, had the statesmanship and the courage to sign a law outlawing the Communist Party from the Philippines.

President Garcia, during the Second World War, won high praise from Gen. Douglas MacArthur for refusing to collaborate with the enemy. He was with the Filipino guerrillas in the hills of Bohol, offering civilian resistance so heroic a heavy price was put on his head. He could have accepted the offer to work in Manila as a puppet official, but he chose to risk his life in defense of his principles and throughout the entire enemy occupation he was with the forces of resistance, suffering with them all the privations and sacrifices of living in the mountain fastnesses as hunted animals.

The Filipino people have elected him as their President during a difficult period in world history. The Philippines is facing economic problems of great magnitude, as a result of the present world recession. President Garcia can be assured of a sympathetic hearing and a genuine desire on our part to help. The Filipinos are entitled to our every consideration, for theirs is a republic that was born under the protection of our flag, and they have lived up to our highest expectations, upholding courageously our democratic ideals and way of life. Let it never be said that we do not know how to recognize the loyalty of

friends who have been unwavering in their support of the United States.

The Filipinos are meeting their problems in a most creditable way. As an evidence of this, I wish to quote an editorial of the New York Journal of Commerce of April 18, 1958, which analyzes the financial position of the Philippines and shows how President Garcia has inaugurated an austerity program that is beginning to pay off. What the Philippines need is development loans, and the editorial explains this in a telling manner. The editorial follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of April 18, 1958]

STRESSES IN MANILA

Encouraging signs have appeared on the Philippine economic horizon of late.

After reaching a low of $136 million in January, the Philippine international reserve has recovered to $152 million. A favorable balance of $13 million is expected to show for the first quarter of this year. To all appearances, the heavy pressure on the government is easing somewhat.

This attests, among other things, to the effectiveness of the austerity program instituted last year amid much adverse criticism. It brought about a further tightening of credit control and cut import allocations and government borrowing for economic development projects.

As a result, Manila has been able of late to remove some of the most painful of these curbs. Specifically the monetary board has eliminated many of the restrictions imposed in its much-criticized Central Bank Circular No. 79, and has canceled the cuts it imposed on import allocations, a series of high cash-deposit requirements on certain import letters of credit and its prohibition on loans for the import of nonessential consumer and producer goods.

All this, recently reported by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo on his return from Manila, is to the good, and it is to be hoped that it will ultimately signal more to come.

The fact is, however, that the Philippine Republic's economic troubles are far from over. Some staples, including rice and corn, are still in sufficiently short supply to keep alive the threat of inflation. There is also a strong possibility that foreign exchange receipts will drop with the decline in sugar shipments after May or June.

On top of this is the fact that loans aggregating $20 million from two United States banks, on which payment has already been extended for 6 months, must be met before June 30. In the circumstances, Ambassador Romulo says, "It will not be possible for the central bank to provide exchange for the import of machinery and equipment for new industries, especially if a portion of the raw materials they would have to use would have to be imported."

So despite the silver lining which has begun to appear along the economic clouds over Manila, prospects are for more unemployment, a further contraction of reserves, and possibly more austerity unless assistance is forthcoming from abroad—primarily from the United States.

This is the framework in which President Garcia's forthcoming visit to this country must be viewed. It is no secret that when he arrives here in June he will be seeking loans from the United States Government and private capital to further Philippine economic development—one argument being, as explained by Ambassador Romulo, that without outside help it will be difficult for the central bank "to provide exchange for the import or replacement of spare parts of machinery and equipment required by established industrial plants."

President Garcia's reception in Washington is thus likely to mark a crucial milestone in Philippine economic policy.

Few of the many countries seeking financial help from Washington deserve a more sympathetic reception that the Philippine Republic.

It is not only a matter of the steadfastness with which the Filipinos have stood by us in grave periods of international stress, though that is certainly a factor too important to be overlooked, President Eisenhower, and those of his associates with whom Mr. Garcia will be conferring, should also take into consideration the fact that the Philippine Government has tried hard to meet the worst of its problems from its own resources, even though its efforts have necessarily led to much tightening of belts, painful measures and a good deal of unpopularity among local freespenders.

A major problem still facing Manila is that of providing more employment for its growing labor force by getting its economy gradually into better balance. This country has given it considerable help in this direction up to now. But more help is needed, and when President Garcia arrives in Washington early in June, we hope he will be given every reasonable facility in obtaining it.

President Garcia recently made the announcement in Manila and published in the United States press that he is keeping Gen. Carlos P. Romulo as the Philippine Ambassador to the United States despite a major reshuffle in the Philippine foreign service. This is an action that true friends of the Philippines in the United States welcome wholeheartedly. It shows that President Garcia's appointments are based not on narrow partisan politics but strictly on competence and integrity, qualities which General Romulo has shown in the performance of his duties and which have endeared him to the American people. In the United States Congress where he is a highly esteemed former colleague, General Romulo has countless friends and admirers. He has earned our high regard and respect for the persistence and ability with which he has constantly fought for the best interests of the Philippines. No nation is better represented in Washington than the Philippines, and the Filipino people should be proud they have in General Romulo a diplomat and statesman who has gained world recognition and who in the United States is held in the highest esteem.

We will welcome President Garcia with open arms. We admire him as a leader whose record of patriotism is unsullied, whose work as a statesman is a credit to his people, whose opposition to communism is as courageous as it is uncompromising, and whose loyalty to the democratic way of life he showed in the darkest days of the Second World War when to fraternize with the enemy was the comfortable way, and to resist and fight was to court death.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to pay this tribute to the head of state of our valiant ally in Asia, President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines.

Address by Mrs. John G. Lee, Retiring President of the League of Women Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the League of Women Voters of the United States held their 23d national convention in Atlantic City. This militantly nonpartisan organization has worked intelligently and effectively to produce constructive legislation for many years. During the last 8 years the league has been headed by Mrs. John G. Lee, of Farmington, Conn., who presided over her last convention last week. She is a woman of rare insight, and I feel that her remarks to the convention are worthy of the consideration of my colleagues and I include them—with portions deleted which deal particularly with internal procedures—as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH BY MRS. JOHN G. LEE, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, APRIL 21, 1958

The theme of this convention is new dimensions. These words suggest that we as Americans and as members of the League of Women Voters must break away from the limitations which have bound us; that the length, breadth, and depth of human experience is evolutionary; that old ways, old views may not satisfy the needs of today; that new visions must be sought. Life is on-going, as Professor Whitehead put it once—"the process is itself the actuality." It seems fitting at this time that we review the process which has brought us to the present for here we will find the experience and the values from which the future will be shaped.

* * * * *

One of the curious things I have long noticed about the League of Women Voters is its inherent ability, which has been demonstrated time and again, to reflect quite accurately the climate of the Nation as a whole. If you examine league history, I have a theory that you will find the league usually slightly ahead of the great mass of public opinion and yet within itself containing the currents and crosscurrents which represent public attitudes. Often, the league serves as a sort of barometer which indicates the weather just over the horizon. I shall give you neither chapter nor verse, but a few bits and pieces and hope you will put them together.

For 14 years the league has spent considerable time and energy in an effort to reach what has been called the mass of men possessing a minimum of bite and taste. We have tried to sell the league idea to all manner of women regardless of their natural bites and tastes. We have provided a sort of cafeteria designed to tempt all tastes, but not necessarily to satisfy any real hunger. We have persuaded ourselves that everyone has a natural instinct to be a good citizen and that we can successfully cultivate this instinct by doling out sugar-coated pellets of information which can be taken in monthly or bimonthly doses guaranteed not to upset anyone's digestion or blood pressure.

There is a place for this assuredly, but in our eagerness to be all things to all people we have permitted it to overshadow other requirements of a fundamental character.

I submit there is an illusion here, too, because it creates the false impression that informed and active participation of citizens in government is a simple skill to be acquired with little effort. Furthermore, we are deluding ourselves because we really do know that the exercise of civic responsibility is not an instinctive virtue universally shared.

* * * * *

There is no possible way to surmount the complex difficulties our extraordinary civilization has developed other than by terribly hard and intense application of our minds. Surely there is no dichotomy in a society which nurtures a representative democracy and cultivates a climate conducive to intellectual achievement. The two standards must be joined—dare I say—under Old Glory.

Chief Justice Holmes in his inimitable way put the matter engagingly: "The main part of intellectual education," he said, "is not the acquisition of facts, but learning how to make facts live. * * * All the fact collectors who have no aim beyond their facts are one-story men. Two-story men compare, reason, generalize, using the labors of the fact collectors as well as their own. Three-story men idealize, imagine, predict; their best illumination comes from above, through the skylight." In the league we need 1, 2, and 3-story women, but let us develop more and more 3-story women working under the skylight.

In the Nation's hurry to advance our scientific capacity, we must take care not to lose sight of our ultimate goals. We must see the truth in Andre Siegfried's words, "The essential aim of civilization is not technical progress or output or equipment, but man himself." To achieve an equilibrium will be difficult. There is a need to know all that can be found out about nuclear physics, pure and applied science of every kind; there is an equally pressing need to know in the wide and deep realm of the humanities: literature, the arts, philosophy—where mankind's true values are to be found.

All of this can be seen in precise and practical terms. There is much we, as individuals, can do about it; there is a vitally important contribution which can be made by each local league.

What shall be the aims of our public schools? How shall our education needs be financed and administered? These questions will be decided in each community. There, too, rests the ultimate decision as to the respective responsibilities of the various levels of government. I suspect in time a certain degree of acceptance will be granted the notion that in many areas of our lives the National Government must play an increasingly important part since so many of our interests and problems are national in scope and concern.

We Americans have a penchant for setting up a new commission or institution and appropriating special funds whenever we face an emergency. Seldom do we see a more proficient utilization of what is already at our command as a first requirement. Additional expenditures will not necessarily change old attitudes and it is surely in the realm of public attitudes toward education and educators that a right-about-face is acutely needed.

Surely our salvation lies not in being able to annihilate Russia, nor in remaking the world into our own image. It lies in our capacity to advance human life and thought. It lies in our ability to operate a form of government demanding the highest degree of sophistication, maturity, restraint, and skill. In brief, it is required of us, as Americans, that we not only train ourselves, but that we be educated.

We need to know the difference. The decision lies in the hands of individual citizens each in his own community. Again, there is something vital each one of us can do in our own hometown to assure our progress toward this goal.

I have often thought that one of the most useful contributions the leagues can make in this area is to facilitate a desperately needed political education. I do not mean this as it applies to adults alone, but as it might be incorporated into our educational systems. The league has made little, if any, impact upon this aspect of education and serious consideration should be given to ways of extending its service.

We find that more often than not even the college graduate, who becomes a new member, must receive through the league an elementary education in practical politics. Yet through the mechanics of politics our destiny as a Nation is determined. When we talk of the need to develop great numbers of scientists, let us remember the crying need for political scientists, for broadly applied political education, for the skills to develop political judgments; for only thus will we avoid shortchanging our future. The league is needed to help attain a balance.

* * * * *

You are about to debate and decide upon a program. I have often found that I cannot feel strongly partisan about any of the subjects you might choose so long as they are in the vanguard of American political thought. If they have this quality they will have vitality and they will be geared to carrying out the purpose of the league. There are three areas I want to mention briefly, however, which in my judgment need a little special attention: Integration, metropolitan development and United States foreign policy. I shall not even remark upon how far we have come in our present program commitments since this is all adequately covered elsewhere.

First, I want to make clear once again my profound admiration and respect for those who are operating leagues of women voters where racial tensions are running high, especially in the South. It is well for us to realize that racial conflicts are as old as man; they will not be solved today or tomorrow; if at all, it will be in the distant future, for the history of evolution indicates surely that man is his own worst enemy.

This then is a universal problem and the particular aspect of it with which we are plagued today is national in character. Industrial expansion and population growths and shifts are bringing changing patterns in American life to the farthest corners of the Nation. It is impossible for the League of Women Voters to ignore the problem of integration; it would be disastrous, in my opinion, for the league to become directly involved in it. While I realize there are grounds for apprehension in my discussing this subject, I believe it is important for all of us to understand where the league stands and why.

The first principle of government which the league supports is this and I quote: "The principles of representative government and individual liberty established in the Constitution of the United States." This statement establishes the authorization for the adoption of current agendas. The concept inherent in it prohobits a current agenda item favoring segregation; it would permit a current agenda item supporting integration. But the League of Women Voters of the United States has not adopted an item under this authority and therefore has no position on the integration issue.

I would like to remind you of the statement on membership which appears in our national bylaws: "Any person who subscribes to the purpose and policy of the league shall be eligible for membership. The membership of the league shall be composed of voting members, associate members, and members at large."

I have attended membership meetings all over this country and I have seen in every State of the Union evidence that those who subscribe to the league's purpose and policy do so regardless of race, color, creed, or sex.

The history of the league has revealed time and again that under certain circumstances an indirect approach in seeking solutions for public problems may be more effective than a direct attack. Furthermore, in promoting citizen participation in government the league is more concerned with the political development of the individual than with a specific issue.

It follows then that the league must choose its program with this ultimate objective in mind. This is not to say that the league should avoid conflict; it is to say that it is wise to avoid issues which are divisive in character when it is evident that the league will be unable to make a constructive contribution to the solution of the difficulty. In the present integration conflict, it is clear that activity in this field would handicap, possibly destroy, the league's ability to make its own unique contribution to the political life of the Nation.

It seems to me, the leagues in the South, where the pressures are greatest, have pursued the only tenable course. Slowly but surely and almost invisibly you have worked to provide for the strengthening of representative government. You have worked unobtrusively and undramatically to better conditions, a little here, a little there, and each improvement, no matter how small, has removed a source of tension.

Americans, and particularly perhaps the League of Women Voters, are impatient by nature and prefer direct action. Yet the democratic process is tedious and deliberate and requires infinite patience, tolerance, and maturity. It demands an atmosphere in which understanding can be developed, adjustments and compromises can be made. To my mind, the league's greatest contribution under the present circumstances, and I do not underestimate the crisis quality of today's situation, is to continue to work in every possible way in each community to strengthen the understanding and the application of the values of the great concepts on which this Nation was founded.

* * * * *

One of the best statements I have read describing our national objectives is put forth in the Millikin, Rostow book, A Proposal, Key to an Effective Foreign Policy. I want to quote it to you.

"The fundamental task of American military and foreign policy," they say, "is to maintain a world environment for the United States within which our form of society can continue to develop in conformity with the humanistic principles which are its foundation. We must physically protect our country; but the protection of American territory is essentially a means to a larger end—the protection of our still developing way of life. We have a major and persistent stake in a world environment predominantly made up of open societies; for with modern communications (and this word must include missiles) it is difficult to envisage the survival of a democratic American society as an island in a totalitarian sea." Millikin and Rostow also comment that "the art of American statesmanship is to formulate courses of action which in specific settings harmonize abiding American interests and abiding American ideals."

In short, they are saying, I think, our national efforts, military and political, must go forward together to assure independence and human liberty and must create a world climate in which threats to our way of life become minimal.

This, let us assume, is a reasonably satisfactory description of the objectives of our foreign policy. It is quite conceivable that free traders and protectionists alike, for example, would support such a statement. The rub and seemingly interminable differences of opinion occur at the next point: that is, when we try to hammer out a policy designed to achieve these ends. Here we become involved in all manner of different attitudes, conceptions, and judgments. Here, too, the league comes in, since it offers an opportunity for people of varying points of view to find areas of agreement through examination of the facts and free discussion.

I was impressed with a comment I read in regard to the value of discussion. It was put this way: "Discussion is the chief device for letting all the voices, the stray, the wonderful, the bewitched, and the prophetic get their chance and make their gifts to the future." We have heard in the league, as in the Nation, the wonderful and the prophetic making their gifts to the future and sometimes, alas, we have mistaken them for the stray and the bewitched. We need perhaps to sharpen our hearing.

Moreover, we have found in the league, through long experience, that each voice starts out singing a different tune, but that through much practice a commonly accepted theme evolves—and this we call consensus.

Through the years we, the American people, have demonstrated by and large a rare capacity to grasp and build on the great new concepts which have emerged during this most turbulent of all centuries. We have committed ourselves to the principle of international cooperation. There is less need for the country to examine this proposition again than there is need to know better how to implement it. The United States has conceived of or underwritten such bold and unparalleled experiments as the United Nations, the Marshall plan, NATO, mutual security, to name only a few.

There is need now to cultivate amongst Americans attitudes and judgments which will assure us of balanced progress toward our goals as we proceed into the irresistible and inscrutable future. It is imperative that we acquire an attitude which will make it possible for us to resist the temptation to criticize or place blame on a segment of the society. That is to say, there is no use in blaming business or labor or one or the other political part or the Congress or the Administration.

Criticism we must have; it has been said that "an age that had great critics was a great age"; but the searching criticism that is needed must be directed toward the society as a whole rather than to a part of it. This attitude will be increasingly difficult to maintain as we move deeper into an election period, but I believe the League of Women Voters has a particular and vastly important role to play in this regard.

It has been pointed out over and over again that when a society slows down it falls into a decline. Lack of progress, in the sense that the fundamental objectives of a society are not being earnestly pushed, deprives that society of the vitality that gives it life. Has this happened to us? It is safe to say not yet, but we can observe some ominous danger sign. Great prosperity with cultivates complacency is one; the fact that scientific and technical advances have outstripped advances in our institutions or government is another; our delay in recognizing the worth of intellectualism is still another; our reluctance to accept certain realities existing in the world today is one more.

These things demand of us a shift in contemporary values, a return to the fundamentals, a vision of new dimensions. A high level of individual prosperity is less important than a sense of national mission; politics as usual deprives us of our ability to meet new needs; educators and intellectuals are of more value to the national welfare than cigarettes and chromium fins. The Nation could not exist half slave, half free; a similar choice faces the world. These and many other realities must be taken into account, privately and publicly.

It is not a question, I repeat, of the worth of our ideals or principles; they are as sound as ever; it is a question of how well we carry them out in our individual daily lives and in our public affairs. I venture to say, too, this is less a matter of leadership than it is a matter of our own determination to weld a whole out of the parts that make up the Nation. In the days ahead I fear that our habitual mudslinging election techniques will tend to deepen the divisions between us. This could be calamitous. I hope the league will do its utmost to counter it by promoting the kind of objective approach to great problems which unites rather than divides, which develops judgment rather than passion.

I have mentioned our reluctance to see the realities of the world as they exist and I would like to comment on this further. It is necessary, of course, to base our foreign policy on realism—that quality which Lester Pearson describes as involving a duel vision, both sight and insight. There are several matters upon which we have been guilty of ostrich-like attitudes; we have buried our heads in the sand and seem to pretend certain things don't exist.

For example, I do not belive we can afford to count on either the destruction or the complete containment of Soviet-Russia; nor do I think we can sit around and hope for another Russian revolution. This does not make sense. We would better accept the U. S. S. R. for what it surely is—a powerful and skillful antagonist, a dynamic and growing influence in the world.

Americans, perhaps because of their incurable optimism, tend to lose sight of one of the fundamental facts of life without which we cannot deal successfully with the Soviet Union, namely, that international communism is a revolutionary movement; by its very nature a revolution seeks to destroy the existing order. We must take into our calculations that communism does not change its basic objective, which is to destroy western civilization; this has been officially stated again and again by the Communist leaders.

Furthermore we must make a concerted effort to understand Communist-inspired motivation and behavior. This is perhaps our hardest task since everything in our heritage and tradition makes it almost impossible for us to accept as real the convolutions of Communist thought and strategy. Yet we have witnessed the Kremlin calling black white and getting away with it. We have seen how communism has perverted the words peace and democracy. This baffles and frustrates us; the deviousness and deceptiveness of this procedure put us at a frightful disadvantage; we are kept off balance and unprepared, which surely is what is intended.

A revolutionary movement, communism in particular, has no honor or loyalty other than to its purpose. It takes advantage of every opportunity to advance its cause; it creates tensions by its very nature, and reduces them only to gain advantage. It is this quality which makes negotiations, agreements and settlements with the Soviet Union so exceedingly difficult and treacherous. Understanding these factors and developing strategy designed to cope with them successfully is a matter of life and death in a nuclear age.

It seems to me there is 1 hope and 2 main lines we can fruitfully pursue. The hope is twofold: that a middle class will emerge in Russia which will cause a modification of aggressive revoluntionary communism and that the competition for intellectual supremacy in the sciences, which has advanced so dramatically within the Soviet Union, will develop inevitably a climate which will be conducive to a certain amount of intellectual freedom. Freedom of any kind surely will penetrate and weaken totalitarian control. A people who have achieved material and spiritual advantages tend to conserve them. Thus it seems possible that the evolution of a middle class and intellectual freedom of sorts may occur and will force the Kremlin in time to take a less militant and revolutionary posture. We should advance this development by every means within our power.

For example, I personally believe it would have been to our interests had we originally opened, rather than closed, more doors in the United States to Russians as a counter move to the Kremlin's restrictions on American travel within the Soviet Union.

The two main lines we may fruitfully pursue are these: (1) The development of unity with our allies; (2) an identification in the minds of men everywhere in the United States and the Western World as the true champions of mankind.

As for the first of these, unity with our allies is an essential condition for our own survival. We can ill afford a Suez or a Tunisia. We can afford to take the risks and to pay the price required of us in an effort to establish political, economic and military unity with our allies and full participation and sharing in common objectives. While military strength is of prime importance, we must place a high value on political and economic cooperation. Firepower may be used to destroy our world or paradoxically to prevent man from destroying himself; yet human progress will be built with ideas, not with military hardware.

The second main line is a far more subtle and difficult one to establish, but one in which our background gives us a special competence. We must build an image in men's minds that establishes western civilization as the true champion of the aspirations of humanity. Here we must seize the initiative. If mankind is responsive to a nonviolent but still revolutionary spirit, we surely can supply the motivation and shape the behavior, not necessarily in our own image, but within the wide and deep frame of reference of our historic experience. Let us have confidence in our capacity to deal on the open market of ideas and to match any nation's gift to humanity.

Another line which converges on both of those I have mentioned and offers us limitless access to the spirit of men everywhere is in sharing our economic and technical wealth and skills. I need not tell you of the importance of trade and aid. They are to my mind supreme examples of the tools and the skills we have in our hands which are best designed to prevent the awfulness of war. In so much of our current reading we find impassioned pleas for new and bold ideas and leadership.

I submit we need these less than we need to use and expand what we already have and know: broad and generous foreign aid and technical assistance programs, domestic, and international measures to expand world trade, recognition of the values of consistency, durability, and longevity in our domestic and foreign policies. More of us need to know better the intrinsic value of these tools in shaping the kind of world we want; some of us will have to make hard personal sacrifices in order to support the overall interests of the Nation as a whole. Leadership of whatever quality it may be cannot succeed without popular response support.

Perhaps one of the most significant and hopeful developments in this country which should be noted in this context is the increasing number of private groups which are devoting themselves to long-rage study and recommendations on many matters of public

policy. The contribution of such groups as the Rockefeller Brothers, Committee on Economic Development, National Planning Association, Council on Foreign Relations, the American Assembly, and the universities are beyond partisanship and price. This is a unique, invaluable, and new sort of leadership.

I have often wondered whether or not this Nation has reached a point of maturity which will enable it to develop a sort of sustaining philosophy in regard to its purpose in the world at large. I am not sure we have, but I think we had better hasten the process. We cannot exist for ourselves alone, nor can we maintain high prosperity in economic isolation. We have been stirred to greatness in times of crisis and calamity. It is another thing altogether to accept and sustain voluntarily a global responsibility for the development of other free societies.

Yet we could well see this as our purpose in the world, as our destiny. This could provide us with a spiritual quality which would lift us out of ourselves, give our own experiment deeper meaning and provide us with the dynamic vitality that will be true to our traditions and heritage and promise. We must not become so absorbed in our desire to conquer outer space that we fail to reach for new dimensions in our own inner space. The pursuit of liberty, equality and justice is still a mission uncompleted. For most of mankind these are revolutionary ideas; they are ideals universally cherished, still unrealized.

I hope so earnestly you will make the most of your opportunities as leaders in the development of public understanding in one or more of these areas. I have, of course, only skimmed the surface and treated the general instead of the specific. It is up to you to weigh and balance and choose the exact points at which your effort may reap the greatest harvest. I trust you will neither underestimate the power of your influence nor the need to exert it. In many ways I believe the Soviet Union's challenge has delivered America from herself and that in a very real sense, as was said so eloquently long ago, "a great destiny is ending, a great destiny is beginning." I want to see the League of Women Voters at the core of this great emerging destiny, pulling its full weight for all it is worth.

In conclusion, I would like to remind you again of the theme of this convention, New Dimensions. No doubt this phrase calls up as many different images in our minds as there are individuals here. Some of us will think of science and technology and perhaps view with apprehension the constantly changing pattern of our lives caused by their swift advancement. Some of us will see in our mind's eye the political scene, a picture puzzle indeed, of shifting and increasing intricacies and imponderables. Some of us will catch a glimpse of economic and social horisons, expanding and extending beyond the powgr of human imagination to define. Some of us surely will have a sense of man's universal aspirations and the infinite hope that the spirit of humanity will find guidance and expression. Perhaps some parts of all these will run through every mind.

The dominant thought in my mind is that new dimensions refers to you and to you and to all the other 128,000 members throughout the country. It is the genious of the League that it brings to each and every one of us new dimensions in knowledge, in understanding, in freedom; new dimensions in capacity and even in fulfillment. This is the real reward the league holds for us; this is its true greatness; this is the very stuff of which democracy is made. We talk of informed and active participation of citizens in government. These are dry words indeed; yet if we have eyes to see and hearts to feel we know that in these words lie the values and the power to bring new dimensions to the lives of individual human beings wherever they may be.

Eight years ago in this place words were spoken which I in turn can say to you with all the depth of feeling and meaning these years have brought to me:

"And who knoweth whether thou are come to the Kingdom for such a time as this."

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, I sent 110,000 questionnaires to every household in the 42d District of New York. A memorandum of the issues relating to the questions was also sent. It outlined the facts and arguments pro and con.

A total of 10,350 questionnaires were returned. This large return indicates a keen and healthy interest in our public affairs on the part of the people of this district. I was gratified with the large number of valuable and sound suggestions contained on the questionnaires.

The tabulated results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

PAY TV

Do you believe pay TV would produce better programs than are now available? Yes, 1,675; no, 7,690.

Do you believe that pay TV should be restricted to transmission by wire which does not compete for the present free TV air channels? Yes, 7,107; no, 1,729.

Do you favor pay TV on an experimental basis using some of the existing free TV air channels? Yes, 1,317; no, 7,873.

Do you believe that the NBC, the CBS, and ABC television networks have a monopoly that is contrary to the public good? Yes, 2,408; no, 6,547.

NATURAL GAS BILL

Do you favor the exemption and modification of Federal control over gas prices as proposed under H. R. 8525? Yes, 1,778; no, 7,427.

POSTAGE RATES

Do you favor a 4-cent letter rate with substantial increases for second-, third-, and fourth-class mail? Yes, 3,325; no, 2,943. Or do you favor a 4-cent local letter rate and a 5-cent nonlocal rate, with substantial increases for second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, with $175 million set aside annually for modernization of equipment? Yes, 3,133; no, 3,236. Or do you favor retaining the present 3-cent letter rate and to increase rates for second-, third-, and fourth-class mail so that each service fully pays its costs? Yes, 4,564; no, 2,451. Or do you favor retaining present postage rates without any increase? Yes, 875; no, 4,663.

POSTAL WAGES

Do you favor a 7½ percent plus $240 annual bonus, averaging about $500 a year, for postal employees? Yes, 2,290; no, 2,512. Or do you favor a 6 percent annual pay raise averaging about $260 a year for postal employees? Yes, 4,150; no, 1,497.

RECIPROCAL FOREIGN TRADE ACT

Do you favor the Administration's request for a 5-year authority to reduce import tariff rates by 25 percent? Yes, 1,876; no, 2,876. Or do you favor an extension of the present act authorizing a reduction of import tariff rates by 15 percent over another 3 year period? Yes, 2,176; no, 2,332. Or do you favor no extension and no further reduction of import tariffs, leaving tariff rates at their 1945 to 1953 levels? Yes, 3,656; no, 1,485.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND RECESSION

Do you favor a substantial program of additional military spending (about $5 billion) now? Yes, 2,657; no, 2,936. Or later, if business does not improve? Yes, 1,940; no, 1,674.

Do you favor a substantial program of public works (about $5 billion) now? Yes, 3,098; no, 1,949. Or later, if business does not improve? Yes, 2,311; no, 1,038.

Do you favor a tax cut by increasing tax exemptions to $700 now? Yes, 4,929; no, 1,351. Or later, if employment does not improve? Yes, 1,510; no, 1,456.

Do you favor a flat 5 percent tax cut? Yes, 1,995; no, 3,104.

Do you favor a corporation tax reduction from the present 52 percent? Yes, 1,790; no, 4,491.

MISSILES

Do you believe that $3.8 billion recommended for missiles in 1959 is: (a) about right, 4,398; (b) not enough, 2,298; (c) too much, 1,202.

Do you believe that the proposed military expenditures of $39 billion for 1959 is: (a) about right, 4,048; (b) not enough, 1,532; (c) too much, 2,123.

Do you favor a program to construct shelter in cities against possible attack to be financed by the Federal Government? Yes, 4,068; no, 4,397.

SUMMIT MEETING

Do you believe that the United States should negotiate with the Soviet now regardless of our lack of position of strength, regardless of the lack of an agenda and regardless of what the prospects of success may be? Yes, 1,786; no, 6,370.

Do you believe that an unsuccessful meeting might increase the tensions and prospects of war? Yes, 4,787; no, 3,239.

Do you believe that a summit meeting should be held on the best possible terms and trust our officials to fully safeguard our interests? Yes, 6,035; no, 2,353.

STATEHOOD

Do you favor statehood for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska now? Yes, 4,339; no, 3,867

Or would you prefer to delay statehood until (a) communistic influences in Hawaiian politics is eradicated and (b) legislation is enacted which would apportion membership in the United States Senate on some equitable population basis for States hereafter admitted or (c) require Alaska and Hawaii to consent to less than two United States Senators under article V of the United States Constitution which provides that States may consent to less than equal suffrage (2 Senators) in the Senate? Yes, 4,667; no, 1,752.

FOREIGN AID

Do you favor maintaining foreign aid at the present rate? Yes, 2,398; no, 5,160.

Do you favor substantially reducing foreign aid with a program for more efficient administration? Yes, 6,414; no, 1,352.

Do you favor terminating all foreign aid? Yes, 1,051; no, 6,368.

Do you favor ending military aid and continuing economic aid? Yes, 1,976; no, 4,756.

Do you favor limiting foreign aid only to those countries who are military allies and receive no aid from the Soviet? Yes, 5,361; no, 2,405.

MISCELLANEOUS

Should Congress enact laws to protect welfare and pension funds under union control? Yes, 8,179; no, 767.

Do you favor added construction of irrigation projects while the United States Government engages in buying surplus agricultural products? Yes, 2,398; no, 5,500.

Do you believe that a Presidential disability law should be passed now? Yes, 6,922; no, 1,820.

Do you believe that Red China could be persuaded to sever her close relations with the Soviet on the basis of her conflict interests in the vast mineral resources and agricultural lands which the Soviet controls in Siberia on the borders of Red China? Yes, 2,892; no, 4,415.

Would you support a drastic curtailment of Federal services and grants-in-aid in order to balance the budget and also expand our national defense? Yes, 4,676; no, 3,375.

Do you favor a baalnced budget regardless of defense needs, unemployment or curtailed services? Yes, 1,682; no, 6,886.

The Hoax in the Summit Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article which appeared in the April 11, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report entitled "The Hoax in the Summit Game." The author, Robert Strausz-Hupé, is a professor of political science and director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania.

THE HOAX IN THE SUMMIT GAME

(By Robert Strausz-Hupé)

It is almost certain that, sometime this year, the western heads of government will meet with the leaders of the Soviet Union. As we are heading toward another summit, we may ask ourselves the question: Why are we going, and what may be reasonably expect to find at the goal of our journey?

The idea of a summit conference this year originated with the Soviets. All along, the United States Government has been cool toward the idea of a full-dress meeting which, in the full glare of world publicity, would bring face to face the leaders of the great democracies and the rulers of Soviet totalitarianism. And this with good reason.

The letters addressed by Nikolai Bulganin (then Premier and spokesman for Nikita Khrushchev, but recently demoted) to President Eisenhower and the heads of allied governments, were not confidential documents. They were intended for publication. They were missiles of propaganda warfare rather than notes of diplomacy and aimed at public opinion outside of the Communist bloc.

Since the Communist rulers do not tolerate free discussion at home, their propaganda campaign for a summit conference is being waged—like all cold-war battles—upon the territory of the free world. If they intended, by a show of willingness to talk terms, to further divide public opinion in the democracies, they have succeeded brilliantly. The Soviets, having maneuvered the western powers into agreeing to a summit conference, have scored a victory in that same cold war which they started 10 years ago and now propose to settle by a few days' polite conversation.

It is the prodding of their domestic critics rather than the arguments of Soviet rulers which impels the western governments along the road to the summit. For this reason, if for no others, the West cannot hope to win at the diplomatic game to which they were invited by the Soviets. The dice are loaded. The Soviet negotiators are free agents; their western counterparts are not. The Soviets need not worry as to whether the conference will be barren of concrete results. The western leaders will be loath to return emptyhanded and to disappoint the hopes, however ill-founded, of their peoples.

The pitfalls of a summit meeting are not matters of conjecture. In 1955, the President of the United States and the Premiers of France and Britain met with Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin at Geneva. No substantive agreements were reached. The communiqué, jointly issued by the conferees, ticked off the issues which the conference had discussed—and had failed to settle. These issues were European security and Germany, disarmament, and the development of contacts between East and West.

The heads of state agreed that (1) a close link existed between the reunification of Germany and the problems of European security, and that the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections should be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security; (2) they would work together to develop an acceptable system for disarmament; and (3) personal and cultural exchanges should be stepped up.

After nearly 3 years, only the last agreement in principle has been implemented. With respect to the two other matters—the German question and disarmament—no progress has been made. Thus the concrete results of the widely touted meeting boiled down to little more than a travel arrangement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The ink of the Geneva communique was hardly dry when the Soviets launched their first probing thrust at the Middle East. Czech arms shipments arrived in Egypt. This move did not elicit an energetic western response, for the spirit of Geneva had numbed the reflexes of the Western Powers.

Thus reassured, the Soviets intensified their campaign for the subversion of the Middle East. To the western peoples, the Geneva Conference seemed to mark a step toward peace and a step away from the brink of total war, for there was, as President Eisenhower put it, "no alternative to peace." For the Soviets, the Geneva Conference was a maneuver in the cold war which set the stage for a flanking move into the Middle East, the unguarded rear of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance.

If great expectations are being attached now to a second summit meeting, they must be based on considerations other than those warranted by the net results of the first.

Their leaders have made it clear that the Soviets do not wish to be reminded of the agreements reached at Geneva. The Soviets now refuse to talk about German unification by means of free elections. They insist that this matter must be the subject of a dialogue between the West German Republic and the German Democratic Republic, that is, the puppet regime of Soviet-occupied East Germany.

This narrows down the discussion to disarmament. Aside from the often-repeated Soviet proposals for the cessation of nuclear tests, the problem, as the Soviets see it, is the prohibition on the stationing of nuclear missiles in a zone consisting of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Germany, and the withdrawal of foreign forces from the European continent. In brief, the Soviets are prepared to talk at the summit about the liquidation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense system as a quid pro quo for the withdrawal of Soviet forces to the east of the Polish border.

In 1955, President Eisenhower commanded at Geneva not only the virtually unanimous support of his countrymen but also the respect of America's allies. The United States was at the height of its power; the retaliatory capabilities of the Strategic Air Command were not in doubt; and the Communist bloc was still shaken by the reverberations of the great Stalin scandal and the commotion over Stalin's succession.

Yet the fruits of Geneva had turned sour before the end of 1955. Germany remained divided; the Soviets kept on developing their strategic air and missile power; and Communist propaganda and weapons moved unhindered into Egypt and Syria.

Is it reasonable to expect that the prospects for a summit conference are brighter now than they were at the high noon of American power? The Soviets have closed the technological gap; all of Europe is within the range of Soviet guided missiles—no matter whether they are stationed to the east or west of some imaginary line drawn across the Pripet Marshes. And the Soviets have added several potential bases inside the Western defense perimeter—Egypt and Syria—to their already vast holdings of European and Asian real estate.

The fiber of western determination has not grown stronger. The British Labor Party, counted a sure winner in the next British elections, clamors for not only a general disarmament agreement but also for the suspension of patrols by aircraft based in Britain carrying hydrogen bombs and all physical steps for basing missiles in Britain before another round of negotiations with the Soviets. France is being bled white by the Algerian war, and all throughout the West a growing chorus of politicians, journalists, and academics is calling for further concessions to the Soviet point of view.

Since 1955, there has been a massive deterioration of the West's bargaining position. Every sign points to another summit conference turning into a diplomatic Waterloo for the western alliance.

The best course for the United States is to keep clear of summits. Should we refuse therefore to negotiate with the Soviets? Of course, we should do nothing of the kind. As a matter of fact, we have been negotiating with the Communists for a long time. All diplomatic contacts connote the readiness to negotiate; the exchange of diplomatic notes is a form of negotiation. These last 10 years we have been exchanging diplomatic notes with the Soviets at a furious pace. On all important issues we know, beyond a shadow of misapprehension, the position of the Soviets. They know ours.

There is available for everyone's inspection a long series of conferences with the Soviets. Mr. Roosevelt negotiated, at Washington, with Mr. Litvinov the diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. During World War II, we conferred with the leaders of the Kremlin at Moscow, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. After the war we conferred, on the heads-of-state and foreign-ministers' level, with the Soviets at Paris, London, Berlin, and Geneva, and in the United Nations at New York.

The Soviets proceeded to observe the provision of the agreements reached at these various places whenever they were self-enforcing; they violated the rest. In not a single instance did the Soviet leaders display their eagerness to evacuate territories that they had won by conquest. The only notable exception is Austria, and in this special case the Soviets appear to have yielded chiefly because they hoped that their show of reasonableness would induce the Germans to reject the NATO pact.

If any lesson can be learned from 25 years of negotiating with the Soviets, it is that they respect force. They are prepared to modify their stand whenever the prevailing power relationships make this advisable or necessary.

The Soviet barrage of proposals for negotiations, beginning with Bulganin's letter to President Eisenhower in November 1956 leaves no doubt of what the Soviets are prepared to negotiate about: a rollback of western military power in Europe.

Now, it is possible to conceive of arrangements under which the forces of the United States and the Soviet Union could be withdrawn from their present position and a zone be created between, let us say, the Dnieper River and the North Sea, where no foreign forces will be stationed. It should be noted, however, that such an agreement would have to satisfy a condition on which the United States cannot yield.

In the minds of men everywhere, United States foreign policy is associated with two principles, namely, the right of national selfdetermination and democratic process. We have so strenuously avowed our devotion to these principles that we must submit to being judged by the measure of our adherence to them. If the Soviet Union agrees that all peoples between Russia's national borders and the NATO countries shall choose their respective national governments by free, direct, secret, and popular vote, the conditions of a far-reaching agreement on a European settlement would have been met.

Is it likely that the Soviets will agree to the liquidation of Communist puppet governments in Eastern Europe and their replacement by democratic governments presiding over sovereign states? If this question can be answered in the affirmative, then we are justified in hoping that we can obtain, through negotiations with the Soviet Union, peace with honor and security. If it must be answered in the negative, then negotiations with the Soviet Union, although they might lead to the solution of some fringe issue—as, indeed, they have done in the past—will not bring us nearer to peace in our time.

To the contrary, in the light of past experience, such negotiations will be likely to redound to the Soviets' benefit and weaken our position in Europe. In sum, a flexible foreign policy—flexible is a euphemism for soft—is unlikely to wring from the Communists those concessions which our rigid foreign policy has thus far failed to obtain. It is likely to lead to a global Munich.

KREMLIN'S AIM: A BUFFER ZONE

The aim of Soviet diplomacy is no enigma: to remove Western pressure upon the most sensitive part of Soviet anatomy, namely Eastern Europe. What Algeria is to France, Eastern Europe is to Russia: a running sore that will not heal and threatens to infect the body politic of the occupying power. The Soviets seek to insulate this area of disturbance within the Communist orbit by the creation of a buffer zone consisting of neutralist and collectivist states, interposed between democratic freedom and totalitarian domination.

The Soviets once they have secured their weakest flank and smothered the rebellious spirit of the East European peoples beneath the blanket of neutralism, will be free to turn their undivided attention to the struggle for the Afro-Asian world.

Among the West's many illusions, none is more pernicious than that we can best the Communists by peaceful competition for the minds and hearts of the uncommitted peoples. Will the contest over the minds and hearts of the uncommitted peoples prove decisive in the conflict between ourselves and the Communists? Of course, it will not.

If Asia were to go Communist, the West at bay would be no longer a figure of speech about things to come; the domain of freedom would have shrunk to one-fifth of mankind. But we cannot hope to defeat the Communist threat to Asia by compromises in Europe on the terms proposed by the Soviet Union.

At present, the Soviet economic offensive in Asia relies largely on industrial exports from East Germany and Czechoslovakia. Without their control of the productive capacity of Eastern Europe, the Soviets could not render economic and arms assistance to their Middle Eastern friends and Red China and concentrate their own industrial resources in the military sector.

A deal on the neutralization of Germany as suggested by Bulganin would bring the Soviets within sight of their most cherished European objective: the control of the Ruhr, industrial heartland of Europe.

Once Germany has been drawn into the Soviet orbit, the Soviet economic drive in Asia would be nourished by the resources of the technologically most advanced country in Europe. The Soviets do not expect to attain this goal tomorrow. For the time being, they must content themselves with milking their European satellites for the benefit of their Asian clients—which is one reason why they have not the slightest intention to relax their grip on East Germany and Eastern Europe.

Important as it is for us to stay ahead of the Soviets in the competition for the Asian markets, we cannot hope to block the Communist penetration of Asia by economic efforts—nor, for that matter, can the Communists defeat us by building steel mills in India and highways in Afghanistan. The basic problems of Asia cannot be solved either by us or by the Communists. They were created by developments which antedate the conflict between democracy and communism by several hundred years.

These developments were set in motion by the impact upon ancient and stagnant civilizations of a young and vital civilization; namely, that of the West. The improvements in hygiene, transportation, and administration, wrought by the West, triggered a huge expansion of Asian population. How to keep economic productivity growing in order to feed a vast addition of hungry mouths—this is the burning question confronting virtually every Asian government.

Soviet or American economic aid, even were it many times larger than its present size, cannot effect any substantial alleviation of Asia's population problem. That problem can be solved, if it can be solved at all, only by the Asians themselves, through initiatives of their own. Its magnitude severely limits the effectiveness of foreign intervention, economic or pedagogical.

To admit this fact is not to argue against American assistance in forcing the most rapid economic growth compatible with the underdeveloped countries' resources. In all cases, such assistance is justified by the claim of human suffering upon our generosity, in some cases, it is also good business and good politics. But when this line of reasoning is stretched to mean that American economic policies toward the uncommitted countries, bold and expensive as they may be, can achieve a decisive change in the balance of power between the Soviets and ourselves, then we are asked to reckon without the West's fundamental dilemma in Asia.

No one can reasonably hope for more than that southeast Asia, India, and a goodly part of the Middle East will not go Communist. At best, these lands will maintain their present, ambiguous posture vis-a-vis the two blocs. In the foreseeable future, they cannot be expected to side with us against the Communists. The maintenance of the Asian status quo will be no mean achievement of western statecraft. The West can thank its stars if it manages to hang on to its remaining strategic and economic stakes in the rimlands of Asia.

SOVIET STRENGTH IN ASIA

For geographical and historical reasons, the position of the Soviet Union on the Asian continent is strong, and that of the West is weak. The Soviets enjoy the strategic advantages of geographical proximity and the continent's inner lines of communications. The Soviets do not have to live down hundreds of years of colonial history; the West is burdened by the many real—and the many more imagined—wrongs that its colonial rule inflicted upon native peoples.

The United States, because of its close affinities with Europe, can never hope to cleanse itself, its fervent anticolonial professions notwithstanding, of its "imperialist" guilt by association. True, in every Asian land we have friends who credit our good intentions and are awake to the menace of Communist imperialism. Unfortunately, only in a few countries do they control the government, and even there they do not always represent the sentiment of the masses. There is much useful and necessary work for us to do throughout the underdeveloped and uncommitted world. But we must look elsewhere for a favorable terrain upon which to carry the offensive against the Communist citadel.

The most favorable terrain for western strategy in the protracted and irreconcilable conflict between democracy and communism in Eastern Europe. There, in contract with Asia, the historical currents are running against communism, and the West enjoys natural advantages which do not beckon it elsewhere. For the great majority of the satellite peoples—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and East Germany—communism and Soviet rule are unspeakable abomination. This has been so for a long time. The risings in Poland and Hungary revealed that neither police terror nor brain washing can cow forever a people that once had known freedom.

UNREST INSIDE RUSSIA

More important still, the masses of Russia are restive. They are not immune to the spirit of rebellion that has risen in Eastern Europe. The rule of the Communists, despite their more liberal pose and prestige successes such as sputnik, is not as firmly implanted upon the peoples of Russia as they would like us to believe.

The Communists have good memories: It was only by a hair's breadth, and thanks to the incredible blunders of the Nazis, that Communist rule was saved, during World War II, from the wrath of its own people who, when the Germans first advanced toward Moscow and Kiev, were ready to welcome them as liberators.

It is no wonder that the Communists want us to measure our strength with them in Asia—and to relax our pressure in Europe. If the West can be induced by propaganda, intrigue, and negotiations to withdraw from central Europe and to dissolve NATO, the Communists will be able to consolidate their position where, notwithstanding their formidable military posture, they are now vulnerable, and to reinforce their position where the West is now weakest and can never hope to score decisively against communism, namely, in Asia.

The Communists would like to achieve this end without war. They hope to succeed through propaganda, intrigue, and negotiation. These methods are comparatively safe and cheap. They are particularly effective when applied to the western democracies in peacetime. More violent pressures, such as open attacks in the style of the Korean war, are apt to arouse the western democracies' fighting spirit, whereas more subtle techniques of conflict, such as a peace strategy, alternating with steppedup political war-

fare and subversion, are favored by the democracies' apparent inability to close ranks against all but forthrightly military threats.

Even with the best will in the world, the Soviets can, at the next summit conference, contribute little to the alleviation of world tensions. They cannot help us, were they so disposed, to solve the problems of Asia, for these problems—the pressure of population upon inadequate resources and deep-seated antiwestern resentments—are insoluble, at least for the foreseeable future.

On the other hand, the Soviets have created for themselves problems in Eastern Europe which, too, defy solution. Soviet domination has aroused the implacable resentment of the great mass of peoples in the European satellite states. The Soviets will always be plagued with the threat of rebellion.

Conceivably, the Soviets might wish to get off the lid and withdraw within their own borders. Yet Soviet evacuation of Eastern Europe would bring down the firmly structure of Communist puppet governments and destroy the myth of communism forever. The Soviets cannot extricate themselves from their East European dilemma except at prohibitive cost. In any case, we cannot solve this problem for them—even were we so oblivious of our own interests and professed ideals as to connive in keeping Eastern Europe under the Soviet yoke.

There is not a single major political problem to which another summit conference can find, even with good will on both sides, a practical and honest solution—and good will has never been forthcoming from the leaders of the Soviet Union. There remains the possibility of an agreement on arms control and reduction, for the ban on superweapons is a technological rather than a political question. Yet the question must be asked: Is a summit conference required to ratify an arrangement that exists in fact although it has not been committed to paper?

It is a foregone conclusion that, in another war, the United States and the Soviet Union will seek to abstain from the use of those superweapons which are as dangerous to the user as to his intended victim. The hotly debated question of inspection will probably soon answer itself: When both sides will have space observatories they will be able to inspect each other's territories to their hearts' content.

This will give neither side complete security, for even the closest inspection might not furnish more than a few minutes' warning against a surprise attack. Even the most effective ban on superweapons, solemnly agreed upon by the western allies and the Soviets, would not bring the world one step closer to the termination of the cold war.

The Soviets have made good their penetration of the Middle East without firing atomic weapons or, for that matter, one shot of old-fashioned gunpowder. Would an agreement banning nuclear testing or on inspection have affected significantly the incursion of Soviet power in Egypt and Syria? Evidently, it would have not.

The best we can hope of a second conference at the summit is that it will demonstrate the absurdity of trying to reconcile the outlook and aspirations of free peoples with the implacable power urge of the Communists. Were this to be the outcome, the price of another summit conference, in terms of expectations raised and dashed, might not be too high.

PROSPECTS FOR WORLD PEACE

Bleak as are the prospects for a grand settlement between the Soviets and ourselves, they do not justify Western defeatism. There have been shifts in the balance of power, most of them unfavorable to our side. Yet none of the Soviet advances, political and technological, have been decisive. The Soviets are the last to think so. The grip of our power on the perimeter of the Soviet empire has not been broken. If it had been, the Soviets would not seek to relax it by diplomacy and propaganda. As long as the facts of power politics persuade the Soviets that they have more to gain from conferences than from battles, the prospects for world peace will remain about as bright or as dim as they have been ever since communism emerged as an aggressive force. The Lenins, Stalins, and Khrushchevs come and go; communism remains.

The obstacle to a lasting settlement of international conflict is not the arms race or the division of Europe or the troubles of the Middle East, but communism itself. Conference or no conference, the cold war will continue, and the end of the protracted and irreconcilable conflict between democracy and totalitarianism is not in sight. For the West, the watchword is still what it has always been—build its strength, preserve its unity, and keep its powder dry.

National Guard Must Be Preserved To Serve the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is not necessary for me or anyone else to remind the Congress of the great contributions the National Guard has made to the defense of our Nation. Its record of glorious performance is written indelibly in our military history; its availability on short notice to defend the Nation in emergencies has more than once confounded the plans of those who have fomented wars against us. Nor is it necessary for me to point out that the National Guard represents the traditional American way of preparing ourselves and our citizens for the defense of our Nation, the citizen soldier has always been the Nation's best weapon and the National Guard has been the mechanism which has trained and mobilized that weapon.

We recognize that with changing military objectives, strategy, and new weapons, the National Guard as well as the other elements of our defensive forces, requires modernization and modification from time to time. And as we all know, the Congress is considering a plan for such a modernization of the National Guard in the light of the problems of atomic and missile warfare. This plan is, in part, at least a response to repeated requests by leaders of the National Guard itself for such modernization. And certainly, all of us will welcome any plan which will make our citizen soldiers and the National Guard more effective guardians of our Nation's security. But the plan requested by the Secretary of the Army goes far beyond this aim and proposes a reduction in force and units which, to be blunt, cannot escape the suspicion that it is intended to cut the National Guard down to a size more to the liking of those who have never loved the National Guard. I am particularly disturbed, Mr. Speaker, because under the proposed reorganization it would be the smaller units in the smaller communities which would be discontinued. I do not desire to make comparisons as to whether our best soldiers have come from the cities or the rural areas. Our history has fortunately proven that whether they come from metropolis, town, hamlet, or farm our citizens make magnificent soldiers when properly trained. But I cannot forbear pointing out that Sgt. Alvin C. York was the most outstanding hero of World War I and was a small-town product. Certainly it would be neither fair nor prudent for the Nation to make it difficult for less populated areas of our Nation to make their contribution of trained citizen soldiers to our defense.

In any event I am sure my colleagues will desire to give the plan to modernize the National Guard extremely careful scrutiny. In this connection, Maj. Gen. Joe W. Henry, the Adjutant General of Tennessee, has prepared a memorandum on the proposed reorganization. General Henry has an outstanding military record and under his guidance and direction the National Guard in Tennessee has made notable progress. His analysis of the reorganization plan will, I am sure, prove to be of much value to my colleagues in their consideration of this vitally important matter and accordingly I request unanimous consent to have this memorandum printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED REORGANIZATION AND REDUCTION OF THE TENNESSEE NATIONAL GUARD

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to bring you up to date on the current status of the proposals which directly effect the strength and effetciveness of the Tennessee National Guard. As you know, the Department of Defense proposes:

1. A conversion of our units to conform to the pentomic concept of warfare.

2. A reduction in personnel of the Army National Guard of 40,000 officers and men as proposed in the President's budget for fiscal year 1959.

3. A reduction in units featuring the elimination of six National Guard divisions plus several hundred existing operational, combate, and combat support nondivisional units.

I shall proceed to discuss these proposals seriatim.

THE PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

The Army National Guard has repeatedly requested that the Pentagon permit the application of the Pentomic concept to its divisions. We must streamline, modernize and refine our organization to give the guard the powerpacked, mobile and flexible organization indispensable to survival on the battlefield and to provide a balanced force. We are convinced, however, that this can be achieved within the framework of the present Army National Guard and without loss of a single unit. (Conversions, redesignations, etc., of course, would be necessary.)

THE REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL

Nationwide, the fiscal year 1959 budget will force a further reduction of 40,000 in the Army National Guard, cutting it from a high strength of 434,000 in April 1957, to a low of

360,000 in fiscal year 1959. Present strength is about 400,000, a figure to which we were forced to reduce.

On the State level, it would reduce us from 11,730 on June 30, 1957, to a low of approximately 10,577 in fiscal year 1959. Present strength under curtailed recruiting as of March 31 is 11,124.

While we have made every effort to avoid any semblance of criticism of the Reserve, one cannot escape some observations by way of comparison. It is insisted, for example, that the Reserve too is being reduced, and so it is, from an authorized 300,000 to 270,000, but the Reserve has only approximately 240,000 members. Therefore, where we are losing warm bodies, they only lose on paper and even under the reduced authorization, not only will they not lose, they will have about 30,000 vacancies. The effect of these cuts would be to:

1. Reduce some of our units to the point where effective unit training would be impossible.

2. Seriously reduce the combat capability of the only immediate callable Ready Reserve the Army now has available.

3. Place an undue restriction upon the opportunity for a young man to participate in National Guard activities and thereby fulfill his military obligation.

4. Force us to discharge substantial numbers of officers and men who have placed their faith in us, with a resultant loss of retirement benefits and other privileges.

5. Adversely affect the national defense effort.

6. Adversely affect the performance of our State mission.

THE REDUCTION OF UNITS

This is the more serious of the three problems and is in addition to the troop structure reorganization and the personnel reduction.

The Regular Army, apparently because of the emphasis on guided missiles, supersonic aircraft, earth-girdling satellites, and other Buck Rogers-type gadgets of destruction, has mothballed 4 of its former 10 divisions, leaving a net of 15 at present.

Significant it is that Russia, notwithstanding her sputnik successes and her superiority in the satellite field, has not seen fit to mothball any of her 175 divisions.

The guard today has 27 divisions (21 infantry and 6 armor).

We lose six of these divisions.

Again it is significant that the Army has placed a veil of secrecy on this proposal.

It is generally believed—although the Pentagon refuses to confirm or deny this—that the guard will lose approximately 30 percent of its company and detachment size units, which would reduce that number from 5,437 to about 3,806.

On a State level this would reduce us from 140 company and detachment size units to 98.

It is the Guard's position that slashes in the Regular Establishment should be offset by a buildup in the Reserve forces, to the end that he active Army, the National Guard and the Reserve, when taken as a whole, will present what we know as a balanced force.

The Guard insists that reductions in the Guard and Reserve, made concurrently with reductions in the Regular Establishment, violates this time-honored balanced force concept.

As Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, phrased it in testifying before the Brooks Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in February 1957:

"Really we should view our Army as a combination of the active Army and the two Reserve components. As one goes down the others should go up."

We agree.

Again we are forced to odious comparisons with the Reserve.

As aforesaid the Guard has 27 actual divisions, all operational.

The Reserve has 10 nominal infantry divisions, 12 replacement training divisions and 3 maneuver area commands. Under the proposal the Reserve would lose 4 of its divisions.

The smallest guard division (the 45th Infantry Division of Oklahoma) is larger than the largest Reserve division.

Guard divisions are self-sufficient, accomplishing their own administration, training, and logistical backup, while Reserve divisions must depend almost entirely upon the Active Army for their administration, training, and logistical support.

The guard has on hand vast quantities of arms and equipment while the Reserve has little or no equipment.

The guard, for the most part, is housed in armories and has a vibrant, well-planned State-supported program for the completion of its construction requirements, while the Reserve facilities are, for the most part, nonexistent.

A comparison of the state of training between the guard and the Reserve divisions is impossible since this is a closely guarded secret.

Some 2 years ago, Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times wrote an article in which he said, in part:

"The condition of the guard is in startling contrast to the lean and hungry look of the Army's Reserve, as presented by the Pentagon in congressional testimony."

The loss of one guard division (any) cuts deeper into the Nation's defense structure than the loss of any Reserve division.

It is the guard's position that if 10 divisions are to be deleted from the troop structure, sound planning, duty to country and honor of profession demand the establishment of reasonable criteria to the end that the 10 least effective divisions, whether guard or Reserve, be eliminated.

The Pentagon planners should peruse the parable of the talents.

THE 6-MONTHS TRAINING PROGRAM

At the last annual meeting of the Adjutants General Association, Secretary Brucker appeared before our group and gave assurance that the Army would accept every man the National Guard sent to it for 6 months' training and that they would be sent at a time they wanted to begin training. He further pledged that no quotas or similar restrictions would be imposed.

I feel impelled to state parenthetically that Secretary Brucker is an honorable man and has been a friend of the guard, but he too is answerable to the civilian masters in the Pentagon who saw fit to cut the foundation out from under him.

For after we had relied upon this assurance and after the memorandum of understanding forced by the Brooks subcommittee was signed, and after the guard had sold the program, the Department of Defense imposed strict fund limitations and forced the imposition of firm quotas, with the result that the present input is not, and cannot be, sufficient to maintain the strength of the Army guard.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1959 permits only 22,000 6-month trainees. Eighteen thousand of these will enlist in fiscal year 1958, but train in fiscal year 1959. This permits only 4,000 new enlistees, whereas we need 45,000 to maintain enrolled strength of 400,000.

You will bear in mind that the Guard is now permitted to enlist only prior service personnel, obligated reservists and those who agree to take 6 months active duty for training.

Yet the latter category is so limited that we can send only about one per company in fiscal year 1959.

The veteran, as a rule, is not interested in further military service.

The obligated reservist is difficult to recruit. In a large number of cases the distance to the nearest unit precludes his enlistment, moreover, experience indicates that few desire to participate in Guard or Reserve activity.

Incidentally, Tennessee led the Nation last year in the recruitment of obligors.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSALS

In addition to the foregoing specific objections to these proposals, there are some general objections; among them are:

1. There is little or no escape from a conclusion that this is but a backdoor approach toward federalization of the Guard and building up the Reserve at the expense of the Guard.

2. There remain those who dislike the Guard, because it is an arm of the State with which they must share control.

3. States rights is heavily involved.

4. The whole proposal is shrouded in undue secrecy and it is a fact that the Pentagon has declined to forewarn and forearm the guard by stamping a secret label on the entire transaction. Their strategy seems to be to ambush and lie in wait, as they view all efforts to ferret out the details of this nefarious scheme hatched in the hollow of a log, as being an effort to compromise the security of the Nation. The States have a vested interest in the guard and a right to know. Surely the governor of a sovereign State cannot be denied that information which is readily available to the ruling caste in the Pentagon. After all they have no monopoly on patriotism.

TENNESSEE'S PARTICIPATION IN THE FIGHT AGAINST THESE PROPOSALS

Our participation has consisted primarily of the following:

1. The adjutant general has made repeated trips to Washington to confer with other adjutants general and military leaders.

2. The adjutant general, the commanding general, 30th Armored Division, the president of the National Guard Association of Tennessee, and the immediate past adjutant general have conferred in Washington with every Congressman and Senator from Tennessee and without exception they have rallied to our cause.

3. On Sunday, January 12, 1958, the senior commanders and staff officers of the Tennessee Army National Guard were assembled in Nashville and briefed.

4. The National Guard Association of Tennessee has been briefed fully, both by the adjutant general and the presidents of both the State and national associations.

5. An extensive publicity campaign has been carried out.

ACTION OF THE BROOKS SUBCOMMITTEE

On March 4, 1958, after hearing testimony from representatives of the Department of the Army, the National Guard Association, the Adjutants General Association, Members of Congress, the American Legion, and a number of governors, the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee unanimously adopted a resolution, the pertinent parts of which are as follows:

1. That the strength of the Army National Guard be maintained at 400,000.

2. That spaces be provided for 48,000 6-month trainees.

3. That the Army be directed to proceed with the development of plans for a revised National Guard troop basis, coordinating the same with the States. (Incidentally, the Governor must agree to deactivation of units under the law.)

4. That sufficient appropriations be provided to maintain the strength of the Army Guard as above set forth.

PRESENT STATUS

It is understood that the Secretary of the Army will soon approve a revised troop basis for the Army National Guard, directing the

elimination of 30 percent or approximately 1,700 federally recognized units, of which Tennessee must lose its fair share.

This plan is not acceptable.

Based upon the law and on the Brooks subcommittee resolution, which later was adopted by the full House Armed Services Committee, the proposed troop basis, when approved by the Secretary is only a starting point for further negotiation between the Army and the several States.

The Secretary of the Army will address the annual conference of the Adjutants General Association which convenes in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 14, 1958. The Adjutant General and the commanding general, 30th Armored Division, as well as others will be present for this conference.

The Secretary of Defense has been invited to appear before the annual meeting of the Conference of Governors in Miami in May.

You will be kept informed of any further developments.

JOE W. HENRY, Jr.,
Major General, Tennessee National Guard, The Adjutant General.

Report of J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the Los Angeles Examiner of Wednesday, April 23, 1958, concerning the recent annual report of Federal Bureau of Investigation Director J. Edgar Hoover:

THE HOOVER REPORT

In his annual report on the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Director J. Edgar Hoover makes a comprehensive accounting of the tremendous job this vital agency is doing in the prevention of crime and in providing safeguards for the security of the American people in the fields of subversion, sabotage, and espionage.

But he makes a major point of another phase of this whole matter of law enforcement that spells out the basic difference between the police concepts of a free society, such as ours, and the authoritarian state, such as that of the Communists.

Mr. Hoover repeats on this occasion as he has done so many times in the past, that "the fight against subversion and betrayal from within is a relentless struggle." But he emphasizes that in pursuing this objective, the Bureau is forever mindful of one important fact—that it is an investigative agency, not a prosecuting arm of Government.

The great pride of the Bureau, and of Mr. Hoover as its Director, is not that it has examined the loyalties of more than 1 million people during the past year, but that many of these investigations resulted in the complete exoneration of the persons involved.

The most complete and absolute compulsions under which the Bureau operates are these, as Mr. Hoover enumerates them, that: "No infringements upon the rights and privileges of the people can be tolerated • • • investigators must work as diligently to establish innocence as to identify and apprehend violators of the law."

In other words, the law-abiding and loyal citizen has nothing to fear from the highest police agency in the Nation, and instead looks to it confidently not only for security of his person but for the defense of his integrity as a human being.

The Communist and totalitarian police states would fall apart if compelled to work within the limits of humanity and common justice that are inviolable under the FBI and its dedicated Director.

Mr. Hoover's annual report leaves the American people with a profound sense, not of security from crime and subversion alone, but of the infinitely greater form of security that emerges from a way of life safeguarded against police tyranny.

Law enforcement that seeks the proof of innocence as zealously as it pursues the proof of guilt is too little known in the world, and that we have it in America is our good fortune and our strength.

Views on the Current Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to your careful reading the statement issued by the board of directors of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. Mr. Harlan Hegener, of Bloomington, Ill., is chairman of the board.

That we have been experiencing an economic recession no one denies, and we must take cognizance of it. But I deplore the atempts being made, and largely for political purposes, to exploit this situation to the extent of creating a hysteria that inevitably leads to ill-advised action.

This statement expresses the views of the Illinois retail merchants, and I believe the views of every thinking person, as to great need for temperate words, thought and actions in dealing with this economic problem.

I especially call your attention to the comment of Mr. Hughston McBain, chairman of the board of Marshall Field & Co., in an address he made last January before the business and political leaders in Chicago.

The statement follows:

APRIL 22, 1958.

To the Illinois Delegation in Congress:

The board of directors of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, meeting in annual session in Springfield, Ill., on April 17, directed me to send you this statement covering the reactions of the Congress and of political and economic leaders to current business conditions.

The board also instructed the undersigned to relay to you the following opinion, which it firmly believes represents the thinking of the vast majority of the people of the State of Illinois and the Nation.

I. The current status of our economy does not present a condition which lends itself to cure by hysteria.

II. Temperance on the part of Congress will do more to restore public confidence in the economy than the distortions created within the economy under the delusion that economic stability can be created by an extravagant use of public funds.

III. America will best be served by a temperate Congress which will give the American economy a full opportunity to solve its own problems in the traditionally sound manner characteristic of a free economy; of an economy striving for economic and moral greatness instead of immediate panaceas resulting in future socialization.

As a substantiation of our conclusion we add, herewith, what we consider a most concise summary of the operation of a free economy:

On January 24, 1958, Mr. Hughston McBain, then chairman of the board of Marshall Field & Co., speaking to the business and political leaders of Chicago, made this pointed comment:

"In the world of economics, as in the natural world, what goes up, comes down. Each new generation, of course, thinks good times can go on without end, and, to be honest, over extends itself, out of sheer optimism and exuberance. That is good—it's youthful, it's enthusiastic, it's a desire for a good life—but just a bit foolish.

"Because some where along the line, business must level off, must pause to consolidate its gain, must even fall back a bit in order to correct any excesses.

"And while it is naive to think that prosperity is never ending, it is equally foolish t despair at the slightest setback. Because, just as good times cannot last forever, harder times are always temporary, too.

"And perhaps even sillier than faith in good times forever, is the belief that the economic life of a nation can be managed • • • that the peaks and valleys can be completely leveled off.

"Those who believe that Government can outlaw fundamental economic laws and can legislate corrective measures are deluding themselves. The idea of legislating the economic law of supply and demand is hogwash.

"Even one of our top Federal economists said recently: 'The business cycle simply reached its peak and began to subside and all the king's horses and all the king's men, not to mention all the economists, politicians, amateur tinkerers, and easy-money experts, could do absolutely nothing about it.' You and I know he is right."

The board of directors of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association has unanimously approved this policy statement and recommends your thorough usage of all of it in resisting the experiments to allegedly improve business which are before you and which are probably yet to come.

National Guard Should Be Kept Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, this week a number of the adjutant generals of the Army National Guard are in Washington to protest the Department of Army's announced plan for the National Guard and the Army Reserve.

In broad terms, the Army's plan calls for the elimination of 6 National Guard divisions and more than a thousand nondivisional units—one-third of the present Army Guard; for the elimination of 4 Army Reserve divisions; and for the reduction in the aggregate national strength of the Army National Guard from 404,000 to 360,000. In the State of California alone this will mean a loss of approximately 80 company size units and

the elimination of over 2,000 officers and enlisted men.

The Army's plan represents a serious threat to the vigor and stability of our first line of defense.

Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, president of the National Guard Association, has declared that:

It is ridiculous to pretend that we are modernizing our Reserve forces by cutting them by one-third; that it is sheer pretense to maintain that utter and complete elimination of strong, well-officered, well-manned, well-trained, and well-equipped National Guard units is a progressive step.

In February of this year full hearings on this matter were held before Representative OVERTON BROOKS' Armed Services Subcommittee. Both sides were given a conscientious hearing. And when the hearings were concluded the full committee unanimously adopted resolutions supporting an Army Guard strength of 400,000 and an Army Reserve strength of 300,000. Furthermore, the resolutions called for sufficient funds for an input of 55,000 nonprior servicemen into 6 months' training, and directed that the revised troop basis for the Army National Guard be developed with the approval of the States and Territories.

Yet the Department of the Army is obstinately sticking to its plan.

The National Guard has been accused of bucking modernization of our defense forces. The facts tell a different story. The record plainly shows that the National Guard is eager to keep pace with the fast-moving world of modern warfare. The National Guard has been accused of being motivated by sentiment and tradition in opposing the Army's plan. The guard, it is true, abounds in tradition. But in deploring the Army's proposals it is motivated by the very sound and realistic conviction that it makes no sense to cripple our first line of defense while our potential enemy continues to build its military strength.

The House Appropriations Committee is now considering the Department of the Army's recommended budget cuts for the National Guard and the Army Reserve. It is my earnest hope that the committee will think twice before supporting these budget cuts. It is my hope that in considering a disarmament move on our part the committee will not fail to keep in mind that no announced plans for disarmament have been heard from our potential enemy.

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 20, 1958, I received a letter from Hallie N. Nicholson of Pasadena, Calif., submitting the signatures of 103 persons who reside in or are adjacent to my congressional district, urging passage of the Langer bill, S. 582. Pursuant to the request of Mrs. Nicholson, notation to this effect is being made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

American Legion's Program To Aid Unemployed Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article featured in the April issue of the Pennsylvania Legionaire which outlines the American Legion's 13-point program to aid unemployed veterans:

LEGION HAS 13-POINT PROGRAM TO AID UNEMPLOYED VETERANS

WASHINGTON, March 28.—A 13-point program to assist unemployed veterans has been proposed for implementation through the 17,000 posts of the American Legion.

The proposals call for a close understanding with labor groups, employers, and other organizations or individuals who are interested in employment for veterans.

Endorsement for the program was given at a meeting called at the Legion's Washington office by National Commander John S. Gleason, Jr., at the request of J. Edward Walter, chairman of the national employment committee of the Legion's national economic commission.

"With close to a million veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict now unemployed, an effective program on a communitywide basis with each Legion post participating actively, has become an essential necessity so that the veterans of our Nation may be assured that everything is being done to assist them with their employment problems. I am therefore calling on all department commanders of the American Legion to support these proposals," Commander Gleason declared.

Department Commander John W. Collins termed the program as a forward step by the Legion to meet the effects of the recession on veterans and their families.

Many of the employment problems which are common to veterans may be answered if they are properly identified and if an honest and energetic effort is made by those responsible for solving them especially in hard-hit Pennsylvania, Collins added.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Following are a few things which can be done to assure the post employment officer of some degree of success in his efforts:

1. Frequently visit the nearest State Employment Service office and become acquainted with its services and responsibilities.

2. Get to know the veteran employment representative, the local office manager, the representative who is in close touch with labor unions, the personnel who handles employers' orders for help and who make the selection and referral of applicants to job openings, the man who contacts employers and the counselors who assist veterans having unusual difficulty finding or holding jobs.

3. Make it a regular requirement to discuss veterans employment problems and labor market conditions at all post meetings.

4. Determine and inform members in need of employment if other members, who are employers, need workers.

5. Make available to the membership current information about jobs available in the area. This information can be furnished or obtained by your State employment service. If veterans seem to qualify, send them to the employment office for final determination and referral if qualified.

6. Make sure that all veterans in need of employment are referred to the nearest State employment office immediately to register for employment and any other service pertaining to employment that they may need and which the post does not know how to provide.

7. Where possible, suggest to employers that they should list their employment needs with the Employment Service and if possible, notify the post service officer.

8. It is suggested that you appraise the advantage of and inform members of opportunities for employment in other areas outside of the locality. The Employment Service has information on jobs in all parts of the United States. Many Federal positions are available to veterans. Advise them to check with local Government establishments such as post offices which carry civil service openings.

9. Keep your veterans advised through your service officer or other Government representatives of available training under VA regulations.

10. Keep familiar with laws and regulations affecting veterans' preference in Government work and regarding reemployment rights.

11. Work with all community industrial groups and organizations attempting to bring new industries in the area.

12. Work and encourage the acceptance of such programs as employ the handicapped, older workers groups, and other worthwhile work programs.

13. Above all, maintain a close understanding with labor groups, employers, and other organizations or individuals who are interested in employment for veterans.

Law Is a Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an editorial which appeared in the April 28, 1958, issue of Life magazine and is entitled "Law Is a Force":

LAW IS A FORCE—AND LAW DAY REMINDS US HOW MUCH IT CAN DO TO MAKE A PEACEFUL WORLD

In Soviet Russia, May 1 will be the same old holiday, dedicated to the world proletariat. In the United States this year it will be dedicated to quite a different abstraction. By presidential proclamation, May 1 is Law Day. The President asks us to reflect not only that law secures our freedom as American citizens, but also that "the rule of law in the settlement of international disputes would greatly enhance the cause of a just and enduring peace."

Which of the two abstractions is more potent? The idea of a militant proletariat has

raised communism to tyrannical power over nearly a billion people. Against its noisy banners, the idea of law seems feeble and vague. Much more tangible western weapons—billions of dollars, arsenals of H-bombs, tireless diplomacy—have failed to win us the kind of world in which freemen can feel safe.

But the idea of law is more venerable than any of these weapons, and perhaps more powerful. It was a force in human affairs long before the proletariat was invented. It has been a force since the time of Hammurabi and Confucius, of Moses and Solon, of Cicero, Grotius, John Marshall. It is the "bond of civil society" (Cicero) and the basis of all honest government. It is the means of justice; and justice, says the Roman axiom, is the way to peace.

Lawyers have dominated United States politics since the framing of the Constitution. But in recent years too many of them, preoccupied with law as a mere livelihood, have neglected its grander lineaments and wider potential. The observation of Law Day is part of a crusade to correct this myopia. Says the crusade's leader, Charles Rhyne, new president of the American Bar Association: "The need for law in the world community is the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization."

THREE VAST FIELDS

How then does one go about filling this gap? Where can law be extended among the nations?

First, take the vast field of business and economic relations. Conflicts here were recently thought to be the cause of wars. Yet within the free world large areas of economic conflict have been brought under treaties since the war. Chief Justice Warren has declared: "We can reasonably resolve that this whole field will be subordinated to peaceful procedures during the next 25 years." Why not the next 10? Due process has many wider economic applications. An obvious example: let the United States ratify the Organization of Trade Cooperation. A less obvious one: let the United States adopt the plan of German Banker Hermann Abs for a magna carta of international investment and property rights. This would be a treaty among freedom-loving countries setting standards of how governments should behave toward other people's money, and vice versa.

Second, there is the equally vast area of international disputes over personal rights and wrongs. Many of these are "justiciable" under existing international law; yet the world court, their natural forum, is virtually unemployed. It would soon come to life if more governments, including the United States, would support and use it. Able lawyers have also urged a system of regional or other subsidiary international courts and arbitration tribunals. One lawyer, Luis Kutner of Chicago, has even proposed a treaty to internationalize the right of habeas corpus, that cornerstone of Anglo-Saxon liberties whose lack still brutalizes so many of the world's jails.

But third, there are those disputes of "power politics" that engage the prestige and fears of proud nations. These great clashes, loud or muffled, echo regularly through the U. N. The U. N. is a dubious source of law, having been born as a league of victors rather than an instrument of justice. Yet whenever a U. N. decision is respected by the disputing parties, the idea of due process is fortified. It was fortified when Britain, France, and Israel accepted its Suez cease-fire, as it was weakened by Soviet defiance over Hungary.

LAW AND THE SHERIFF'S POSSE

The obvious imperfection of the U. N., made glaring by the H-bomb, has turned many law-minded logicians into advocates of world government. All laws need enforcement; peace needs the enforcement of an international government and police force; so runs the syllogism. (For an impressive recent example, see World Peace Through World Law by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn.) But logic alone does not make world government feasible or even desirable. Nor is force the whole definition of law.

"May it not be," asks Dean Roscoe Pound, "that universal law must precede the universal state which will undertake to put any required force behind it?" What Pound calls a general body of recognized principles of adjusting relations and regulating conduct already exists in scattered, unmatched and incomplete form among the nations of the free world. It wants only the will and work of devoted lawyers and statesmen to turn it into a true legal order. As for force, that too exists among law-minded governments; it should not be impossible to mobilize it behind the rules on which we are already agreed.

"The sheriff's posse lurks behind every rule of law," said Pollock. But behind the posse lies still a greater force—the force of reason and consent. There have been many bloodless revolutions in the growth of law. The story of Sir Edward Coke, so well told by Catherine Drinker Bowen in her prize-winning The Lion and the Throne, is one such. When he declared, "The King is under God and the law," Coke made the King furious; but his doctrine held. It permanently tamed the arbitrary power of the British Crown and established the supremacy of law which is still the glory of the American political system. Our own John Marshall made a similarly peaceful revolution: by the unarmed force of legal reasoning, he turned a confederation into a Nation.

TRAGIC NEGLECT

Law is a system of rational, peaceful, and agreed procedures for settling disputes. An established system presettles and therefore prevents most disputes by its own clarity. Stone by stone, the firm habit of due legal process can be pushed into the anarchic marsh of international relations. To reduce even minor areas of dispute reduces the risk that one of them might lead to war.

John Foster Dulles is a great international lawyer. Both he and the President have frequently proclaimed their devotion to law as the means of peace. How tragic, therefore, that the United States Government in its time has done so little to implement this devotion and give a lead to the crusade which the bar itself is now launching. There is a hunger and thirst for the rule of law throughout the thinking part of the world. Said Tom Paine, "An army of principles will penetrate where an army of soldiers cannot." To promote the principle of justice through law is not merely powerful propaganda; it is a work natural for Americans toward a goal which we share with the whole human race.

"Temporary" Becomes "Forever"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "'Temporary' Becomes 'Forever'." It has been a matter of much concern to many of us that programs which have been undertaken on a temporary basis have later become permanent practices of the United States Government. This is especially true of the foreign aid spending program, which was supposed to have completed its purposes at the end of a 4-year period. We are now told by the Secretary of State that it may need to go on forever. The foreign aid spending program has already cost us more than $120 billion when interest charges are included. This is a large percentage of our Federal debt, and the responsibility of meeting it will fall pretty largely on our children and our grandchildren. The editorial of the Chicago Tribune is a very timely exposition of what happens in this country to many of our temporary programs. The editorial follows:

TEMPORARY BECOMES FOREVER

Secretary of State Dulles told the Senate foreign relations committe Monday that foreign aid is with us forever. He offered a few dim prospects of relief, hinging on disarmament "negotiated in good faith" by the Communists, or provided that Ameriacn private investment flowed to the aid of underdeveloped countries. But, by and large, he expected the annual bill for handouts to increase rather than diminish.

It is one of the wonders of the age how Government programs instituted as temporary measures of relief soon come to be represented as permanent and indispensable. Foreign aid is one of them.

The origins of the idea lie with the late Mr. Roosevelt's plan to pay the bills of Britain and her allies in World War II. This giveaway was labeled lend-lease and was likened by Roosevelt to lending a gorden hose to a neighbor whose house was on fire. Of course, the hose was to come back, and so was the money and war material lent or leased. The United States was to count upon either return of the original article or "repayment in kind or property." After $51 billion went out, practically nothing came back.

The Greek-Turkish aid project was launched by Mr. Truman in 1947 to save those countries from an imminent menace of communism. Dean Acheson, then Undersecretary of State, said he "hoped" that Greek aid would succeed in 15 months. Will Clayton, Undersecretary of Economic Affairs, was even more optimistic. His opinion was that a year would suffice. Eleven years after both countries are still collecting.

The seed for what was to become the Marshall plan was planted by Acheson in a speech in Mississippi. The idea was taken up by Secretary of State Marshall in another speech at Harvard University in June 1947. The program as originally projected was to run 4 years and the total outlay would be in the neighborhood of $17 billion. By 1952 the program of economic relief for Europe would have produced its effect and European nations would then be enabled to maintain their trade balances with the United States without the protective devices of controlled trade.

But it turned out that this temporary program was also destined to be permanent. The United States, 6 years after the date Marshall aid was supposed to terminate, is still engaged on a large scale program of economic assistance, and to this it has added an even more costly program of military aid.

"In my judgment," said Secretary Marshall in his sales talk, "the proposed program in 4 years should make possible sustained economic recovery in Western Europe."

But soon the Truman administration was appealing for military handouts to supplement economic assistance. Mr. Acheson

started out asking only for an interim appropriation. Thereafter, he said, Congress would be "free to do what it considers wise and best about the matter." Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson chimed in that the military aid appropriation would be self-limiting. He would have been more frank to say self-perpetuating.

And now comes Mr. Dulles to tell us that all of these temporary, self-limiting burdens are to be considered permanent. The American people have been made the victims of false labeling and misrepresentation in official advertising. Spending programs of limited duration have become unending. But Secretary Dulles may be wrong about their being with us forever. They may be with us only until we go broke.

The American Merchant Marine: Significance of the Steamship "United States"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, there is scheduled to be considered on the floor of the House this week a bill, H. R. 11451, reported from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

This bill would authorize the construction in American shipyards of two fast, modern passenger liners specially designed for operation in the transatlantic and transpacific trades, respectively. It is important legislation on a vital subject. I hope all Members will find the time to give it his most careful thought.

This country has learned bitter and costly lessons in national emergencies several times in this century. With intent to avert repetition of past mistakes, the Congress has firmly established our national policy to maintain and develop for the national defense and our foreign and domestic commerce an American flag merchant marine composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

The steamship *United States* is the unparalleled exemplar of that policy, so it was with much interest that I read a powerful and convincing address delivered by Rear Adm. Halert C. Shepheard, USCG—retired—before the United States Power Squadrons at New Haven, Conn., on January 9 of this year.

Speaking of the steamship *United States*, he said:

> Although American science is being challenged in space pioneering, it still is a world leader in many fields and I am going to give you but one example of that leadership.

He points out how that great ship proves we have the know-how, but cautions that unless further such steps are taken to modernize our merchant marine we will once again find it to be the weakest link in our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Shepheard's distinguished career in the public service and his many outstanding contributions to the American merchant marine, and the cause of merchant-marine safety, eminently qualified him to speak with authority and command the attention of all. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD his recent speech on merchant-marine safety and the significance of the steamship *United States*, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE SAFETY

(Address by Rear Adm. Halert C. Shepheard, U. S. Coast Guard, retired)

Commander, ladies and gentlemen, I have followed the growth of your fine organization, the United States Power Squadrons with keen interest since its inception back in 1914. The waters around Boston, where as a boy I gained my experience in the handling of small craft, was also the scene of activity leading to the founding of your organization. Having spent the best part of my career in the promotion of safety afloat, you and I have much in common. For the aims and objectives set forth in your proposed constitution, which fall in two parts—one aimed to enhance safety afloat, the other to stimulate interest in activities which tend to the upbuilding our our Navy, Coast Guard, and merchant marine. For those outstanding objectives in the national interest, I salute you.

Although American science is being challenged in space pioneering, it still is a world leader in many fields and I am going to give you but one example of that leadership.

I am here to talk about the steamship *United States* as a great transatlantic passenger liner and as a tremendous weapon of national defense. This ship is living proof of what the combination of American industry and wise government can accomplish when a challenge is offered and the opportunity presents itself to do what has never been done before.

This country of ours is never to be sold short. In its comparatively short history, this country has, on many occasions, escaped disaster and emerged triumphant by accomplishments which seemed miraculous to many, but which seemed probable to a majority of our people, because their frontier spirit kept pace with the challenge they faced. The steamship *United States* is an example of that spirit.

The ship was planned from the beginning for quick conversion into a fast troop transport, capable of travelling 10,000 miles without stopping for fuel or supplies at an unprecedented speed. It is so strongly built as to be able to withstand several times the shock which would destroy the ordinary ship, and is so constructed, that burning it is a practical impossibility.

As I continue you will see that the steamship *United States* not only aids our national defense by providing swift and safe transport for our troops in times of national emergency, but that it also provides the ultimate in safe transportation in times of peace. The mention of a few great maritime disasters clearly indicates the advisability of such high safety standards.

Bear with me while I turn the clock back and refresh your memories of a few historic disasters at sea.

In April 1912 the British ship *Titanic* set sail on her maiden voyage. When in mid-ocean, this new queen of the seas plowed against an iceberg of tremendous proportions at full speed, and, in less than 3 hours, went to the bottom taking a toll of 1,517 lives.

On a calm night in 1914 the British ship *Empress of Ireland* collided with a collier in the St. Lawrence and sank in 15 minutes; 1,012 passengers were lost.

In November 1928 the British passenger ship *Vestris*, outbound from New York to South American ports, capsized when off the Virginia Capes, taking a toll of 110 lives.

Many of you recall the loss of the *Morro Castle* as she was returning to New York from Habana in September 1934. The captain was found dead in his cabin the night before the ship's scheduled arrival in New York. The passengers, unaware of his death, continued their gala last night's celebration. As the party ended, and the guests retired, that most dreaded of all catastrophes of the sea overtook the ship. Fire broke out, and in a very short time it was completely out of control.

When I boarded the smoldering hulk by breeches buoy at Asbury Park, the check of passengers and crew showed 124 lives lost. At the stern of the ship, partly burned shoes lay neatly in pairs in mute evidence of the suffering and the tense last moments of those unfortunates driven into the sea by the heat. They had chosen the easier death.

These are but a sampling of the great peacetime marine disasters prior to World War II. During the war there was the British troopship *Rohna*, which was carrying United States troops and a few Red Cross workers. She suffered air bombing in enemy action but went to the bottom only after the hull had been holed and fire broke out. Over 1,300 lives were lost. Another British troopship is reported as having sunk in 1 minute and 40 seconds, taking over 1,400 lives. Both of these disasters are war casualties declassified several years after the war at my request, so obviously they were not publicized and therefore did not attract public attention.

A disaster at sea occurred about a couple of years or more ago when the British passenger ship *Princess Victoria* sank in the Irish Sea with the loss of 133 lives.

The dramatic collision of the *Andrea Doria* and the *Stockholm* is another case fresh in the minds of all. A fine, relatively new ship, built in accordance with the latest international convention, sank after damage apparently less than she should have been able to withstand. She sank with heavy material loss and heavy loss of life. That this loss of life was not much worse was due only to fortuitous circumstances and superb action on the part of other ships and seamen in the vicinity.

The lessons learned from disasters such as these are numerous.

The loss of the *Titanic, Empress of Ireland, Vestris*, and now the *Andrea Doria* focus attention on the matter of subdivision—otherwise known as watertight compartmentation—the design feature often permitting the survival of the ship from collision, torpedoing, or other hull damages causing flooding. Today, as in the case of all major safety matters, the subdivision and stability standards applied to American ships, and particularly to the steamship *United States*, are the highest in the world.

Hidden behind the *Titanic* tragedy was a shipboard fire. Unknown to the passengers, this brandnew ship was on fire from the day she sailed from Southampton on her maiden crossing. Her officers and crew knew it, for they had been fighting the fire below—and who knows but that the anxiety caused by that fire was the basis for the high speed with which the ship was plowing the seas in complete disregard of the warnings that icebergs were in the vicinity.

I mention this fire factor because from the time of the Phoenicians fire has been one of the hazards of the sea most difficult to overcome, so the development of fireproof and flameproof materials used in connection with the construction of the steamship

United States is one of the most thrilling accomplishments in the history of American industry.

In many instances the specifications for materials used in the construction and adornment of this ship called for a higher degree of fireproofness than had previously existed. It therefore became necessary to develop new materials and new fireproofing techniques in order to meet the specifications.

One example of this is paint. Most of the leading paint companies of the country, on reading the specifications, threw up their hands in despair and walked away saying such a paint was impossible to produce. Yet, persistent industry solved the problem.

When the construction of this ship was begun, there was no suitable method of fireproofing textiles—such as curtains and furniture upholstery—but the rigid specifications laid down for the steamship *United States* brought about the the development of an entirely new process.

Added problems were presented in connection with wood deck coverings, padding for seats and chairs, also for boyant material for life preservers. These problems were solved and are but a few of the examples of the ingenuity of American industry in developing entirely new materials to meet a need.

It is true that the high standards of safety applied to the construction of the steamship *United States* as compared to the use of obsolete wooden construction and flammable fittings of the past do add to the cost of the ship, but a mere moment's reflection clearly shows this additional cost is justified. Large passenger ships lost by fire from about the time of the loss of the *Morro Castle* due to other than war action, include the *Georges Phillippar, Atlantique, Paris, Champlain, Normandie, Bremen, Milwaukee, Monarch of Bermuda, Kron Prince Frederick, Empress of Canada,* the lake ship *Noronic,* and others.

Insofar as marine safety is concerned, we may be justly proud of our progress. As a matter of fact, we should swell with pride at the mention of this safest and greatest passenger ship ever built—the steamship *United States.* She represents the very highest advances yet reached in naval architecture. In speed she has outclassed the best. In carrying capacity she is equal to anything afloat.

Ships under the American flag incorporating the general features of the steamship *United States* would give the word safety a broad meaning—not only regarding the safety of the individual transported but the security of the Nation. Bills have been introduced in this Congress to build another superliner equivalent to the *United States* and a superliner for the Pacific. Unless such steps are taken to modernize our merchant marine we will once again find our merchant marine the weakest link in our national defense.

I am not here to recommend the financial incentive that should be arranged by our Government to build ships, but will say that it seems to me that whatever arrangement is made will be in the national interest. Unfortunately, an attitude seems to prevail that the recipient of a shipping subsidy is being guaranteed a profit and is otherwise receiving monies to the detriment of the Nation.

Not too long ago a tabulation was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to correct the erroneous and distorted impression that merchant-marine subsidies were tremendous. This tabulation showed that over a 15-year period:

1. The merchant marine operating subsidy amounted to less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the total of all subsidies paid; this was the only subsidy subject to recapture.

2. If the ship-construction subsidy is added, only between 2 and 3 percent of the total was earmarked for the entire merchant-marine industry.

From other statistics we can see that today:

1. More dollars are going to the price support of wheat per month than is being spent per year for merchant-marine operations.

2. Four times as much Federal money goes to the support of milk production as to the operation of the whole merchant marine.

3. In the coming year's budget overall agricultural support expenditures are 20 times the anticipated expenditures for merchant-marine subsidies.

I could go on along these lines, but this is no time for a lengthy statistical discussion. Let me point out just one additional item.

During the 11-year period ending about 1949, the subsidized lines paid approximately two and a half times the net retained subsidy in taxes. It is amazing but only a few realize that the underlying principle of Government subsidies to shipping parallels our protective tariff. Certainly it is clear that the shipping industry could not possibly absorb upward of three times the labor costs of its competitors. Do not our tariffs protect essential American industries against the products of cheap foreign labor and by support prices in the case of agriculture?

To say the least, great credit should go to the United States Lines for having had the courage and vision to make such a large investment in a pioneer venture.

General Franklin, the president of that company, knows from his own experience during the war in transporting millions of fighting men and hundreds of millions of tons of support cargo, as no other individual knows and appreciates, the great value of this ship should war come.

Mr. William Francis Gibbs, the naval architect of the steamship *United States,* was appropriately awarded a trophy—an "Oscar"—by the National Defense Transportation Association for the contribution this ship offers toward defense preparedness.

This great ship has proved that we have the know-how. It is generally recognized that before this country rose to maritime prominence in the 18th century, there had been only 7 nations in the entire history of the world which showed real maritime genius. They were Phoenicia, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Holland, and England. Since then we have shown our maritime genius on several occasions, even though it has been only under threat of war or of commercial strangulation by other nations. Under such circumstances we have always managed to achieve supremacy. However, it has always been dearly bought, and we have invariably thrown away this invaluable knowledge when the crisis passed.

At the end of World War II, we were once more on the threshold of real leadership. Today the 12th hour for the vital decision is rapidly approaching. If we rely upon our past experiences, they will clearly show that we must have a strong shipbuilding industry and a privately operated merchant marine. All the past lessons point to the fact that shipbuilding skills and the know-how of ship operation are essential national assets that must be preserved—they nevertheless are rapidly dissipating. We are on the verge of again ignoring one of the great lessons of history.

The shortage of American passenger ships is increasingly apparent. There were only 35 privately owned units as of January 1 of this year, as compared with 117 such vessels in our merchant marine on September 1, 1939. The parade of statistics on this point is convincing.

I only wish it could be made clear to the American public that a merchant marine is not only vital to our whole economy but to our very security as a Nation as well, for in time of war or national emergency whatever ships are most readily available are pressed into national service. Imagine, during World War II, overnight coastwise passenger ships were being employed for the transportation of troops overseas. One such vessel was torpedoed en route to Greenland with 900 troops aboard; 675 perished. Substandard foreign passenger ships were likewise utilized—at exceedingly high costs to us for conversions and charters. These are the types of ships, substandard as they are, that the theorists would have you depend on in an emergency—if they have not already gulled the public in believing that we can rely on foreign bottoms to meet our transportation needs should war come. This is a dangerous dictum.

During the last war slow wartime ships that were built in frantic haste were just as hastily converted to hospital and troopships. We began to experience trouble with these ships cracking, so we quickly fitted them with riveted straps. In fact, we would have used baling wire in an attempt to hold them together as we were desperate for ships. But, don't think for a minute the responsibility was not great in giving approval to the proposed carriage of about 1,300 troops on ships which at the time were giving us such concern. Several had broken in two, and charges were made that it would be criminal negligence to carry troops on these ships.

We took many a calculated risk. To say the least, it is a miracle that more lives were not lost as the ships on which they sailed were poorly subdivided, were practically firetraps, and were structurally weak.

These are but a few examples of our experiences in the last war. Today, there is a false sense of security in looking over our reserve fleets where we have a number of Victory and C4 troopers. I could point out many of their deficiencies, but need say no more than that these reserve troopers are not properly subdivided for the carriage of large numbers, and, most important of all, they could not compete with the speed of the modern submarine.

Where does that leave us? Well, I have briefly shown that great advances in naval architecture and marine engineering during the past decade or so; also that much of the safety progress is based on peacetime disasters. The bitter lessons that have been learned are of great value in minimizing the unpublicized terrible losses attributed to war. Recklessness induced by war and the disregard for safety during such a period is based on the arbitrary premise that military necessities will always outweigh the normal hazard of the sea. I can't agree with this entire premise. A man killed in, or as the result of a shipboard casualty, such as fire or foundering, is just as dead as though he were killed by the shell of an enemy gun. There is no need to risk unduly the lives of troops and seamen because human lives are always mighty important. That is the great lesson upon which we should not turn our backs.

I appeal to the American public on the basis of supporting an American merchant marine which in the end will provide reasonably safe transportation for the youth of our country, and it should be clear that failure to have cargo ships to maintain a service of supply could be fatal.

Out of the ports of the United States sail the finest and safest passenger and cargo ships in the world under the American flag, topped by the flagship, the steamship *United States,* but the real problem today, insofar as ships are concerned, is not only in the lack in numbers of such ships, including another *United States,* but in a stable, long-range policy which will encourage constant modernization effectuated by suitable appropriations. The most assured guaranty of an adequate American merchant marine which incorporates fireworthiness, proper safe-

guards against sinking, and speed to match the modern submarine—in other words, the best guaranty for these things to meet our next national emergency—is a merchant marine created to modern standards in these uncertain times of peace.

Special New York Times Supplement Describing the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my home State of Oregon contracted with the outstanding daily newspaper, the New York Times, for a special supplement about Oregon and its opportunities; and it was published as part of the Times for Sunday, April 7, 1958.

The supplement affords readers throughout the Nation a splendid opportunity to understand Oregon's outstanding features in scenery, resources, education, recreation, and citizenship.

This special State of Oregon supplement has been described in detail in an article written by Mr. A. Robert Smith, the correspondent for a number of leading Oregon newspapers, which was published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of April 10, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON DO-IT-YOURSELF KIT OFFERED TIMES' READERS

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Millions of easterners this week received copies of a handsome, colorful publication boosting Oregon as a good place to live, work, and play. With it went an offer of a free Doglas-fir for stranded unfortunates in the East.

The publication was in the form of a supplement to the Sunday edition of the New York Times, a newspaper with a circulation on Sunday of over a million.

On its cover it displayed an artist's conception of Oregon in color—including fish leaping from coastal waters, a cheese near Tillamook, a big rose near Portland, the State capital, a power dam along the Columbia, a bucking bronc near Pendleton, a pear near Medford, an apple near Hood River, mills, trees, and transportation symbolic of industrial activity, cattle, sheep, and crops symbolic of agricultural resources, and an ox-drawn covered wagon symbolic of Oregon's pioneer spirit.

A message from Gov. Robert D. Holmes recalls that pioneers coming to Oregon "found a land of great resources: Rich soil for their plowshares, giant timber for their saws, abundant waterpower for their mills, scenic beauty for their souls." These resources are still intact, he goes on, and are now being developed.

"In recent months we have seen a rebirth of the bold, pioneer spirit and energy here in Oregon. In these months we have watched the mighty Columbia's first surge over newly completed dams; we have stood on the rim of the dramatic canyon of the Snake and realized its great potential of waterpower and storage; we have watched harvesters sweep through fields of wheat and peas in the Umatilla country, and watched the fruit harvests in our green, clean valleys; we have watched the giant fir trees on their way to the mills to become lumber and plywood and we saw the beginnings of new plants for processing uranium, lime, zirconium, woodpulp, electronic devices, frozen foods, and aluminum," Governor Holmes said.

Holmes said it will take more pioneering work for the fulfillment of the State's human resources, but that Oregonians realize "the advantages of labor and management working in friendly cooperation; the advantages of a shared prosperity and the reasonable hope for better things to come; the advantages of hundreds of miles of public beaches, of millions of acres of public-owned recreation areas, of accessible fishing streams and hunting grounds; the advantages of leadership in literacy and the advantages of unsegregated schools and busses and homes."

"These are some of our assets," said the governor. This is our invitation to share them with you."

The tabloid-size publication contains articles on lumbering, water and power, labor resources, agriculture, plans for the Oregon centennial next year, natural gas, the city of Portland, soft goods made in Oregon, brewing, recreation, fisheries, aid to industry, taxation, sports fishing, health, ocean ports and minerals.

Much of the cost of the publication was covered by advertisements placed by Oregon interests—utilities, banks, manufacturing concerns, city of Portland, Lane County, Coos County, Multnomah County, and ports of Portland and St. Helens. Editing was done by Thomas G. Wright, Jr., administrative assistant to Governor Holmes. Wright previously was a reporter for the Oregon Statesman and, as a journalism student at the University of Oregon, was editor of the Emerald campus newspaper.

In an otherwise straight-faced recital with pictures of Oregon's attractive features, the publication carries an ad by a Portland brewer in a light vein with the boldface title "Keep Times Square Green." It starts out as follows:

"Just picture what reforestation will do for Times Square. Cool and green, teeming with game, salmon swimming up Pepsi-Cola signs to spawn. Why, it'll be a little corner of Oregon."

It seeks to entice readers to come to Oregon because the firm's beer isn't available in New York. But realizing some may not be able to come "right this minute," the company offers "to you stranded unfortunates" an "Oregon do it yourself kit: an Oregon fir and directions for planting."

This stranded unfortunate just clipped the coupon and sent for his fir.

The Mallory Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the Los Angeles chapter of the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., to correct the Mallory decision:

SOCIETY OF FORMER SPECIAL AGENTS OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States of America, under date of June 24, 1957, issued its decision in the case of *Andrew R. Mallory v. The United States of America*, which in effect held that the elapsed period of 7 hours from the time a suspect is first talked to and his arraignment is unreasonable; and

Whereas the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary did on April 1, 1958 approve of H. R. 14477 to correct said decision: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles Chapter of the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., meeting on April 10, 1958, does unanimously approve of and recommend the passage of H. R. 11477 by the Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman H. ALLEN SMITH, together with such additional copies as he may desire so that they can be distributed to the appropriate Members of Congress to evidence the action taken herein.

EMMETT C. MCGAUGHEY,
Chairman, Los Angeles Chapter.

The Line Grows Thinner of Those Patriots Who Served in the Spanish-American War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial entitled "The Line Grows Thinner," which concerns those gallant Americans who served during the Spanish-American War appeared in the April 24, 1958, issue of the National Tribune and the Stars and Stripes. This editorial is a fine tribute to the 485,000 young men who volunteered from civilian life for service in the war with Spain. Only 45,000 of these patriots remain, but every one of them is still fired with the same patriotism that led them to answer their country's call six decades ago.

The editorial follows:

THE LINE GROWS THINNER

Just about this time 60 years ago young men in the United States were hurrying to respond to the call of President McKinley for service in the war with Spain.

From all walks of life they came. Rich and poor, but all willing to do battle for a cause in which they believed, they thronged to the recruiting stations to join with their brothers of the small Regular Army, also volunteers, to espouse the fight for liberty of the people of Cuba.

With the cry, "Remember the *Maine*," ringing in their ears, they came from every State of the Union and from the Territories which had not yet attained statehood. Yes, these were muster-in days for that gallant group who joined up as Kipling might have put it "to right a nation's wrongs." Some 180,000 enlisted.

The National Tribune of March 24, 1898, reports that in a recent speech, General Miles said: "During the past few weeks we

have witnessed a memorable display of patriotism. Hundreds of our brave sailors have gone down in the *Maine;* have met death in the terrible steel-bound compartments of the battleship. They are entitled to all honor and credit as national heroes. Notwithstanding the horrors of that night in Havana harbor, we have seen thousands of boys marching up, ready and anxious to take the place of those noble sailors on the ships of our Navy, regardless of the fate that might befall them. No grander sight was ever presented than that at our recruiting stations during the last two weeks."

The war with Spain itself was of but short duration and many of the men who had volunteered for service were mustered out. But their period of rest and inactivity at home was broken by still another crisis.

The Philippine Insurrection broke out and the Boxer Rebellion demanded more troops from the United States. The Regulars were still inadequate to cope with the situation and these same men who had volunteered for the war with Spain again volunteered and were shipped overseas to do battle, not only with a persistent enemy, but also with the hardships of tropical warfare to which they were not accustomed.

Before the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection was over the number of volunteers from civilian life was nearly 485,000.

From this group of patriotic young men there remain now about 45,000. Old men but still fired with the patriotism which led them to answer their country's call six decades ago.

It has been our pleasure, over the years, to meet them when they come to call at the offices of the National Tribune in Washington, D. C.

When it was our privilege to meet them first they were still young, not only in heart but in body, and it was a pleasure to see how they carried themselves, proud of their service and of their country.

Little by little our visitors, veterans of the campaigns of 1898–1902, have become fewer. They are now in their late seventies or early eighties, but when they do drop in to pay us a call we marvel at their erectness, their vitality and their vigor of mind and we pray that we may be like them when we reach their age.

At this time, in camps throughout the Nation, United Spanish War Veterans will be meeting to commemorate the day when they became soldiers or sailors or marines 60 years ago. True, not as many turn out for the muster-in ceremonies now as they did some years ago, but wherever possible, a small group of the camps will meet and recall those experiences of the long ago, renew old friendships, and express the hope that when next year rolls around again they will be able to gather together for another reunion.

We might go on to develop the gains to the United States the efforts of those volunteers brought. They proved to the world that a new power, a new nation, had been developed which must be reckoned with in all future discussions between countries on world affairs.

Their response to the President's call welded together a country which had been severed by the bitter Civil War of 1861–65. North and South flocked in and forged a unity and brotherhood which have survived the test of time.

The only conflict in which we might call modern times, and in which we won not only the war but the peace, was gained by these men of 60 years ago.

It is only just that we pay tribute to them at this time and acknowledge the country's debt to them. Let it never be said that they are forgotten as long as the last man remains alive.

Address by Dr. Bronis J. Kaslas, of Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, at a Meeting of the Tatra Club Earlier This Month

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Dr. Bronis J. Kaslas at the initiation ceremony of the Tatra Club held on April 12, 1958, at the Hotel Sterling in Wilkes-Barre:

Mr. Chairman, reverend monsignor, Hon. Congressman FLOOD, honorable judges, senior members, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to say a few words on behalf of the new members of the Tatra Club. It is very hard for me to anticipate all the feelings of the new members initiated here at this very impressive ceremony. I am, however, sure that all of us new members are very happy to become associates of this distinguished society.

We thank you all for your friendly and paternal acceptance; we are especially grateful to our beloved Judge Selecky for the part he is taking in this unforgettable initiation ceremony.

I wouldn't do justice to the Tatra Club and this select assembly gathered here to celebrate our initiation if I kept silence on some things lying close to my heart; those things are my memories of happy days in prewar Europe. I was then research scholar at the postgraduate school of the University of Strasbourg and a newspaperman of Lithuania's periodicals. I was roaming all over Europe. I personally witnessed the historical events which today we learn about in the schools. And by the strangest, most unbelievable coincidence, I teach today in the Wilkes College those events which I lived through. I never dreamed of this possibility when in 1938 I followed Hitler, almost in his footsteps, to Vienna which was submerged in Nazi swastikas and black and brown uniforms.

From Vienna I went to Bratislava, the splendid capital city of Slovakia. The faces of Czechs and Slovaks were resolute, but marked by sadness and anxiety. They asked me, and asked themselves, What was going to happen, what fate was awaiting them? The only answer I could give them was that Hitler will never stop, unless he is stopped. And he really did not stop until he was stopped. I had a feeling then that this might be the last time I was traversing that most spectacular and the only democratic country of central Europe.

It was late summer and September 1938. From Bratislava I took the train to Trnava, and rolled through a most beautiful panorama formed by the Vah River and Nizkie Tatry-Low Tatra- Mountains. The peaks of Dumbier and Kralova Hola were jutting up proudly like the symbols of the heroic and noble nation of Czechoslovakia. Through Branska Bystrica, Turchansky Svaty, Ruzomberak I went to Vazek, at the foot of the Vysoke Tatry-High Tatra- Mountains separating Poland and Czechoslovakia. From here I could see the highest peak of the Tatra Mountains Gerlachovka, nearly 9,000 feet high. Gerlachovka was standing there majestically, a real, invincible miracle of God's nature. I felt as if Gerlachovka was proclaiming: "Hitler or Stalin can subjugate the human bodies, but they will never be able to enslave the hearts of European nations." Surrounded by Tatra Mountains, overpowered by their symbolic beauty, I had in that moment not the slightest idea that some years in the future I would become a member of the club bearing the name of these majestic mountains.

It was a beautiful September of 1938. The leaves here and there were coloring. I crossed into Poland in the Tatra Mountain region. What a beautiful place and historically famous nation. The triumph of the glory and power of Poland was, while in union with the heroic nation of Lithuania, under the leadership of the Lithuanian royal dynasty of Jagellon. Both nations fought the Asiatic Tartar and Turkish invasions of Europe. Many times they saved Europe from savage Tartar and Turkish subjection. They defeated the Turks at Varna in 1444, where the King Ladislas found a heroic death in the battle for Christian civilization. In 1682, Slavonic nations in alliance with Austria, under the military leadership of the Polish King, John Sobiesky, crushed the power of Turks, relieved the siege of Vienna, and repulsed them deep into the Balkans, thus saving all Europe from Turkish domination. Again, Poland and Lithuania were responsible in arresting the Drang nach Osten of Teutonic Germany when in 1410 the united armies of these two nations, under the direct leadership of the Grand Duke of Lithuania Vytautas and King of Poland Jagello at the famous battle of Tannenberg, destroyed the huge armies of Germans and thus saved all eastern Europe and Ukraine from becoming German colonies. This battle was the greatest and the most decisive event of the Medieval Ages.

These and other historical facts were roaming in my mind when in September 1938 I continued my travel through the areas where those decisive battles had taken place many ages ago. But again, at this moment, the same Teutonic sword was hanging in the clouds of Europe and was aiming at the hearts of Slavonic and Lithuanian nations; the shadows of Attila and Genghis Khan, this time in the red armor, also were visible again.

The famous Englishman with an umbrella, Chamberlain, was flying in that September 1938 back and forth to Berchtesgaden to beg the great master of the Teutons to leave in peace innocent, poor Czechoslovakia. But the proud fuhrer was adamant. And on September 29, when my train was rolling from Prague to Strasbourg, the decision of the Munich conference between Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain, and Daladier was announced that Czechoslovakia was to be dismembered and given to Hitler.

Ladies and gentlemen, you might easily guess how I then felt. I went straight to Paris, where I was completing my book on Baltic League in which I advocated a league of the nations around the Baltic Sea uniting for the defense of their destinies. Without having finished the gathering of all material, and still under the influence of my almost tragic journey, I wrote the last paragraph of my book which was a factual, desperate appeal to east European nations. The book was published in 1939, just about 2 months before Hitler and Stalin, 2 princes of darkness, attacked and subjugated Poland. That paragraph in French was something like this: Unissez maintenant ou perissez, car tel heure ne revidendra plus sur le cadran de l'historie,' (Unite now or perish, because another such hour might never come again on the dial of history).

Thank you.

Eulogy of Former Gov. Paul A. Dever, of Massachusetts, Delivered by Lt. Gov. Robert F. Murphy, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in Boston, Mass., on April 19, 1958, the greater part of the evening was spent in eulogizing our beloved former Governor, the Honorable Paul A. Dever, who died on April 11.

The one chosen to make the principal tribute was the present Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Robert F. Murphy. While I was the speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, I had the pleasure of serving with Bob Murphy, who was then the majority leader. Later he served as minority leader and in 1954 was the Democratic nominee for Governor. In 1956 he was the nominee for Lieutenant Governor, the position which he now holds in the Commonwealth.

Bob Murphy is a man of exceptional talents and qualities. He is an excellent speaker, well versed in the field of public service; a former newspaperman, and a lifelong Demochat. On this specific occasion he rendered glowing tribute to Paul Dever in remarks which came from the heart and which echoed the sentiments of those assembled. I am proud and honored to include his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EULOGY OF FORMER GOV. PAUL A. DEVER DELIVERED IN BOSTON, APRIL 19, 1958, BY LT. GOV. ROBERT F. MURPHY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Tonight, while grief locks the heart, and sadness throttles the tongue, and there is an overwhelming emotion of complete loss, this particular occasion is unique.

This annual dinner with its productive elements for the Democratic Party can well be called Paul Dever's party, because it was the function closest to the heart and mind of our late and lamented and never-to-be-forgotten friend.

But he would want it, I think, not as a tribute to himself.

He would want it so that the means can still be procured to perpetuate the record of achievements, which his philosophy of life translated into a long, litany of deeds, in the interests of the poor; the lowly; the sick of mind, heart, and body; the homeless; the little ones and, indeed, all those forsaken and forgotten.

JEFFERSON-JACKSON

Paul Dever stood forequare and always for the old-fashioned civic integrity of an Andrew Jackson.

Time after time, from this very rostrum, he held that "the principles of Thomas Jefferson are the definitions and the axioms of a free society."

The late, great governor was first and foremost for the people, because he was of the people.

BUSINESS

Paul Dever destroyed the falsehood that democracy was hostile to Massachusetts business. While he was pilloried as the enemy, he lifted the economy and, today we defy those detractors to name him or any other Democratic governor, as an enemy of business.

He gave us 318 miles of better roads, greater safety on the highways, an expanded tourist trade; he increased our commerce, and he lowered automobile insurance rates.

He built us new homes: In 2 short years he took them out of the blueprint stage and started 115 projects, that provided 12,240 apartments.

When he took office, not a single project, not even a single apartment, had been completed.

Today, over 50,000 veterans and their families are living in healthful, respectable, low-cost dwellings.

And he sparked job opportunities when he developed the port of Boston and made Logan one of the premier airports of the world.

PUBLIC HEALTH

In the field of public health, once Disraeli said: "The health of the people is the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state, depend."

Massachusetts made her greatest advances, in the science of public health, under Paul Dever.

Lemuel Shattuck, the finest chronic disease hospital, is, today, a reality. The new wing of the Chelsea soldiers' home now stands majestically for all to see.

The Holyoke soldiers' home came into being while he provided annuities for our paraplegic veterans.

MENTAL HEALTH

"Paul Dever did more in 1 year in the field of mental health than other governors did in a hundred years," once said Dr. Clifton Perkins, the long-time commissioner of mental health.

Under Dever, for the first time in years, Massachusetts' mental hospitals discharged, as cured, as many patients as they admitted. He segregated mentally ill children from the adult insane.

He provided special training for the feebleminded, afflicted with blindness, and he separated the physically well insane, from those others, ravaged with tuberculosis.

RETARDED CHILDREN

For a century, others talked about the need for a program to help retarded youngsters. Tehy needed help and under Paul Dever they got it.

For lasting cure replaced neglect.

Myles Standish Hospital was born in Taunton, to care for 2,000 exceptional children.

Today, thanks to a compassionate heart, there are no more commanding waiting lists. Firetraps were replaced with seven other new mental-health schools and hospitals. Underpaid attendants were made whole. Understaffed institutions were strengthened.

Myles Standish, Paul Dever always claimed, was his greatest achievement—and, as longtime legislator myself, I know that the present general court will eargerly respond to the suggestion of Governor Furcolo, that the name of Myles Standish be changed to the "Paul Andrew Dever School."

Then, indeed, there will be a lasting memorial in respect to his memory.

Someday, through the succession of governors, the time will come when his portrait will be removed from the walls of the executive chamber where it now hangs.

And when that day comes—when that moment is here—it is my fond hope, that it will be moved to Myles Standish where it will hang from, and adorn the walls of that institution, in, immortality, and in respect—yes, in reverence to the memory of one possessed of a lofty ideal and a benevolent heart. For he once said this regarding retarded children:

"You can have what I have provided; the roadways which lace the landscape—you can build your bridges and tunnels above and under our rivers—you can have your modern buildings with towers piercing the clouds—and all of that.

"And in my welcome days of future, private citizenship, I can look back to all of those with great pleasure.

"But if there is one thing that will warm my heart, and which I am sure, will be an endorsement on a passport by St. Peter, it is that, which I have been able to do, for the mongoloid youngsters of Massachusetts."

LABOR

He was one of the most devoted friends the workingman and woman ever had.

He broadened the workmen's compensation law.

He doubled compensation for the loss of an arm.

He tripled compensation for the loss of an eye.

He raised the minimum hourly wages of the lowest-paid Massachusetts worker.

He gave long-overdue increases to those in the State service, who were caught in the spiral of inflation.

He enacted a new anti-injunction law.

He insisted that maritime workers be made eligible for unemployment compensation.

To labor, a stalwart has gone.

EDUCATION

"It was in making education common to all," once said Russell Lowell, "that the destiny of the free Republic of America was practically settled."

Paul Dever's contributions to public education were legion. He turned his attention to repairing and refurbishing our many State teachers' colleges which had been in bad disrepair for years.

He powered the physical plants at our textile institutes at Lowell and Fall River and New Bedford. Today, they are the best of their kind in the world.

He never stopped trying to provide needed new facilities at the University of Massachusetts.

New instructors were added to the teachers' colleges to train more teachers; and to man, and to staff, our understaffed schools.

In one stretch of 2 years under Paul Dever, 270 public-school buildings were erected in 212 cities and towns, with the State underwriting the cost up to as high as 65 percent.

Regional school consolidation came into being that made it possible for our very smallest communities to grant education comparable to that given by our largest cities.

He approved scholarships to 100 worthy boys and girls at the University of Massachusetts.

He increased scholarship benefits for children of veterans killed in war, and devised a State-aided, vocational-education program for 13,000 handicapped youngsters.

CONCLUSION

I shall always think that Paul Dever was less than enthusiastic about it, but he bowed to the wishes of his friends and associates when he ran for reelection in 1952, after completing two terms as Governor of Massachusetts.

He probably was not too well physically, but he did not complain. Instead, he responded to their urge with his usual vigor.

This followed his choice as the keynoter at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, and the unfortunate incident that occurred there. He went there to help our cause. He went there, true to his character, to aid his friend Adlai Stevenson, and to proclaim that democracy is inseparable from the liberties of men. Democracy that had given a Jefferson, a Jackson, a Wilson, a Roosevelt, and a Harry Truman, to the service of mankind.

He was not defeated by the Eisenhower sweep. Instead he was crucified by the assaults on his character and by the attacks on his personal probity.

For Paul Dever went down in 1952 by the cowardly and the poisonous thrusts of those who vilified him, as no other man had ever been so debased before.

I have many times thought that he became so crestfallen, so downcast by a succession of untruths and slurs and outright attacks on his honesty, his integrity, and his moral uprightness—and by one, I might add, that he thought would show some essence, some atom of fairness—that his illness began and became so accentuated, as to lead to his ultimate, and to me, his most untimely death.

But our zeal, our admiration for his goodness of character, and for his sincerity will never waiver.

Our admiration for the cold, even light of his brilliant mind, will never cease.

For he was, in fact and in truth, the leader here in Massachusetts of our party. And his influence for the common good will remain long after his assailants have gone.

To them, to them, I say that our faith in him shall never end. To them I say we shall always remain inspired by his precepts and by his example.

To them I say that Paul Dever was the builder, the architect, who while he lived, lifted us to such heights of moral grandeur as we had seldom known before.

For his name and his purpose made hearts beat a little faster in lowly places. And today his name and his good deeds and his charity are being sung in every nook and cranny of this Commonwealth.

And now that he is gone, his spirit soars. For, with his death and with his passing, he has left for history and humanity and eternity for all mankind the everlasting and immortal memory of Paul Andrew Dever.

For the spirit of Paul Dever lives on.

The spirit of Dever will never die.

The spirit that slowed a week ago lives again.

For he has bequethed to us the unfinished fight to aid the jobless; to strengthen our economy; to care for the aged and the sick; to build our highways; and to go forth to battle for the cause of man.

Yes; he has left to us, too, the legacy of helping the Mongoloid kid, and providing the new techniques for the retarded child.

And, as it always was with Paul Dever, so may it always be with us.

May his immortal soul rest in peace.

Marker Urged for Paderewski's Burial Place in Arlington National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of April 23, 1958, calling attention to the fact that no marker has been placed on the grave of the great Polish pianist and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski, who died 17 years ago in New York City and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery:

PADEREWSKI MARKER

The great Polish pianist and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski, died in New York City on June 28, 1941.

By a resolution of Congress, Paderewski was accorded the honor of burial in the Arlington National Cemetery as a temporary measure since his last request was to have his final resting place in his homeland after the restoration of Poland's freedom and independence.

Seventeen years will have elapsed this June and it will still be impossible to fulfill Paderewski's last request. In spite of this length of time, however, there is still no marker in Arlington Cemetery to show Paderewski's burial place. We wonder if the approaching anniversary of his death would not be an appropriate time to erect a plaque to mark his temporary resting place. Surely the friends and admirers of this great musician and patriot would willingly subscribe the necessary funds to do him this small honor.

KARLIS KALNINS.
ADAM M. SCHMIDT.
CHARLES V. WEST.

Need for New Approach on Foreign-Aid Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 10, 1958, the Charlotte Observer, of Charlotte, N. C., printed an editorial entitled "New Approach Is Needed on Foreign-Aid Spending," in which it compliments the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for the idea advanced by him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW APPROACH IS NEEDED ON FOREIGN-AID SPENDING

A majority of Americans, we suspect, view the approaching congressional debate on foreign aid with a resignation born of weariness.

Hearings on the Eisenhower administration's $3.9 billion foreign military and economic aid program have turned up little new information for the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Secretary Dulles' contention that the $3.9 billion figure is a rock-bottom sum has a ring that became familiar before President Truman left office.

On the other hand, foreign-aid critics have already dusted off the tired "Uncle Sap" and "Uncle Sugar" sarcasms to imply that spending United States funds abroad is the work of suckers and softheads.

The truth is probably somewhere between the two extremes. But the American voter and taxpayer, denied access to top-level intelligence reports and strategy plans, has no way of getting at the truth.

Unquestionably many mistakes have been made in the administration of the postwar foreign-aid program.

In a recent closed-door session of the House committee, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell cited numerous examples of inaccurate record keeping, inadequate control of documents, lags in reporting deliveries and other deficiencies.

He urged Congress to conduct a strong internal audit of the whole foreign military-aid program.

Campbell's testimony was later supported by a report from the General Accounting Office listing numerous luxuries and frivolities in what the Pentagon had called an austere foreign military-aid program.

Such mistakes are perhaps inevitable and do not of themselves nullify benefits to the United States including the prevention of postwar economic collapse in a number of free nations, the obtaining of access to essential resources abroad, and the establishment of the worldwide network of United States military bases.

Moreover, the great bulk of military aid funds has been spent right in the United States to the benefit of United States industry and United States wage earners. Even the economic phase of the foreign aid program has indirectly contributed to United States exports by placing hard-to-get dollars in the international monetary pool.

Hence foreign aid is not entirely a charity handout.

Perhaps the need at the moment is a new approach to the whole question, one which will achieve the same objectives but on a sounder basis.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has advanced one new idea.

He proposes the establishment of an international development association, with a capital stock base of dollars and other hard currencies, but also using local soft currencies. The association, working with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, would make long-term loans at low interest rates.

MONRONEY explains in these terms his resolution introduced on February 24:

"It is an effort to facilitate economic development of young nations through international banking machinery instead of through United States loans and grants. It will help us to put to work the vast amount of local currencies we have received and will receive from sales of our agriculture surpluses abroad. By mixing these local currencies with hard currencies, we can make the dollar do the work of many dollars now being spent."

There may be flaws in the Monroney proposal, but at least it has the virtue of fresh originality.

To date, the Eisenhower administration has merely reemployed the techniques of its predecessor, including indulgence in name calling. "Ostrichlike" was the biting phrase used by Mr. Eisenhower to describe criticis when he spoke to the recent bipartisan foreign aid rally in Washington.

The President would be better advised to seek a new formula that would hold out to American taxpayers some hope that foreign aid would eventually become self-liquidating.

The alternative—permanent annual appropriations running into the billions—is both dismaying and depressing.

An Appreciation of Gonzalo Facio, of Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the able and dynamic editor of the Washington Daily News, John T. O'Rourke, is also president of the Inter-American Press Association. From that vantage point he has the perspective from which to view Latin America and especially their ambassadors from Latin America here in Washington.

On the editorial page of the News for Thursday, April 24, he wrote the following appreciation of our mutual friend, Gonzalo Facio, who left yesterday for Costa Rica and private life.

Under a previous consent I am inserting the text of Mr. O'Rourke's article:

YOU CAN'T KEEP A GOOD IDEA DOWN

(By John T. O'Rourke, editor, Washington Daily News)

Good ideas have a life of their own. Once uttered, a good idea seems to take on its own mysterious vitality, quite apart from that of the man who originally gave it voice.

So that, once a good idea gets into the general consciousness, you can kill it here, only to find it cropping up there, stronger than ever.

We are reminded of this as the personable young Ambassador from Costa Rica, Gonzalo J. Facio, leaves his post here for his homeland to resume his newspaper work. He departs next Sunday.

He has been in Washington only 2 years or so, but the future may show that in that brief time he started something that may contribute more to the peaceful well-being of the South American community of nations than has the work of many other better known diplomats who have spent their whole lives in equivalent posts.

Ambassador Facio began looking at the expenditures which many South American nations make for arms sold to them under the mutual defense agreements. The United States sells these arms at a fraction of the cost to United States taxpayers but, nevertheless, for underdeveloped economies, the burden is heavy. Indeed it is a real impediment, because it absorbs funds which could otherwise be used on all sorts of constructive things.

Since the mutual defense agreements were negotiated, vast changes have occurred in military technique. In an age of the intercontinental missile and hydrogen warheads, cannons and battle cruisers become just so much expensive curios, insofar as hemisphere defense is concerned.

Ambassador Facio says that if various arms have potential value, then keep them. But he makes the point that if they are obsolete and useless, the money spent for them would defend the hemisphere against communism and Communist ideology better, if it were spent on projects conductive to general social progress and prosperity.

Few would disagree with that. But after all, it was just talk, and it failed to disturb the hemisphere's hierarchies of generals, admirals, colonels, politicians, diplomats, and arms negotiators who have operated pretty much outside the public consciousness.

But then Ambassador Facio cheerfully startled everyone by proposing to the Council of the Organization of American States (to which he also has been ambassador) that it act under the terms of its charter which affirms the principles of collective security. He suggested that OAS use its good offices to have the whole hemisphere's military defense purchases reexamined. That tore it.

His startled fellow diplomats quickly torpedoed his idea, and sank it.

A certain other ambassador, who has been at OAS so long that his friends say he thinks he owns it, said that Senor Facio's proposal was a sinister maneuver by the United States to disarm South America. He knew better, of course; he simply did not care how low he stooped to conquer a good idea.

Well, the idea is still floating around and damn the torpedoes.

We predict that now that it is buzzing around the world, the idea never will be stuffed back into the Pandora's box where some diplomats like to hide disturbing notions.

Ambassador Facio's proposal has been printed, to our knowledge, in many publications in the United States, Mexico, Jamaica, and other countries.

Sooner or later, enough men of good purpose will agree that it is sound and should be acted on. Then a new agreement will be worked out in terms of present-day military actualities.

When that happens, hundreds of new projects from Tierra del Fuego to the Rio Grande will become financially possible and millions of citizens will benefit from them.

Perhaps most of those beneficiaries never will have heard of Senor Facio.

But many here in Washington will remember him, and will honor the practical idealism that guided him during his tour of duty as an ambassador to the OAS and to the United States.

Resources Available Through River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has been a leading advocate of multipurpose development of our great river systems.

In the May issue of the Progressive magazine, he has written an illuminating and informative article entitled "The Miracle of Rivers," which describes how a mighty stream can be put to work to improve navigation, reclaim agricultural land, generate vast quantities of waterpower, and prevent disastrous floods.

Senator NEUBERGER's article appropriately features a special issue of the Progressive devoted to the 25th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has done so much for the great area I help to represent in the Senate.

I am particularly gratified that the junior Senator from Oregon has called to our attention the enormous and awesome river projects presently under construction by the Soviet Union, along the mighty waterways of Siberia and European Russia—projects which dwarf even our own Grand Coulee Dam. Senator NEUBERGER has drawn upon the significant and alarming testimony presented to the Senate Interior Committee by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], following his extensive travels in the Soviet Union last fall when he saw being built the huge hydroelectric dams on the Angara and Volga Rivers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the May issue of the Progressive by Senator NEUBERGER be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIRACLE OF RIVERS

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)[1]

I

Men have been fascinated by the miracle of rivers ever since the early origins of the human race. Primitive tribes traveled on rivers in crude dugout canoes, and dragged fish from the swift rifles of these rivers. When mankind had advanced farther from the cave, rivers were used to turn wooden wheels which ground grist to flour. But fields of wheat in many realms of the world needed water for irrigation, before this grain could grow. So the massive strength of rivers was tapped to move still larger wooden wheels in order that water from these rivers could be deposited on furrows which required such life-giving succor.

In the sunrise of history, men of course knew nothing of the unseen giant of hydroelectricity, which lurked wherever a river foamed over a precipice or shot through slanting narrows. Even the later frontiersmen and pioneers in buckskin were unaware that in every waterfall hovered a source of fuel mightier and more enduring than any yet discovered. But, as boundaries were laid down, it became more difficult to put these rivers to full and untrammeled use. Boundaries, after all, are made by men. In this same category are such institutions as passports, customs duties, tariffs, and doctrines like States rights or national sovereignty. But rivers recognize none of these artificial or synthetic lines. Their destiny has been shaped by geography rather than by resolutions or treaties.

Snow falls perennially in the mountains and forms icefields and glaciers, which melt in the midday sun. Rivulets seep through the glacial moraine and merge. Where they merge, a creek takes form. Innumerable creeks find their way downhill, through chasms and ravines. They disappear over cliffs in rockets of spray, but take shape again in icy pools at the bottom. When the snowbanks are melting, the mountains trill and echo to the clamorous sound of falling water.

Like capillaries uniting to create a vein or artery, all the creeks and brooks from the highlands finally blend in some gorge of awesome depth and proportions. Eventually, the ramparts of the gorge soften into the timbered slopes of wide valleys. The river, released from its rocky prison, widens into a broad swath as it seeks the distant ocean.

This has nothing to do with State or national boundaries. Instead, it submits to sublime natural processes, by which dense forests permit precipitation from snow and rain to flow to the sea. Theodore Roosevelt, that militant 26th President who loved the outdoors, may have been the father of the TVA idea because he understood the phenomena of nature, where the birth of great rivers occurs. He said to Congress half a century ago, in 1908:

"Every stream should be used to its utmost. No stream can be so used unless such use is planned in advance. When such plans are made, we shall find that, instead of interfering, one use can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such."

This is the hard core of the TVA idea. It is as simple as that. It sprang from the mind of a progressive Republican President. Nearly three decades later, his distant cousin, a liberal Democrat named Franklin D. Roosevelt, put it into practical effect in the watershed of the Tennessee River. The link between the reign of these two Presidents was a mild, tenacious United States Senator with snow-white hair and a valiant soul who

[1] RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon, has specialized as a writer and legislator in the field of conservation and water-resource development. He serves on the two major Senate committees concentrating in these fields, the Interior and the Public Works Committees.

knew them both—George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

Water, of course, is virtually inexhaustible. Rivers replenish the ocean, and water from the ocean is sucked into the heavens and dropped as snow and rain on the mountain ranges, where rivers are cradled. This process was under way epochs before Neanderthal man. It will still continue, even if man manages to destroy himself with strontium 90 and hydrogen weapons. It is eternal.

I stood looking at Bonneville Dam with former Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman. "Dick," he said, "that is an oil well which will never run dry, a coal mine which will never thin out."

II

In every river that rushes downhill, the same water can be used to float boats, irrigate land, generate power, and provide habitat for fisheries. Within these categories, there are subdivisions. Boats can mean a family's aluminum canoe or a throbbing diesel tug hauling half a dozen barges loaded with petroleum or wheat. The reservoir behind a dam can provide swimming for many, and at the same time it can prevent disastrous floods from inundating great cities far below on the Coastal Plain. A river never sleeps.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt sat in the White House, his political enemies charged that he hoped to establish a TVA on the Danube. The suggestion is no longer a political canard. The Eisenhower administration, while indifferent to the TVA which Franklin Roosevelt developed on the Tennessee River, has talked frequently of advancing American funds for a TVA on the legendary River Nile, so that Egypt can become a land of industry and prosperous farms. Friends of that outpost of democracy in the Middle East, Israel, speak hopefully of a TVA on the Jordan River, where the Scriptures were written. Before China was taken over by the Communists, many Americans predicted that this ancient nation might be rehabilitated by a TVA on the Yangtze.

Yet the TVA idea is not exclusively for export. Despite the coolness of his regime to Federal power development generally, President Eisenhower quoted from Theodore Roosevelt's statement about each river system being a single unit when he signed the bill in 1955 authorizing a costly network of storage dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado. In the river basin of the greatest hydroelectric resources, that of the majestic Columbia, many bipartisan groups today are calling for a regional power corporation that would be extensively modeled after the TVA self-financing act, approved by the Senate last summer. A leading advocate of such an undertaking is Oregon's traditionally Republican newspaper, the Oregonian, which not long ago called attention to the fact that "as of June 30, 1957, Congress had appropriated approximately $1.8 billion for all (Federal) power projects in the Columbia River system. And as of that date, $226 million has been returned to the Treasury to apply on the principal, nearly $80 million ahead of schedule. Interest paid on the Government funds was $161 million. This does not take into consideration, of course, the tremendous cash benefits accruing to the Government through increased taxes paid by individuals and industries which depend on federally generated power."

Need there be any more conclusive evidence that Federal investment in great rivers is just about the safest, most solvent expenditure made by the United States Government?

Nature was generous in endowing America with rivers. They rib out the continent from sea to shining sea. Many of them await the kind of unified development symbolized by the TVA, the integrated program which Theodore Roosevelt had in mind when he spoke of treating as a whole each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast.

Five major watershed areas, scattered all the way across the Nation, are most susceptible to this kind of treatment. They are:

1. The Columbia, in the Pacific Northwest.
2. The Sacramento, Feather, and San Joaquin, in California.
3. The Colorado, in the Rocky Mountains.
4. The Missouri, on the Great Plains.
5. The St. Lawrence, in the Northeast.

Two of these magnificent waterways are involved in international negotiations. They are the Columbia and the St. Lawrence. I recently toured the St. Lawrence seaway, where a 27-foot navigation channel is being tooled from the Atlantic's waters to the Great Lakes. At Barnhart Island, some 2 million kilowatts will be a collateral benefit of this undertaking. Through authorization by Congress, the New York State Power Authority will tap some 1.8 million kilowatts by drawing off water above Niagara Falls under cover of darkness, when the scenic spectacle will not be jeopardized. The water then will be dropped into the Niagara Gorge through huge penstocks during the daylight hours, when low-cost energy is most neded to move the wheels of industry.

The St. Lawrence seaway is a joint undertaking of the United States and Canada. After years of delicate negotiations, the obstacle of the international border at least has been overcome. The cost of the St. Lawrence seaway is about $1 billion, with some $300 million invested in the navigation improvements and the rest in the colossal powerplants. Yet here, as in the TVA itself, revenues from the sale of hydroelectricity will eventually help to finance the entire undertaking, although tolls also will be collected from the freighters which ply between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and such great new inland "seaports" as Toronto, Chicago, and Milwaukee.

No such happy and beneficial use of the Columbia River on an international basis can be reported, although the same pair of countries share it. Yet upstream storage reservoirs on the main stem of the Columbia, in Canada, could add the equivalent of four extra Bonneville Dams to Federal generating capacity in the United States—to say nothing of far more kilowatts north of the border in British Columbia. These reservoirs have not been built because unified development is lacking.

While Franklin D. Roosevelt and his successor, Harry S. Truman, were in the White House, exactly 20 multipurpose projects were approved for the Columbia Basin. Five years ago this policy underwent an abrupt change. No multipurpose projects have been authorized for construction by the United States Government since 1953.

What is a multipurpose project? It is a project which symbolizes the Theodore Roosevelt concept that a river system surges from alpine meadows to the ocean as a unit. Thus, the same dam of concrete and steel can (1) store water to retard or prevent floods, (2) drown out rapids which impede navigation, (3) provide locks to get tows and freighters past the dam itself, (4) pump some of the stored water to irrigate arid land for agriculture, and (5) generate vast quantities of hydroelectricity which will produce enough revenue to amortize the cost of the whole undertaking—principal, plus interest.

Throughout the United States, this concept is urgently necessary today. On the silt-laden Colorado River, which men once described as "too thick to drink and too thin to plow," it is needed to provide water for thirsty Los Angeles and for potentially-fertile valleys in the distant uplands of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. In the vast Central Valley of California, it is needed to transfer water from the snow-cushioned mountains of the north to orchards and lettuce fields parched for lack of irrigation in the south. On the sluggish Missouri, it is needed to level off floods and to improve navigation far into eastern Montana.

Everywhere in these river valleys, men cry out for the beneficial use of water which is now going to waste or even wreaking harm. They seek unified development, although some shun the controversial initials TVA. But regardless of the initials or appellation applied, a dam by any name is a dam just the same. And now a new and compelling reason exists for harnessing the magnificent rivers by which America pours its tribute of snow and ice and rain to the eternal oceans. That reason is the sweeping program of unified development presently underway on the stupendous rivers of the Soviet Union—one of the dramatic stories of this century.

In examining that story we should first understand that our own Nation is not alone in possessing rivers of truly great magnitude. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, has pointed out the sobering geographical fact that of American rivers only the Columbia "begins to compare with the four major rivers in Siberia" in hydroelectric capacity. The St. Lawrence has quite a large hydro capacity, but aside from that, the other rivers do not have a very large amount," General Itschner said. The Columbia alone carries in its waters 40 percent of our Nation's total hydroelectric capacity.

In the famous interview with Khrushchev on the CBS Face the Nation television program, the top man of the U. S. S. R. said: "We declare war on the United States in peaceful production. * * * We will win over the United States."

Khrushchev knows that the four major rivers of Siberia—as well as the other great waterways of his country—could be heavy artillery in that rivalry. Energy reserves may shape the destiny of world conflict, because all industrial output rests ultimately on units of energy. Coal mines wear out, and miners decline to work underground. Oil wells eventually run dry; already it requires at least 20 times as much drilling in Texas to bring in a single barrel as it does in the Middle East. Uranium may be the fuel of the future, but how does mankind dispose of waste material which can inflict cancer of the bone on future generations? A single rampant barge of this sinister sludge terrorized shipping on our eastern seaboard.

But a river flows on forever.

In the last budget prepared by President Truman, the United States Government spent on all its Federal power undertakings—TVA, Columbia River projects, Bureau of Reclamation, Southwestern and the Southeastern Power Administrations—a total of $681 million. By the fiscal year of 1957, under the hostile spell of the Republican residency at the White House, this sum had dwindled to $316 million.

But while the United States Government was cutting in half Federal investment in the development of its rivers, Soviet Russia accelerated a program headed in the opposite direction. Details of this program were described to the Senate Interior Committee by three qualified men, while fellow members and I sat in fascination. The tale was told to us by General Itschner, who, as Chief of the Army Engineer Corps, is responsible for the bulk of our Federal river projects; by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, who visited Russia in 1957, and by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, who has toured the Soviet Union for each of the past 3 years and who, in 1957, had the opportunity of seeing remote areas in Siberia never before visited by an official of the United States Government.

After these presentations, I felt certain that no more profound mistake could be made by us than to neglect the wise use of

America's rivers. I felt equally sure that, if all the people of our land could have heard what was said by these three men, there never again would be a concerted voice raised in opposition to such undertakings as the TVA, Grand Coulee, and Bonneville Dams, the St. Lawrence seaway, the proposed high dam at Hells Canyon, or a river pact with Canada on the foaming reaches of the upper Columbia.

Declared General Itschner in summary: "The Soviet water resource is demonstrating to the world what can be done in this field by well-considered, long-range planning and a willingness to make sacrifices in present standards of living in order to achieve the goal of a great future industrial development. Indeed, the Soviets have given water-resource development a priority second only to the development of heavy industry designed to support military programs."

More than 40 river projects are under construction in Russia. Four of them will be the mightiest hydroelectric plants ever built. They are:

1. Krasnoyarsk Dam, Yenisei River, 4,004,000 kilowatts.

2. Bratsk Dam, Angara River, 3,340,000 kilowatts.

3. Stalingrad Dam, Volga River, 2,350,000 kilowatts.

4. Kuibyshev Dam, Volga-Samara Rivers, 2,100,000 kilowatts.

By way of contrast, the largest powerplant in America is Grand Coulee on the Columbia River—until now, Number One on earth—whose capacity is 1,944,000 kilowatts—less than any of the four Russian giants, and less than 50 per cent of that of the fabulous project rising across the Yenisei River in Siberia. And there would not even be a Grand Coulee in the United States today, if the Washington Water Power Co. had been as successful in its opposition a quarter of a century ago as the Idaho Power Co. has been in our own time, in seeking to block the great Hells Canyon project on the Snake River along the Oregon-Idaho boundary.

In hydroelectric development, according to General Itschner, "the Soviets already approach us in total installed capacity and have individual projects under construction that far exceed any American project in capacity."

For many years, American engineers predicted that Russia's brutal winters would make impossible any successful waterpower projects on rivers which freeze as hard as granite nearly five months of the year. "But," said General Itschner, "the Soviets have shown marked ingenuity in dealing with this handicap." A proposed 6 million-kilowatt dam will be across the Yenisei, in icy Siberia. Furthermore, General Itschner has estimated that at least 25,000 trained Soviet engineers are concentrating on the Russian water-development program. This compares with some 8,000 in General Itschner's own agency, and another 4,000 in the employ of the United States Bureau of Reclamation.

The Krasnoyarsk Dam on the Yenisei River will hoist ships 370 vertical feet, as compared with the 100 feet of the great McNary Dam lock on the Columbia River. Each of the generators at Krasnoyarsk will produce 286,000 kilowatts; this compares with 108,000 kilowatts for the biggest American generators, presently in operation at Grand Coulee. Today, the total known capacity of Soviet hydroelectric plants is 25,883,188 kilowatts, although this does not include 44 plants for which output has not been disclosed. In comparison, total American hydroelectric capacity at the end of 1957 was 27,676,000 kilowatts, with about 10 million more kilowatts under construction.

"Thus," continued General Itschner, "right now Soviet hydroelectric development appears to be roughly equal to ours in amount. However, their rate of increase is greater than ours. * * * The United States has no plants completed which will reach the 2-million-kilowatt mark, although John Day Dam on the Columbia River, on which construction will start this year, will ultimately have 2 million kilowatts if sufficient upstream storage is developed to make this amount of capacity economically justified."

Being a soldier subject to superior orders, General Itschner did not add that the Republican administration—plus its allies in Congress—had fought for 4 years to block construction of John Day by the Federal Government. Finally, the first John Day Dam appropriations were put through by Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democratic chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, over the antagonism of President Eisenhower's Bureau of the Budget. Nor did the general reveal that nearly 3 million acre-feet of water had been eliminated from the sufficient upstream storage which he mentioned by the decision of President Eisenhower's administration to substitute three small private-utility dams for the great Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

IV

Many Americans have a conception of Russia as a nation without technical skills. General Itschner does not share this notion. He told our committee: "A major feature of Soviet power development is the construction of a national transmission grid which will bring electricity, generated sometimes at remote hydro stations, to industrial centers of the U. S. S. R. The beginnings of this plan already have been accomplished * * *." General Itschner, under questioning, emphasized that "building this equipment required Soviet engineers to solve unprecedented electro-mechanical problems." The discussion then continued:

"Senator O'MAHONEY. If that is the case, General, I assume it is your opinion that the technical knowledge and efficiency of Soviet engineers should not be underestimated.

"General ITSCHNER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. They have shown a very great ability in designing lines of this type. You see, the alternating current type of transmission line is the only type that has been used in the United States for any distances. Now, we see here a direct-current type of transmission that reaches up to 800 kilovolts. A great deal more electricty can go over an 800-kilovolt direct-current line than would go over and 800-kilovolt alternating-current line.

"Senator KERR. Do you think we would know how to do the same thing in this country?

"General ITSCHNER. I am sure we can do it, sir, but we have not yet accomplished it."

It was a somber group of Senators who listened to this testimony. Had we voted on Hells Canyon, or TVA self-financing, or a similar program for the Columbia River in that sobering moment, I doubt that there would have been many dissenters.

I sat at the long green-felt conference table in the same solemn mood, as General Itschner and Senator ELLENDER continued their startling disclosures. First, the general told us how Soviet use of inland waterways was beginning to challenge the superiority of the United States. As commerce multiplied through the locks on the Volga and other great rivers, American dominance in this realm was narrowing. American ton-mileage on its waterways in 1956 amounted to 130 percent of 1950 and over 200 percent of 1928. But Russian ton-mileage on its river systems was 175 percent of 1950 and an unbelievable 820 percent of 1928. "Obviously," said General Itschner, "the Soviets are only beginning to learn to use their waterways in the modern sense with which we Americans are familiar." While the Chief of our Corps of Army Engineers was speaking, I wondered if any twinges of conscience pricked those political spokesmen for the private power companies who had tried so hard to discourage the construction of dams, which have increased by manifold the barge commerce on the Columbia River where it cuts through the Cascade Mountain range.

Through the long afternoon the comparisons continued—of 2,200-horsepower tugboats on Russian rivers, rivaling any such craft in the United States; of 6 million Russian agricultural acres brought under irrigation between 1951 and 1956, as compared with 5,500,000 acres in the United States; of a Soviet reclamation project in the south Ukraine which will pump water to 8,500,000 acres, as contrasted with the 1,200,000 acres of the Columbia Basin project, biggest in the United States; of even 300,000-kilowatt turbines planned in Russia for the future, thus eclipsing by nearly 3 times those spinning below the penstocks at Grand Coulee Dam.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, for many years a prominent advocate of reclamation projects, was especially interested when Senator ELLENDER described the model city being constructed for the workers who will erect the immense Stalingrad Dam on the Volga River.

"That is the way we do it in the West—build our cities first," said Senator WATKINS.

"We do not do it that thoroughly, though," replied Senator ELLENDER. "This is a permanent city. I saw huge apartment houses built along wide avenues, lined with trees; in connection with this city they have hospitals, schools of all kinds, kindergarten and secondary schools, even technical schools, wherein the workers who work on the dam and who will probably be workers later when electricity is used to produce manufactured goods, can go to school in order to prepare themselves for the coming event when Stalingrad Dam is completed. * * * They also have a large cultural center where children of the workers, as well as the workers themselves, who play music or who desire to take up drama in connection with their work, can come in and exhibit their talents."

In one shattering burst, the Soviet Union has moved from peasantry to the industrial age. It exceeds us in area, in population, and in discipline. Does it exceed us in the capacity to sacrifice, so that a way of life—either of tyranny or freedom—may continue and endure? This may be the dominant question of our time.

The Theodore Roosevelt-TVA idea of unified and full river development has been an influence in Russian technological gains—in transportation as well as in industrial production. It is ironic that the Soviet Union has turned to its great rivers for strength just at a time when the American Government is in the hands of the first administration in over 2 decades which has been fundamentally inhospitable to the whole idea of Federal multipurpose river projects.

If this policy persists, we shall have only ourselves to blame for wasting much of the sustenance and sinews of America. Rivers rushing downhill may be the muscles of a continent. Shall they be dissipated and made the object of waste? When I stand on the banks of a stream in my own home region, I think of the incredible folly of those who would abandon such a resource. If Russia taps the Yenisei while we fritter away the Snake, who is at fault except ourselves?

Our destiny in power energy lies in waterfalls and that is why the warnings of such pilgrims as Senator ELLENDER and General Itschner must be heeded. The TVA idea of unified stream development, from Teddy Roosevelt's "headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast," was never more urgently needed in America than today.

And so the Selway flows to the Lochsa, the Lochsa to the Middle Fork to the Clearwater, the Clearwater to the Snake River, the Snake

at last to the Columbia, and the Columbia on to the sea.

A river flows on forever.

Committee for Student Awareness at the University of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, students in every State are increasingly concerned about our Nation's nuclear weapons policies. The following is a letter I received from the committee for student awareness at the University of Oregon, Eugene, and an editorial from the Oregon Emerald by William Cook:

COMMITTEE FOR STUDENT AWARENESS,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., April 22, 1958.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Our society is faced with a compelling problem. This problem broadly speaking involves nuclear attitudes, disarmament, and questioning. Perhaps this all sounds vague, but as we progress, we hope to make clear to you how we feel.

A few short days ago a play called E=MC² was presented by the University of Oregon Theater. Its theme was a future era in which all nations had possession of intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads operated by pushbuttons. At the underground headquarters of SAC in San Francisco an earthquake is mistaken for an enemy attack. Retaliation comes before clarification, and a final chapter of catastrophe is written in the book of man. The last line of the play disturbingly reechoed, "What are you going to do about it?"

Before we could complacently shrug our shoulders and say, "Oh, nothing," or deny the whole presentation as ridiculous, we were forced to ask some tough questions. In the following paragraphs we would like to present these questions:

First. Does the American public have adequate information regarding the harm done humankind by raised levels of radioactivity resulting from nuclear tests?

Second. Is the public aware of what an all-out attack on the United States with thermonuclear weapons would do?

Third. What has the role of the Atomic Energy Commission been in making information public and what should it be?

We suspect the executive branch of the Government of deliberately withholding information and fostering misinformation. The instrument of this action has been the Atomic Energy Commission. Fortunately, much of the information regarding the effects of radiation on human life does not lend itself to secrecy. If a person wants to dig deep enough he can find a vast number of unresolved problems. Scientists, well qualified in the field, state that the permissible level of radioactivity is as much a moral as scientific problem. The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, a monthly magazine, presents fairly objective, informed evaluations of problems of this nature.

This information has not reached the general public. What the public has received are statements that the positive good from atomic tests outweighs the risks involved. At best this is a nonpublic opinion in lieu of information from which the public should make a decision. Instead of this they receive apologies from Teller and Latter that we open the door to aggression by renouncing atomic weapons. This is not the issue, but it is used to overpower a petition by 9,000 other scientists recently presented to the United Nations. Perhaps it is desirable to develop clean explosives, but we must remember they are precisely the type that will not be used in an all-out war.

The issue of bomb testing involves political as well as moral questions. What of a future when all nations have atomic weapons? Will any peace be safer than the precarious power structure preceding the last two modern wars? Will we not regret our failure to work out collective security and atomic control even if the endeavor only includes non-Communist areas?

For the public decision, which must resolve moral, political, and security questions, adequate and accessible public information is imperative. When the press has access only to what government feels expedient to release, decision can easily be removed from the people. We feel the AEC informational endeavor proposes not to inform the public opinion but to form it in accordance with a preconceived mold. The AEC must not be allowed to gravitate into a Goebbels propaganda ministry.

Any information you could give this committee would be appreciated. We thought it important for you to know how we, as the silent generation, feel about this situation. In the Oregon Daily Emerald, the campus daily student publication, debate on the editorial page by both student letters and members of the Emerald staff has centered around this and related issues. We are enclosing an editorial by William Cook pertaining to this problem.

We remain respectfully yours,
Committee for Student Awareness,
Page B. Mahler, Robert William Adler, Yasumase Kurode, Jim Maxson, Karen J. Horton, Elizabeth Jallie, Julie Pingle, Mary Minor, Diane Day, Douglas W. Fuller, Paul J. Clark, Helen Knight, Ralph G. Swenston, Charles Land, Gary Sala, George M. Boyet.

P. S.—Your visit here to the University of Oregon was an inspiration to all of us interested in this controversy.

[From the Oregon Daily Emerald]

TEMPORARY TEST SUSPENSION WOULD ENHANCE UNITED STATES POSITION

(By William Cook)

For the past several days the letters column of the Emerald has been filled with a pro-and-con discussion of whether the United States should continue testing nuclear weapons. In any discussion of nuclear weapons and their testing, some unknowns and unanswered questions must be acknowledged.

First. Is the level of radioactivity deposited in the atmosphere by nuclear-weapons testing actually harmful to living cells, particularly those of humans? Is the average 2-percent rise in radiation which we're getting from nuclear fallout actually harmful? And are deposits of the long half-lived radioactive element strontium 90 building up in our bones to a dangerous or potentially dangerous level?

The Atomic Energy Commission says the radioactive fallout from testing is not dangerous; Linus Pauling and his petitioners—working from the same data—say it is; we, who ultimately hold the decision, don't know whom to believe.

Second. Do the Russians, perhaps overburdened with the cost of the present arms race, want to call a breather by suspending their tests in the hope that other nations will do the same?

Or is their suspension announcement a "red herring" to divert world notice from the fact that their recently completed test series was reportedly the "dirtiest ever" in terms of nuclear fallout?

We don't know if the Soviet Union, which wants a summit conference badly, really wants to make genuine concessions—provided they are reciprocated—or if they are simply making a propaganda play.

Third. What is the position of the United States in the world today? Do we command respect among the nations of the world with our policies or are we branded as a nation which really doesn't want peace badly enough to give even an inch to try to achieve it? Are we so convinced—officially at least—of the rightness of our position that we are blinded to alternative solutions or to changes in strategy?

Fourth. How do we regard the so-called tide of neutralism which is reportedly sweeping through our NATO allies in Europe? Are our European allies willing to try for a peace at almost any price or are the neutralists merely a highly vocal minority?

Here are some observations we can make:

We know the whole Communist Bloc is committed to a doctrine of eventual world domination. This should always be acknowledged when dealing with the Soviet Union, but we also shouldn't let this doctrine stand in the way of attempting to achieve short-range goals—such as controls on testing which could lead to more peaceful coexistence.

We have learned from hard experience that the only way to deal effectively with the Soviet Union is from a posture of strength—and this implies the strength of world opinion, diplomatic skill and economic power as well as military strength.

If we have a posture of strength we can then give concessions and exact them in return. Without such strength we are crippled—especially around a conference table.

We already possess a strong military force oriented around the use of nuclear weapons. We possess enough nuclear weapons to destroy the Soviet Union several times over.

The military problem of nuclear weapons is principally concerned with the devices to deliver them—missiles and long-range bombers, for example. We are behind the Soviet Union in developing missiles; we are ahead of the Russians in the development of nuclear weapons.

It now appears that nearly all nuclear explosions can be detected around the world. The "tiny" bomb which was exploded inside the Nevada mountain was detected as far away as Alaska. The larger bombs can be detected easily with seismographs and upper air samples.

The United States has called for an end to the arms race, controls on nuclear weapons production and testing and controls on the use of outer space. And the United States has suffered at least three major propaganda setbacks since the sputniks.

From these data and arguments several tenable positions can be logically taken. One in particular can be suggested which would involve a minimum of risk and a maximum of possible gain.

We could suspend our nuclear testing—at least until after what looks like the inevitable summit conference later this year. This concession would cost us little in a military sense, for the tests are only to try clean, humanitarian bombs (i. e., ones which produce less fallout than present bombs).

We would stand to gain a favorable climate of world opinion for the present uncertain one.

Since the Russian test suspension is contingent upon other nations also suspending their testing, they would be in a position at

a summit conference to say they halted their tests but that no other nation would. For a summit conference would come after our nuclear tests, which start next month.

At the summit conference we could find out if the Soviet Union is really willing to make some first steps toward the disarmament which we eventually want. If the Soviet suspension announcement is a bluff, we would call it and at least be able to tell the world of it and score a propaganda victory. And then, if we wanted, we could return to testing nuclear weapons.

But if the Soviet Union is really willing to suspend nuclear testing, then we must not ignore what could be a first step toward ending the present arms race.

A Strong National Guard and Federal Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of appearing before the Department of Defense subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and presenting my views on the question of a strong National Guard and Federal Reserve. This is a copy of my statement to this subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure for me to appear here today representing the Armed Services Committee, by duly authorized resolution, to urge you to increase the budgetary request of the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1959, to insure a maintenance of the authorized strength of the Army National Guard at 400,000 and the Army Reserve at 300,000.

I have the privilege to serve as chairman of the Reserve Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. We held extensive hearings on the proposed reduction in strength of these two Reserve components. We heard from representatives of the Army (including the Secretary), National Guard Association, Adjutant Generals Association, Reserve Officers Association, the American Legion, individual guard division commanders and Reserve commanders, four governors (including the chairman of the Governors' Conference) and Members of Congress. Speaking of the appearance of the governors, I might add at this time that the committee was informed that 36 governors have strongly urged that the Congress maintain the Army Guard and the Army Reserve at their present strength. At the conclusion of the hearings my subcommittee unanimously adopted a resolution supporting an Army Guard strength of 400,000 and an Army Reserve strength of 300,000. This resolution was unanimously approved by the full committee by a vote of 34 to 0.

Mr. Chairman, last year the guard and the Army almost came to blows on the 6 months training program. A year ago in February my subcommittee held extensive hearings to determine whether an Army order should be promulgated which required all new enlistees in the National Guard to take 6 months active duty for training. At the same time we reviewed the strength of the guard and asked the Army to project its thinking on the guard's future strength. The subcommittee came to a decision, which was approved by the full committee, to the effect that new enlistees in the guard should be required to have 6 months of active duty for training and that the size of the guard should be pegged at 400,000 or at such figure as might be set by appropriations granted by the Congress. This figure of 400,000 was not one we snatched out of the air. Quite on the contrary, it was a figure agreed to by the Army and supported by the testimony of our best military advisors. To conclude the agreement we asked the Army and the National Guard to enter into a memorandum of understanding, which they did, and we thought we had put the matter of the future strength of the National Guard to rest.

Imagine our surprise, then, when the President proposed his budget to Congress for fiscal year 1959 and we discovered that he was asking for a 10 percent reduction in the strength of both the Army Reserve and the National Guard. The Army Reserve would be reduced from 300,000 to 270,000. The Army National Guard, which was forced to reduce from 437,000 to 400,000 last year, would again be reduced to 360,000 in fiscal year 1959.

I would like someone to explain to me what has happened in the international situation which justifies our decreasing our military Reserve strength. I was under the impression that the Russians had not agreed to disarmament. But if the Congress and this outstanding committee goes along with these budgetary proposals we will be starting disarmament on our own. Furthermore, the size of the Regular Army is being reduced—to which I am unalterably opposed—and in my 21 years in the Congress I have been told over and over again by our military advisers that to insure the national defense the Reserve must be increased when the size of the Regular force is decreased. Apparently this elementary principal of preparedness has now been forgotten.

Now it appears clear that budgetary considerations have taken over and are overriding considerations of national security. As a consequence in order to save dollars we decrease the size of our active establishment and the Reserve components as well.

I believe the main fault in this plan must be laid at the doorstep of the Department of Defense because the Secretary of the Army, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower, Personnel and Reserves), and the Chief of Staff, United States Army, all recommended a National Guard strength of 400,000 and an Army Reserve strength of 300,000—in other words, no reduction in their current strength.

However, I do not absolve the Army from fault in this proposed cut. Last year the Army entered into an agreement with the National Guard and the Armed Services Committee that the guard would be kept at a strength of 400,000 providing appropriations were provided by Congress. But, I do not believe that the Army made strong enough representations to the Department of Defense when the budget was under consideration before its submission to Congress. It is my feeling, after listening to all of the testimony, that they recommended no reduction in the guard and the Army Reserve, but did little more than recommend. We know the preparation of the budget is a give-and-take matter and it would appear that the Army gave in and took it on the chin with little or no struggle.

But be that as it may, what more can I say to this committee than that the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, an outstanding soldier, states that in his considered military judgment the size of the Army National Guard should be maintained at 400,000 and the Army Reserve at 300,000.

I should briefly discuss one other matter before closing. In previous years the language of appropriations bills have set the strength of the Army Reserve exclusive of 6-month trainees and the strength of the Army National Guard inclusive of 6-month trainees. The Department has expressed a desire for the language to be the same. In order that there be uniformity between the two may I suggest that both be inclusive of 6-month trainees when describing the strength of the Army Guard and Army Reserve.

I wish to thank you for your kind attention and I earnestly hope that this committee will see fit to maintain a strong virile Army Guard and Reserve so our Active Army can be adequately augmented in case of war or national emergency.

The International Development Association—New Idea in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial and an article dealing with the subject of the International Development Association. The editorial is from the Northern Virginia Sun and the article is from the Cleveland Press.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun of March 27, 1958]

MR. DULLES IS MISSING A GOOD BET—NEW IDEA IN FOREIGN POLICY

New ideas are among the world's most precious commodities. Especially are they hard to come by, it seems, in the field of foreign policy. Therefore it is refreshing when a major new foreign policy idea is introduced, and disappointing to see the Eisenhower administration greet it coolly.

The new idea has been put forward by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma. Senator MONRONEY proposes the establishment of an International Development Association (IDA) as a supplement to the World Bank. That bank is limited to making loans in the scarce "hard" (or easily convertible) currencies, such as dollar, or German marks or Swiss francs, and must be repaid in hard currencies. This puts a severe limitation on the kinds of loans it can accept as bankable.

Senator MONRONEY'S supplementary bank would greatly expand the range of multination loans that can be made by making use of "soft" currencies where those will suffice. The capital of the IDA would be made up of a combination of hard currencies and soft currencies—many of the soft currency contributions coming from frozen assets which are now lying idle. An example of this is the currencies accruing to the United States from its disposal of surplus farm commodities abroad.

Acting in combination, the World Bank and the IDA could underwrite loans which the World Bank alone cannot now do. For example, a solution of the India-Pakistan disputes might be achieved by a $400 million development of the Indus Rivers that run through both countries. Such a project is not presently bankable by the World Bank; but if the World Bank were to finance those parts of the project that demanded the use of hard currencies (such as German earth-moving machinery), the IDA could underwrite the remainder that merely required

soft currency funds (the labor and many of the locally furnished materials).

The potential of the Monroney idea is evidenced from the opinion of World Bank President Eugene Black that had the Monroney plan been in existence, the World Bank could have expanded its lending activities by 50 to 60 percent.

There are many attractive aspects to the Monroney plan from a strictly selfish United States point of view. For one thing, it could reduce the number of dollars the United States is presently putting into foreign-aid loans. The administration is currently asking Congress to provide an additional $625 million in loan funds; Senator MONRONEY proposes an initial United States contribution to the IDA of less than half of this.

For another, the multi-nation character of the loans would take the United States out of the position of a rich uncle making loans or outright grants to poor relatives, and would permit a great many nations to participate on a self-help, self-respecting basis. Moreover, it permits them to plan long-range projects, which they are unable to do when dependent on year-to-year congressional whims.

The Monroney plan has attracted significant support. Not only is it looked on with favor by Mr. Black, but it has received the warm support of the first foreign-aid administrator, Paul Hoffman.

Yet the Eisenhower administration is eyeing the plan without enthusiasm. Treasury Secretary Anderson was publicly cool to the idea in testimony before a Senate committee. Secretary of State Dulles appears to prefer making loans on a strictly unilateral basis, even though this will probably cost the United States more and might well be a less effective way of winning friends and influencing people.

Senator MONRONEY, in presenting his plan, to the Senate, had the grace to acknowledge that former Democratic foreign policies, while valid in their time, had become outmoded by onrushing events. "If we insist on retreading badly worn Democratic tires, good in their day but now worn down to the fabric," he said, "our foreign-aid program will be broken down while the world passes us by."

Secretary Dulles might well take these words to heart. We hope he will relax his rigid adherence to present policies, and show a greater willingness to accept new ideas.

[From the Cleveland Press of March 14, 1958]

MANY KINDS OF FOREIGN AID, AND TOO MUCH HEAT GENERATED

(By John W. Love)

"Treason," a reader shouts as he returns to me an article in which I suspected businessmen would soon be taking greater interest in our foreign aid program now before Congress. He has no use for it.

His bitter word may have referred to foreign aid in general or to certain items that went sour. Mistakes there will be in a program so huge.

If it's treason to support these forms of assistance, then O. K., as Pat Henry said in the House of Burgesses, make the most of it.

One of the appeals which foreign assistance has for American businessmen and industrial workers lies in the market it provides for our products and engineering talent.

Some of the dollars lent or granted abroad may take a long time getting back to this country, they may be used as foreign bank reserves in place of gold, but even when they are not visibly spent here they promote the international trade so needed for prosperity. The greatest compliment our foreign aid has received has come from the Russians—they have been taking up the same thing.

The recent loan of $225 million to India has been generating some heat. This is partly because of the way the word of the negotiations came out. Washington dispatches first called it foreign aid, then indicated the Export-Import Bank was handling it.

Early this month the Eximbank announced it was extending a credit of $150 million to India and the Development Loan Fund $75 million, both for 15 years at 5¼ percent interest.

Between the two loans, the money will be spent in this country for equipment for power development, coal and ore mining, roads, communications and industrial expansion. Orders will be placed, it is expected, for textile machinery, electrical and chemical equipment, machine tools, and tools for fabricating heavy structurals.

(How soon the goods can be shipped will depend on the import licenses the purchasers can get them from the Indian government, and it's far from certain when they will be available. The Indians will be woefully short of foreign exchange next summer—may appeal to us or the International Monetary Fund.)

Most opponents of foreign aid, some of them much too shrill, have in mind the work of the International Cooperation Administration, an arm of the State Department.

The quite separate Eximbank makes loans that private banks are not prepared to handle. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), in which the United States has a 40 percent interest, lends similarly.

The big expansion of the Tata steel works at Jamshedpur, India, is being financed by the privately-owned Tata company itself and money from the World Bank and New York and Montreal banks. This job is being handled by the Henry J. Kaiser engineering division. The Arthur G. McKee Co. of Cleveland has a blast furnace subcontract.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY has in mind forming a new international lending agency, one that would pick up sections from more than one Washington agency. It would have foreign participation in the capital. He figures it would be easier to sell to Congress than a United States foreign aid program centered in the State Department.

Facts Versus Allegations in the Plywood Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which was handed to me by Mr. Thomas D. Blake last Friday:

STATEMENT BY THOMAS D. BLAKE

My name is Thomas D. Blake and I live at 4664 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, D. C. I am a public relations consultant, and I have been retained by the law firm of Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C. Sharp & Bogan are attorneys for the Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., World Trade Center, Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif. The Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., is opposed to certain bills introduced into the Congress which would impose an import quota on hardwood plywood. In connection with my work on this matter, I am registered with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate under the Lobbying Act.

On Thursday, April 24, 1958, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date (vol. 104, No. 63, p. 6408), the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, Representative of the Seventh District of Wisconsin, commented on a speech which had just been made by the Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER on the plywood problem in the Pacific Northwest. In the course of his statement, Mr. Laird said, "I would, however, like to state that I have 12 hardwood plywood plants located in my congressional district. The largest hardwood plywood plant in the world is going to be shut down on Friday. It is going to be shut down primarily because of competition from Japan." Later in his remarks, referring to Mr. PORTER'S speech, Mr. LAIRD said, "I am sure that the gentleman [Mr. PORTER] would not want to face up to the 1,000 employees of the Roddis Plywood Corp. and make the same kind of a speech before them that he has made here today in behalf of Japanese imports of plywood and Japanese plywood workers."

On Friday, April 25, when I received my copy of the April 24 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, above referred to, I called the Roddis Plywood Corp. telephone number listed in the New York City telephone directory. I talked with Mr. Hueman, who identified himself as the manager of the Roddis Plywood Corp. warehouse in New York. When I read him Mr. LAIRD'S statement that the Roddis plant was to close today, Friday, April 25, Mr. Hueman expressed great surprise, and said that he hoped that it wasn't true, as he had many customers whose orders he was waiting to fill from the output of that plant. He said that he had no knowledge of any closing of the plant, and when I asked him how I could get information on such a closing he suggested that I call the main office of the Roddis Plywood Corp., in Marshfield, Wis., and speak to either Mr. Don Gott or Mr. J. Wallenstrom.

I immediately put a call through to the Roddis plant and was put through to Mr. Gott (Marshfield 1900). When I read Mr. Gott Mr. LAIRD'S statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Gott said that the plant was not shut down, but that it had shut down on Friday a week ago (April 18). He said that the full reason for the shutting down of the plant was contained in the press release which was issued prior to the closing of the plant. He repeated that the plant was open today, April 25, and had been open since Monday, April 21.

I then telephoned Mr. E. W. Heller (Marshfield 1000), editor of the Marshfield News Herald, and asked him if he had carried a story on the closing of the plant. Mr. Heller said tha he had, and at my request he dictated the story as it appeared in his paper on Thursday, April 17. Mr. Heller's dictation was taken down by Miss Kathryn Beaty, secretary to Mr. James R. Sharp, of Sharp & Bogan. The story, as dictated by Mr. Heller, reads as follows:

"The approximately 950 employees of the Roddis Plywood Corp. plant here will begin a long weekend at the conclusion of the second shift tonight. They will return to work as usual Monday.

"A. C. Baudek, plant manager, in announcing the 1-day layoff this afternoon, said that it was 'an adjustment due to a very temporary situation which was caused by poor spring weather generally. Many of our customers have asked us to hold up shipment for a few weeks on orders which have been scheduled for delivery.'

"As to possible similar brief work interruptions in the future, Baudek said, 'We will have to play it by ear as we get instructions from the field, but we are not pessimistic.'

"Generally bad weather in much of the Nation has delayed the start of building operations which use the Roddis products 'Or-

ders,' the plant manager said, 'have held fairly good and are continuing to come in, and it's principally a problem of scheduling deliveries.'

"He added that most of the local products are made to architect's specifications and can't be manufactured too far in advance of delivery."

Mr. Heller said that they had run an overall story on Monday, April 21, on general business conditions in the Marshfield area, and included in the general story was the following sentence on the Roddis plant, which he dictated to Miss Beaty.

"At the Roddis plant, orders continued to come in at a good rate over the weekend, and there are no plans for another Friday holiday."

Catholic Welfare Conference Offers Thoughtful Statement on Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent statement by the Ohio Catholic Welfare Conference on right-to-work laws:

On previous occasions attention has been called to the necessary distinction which must be made between the wisdom of enacting a law and the moral right to do so. Laws at times have been morally valid in themselves but inept and mischievous in their results. Right-to-work laws seem to fall into this category where a distinction is necessary.

Man has a right and duty to work for his livelihood. This right cannot be circumscribed to the extent that a man loses his liberty of choice of a vocation, nor to the extent that he is deprived of an opportunity to support himself and his family. It does not follow that a man has the unconditional right to work in any and every industry or business at will.

For reasons of social justice it may be desirable, and often advantageous to the common good, that man's right be restricted by certain specified conditions. One of these imposed conditions may require that he belong to a labor union or at least be obliged to join the union subsequently, so as to share responsibility with his fellow workmen in support of the union.

Just as a citizen of the United States is free to live in Ohio, Kentucky, or Pennsylvania, yet is obliged to observe the laws of the particular State as a condition of citizenship, so also, in respect to his right to work; he is free to work in any industry of his choice, but only on condition that he abides by the rules adopted by that particular industry as a condition of employment. In other words, the right to work is a general right and cannot be denied to men in the aggregate; but the right to work in a specific industrial plant or business can be subject to special conditions.

If State statutes were to make such a condition of union maintenance mandatory, we would oppose them as unwise, if not unjust. If State statutes, however, were to forbid the enforcement of such a condition, when mutually accepted by management and labor through collective bargaining, then we would be equally opposed. We believe it is unwise to encourage State intervention in this matter, whether it be in favor of right-to-work laws or against them.

There are certain abuses which sometimes creep into the labor movement, but we are convinced that right-to-work laws are not the proper means to correct them. Corruption of certain labor leaders has been one of these current abuses. The denial of the democratic processes and the denial thereby of responsibility to the rank and file of union membership, whether in election to office or in the determination of union policy, are prolific causes of these abuses.

The right to strike, for instance, cannot be denied under certain definite conditions; but it is a right which must be carefully circumscribed and limited by ethical or moral considerations. It cannot be exercised willfully, that is, without just and adequate cause, and even then only in matters of grave importance, with a favorable issue reasonably secure, and, lastly but most importantly, after all other peaceful means have failed.

The right to picket is a concomitant right if a justified strike is called, but violence against persons and property is absolutely wrong and indefensible in conscience. Even the right of mass picketing is a very questionable procedure because of the physical intimidation involved and the proximate danger of overt acts of violence ensuing.

There have been other issues which cause public concern, such as jurisdictional disputes where innocent third parties are made the victims. There are questions also of secondary boycott which involve serious moral questions. All of these should be solved by an increased sense of social responsibility on the part of labor; and, if that procedure fails to correct the evils, then recourse would be had to regulatory legislation.

If we have pointed out certain abuses in the labor movement, we do so not because we think their leaders alone are at fault. There have been serious abuses also on the part of management, such as unreasonable and unjust opposition to the right of union organization, monopoly prices and profits, misrepresentation of products, and bribery and corruption not infrequently. Two wrongs, however, do not make a right; and the two evils do not cancel each other but intensify the damage done to the common good.

Much progress has been made in creating mutually satisfactory conditions in recent years in our labor-management relations. It would be socially undesirable to jeopardize the gains achieved by precipitating new causes of strife and ill will.

We think it is high time to introduce sound ethical standards into all phases of our economy. The present preoccupation with right-to-work laws may be a good occasion for all our leaders in the field of labor and in the field of management to examine their consciences as to their honest motivation, their ideals, and their practices.

As to the present issue before the electorate in Ohio, we are convinced that a right-to-work amendment would not solve our problems, but might lead to a more intensified struggle for domination and thus postpone an era of peaceful cooperation.

Most Rev. KARL J. ALTER,
Archbishop of Cincinnati.
Most Rev. EDWARD F. HOBAN,
Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland.
Most Rev. EMMET M. WALSH,
Bishop of Youngstown.
Most Rev. GEORGE J. REHRING,
Bishop of Toledo.
Most Rev. JOHN K. MUSSIO,
Bishop of Steubenville.
Most Rev. CLARENCE G. ISSENMANN,
Bishop of Columbus.

Reasons for Going to Eniwetok

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it may be that a first-term Congressman from southwestern Oregon cannot do much to change the administration's nuclear weapons policies, but I intend to keep trying.

Tomorrow morning at 7 o'clock, e. s. t., I board a plane here in Washington as a member of a group of official observers to fly to the Eniwetok atoll in the Gilbert Islands of the South Pacific. The trip each way takes 2½ days. I intend to stay 3 or 4 days, then return whether or not a bomb has been exploded.

Why am I going? I am not on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and I am certainly no expert in nuclear physics or tactics. Here are my reasons:

REASONS FOR THE ENIWETOK TRIP

First. I want to learn first-hand about these nuclear weapons tests and the men in charge of them, and present for discussion to these men certain convictions of mine.

Second. Even though I have been and am sharply critical of its policies and methods including its insistence on holding these tests, the Atomic Energy Commission wants me to go.

Third. My able friend and respected colleague, the gentleman from California, CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Radiation Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and an experienced nuclear test observer, assures me that I will learn much of great value to me as a legislator in the atomic age.

Fourth. I believe mankind today teeters on the bring of doom thanks to the nuclear weapons inventions and I believe that, as a United States Representative, I have both the duty and the opportunity to do whatever I can, however little, to help us survive as a free Nation is a free world.

A CHANCE TO TALK TO THE EXPERTS

As I have an opportunity on the way to and at Eniwetok to talk with experts in nuclear weapons, I intend to see how these firmly held convictions of mine stand up:

A. We do not need any more or better nuclear warheads for national security because we have more than enough now to deter intentional attack.

B. Why go to a lot of trouble to develop a "clean" bomb when we have no assurance the Soviets would use such a weapon in war and the concept of a "limited" atomic war is a delusion based on wishful thinking.

C. The 20-megaton bomb, for example, fits easily into our supersonic bombers and has an explosive power equal to all the explosions in World War II; so why be concerned about a smaller bomb, especially when we have maximum deterrence now?

D. Peacetime uses for atomic explosions, the final reason for the tests after development of "clean" and smaller bombs, should be done underground to avoid fallout and should be carried out under international supervision.

E. Fallout from these tests, however small and innocent, and there is a real dispute among scientists about this, is both a trespass on other countries and an assault on all people, under Anglo-Saxon common-law doctrines. We have no right to infringe on another's person and property even a little bit.

ACCIDENTAL WAR IS PROBABLE

F. The real danger today is from an accidental or unauthorized nuclear explosion triggering the all-out war. Thousands of nuclear warheads exist, most ready for instant detonation and all in the hands of frail, error-prone human beings such as you and I. It would be extremely difficult, in these tense times, to distinguish between an authorized and an unauthorized nuclear explosion and to determine the nature of the other nation's alert following such an explosion—whether it was defensive or offensive.

G. Stopping the tests is only a first step toward effective disarmament and real peace. The mutual inspection procedures should be expanded as soon as possible to include conversion of nuclear warheads to peaceful uses and to the cutback of nuclear weapons production. Hard to do? Yes, but a lot easier than rebuilding the world after a massive exchange of nuclear warheads. Trust the Soviets? Of course not, but recognice their self-interest in survival.

THE EXPERTS ARE CONCERNED TOO

My companions and hosts on this trip will be military men and scientists. They have had much to do with our nuclear weapons policies, too much in my opinion. However, like me and like you, they are sincerely concerned with their country's welfare in a tense and troubled world.

Like me and like you, these men would like to have more assurance that their children will have a chance to grow up and to look upon nuclear energy as a shining promise for a better life for all instead of a black threat of universal destruction and death.

Good Luck, Max Rabb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the April 26, 1958, edition of the Washington Post captioned "Good Luck, Max Rabb." I know this expression of thanks and best wishes is concurred in by my many colleagues who have had the opportunity to work with Max Rabb during the past 5 years. As the first secretary of the Cabinet, his contributions to Government were significant and are still appreciated by his many friends. So to Max Rabb I say: "Well done." You leave behind many friends who will miss you but who find consolation in knowing that the legal profession has regained what we have lost.

The editorial follows:

GOOD LUCK, MAX RABB

Of all the members of the White House staff, Maxwell M. Rabb has been one of the most affable and most effective. As the first secretary of the Cabinet, Max Rabb has tried hard to transform that body from a pro forma and quasi-moribund institution into a more meaningful forum for discussion of domestic policy. He has had a particular interest and concern in the problems of minority groups, and he has contributed notably to some of the good work of the Eisenhower administration in this field. A liberal Republican by disposition, he has been receptive to ideas; and he has helped to dispel the bromides about the palace guard by humanizing the rather austere inner circle of the administration. Whether in his official duties, or in gossiping at parties, or in gaping at Gina Lollobrigida, Max Rabb has been a pleasant and energetic addition in Washington. As he leaves to take up private law practice in New York, his many friends will wish him and his attractive wife well.

The Missouri School of Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the April 20, 1958, Los Angeles Times, entitled "The Missouri School of Journalism":

THE MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

Journalism is something like motherhood: It is neither a trade nor a very formal profession, yet it requires great skill and understanding from its superior practitioners, and these are hard things to teach. Consequently journalism schools, with a few honorable exceptions, are vacuous places, manipulated by teachers with little newspaper experience, much flam and no flair, who stand in the same relation to their students as the spinster social worker to the troubled bride.

Today we wish to salute one of the honorable exceptions, the University of Missouri School of Journalism, which has just weathered its first 50 years. Even disenchanted old editors show a gleam of interest when a Missouri alumnus comes along and some newspapers operate a sort of futurity stakes, picking their entries before they graduate.

The school is making quite a thing of the anniversary—a 10-month celebration beginning in August with a noble theme: "A Stronger Free Press for a Better Free World." President Elmer Ellis of the university and Dean Earl P. English of the school of journalism said in their joint announcement:

"We believe that today the free world is confronted with the most serious threat to its existence since the dawn of western civilization, and that—more than ever before in history—the preservation of this free world depends on the ability of its citizens to exchange information and opinions openly without fear of retribution.

"We believe that the primary responsibility for keeping these avenues of expression open lies not with the Government or with any other agency or group, but with the journalism profession itself. • • •

"We believe that the immense contributions of the communications field are too often 'taken for granted' in democratic societies and that there is a need to emphasize these contributions through a series of events which can earn worldwide attention."

The United States has some pretty poor newspapers along with the great ones and good ones, but the lot of them averages out as the best of the free presses of the world. The Missouri School of Journalism has surely done as much as any single instrumentality of education to help the American press, and if it can, during its golden jubilee, teach a larger part of the public to believe what President Ellis and Dean English believe, it will do more for newspapering—and the free world—than it, or any other school, has ever done before. The enterprise has promise, for the Missouri school has the prestige to make itself heard.

Better Than Food Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the need for a national food stamp plan becomes more urgent each day as a result of the continuing recession. Public assistance rolls in the various States are rising month-by-month and in States where the temporarily unemployed are not eligible for public assistance, the private charities are being overtaxed in trying to help the needy.

But as I have tried to make clear many times in the past 4 years, in urging adoption of a food-stamp plan, even in the very best of times we have probably 6 million Americans going without proper nourishing diets. The number today is, of course, much, much higher.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of so much hunger—and it is really hunger in many, many instances—it is tragic that we cannot use our abundance of food—our huge surpluses—in a much more advantageous manner.

Along those lines, Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented editorially on April 22 on the need for a better plan of surplus food distribution. The editorial, Better Thand Food Lines, follows:

BETTER THAN FOOD LINES

St. Louis this week started the distribution of free cheese, flour, corn meal, rice, and dried milk to those on the public-assistance rolls or otherwise eligible to receive these Federal surplus commodities. The items hardly represent a balanced diet. They are nevertheless a godsend to the hungry, and the city government deserves credit for making them available.

Standing in a food line, however, is one of the most searing aspects of involuntary unemployment. The handout would not be so grim had Washington adopted the food-stamp plan advocated for 4 years by Rep-

resentative LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis. After being certified by a suitable agency, these same people would receive by mail stamps to be traded in for surplus commodities, preferably at a grocery.

As a matter of fact, food-stamp legislation adopted two decades ago is still on the books. It could be used by Secretary of Agriculture Benson without waiting for a new law. More varieties of food could be made available. Under existing law, Benson receives 30 percent of all customs receipts for the purchase of perishables—meat, fruit, vegetables, etc.—when surpluses threaten to depress farm prices. And he is authorized to carry over $300 million of these receipts from year to year. But Secretary Benson annually has allowed a considerable part of this money to revert to the Treasury.

These have been prosperous years, on the whole. Still, about 6 million persons in the United States have not been getting the right kinds of food, nor enough of it for decent nourishment. Thus the food-stamp plan is justifiable, on a small scale, even in good times. Surely it should be put into operation during a recession in preference to the dumping of a few storable commodities.

Extracts From Letters on Cystic Fibrosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, when a Minnesotan gets mad over something, he gets fighting mad. During recent weeks, I have spoken to the House on several occasions on the subject of cystic fibrosis, and have urged the Congress to declare war on the treacherous child-killing disease. Within the past month I have received well over a thousand letters on CF from my own State of Minnesota and from nearly every State in the Union. All these letters say the same thing: "We need more research in the field of cystic fibrosis, now."

There is some CF research being carried on at the National Institutes of Health and at various hospital centers throughout the world, but compared with research done on certain other diseases, not very much. I have asked the Surgeon General of the United States to call a conference of the Nation's researchers in this field to find out just exactly where we are and what we have got to do to get going. I have not heard from the Surgeon General yet but I feel that something will be forthcoming shortly in the form of accelerated interest in cystic fibrosis at the National Institutes.

Many Members of Congress have called me to tell me they are behind my efforts to get the country alert to this disease which strikes about 7,000 boys and girls each year and which is today nearly 100 percent fatal before these children reach adulthood. The disease is hereditary and doctors have told me that about 1 out of 20 Americans carry the lethal recessive genes responsible for cystic fibrosis.

I wish that I could insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the hundreds of letters I have received and which are so eloquent, so thoughtful, so gentle, so urgent in tone, coming from parents and friends of CF victims. These letter say more than I could possibly say on this matter, in far fewer words. So that you may see some of the things these people have been writing, I wish to insert extracts from just a few of their letters:

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS ON CYSTIC FIBROSIS

From Pat Krueger, route 10, South St. Paul, Minn.: "We need help so badly in our fight against cystic fibrosis. We know what cystic fibrosis is, as do our relatives and close neighbors, but the people down the street have never heard of it and we need help from everyone if we are to win the battle."

From Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Gilmer, 1509 North Lyndale, Minneapolis, Minn.: "We have a 'guest' in the house, cystic fibrosis; our 2½-year-old boy is very sick with it. This is not our first child with this dread disease. We have had twin girls who died within the month after their birth. I was married before and lost a 7½-year-old boy in 1946 so I have lived with it for almost 20 years and my husband for half of that time. There is such a thing as geeting used to it, I suppose. Neither one of us refers to what we know is inevitable, we take each day as it comes and enjoy him as much as we are able to without tiring him."

From Mr. and Mrs. Otto Brusewitz, 4623 South Ahmedi Avenue, St. Francis, Wis.: "We are particularly interested in progress of research on this disease because we have lost 2 children (3 and 5 years) with the disease, and we have 2 children 8 years and a 6-months-old baby, who also have the disease."

From Mary Thevenot, 4221 Panola, Fort Worth, Tex.: "I wish your fellow Members of Congress could have been with me this past week. I sat in a hospital with a mother waiting for her baby to die. The doctor could offer little help because he did not know how to combat the disease. This is not the fault of the doctor. It is the fault of all of us for not getting behind this, and doing something."

From Mrs. Gine Grice, 115 East 14th Street, Littlefield, Tex.: "My own little 16-months-old daughter is among the thousands of other children with almost no hope of living beyond their 6th year. The public must be informed of this disease. These children are a tremendous financial burden. Our medical expenses for 1958 totaled $1,672.88. I'm not asking for financial aid for my family. I'm just trying to show how impossible it is for most of us to contribute to a research program. We need financial aid for this purpose and we need it now."

From George R. Sexton, 22 Westminster Street, Westerly, R. I.: "It is heartwarming to us parents to hear that our civic leaders are aware of the plight of our children. Both of my children have cystic fibrosis. So few people know of this dread disease and to us parents so little is actually being done to help these children. * * * Our oldest, Diane, has been given only to the age of 6. She is now 4; we dread each birthday. The boy's life span is just about as uncertain unless medical science can come up with something to help them."

From Dr. and Mrs. John W. Corcoran, 19377 Telbir Avenue, Rocky River, Ohio: "It is a horrible feeling and situation to know that your child will die regardless of the help and aid you are giving it. We know that a cure will some day be found and we live with that continuous hope in our hearts."

From Mrs. Marie Dingledine, 5 Magnolia Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.: "You see, I have buried three babies with this disease, ages 2 years, 9 months, 5 months. There were times when I thought no one knew or cared very much what they had; so little was known about this condition."

From Mrs. Bertha Holte, 5961 56th Avenue, Maspeth, N. Y.: "It is of utmost importance to inform you about the cystic fibrosis campaign for research. We'll specify that these children are soldiers both physically and mentally and most emphatically brave. To see, to hear, and know these seriously ill children is so pathetic. First, because of the long and severe suffering they endure. Second, the manner in which they strive so hard to get well. Third, their own mental gift of understanding to cooperate toward the help that the doctors and nurses from all over the country give to them. The long drawn out treatments, tests, sleepless nights. We, adults, can and will honor these children for their fortitude of their own words to their parents. These children after a certain age of reasoning openly and knowingly know they will die. Their very actions and sympathetic thoughts they acknowledge a devoted love and closeness to their loved ones. It hurts them to see their parents weep. We have lost our son at the age of 10 years and can't forget his words 'Not to cry or to be sad as it's this terrible sickness.' From a religious viewpoint these children are saints—innocently they endure great suffering. It's indescribable to see their little bodies waste before our very eyes. It is so impressed on our memories. We need help to help comfort these most unfortunate little humans."

From Mrs. Charles Ellett, 747 Second Avenue, North Troy, N. Y.: "As I have a twin brother who has 3 out of 4 children (all boys) with this dread disease."

From Mr. and Mrs. James U. Paul, Box 469, Epps, La.: "Our oldest son died in 1952 at the age of 5½ years from this disease. Through the years 1948, 1949, and 1950 we went to numerous physicians who diagnosed Rocky Mountain fever, food intolerance, asthma, chronic bronchopneumonia, etc., finally at Children's Hospital in Denver, Colo., they diagnosed 'fibrosistic disease of the pancreas.' * * * We have two other sons, ages 5 and 8 years. Our son, age 5, has CF also."

From Mrs. Margurite Neiden, 1255 Leo Street, Mobile, Ala.: "It seems everyone has problems but if in any way you can help us, especially our little boy, or help get a fund started to find a cure before it is too late for the children now living, we would appreciate it. I know just saying, 'appreciate it' doesn't sound like much, but if you only knew how heavy our hearts are for someone you love so much, and never know if he will be here tomorrow, how horrible that feeling is."

From Mrs. L. S. Anderson, 949 Learidge Road, Lyndhurst, Ohio: "In the 2 years since our foundation was organized, over 200 cases have become known to us and 50 percent of these cases have since expired, plus an unknown amount of cases which were incorrectly diagnosed but are now being brought to light."

From Mr. and Mrs. H. Gartner, 8 Temple Road, Parlin, N. J.: "As parents of a year-old boy with this disease, we know how cruel it is. We had 2 normal children first and we had never heard of it before. Now I am pregnant again and wonder how we will stand the mental and financial strain of another suffering from this same disease. We spend so much on drugs, vitamins and special diet for our afflicted son there is nothing left for our normal children. * * * His Easter basket was filled with Lederplex, Tri-Vi-Sol, Probana, Pancreatin."

From Mr. R. R. Walker, Lubbock, Tex: "I am glad that something has caused a representative of the people to bring before the whole body of the people's representatives a matter which has brought so much sorrow to the mothers of this country; so many heartaches. * * * I am a grandfather who

has shed many a tear when one of my grandchildren has been taken, not just 1, but perhaps 3. I am told that this disease takes more babies than polio; who knows how many babies have been taken when they know so little about the disease; therefore, I tearfully ask you to do all possible to bring before the representatives of the people this matter and plead for help of helpless babies and heartbroken mothers and fathers."

From Mrs. Harry J. Newman, 12207 East 19th, Spokane, Wash.: "We have just recently moved to Washington State from Iowa. There has been considerable unemployment here recently and last week a young man knocked on our door one evening selling earrings he made out of buttons. He explained he was unemployed at present, his last job having been as a logger. I mentioned this incident as he was trying to provide for his family * * * a wife and two little girls, both of them victims of cystic fibrosis, whose lives they could only hope to prolong. They had already had one little boy die from the disease—all this suffering in 6 years of marriage. We certainly understood his plight in caring for his family."

From Mrs. Frank Weber, 1825 Forbes Street, Cincinnati, Ohio: "I have a little girl, Karen, 17 months old, who is a victim of this dread disease. It a terrible thing to look at your child each day and wonder when this disease will smother her small life."

From Mr. and Mrs. John Como, 2529 Amst Avenue, apartment 15, New York, N. Y.: "I am writing this letter to tell you that I have a little girl who is 6 years old. Her name is Nancy Como. She is a victim of cystic fibrosis, and I have been to 61 doctors and gone in and out of different hospitals. My daughter has been sick for 4 years. She cries and coughs all day and night. She is 30 pounds for 4 years. I try to do all I can but I, and my husband, are very tired. I know what the other parents are going through. There are many sleepless nights with cystic fibrosic children. Always tired, don't care to play with other children. It is a very, very hard life. So I would appreciate if there could be some fast action on this terrible disease. I see it is a sure killer of children. How long could the body of a child take this coughing? I hope you will look into this matter and try to get fast action. I am a very unhappy mother. I have to really plead with you because I am so unhappy as I said before. Please. Please. Try to get action fast for the help and hope of these poor unfortunate children. I'm sorry for the fast letter as I really like to say more but I haven't time. My daughter is coughing and I must attend to her. That's how bad it is that I have to give her all of my attention. It is a good thing I only have one child. Sorry to say I would like to have more but would not have anymore children brought on this earth to suffer with a terrible disease as cystic fibrosis. Please help.

From Mrs. Mary Flannery 561 Valley Road, Clark, N. J.:

"We have a 9-year-old boy who was diagnosed at the age of 2, cystic fibrosis, and since that time we have been living from day to day, not knowing and not daring to look any further into the future. The cost of the antibiotics, vitamins, and necessary pancreatin powders for digestion, not to mention the aerosol pollution and machine, which are needed for daily survival, has always been constant and of a great expense, but for the 2 years, with a considerable increase of lung damage. Our cost has exceeded our income so greatly that it has now become tremendous, and we find ourselves slowly sinking, until we don't know where it will end. We give our all to our children, especially when they are ill, and if it would help, I would give my son my heart, my life, but since that is not possible, we must do our next best which is to give our last penny to keep him alive."

From Mr. and Mrs. John A. McMillan, 101 Lauten Court, Mobile, Ala.: "We know the joy of a healthy 6-year-old daughter and also the agony and pain that our 3-year-old Terry Elaine has suffered since she was 4 weeks old. On a postal clerk's salary many times we didn't think we could buy another bottle of life-saving antibotics for our baby, and could not if it had not been for outside help. Our story is one of thousands who need help."

From Mrs. G. Harkness, 10349 South Charles Street, Chicago, Ill.: "I lost my dear little grandson to cystic fibrosis a year and a half ago. His age, 3 years and 3 months. Still a baby and he didn't have a chance to live. No one realizes the agony of the parents watching their little one from day to day, knowing there is no hope. A broken hearted grandma."

From Mr. Delbert Magee, 413 Baltimore, Latonia, Ky.: "I am Delbert Magee and we live in Latonia, Ky. We have a little girl, and 3 weeks ago we found out that she has cystic fibrosis. Since there is little known about cystic fibrosis and there isn't any cure for this disease, we feel that the Government should help support the research foundation for a cure on this disease. Time is running out for 7,000 children a year and we cannot sit back and do nothing about this. Only through expensive research, our Government support, people, and prayers can our cystic fibrosis children be cured. We are hoping that you will take action on this."

From Mrs. Henry I. Bernbaum, 2583 Ashurst Road, University Heights, Ohio: "As the mother of a child with cystic fibrosis I wish to thank you personally for bringing the matter of cystic fibrosis before the House on March 20. Our child is still with us and we know that his future rests in the hands of God and medical research. This is a baffling disease to medical men and only through medical research can there be a cure or even a hope. Meanwhile, until an answer is found, the value of educating the public to the existence of this disease and its needs is of the utmost importance. Thank you for all you are doing."

From Mrs. M. J. C. McMinn, 6013 Brook Lea, Houston, Tex.: "It's been 3 years since the death of my last little boy (age 6) and I still lie awake nights remembering his frantic efforts to breathe. It is an experience a mother can't blot out very soon but it doesn't cause me to be bitter. It's just that it keeps me constantly aware of the 7,000 or more each year who are still having to face this same thing."

From Robert W. Keeves, Box 412, Roby, Tex.: "In reference to your work, I am writing this letter. I have a friend who is a 6-year-old girl. She has this disease. I hope that you can find a cure for it because I would hate to see her have this disease for the rest of her life. I have not seen this girl in about 3 years. I hope that if I ever do see her again she will be cured of this disease. You may use this letter as a reference for your work and also my name. I hope you find success in this endeavor."

Banning Hunger Without Fanfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial page of the Washington Post is always stimulating, and I find it particularly so on those days when Malvina Lindsay's column appears in the top right-hand corner next to the Herblock cartoon.

Whether she is writing about educational problems, foreign policy, suburbia, civic activities, family needs, or any other subject, she brings to her column a warmth and sensitivity which make her always worth reading.

Consequently, I was delighted and flattered to find her column last Thursday devoted to a discussion of a problem in which I am vitally concerned—the problem of assuring better diets for millions of needy Americans through an intelligent use of a food-stamp plan for distributing surplus foods.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD, Malvina Lindsay's Washington Post column of Thursday, April 24, Banning Hunger Without Fanfare, as follows:

BANNING HUNGER WITHOUT FANFARE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

Returned American tourists, while praising foreign scenery and culture, frequently deplore the beggars. Often they are shocked in various places abroad by the widespread, unashamed pursuit of alms.

The obviously hungry in this country are generally out of sight. So are the greater number of undernourished. And thanks largely to an abundant continent, there exists here a strong tradition against openly seeking charity.

Now, because of increased unemployment, the number of hungry and undernourished is increasing. New problems are resented by those who are jobless and without income, yet ineligible for public relief because of legal technicalities.

How can more of she Nation's food surpluses in the bulging warehouses and on the farms be made available to the needy in a way most efficient, least conspicuous, least pauperizing?

By food stamps, redeemable at grocery stores or elsewhere, say the authors of about a dozen bills before the Consumers' Study Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

But the present method of distribution from warehouse depots is upheld by some Department of Agriculture officials who say it is the most direct answer to needs, and that a food stamp plan would be too involved and costly. The Department says that if Congress wants a food stamp plan it must give specific legislative directive for it.

Those opposing the present plan call it haphazard, wasteful, unfeeling, and a promotion of the breadline. They say that those most needing the food, as the aged, the disabled, parents of small children, must usually lug long distances, by public transportation, bulky sacks of flour, corn meal, dried milk, from warehouse depots in the center or outskirts of cities. Furthermore, say food stamps exponents, such families must parade their want at public places.

Seldom, if ever, is there seen in this country an emaciated, starving human being of the type encountered in more crowded, poorer countries. But there are many undernourished here, an "irreducible minimum," it is estimated, of 6 million who cannot buy an adequate minimum diet. In times of recession this number is augmented.

Yet, the basic price-support commodities, which pile up under support programs, do not lend themselves to rounding out the diet needs of such people. One of the food stamp bills, that of Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, seeks to meet that prob-

lem by extending food stamps to surplus perishables of farmers.

In recent testimony before the Consumers' Study Subcommittee, Mrs. SULLIVAN pointed out there was now on the statute books a provision for Government purchase of perishables (fruit, meat, vegetables) when surpluses get to the point of depressing farm income. She urged that unused money for this be spent in the next 12 months by buying such perishables for use in the school lunch program and to help the needy. A national food stamp program, she pointed out, would provide a readymade market for such perishables, also prevent lopsided diets.

Mrs. SULLIVAN, who has been promoting a food stamp plan for 4 years, said she was presenting as simple and flexible a plan as possible in her new bill. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture decide each month what foods are in surplus and what quantities are available for distribution, then issue appropriate stamps for these items to go to the "provably needy," and to be redeemed at groceries or other agencies. Such stamps, she said, could come regularly in the mails, along with public assistance checks, or be otherwise quietly distributed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and others who testified for a better distribution of American food surpluses emphasized that hunger existed among many American children—not of a spectacular nature, perhaps, but in such a form as to deplete their energy, make them ineffective in school work, and handicap their future usefulness to society.

In channeling excess plenty to the hungry and undernourished the method is important. For if done irregularly and without regard to diet needs, the Nation's future resources of health will not be preserved. If done on a handout basis, the American heritage of pride may be weakened.

A Tribute to the Memory of Paul A. Dever, Former Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the church was crowded during the funeral mass that was celebrated by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston.

Over 1,000 people blocked the street outside, thinking of their late friend and benefactor, and waiting for a last look at the casket embracing the mortal remains of Paul A. Dever, former Governor of Massachusetts.

Inside St. Peter's Church, the archbishop's eulogy communicated his own personal feelings as he said:

At Boston Latin School, at college, and in all the stages of his remarkable career, Paul Dever distinguished himself for the untiring energy with which he worked to make the most of every gift of nature and grace that God gave him. * * * Thus was he able to turn to advantage the difficulties which would have daunted a lesser man. * * * All these hurdles he cleared with great grace because of his capacity for work, work with a purpose and a prayer.

Quietly, the mourners shuffled from the church.

And the funeral cortege glided away.

Even as his life had ebbed in his sleep, outward bound, at the age of 55.

The personality and the achievements of Paul Dever have left a lasting impression on Massachusetts and her people.

In tribute to his memory, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial dated April 18, 1958, from La Gazetta Del Massachusetts:

PAUL A. DEVER

Those who knew former Gov. Paul A. Dever most intimately will not remember him for his limitless talent and capacity as a leader of men, not for his achievements in his meritorious career in public service, not for his devotion to the upholding of the ideals and principles of his political faith, but as an unostentatious man whose generous heart led him to help those in need.

The beneficiaries of the charity of Paul A. Dever will miss him almost as much as will his sisters and brothers. They looked upon him as one who was always close to them and to whom they could turn in time of need with positive assurance that their needs would be met.

This was the Paul Dever that the people did not know. He would not allow them to know him. It is probable that he derived as much personal satisfaction from his ability to help the ill and the needy than he gained from any of his too numerous to mention contributions to the betterment of the welfare of the people of Massachusetts.

Paul Dever was a generous man. He, too, was a kind man. He deserves to be remembered as a giver because he was constantly giving of his material possessions to those who relied upon him as a benefactor.

He made a remarkable record as the Governor of Massachusetts. His interest in the unfortunate and the ill was proven by his insistence upon spending public funds for hospitals and for the betterment of the care of those destined to spend long years in hospitals of Massachusetts.

Hungary and the Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of a statement dated April 18, 1958, released by the American Friends of the Captive Nations and entitled "Hungary and the Summit Conference":

HUNGARY AND THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

The current Soviet drive for a new summit conference is part of its campaign to divide and disarm the West by holding out the promise of peaceful coexistence, a campaign which has been pursued ever since the death of Stalin. Stalin's aggressions in Greece, Berlin, and Korea caused the free nations to unite and rearm. Khrushchev's new policy of smiles was designed to make these sacrifices appear unnecessary.

The Hungarian revolution unmasked Khrushchev's smiles. It revealed the unanimous hatred of an entire people for their Communist oppressors and demonstrated once and for all the empty hypocrisy of Soviet promises.

With their life's blood the Hungarian Freedom Fighters bought the West precious time to mend its defenses. How have we used it?

The beep-beep of two Soviet sputniks has drowned out the cries of Hungary's dying. War-weary people, longing for peace but unwilling to pay its high cost, are listening to the honeyed phrases of Khrushchev calling for a summit conference.

It is 16 months since the U. N. General Assembly documented Soviet aggression in Hungary and called upon the U. S. S. R. to withdraw its armies and permit the holding of free elections. But even the puppet Kadar regime, not to speak of the Soviet Union, flouts the U. N. resolutions with impunity and insults the U. N.'s official representative, Prince Wan Waithayakon, former President of the General Assembly, who is not even permitted to enter Hungary. Instead, Khrushchev celebrates his murder of Hungarian freedom in a triumphant visit to Budapest.

It is only 16 months ago that the world vowed never to forget Hungary. Denis de Rougemont, president of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, wrote:

"Henceforth, to shake the hand of a western Communist who freely approves of his party is to salute an accomplice in the crime of Budapest. To publish his writings is to aid the type of intellectual propaganda which led to the crime of Budapest. To reason with him is to forget that he must of necessity justify the massacres of Budapest. To continue cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union under the false banner of the thaw which has just shown its true colors in Budapest is to walk into a trap. To receive and fete troupes of pretty artists and subservient intellectuals sent to us by the Moscow regime and at the same time to forget the voice of the martyred writers who appealed from Budapest, is to betray their testament.

"Let each one search his heart and determine what action he intends to take in his personal or public sphere of influence, against those who applaud the crime, or will look for an excuse."

Yet today the mayor of Philadelphia suggests that Khrushchev be invited to address both Houses of Congress and visit the leading cities of America to promote good will. Official Soviet cultural and commercial missions, complete with secret service agents, are being received in all the countries of the West, western sport teams exchange visits with the captive athletes of the Kadar regime, and appear in Budapest as guests of that regime, while the Hungarian athletes who chose freedom at the Olympic games in Melbourne are forgotten refugees, scattered throughout the world.

While U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold was being wined and dined in Moscow last month, a Russian soldier, an MVD man, a technician or a member of the secret police stood guard over every 100 Hungarians.

While Premier Khrushchev flaunted his victory over the graves of the freedom fighters, there were still between 80,000 and 100,000 Russian soldiers in Hungary. Their presence is the measure of Khrushchev's fear of the Hungarian people, for the memory of what they did is a living threat of what they or others may do again. That is why he went to Budapest. That is why he wants a summit meeting which will ignore Hungary.

This must not happen.

President Eisenhower has clearly stated that the plight of Hungary and the other countries of Eastern Europe must be discussed at any summit conference, together with the problem of German reunification. We applaud his stand. Yet Khrushchev remains adamant, and popular pressure abroad for a summit meeting on any terms has

become so great that the President and Mr. Dulles may be forced to retreat unless the American people speak out. A summit conference where Hungary is not even discussed would be the supreme triumph of tyranny, the final degradation of the West. It would mean that the West, which did nothing to save Hungary, is now afraid even to speak of it. It would tell the world that Hungary was not only betrayed, it is forgotten.

It is not too late. The millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are, even today, our stanchest allies. They may forgive our failure to help them at the risk of war, but they could never forgive our failure to make their release a main objective in any negotiations with the Soviets. Above all, they could not forgive any settlement which would strengthen the chains that bind them by confirming the status quo. If we fail them now we will not only weaken their passive resistance and relieve Khrushchev of his greatest fear, but we will forfeit our moral prestige throughout the civilized world.

The miracle of the Hungarian revolution and the official recognition of Soviet aggression in Hungary by the U. N. makes the inclusion of Hungary on the agenda of any summit conference a test case for all the captive nations of Eastern Europe. It is the test of Soviet peaceful intentions, the test of the West's ability to stand firm and survive. Since the unification of Germany was already on the agenda at the last summit meeting, where a preliminary agreement to promote German unification through free elections was made and broken by the Soviets, to abandon that subject would also constitute a disastrous western retreat.

Therefore, the withdrawal of Soviet troops and the holding of free elections in Hungary and in East Germany should be preconditions for any agreement between East and West.

Only thus can we keep faith with those who died in Hungary that freedom behind the Iron Curtain might be reborn.

Plywood Imports Don't Help American Plywood Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, plywood prices in the Pacific Northwest during the past week have dropped to $64 per 1,000 square feet, one of the lowest prices in years. Prices on most commodities have been going up. Contrary to this trend plywood prices have been declining.

If the decline continues or even holds, more plant close-downs are predicted and that means more unemployment in plywood-producing areas.

An Associated Press dispatch of last week from Portland, Oreg., says:

PLYWOOD SLUMPS, CUTBACK FEARED

PORTLAND.—A cutback in plywood production was feared Friday, following a $4 slump in prices.

That pushed key grade of sanded, quarter-inch plywood back to its mid-winter low of $64 a thousand square feet.

It was at the $64 level that nearly 30 Pacific Northwest mills laid off workers last winter. Some even closed until prices moved upward again.

Several industry spokesmen said sharp cutbacks can be expected if the market continues to drag.

Douglas fir lumber meanwhile continued its upward trend of recent days. Market sources said some lumber items were sold as far ahead as mid-June.

One reason for the slump is overproduction. Why does Congress continue to permit more than 50 million square feet of plywood a month to be imported when the American market is not absorbing all the plywood now produced domestically.

In Praise of Lester Holtzman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in praise of my colleague, LESTER HOLTZMAN:

LESTER HOLTZMAN is a most exemplary member of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman. No longer a novice in the House, he has won his spurs and is a man to be reckoned with. Affable, easy to approach, he is a redoubtable opponent. Anyone who seeks to worst him had better watch his step. His weapons are sharpness of wit, keenness of mind, speedy action. Although young in years, he is old in political acumen and parliamentary skill.

His approach to problems is along commonsense and logical lines. He never hesitates when he knows that his course is right. He is indeed a man of impeccable character. It has been said that you cannot dream yourself into a good character. You must hammer and forge yourself into one. This is exactly what LESTER has done. LESTER is a good man at all times and is a loyal friend—through thick or thin, in victory or defeat, in prosperity or adversity. He is respected by his colleagues and loved by his associates.

He expresses an avid interest in public affairs. The present economic depression has caused him considerable anxiety and stress of mind. He wrote a forthright letter to the New York Times recently wherein he suggested to the President the need to assemble the country's best brains, savants, publicists, and pundits to evolve a plan to solve our present economic perplexities. It was a compelling suggestion, couched in cogent phrases. I hope the President takes heed and follows LESTER'S suggestion. On the day that the New York Times published the letter, that valued paper published an editorial, approving, in part, the idea of such a conclave. Thus, LESTER indirectly won approval of his idea from the editorial staff of the New York Times.

This is but symptomatic of LESTER'S work in the House of Representatives. Often, during debates in our Committee on the Judiciary, when doubt and uncertainty descend upon the members, LESTER, in his quiet and unassuming way, presents a solution that dashes away doubt and difficulty. He clears the atmosphere with a simple, logical observation. Many of us are startled and say to ourselves, "Why did we not think of that?" Thus, LESTER renders incalculably valuable services in the House. I am proud of his friendship.

The good people of his district, in their wisdom, must return him to Congress. They would do disservice to themselves to do otherwise.

Labor Supports Mack's Stand for Quota Limits on Japanese Plywood Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to receive today a letter from the Western Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers, signed by its executive secretary, Earl Hartley, of Portland, which completely supports my position on the Japanese plywood imports issue.

This union council, which has tens of thousands of workers among the forest-products workers of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, takes two positions that I repeatedly have taken on the floor of the House. It says that plywood workers and the plywood industry are being injured by the Japanese imports and also that relief from these injuries can be obtained by placing quota limits or tariffs on plywood imports or by using both quotas and tariffs to slow down these imports. I have a pending bill in the House that does that.

"If they—the Congress—want to subsidize Japan, why don't they—the Congress—do it with cash. Why take the jobs away from the poor old plywood workers?" Secretary Hartley says in his letter to me.

The western council last week sent all its district councils a circular stating clearly and forcefully its position that quotas, tariffs, or both, are needed on Japanese plywood imports to protect American plywood workers.

One statement in this latter from the Western Council of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers says:

We do not ask that the Japanese be cut entirely out of our plywood market. We do advocate a quota that would reduce Japanese imports to a reasonable and fair volume, or the application of sufficient tariff to effect a realistic price comparison with the United States standards. Either is desirable, but unless something is done to place some restrictions, we can expect these imports to continue to increase in the future with a result of further impact on employment and production in our own plywood industry.

This is exactly the position I have been taking in debates on the House floor on the issue of plywood imports.

Mr. Hartley's letter to me in behalf of the Western Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers and a copy of the council's circular to all its councils follow:

WESTERN COUNCIL LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS, UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg., April 23, 1958.

The Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: Recently, as you know, there has been considerable controversy over the subject of Japanese plywood imports to the United States.

We thought you would be interested in having a copy of the letter that we are, this week, sending to all of our district councils. We briefly review the position of the western council and its affiliated district councils and local unions as established by previous convention actions.

We sincerely hope that you will give this matter your sincere consideration.

Yours very truly,

EARL HARTLEY,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—RUSSELL, if they want to subsidize the Japs why don't they do it with cash? Why take the jobs away from the poor old plywood worker. We shouldn't bear the brunt of this subsidy alone.

WESTERN COUNCIL LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg., April 21, 1958.

Re: Japanese plywood imports.
To All District Councils.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: With reference to the importation of Japanese plywood, it should be noted that the position taken by the Western Council in support of proposals to restrict these imports is in conformity and consistent with the unanimous action of the delegates at the 1955 convention of the Western Council, wherein they approved resolution No. 3, tariff and plywood imports, and this policy was reaffirmed at the 1957 convention by the unanimous approval of resolution No. 6, Japanese plywood. The first resolution opposed the low tariff and the latter resolution proposed the establishment of an adequate quota. Either of these approaches, or a combination of both, could achieve the objective of restricting Japanese plywood importation. Therefore, the Western Council has, as instructed by convention action, supported proposals that have dealt with both the tariff and quota as a means of placing some restrictions on these imports.

On March 11, 1955, a representative of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America appeared before the Senate Finance Committee hearing on H. R. 1 and presented testimony showing the need for tariff relief on these foreign imports. This testimony pointed out the rapid increase in plywood production in Japan which had been accomplished largely with American aid dollars, machinery, and techniques, and their exports to the United States.

For example, in 1953 Japan sold to the United States some 106 million square feet of plywood. This represents an increase of 511 percent over the 1952 figures. With a wage scale of about 11 cents per hour in Japan, it should be easy to understand how the Japanese manufacturers can export to the United States at a price considerably lower than the actual production costs of American mills. To show a comparison of price and costs, we quote as follows from a brief of the Hardwood-Plywood Institute to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on September 16, 1957:

	F. o. b. dock, San Francisco, Calif., duty-paid price of plywood from Japan	United States manufacturers' production cost
Lauan ¼-inch by 4 by 8 feet rotary cut	$76	$128.46
Lauan ¼-inch by 4 by 8 feet	100	141.85
Lauan ¾-inch by 4 by 8 feet	280	300.60
Sen (ash) ¼-inch by 4 by 8 feet	125	230.10

These figures would clearly indicate that imported Japanese plywood can be purchased f. o. b. dock, United States of America, for considerably less than the United States manufacturer's production cost. The testimony before the Senate Finance Committee hearings on H. R. 1 referred to above showed a tremendous increase in Japanese plywood imported in 1953 over 1952. These imports have continued to increase in subsequent years.

In 1951 when these imports first began to reach this country in volume, the imports were 13 million square feet. In 1956 the imports were 527 million square feet or an increase of 3,945 percent. The first half of 1957 imports from Japan amounted to 339 million square feet an estimated total of 675 million square feet for 1957, or an increase over 1951 of 5,092 per cent. These figures coincide with the previous reports reflecting the ever increasing productivity of Japanese plywood plants and exports to this country.

We realize there are divergent opinions on this subject as evidenced by the recent arguments in Congress by Representatives from Oregon and Washington. Japanese plywood imports have become one of the major items of controversy by congressional committees in consideration of the trade program. The very fact that this subject has been given prominent consideration in Congress shows a growing concern over these ever-increasing imports.

We do not ask that the Japanese be cut entirely out of our plywood market. We do advocate a quota that would reduce Japanese imports to a reasonable and fair volume, or the application of sufficient tariff to effect a realistic price comparison with the United States standards. Either is desirable, but unless something is done to place some restrictions, we can expect these imports to continue to increase in the future with a result of further impact on employment and production in our own plywood industry.

There is a good possibility that if our American market remains open and unrestricted, that other lumber items, such as doors and other types of heavier plywood, may soon be among the imports. The results: more unemployment in an already curtailed plywood and door industry. Certainly there is no justification in that the workers in this industry should carry the full brunt of a subsidy to another country.

Fraternally yours,

EARL HARTLEY,
Executive Secretary.

REA Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 delegates, directors, and managers of rural electric cooperatives belonging to the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative met March 22, 23, and 24 in Madison, Wis. At that convention they endorsed a total of 17 resolutions.

Four of these resolutions are of particular significance and grow out of two decades of hard work to develop an effective program of cooperative rural electrification and telephone service. Therefore, I would like to recommend these four resolutions to the attention of my colleagues.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY DELEGATES TO THE 22D ANNUAL MEETING OF WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, MARCH 24, 25, 26, 1958

RESOLUTION NO. 1—REA INTEREST RATES

Whereas in 1944 the Congress enacted legislation fixing a 2 percent interest rate to REA borrowers who would contract to provide complete and continuing electric service to all of our rural people without central station electic power; and

Whereas the electric cooperatives of the Nation have accepted this responsibility and are carrying it out in an admittedly outstanding manner; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture in its 1957 year-end report to the Congress reported that the REA has accrued a net income from lending operations of some $54 million; and

Whereas as a result of an intentional national administration fiscal policy of taking steps to stem inflationary pressures by tightening the supply of money the cost of money to the Treasury in the open money market reached a 24-year high in October, 1957 which resulted in some charges that the 2 percent REA interest rate was below the cost of money to the Treasury; and

Whereas since October 1957 as a result of depressed economic conditions the Federal Reserve Board has been steadily lowering the rediscount rate and the percentage of reserves required of its member systems in an attempt to loosen the credit supply and has resulted in a drop in the average cost of Treasury borrowings to a 3-year low in the neighborhood of 2 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we oppose any legislation introduced which would in any way change the current structure of interest rates charged to REA borrowers, and that any tampering with these rates would result in harmfully and unnecessarily retarding the development of rural electrification; and be it further

Resolved, That we are convinced that most of these attacks originate and are promoted by those monopolistic interests bent on destroying the farmer-owned segment of the electric industry.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—AMENDMENT OF THE REA ACT

Whereas the National Administration has proposed to the Congress that it amend the REA Act to add two additional titles which would provide for a so-called revolving fund,

and also for an insured loan authorization; and

Whereas these titles were described as a means of broadening the source of loan funds to REA borrowers, when they would in fact greatly increase the cost of money, limit the availability of loan funds for capital expansion, and place the program under the responsible direction of a partisan appointee, the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than under an historically independent administrator; and

Whereas the proposed legislation would make the cost of capital funds of REA borrowers far too high to permit them to carry out their responsibility under the act to provide electric service to thousands of rural persons still unserved; and

Whereas the average patrons' equity in the Nation's rural electric and telephone cooperatives still has not reached the feasible level where they could satisfactorily arrange feasible loans in the open money market; and

Whereas we are convinced that the real purpose behind this act is to destroy this program by making us dependent for our future loan funds on the Wall Street money sources which have historically proven hostile to our efforts to electrify rural America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to this legislation and that we direct the WEC Public Relations department to acquaint our congressional delegations of the total impracticability of the proposals it contains, and the hostile and even sinister motivation behind it.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—THE HISTORIC INDEPENDENCE OF THE REA ADMINISTRATOR

Whereas the original REA Act provided that the appointment of an Administrator of the program be a nonpartisan one, and that he serve independently of political pressures in the interest of the program; and

Whereas with passage in 1953 of the Reorganization Plan No. 2, the Secretary of Agriculture was given additional authority over the program although he assured the Congress that he would not exercise this authority to limit the authority of the REA Administrator without prior notice to the proper committee of the Congress in advance of such action; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last year did in fact limit seriously the power of the Administrator to make loans, without giving such prior notice to the proper committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we strongly feel that the Secretary of Agriculture has violated the trust and confidence imposed in him by the Congress and the President and we therefore recommend that the Congress enact bill S. 2990, providing "that section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 shall not hereafter apply to the Rural Electrification Administration, and there are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration all functions which were transferred from the Administrator to the Secretary of Agriculture by such reorganization plan."

RESOLUTION NO. 5—REA LOAN FUNDS

Be it resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress to authorize and appropriate the following sums in order that the rural electric and rural telephone programs might be carried on during the new fiscal year in a manner needed to meet the needs of consumers:

(a) Electric loan funds: $359 million in new regular loan funds.

(b) Telephone loan funds: $100 million in new regular loan funds.

(c) Administrative funds: $9.5 million for administering both programs.

Public Understanding and Support for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the excellent statement made by the problems and policies committee of the American Council on Education. The statement was developed by the committee in a meeting in Washington in late January 1958 and was published in February 1958.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

The American Council on Education, comprising 140 educational organizations and more than 1,000 educational institutions, is a center of cooperation and coordination for the improvement of education at all levels, with particular emphasis upon higher education. Its problems and policies committee, composed of distinguished educators, from time to time prepares and publishes statements on issues that are of concern to a broad sector of the council's diverse membership and to the American people generally.

The statement of propositions that follows was developed by the committee in a meeting in Washington in late January 1958 and is published with the unanimous approval of the committee.

PROBLEMS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 1, 1958

William S. Carlson, president (on leave), State University of New York.

Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College.

Margaret L. Habein, dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Wichita.

Clark Kerr, chancellor, University of California (Berkeley).

Douglas M. Knight, president, Lawrence College.

J. W. Maucker, president, Iowa State Teachers College.

Joseph C. McLain, principal, Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Senior High School.

Leland L. Medsker, consultant, research project in higher education, University of California (Berkeley).

Nathan M. Pusey, president Harvard University.

Robert J. Slavin, O. P., president, Providence College.

Logan Wilson, president University of Texas.

Members ex officio: Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor, University of Chicago, chairman of the council; Arthur S. Adams, president of the council.

PROPOSITIONS THAT NEED PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

1. Most Americans now realize that our leadership, and indeed our national survival, is being challenged as never before in history. Most Americans must be brought to realize that the survival and well-being of this Nation depend no less upon the strength of our educational system than upon the strength of our Military Establishment.

2. Educational institutions in a democracy are properly expected to meet the fundamental needs of society. If they are subject to passing whims and fancies, schools and colleges cannot perform this function. Responsible citizens share with educators a moral obligation to insist upon wise and careful planning to meet fundamental needs and to protect our educational institutions from hysterical demands and panicky reactions.

3. Critical analysis of our educational system is certainly in order, but mistaken efforts to place blame through name calling and fault finding should not be permitted to obscure the fact that our schools, colleges, and universities are seldom much better or worse than their respective publics want them to be. The best of our institutions certainly rise above common levels of aspiration, yet the vast majority simply mirror the values most commonly held. If American education is to undergo a general improvement, the people at large must place a higher value upon intellectual achievement and must be prepared to uphold higher levels of educational performance.

4. Lipservice, to the value of education is not enough. The critical need is for material support. The American people can afford to spend more on education. Doing this, however, will necessitate assigning a much higher priority to the importance of teaching and research as crucial forms of enterprise in a dynamic society. There must be a willingness to practice self-denial in paying higher taxes and in making heavier voluntary contributions to provide greater material support for education.

5. The time factor is extremely important, and basic issues must be faced now. Nothing less than a massive national effort, launched immediately, will do. Local support and control will remain the best safeguards and guarantors of excellence for our diverse educational system. They can and should be preserved, but bickering over forms and sources of financial support necessary to meet the present emergency can be disastrous. Positive and immediate action on all levels—Federal, State, local, and voluntary—is the first imperative.

6. Economic inflation has already levied a heavier toll on educational institutions than on most other forms of enterprise. Still further inflation would be a more serious threat. If this possible consequence of vastly increased governmental expenditures for education is to be avoided, investment in our schools, colleges, and universities must take precedence over existing expenditures which are of less importance to our national security.

7. The total economic resources available for higher education, whatever they may be, will necessarily exist in limited amounts. One demand upon those resources is to raise the general level of performance in all schools and colleges. If this is allowed to be the only call, however, a tragic mistake will be made. A second, and vital, call upon our economic resources is to strengthen our leadership in all important fields and to add to our best existing institutions the appreciable support needed to meet the demands for the highest order of quality. Statesmanship must see to it that adequate support for the attainment of both goals is provided.

8. A genius of American education has been its unity through diversity. This diversity should be preserved, with strengthening all along the line and greater stress on the importance of quality everywhere. In short, all our human resources must be vastly strengthened through the medium of improved education.

PROPOSITIONS THAT NEED PUBLIC SUPPORT

1. The magnitude of the job to be done can hardly be exaggerated. We are not spending nearly enough on education. Modest measures will not do the job. In colleges

and universities alone, the number of qualified students will be doubled by 1970, and a doubling of expenditures will not even perpetuate present inadequate quality levels. To do the job effectively, the following order of priorities should be observed:

Salaries for teachers, scholars, and scientists should on the average be at least doubled;

Existing institutions should be maintained more adequately and some of them greatly strengthened;

Support for the establishment of new institutions will be necessary, but should not be supplied at the expense of existing institutions;

Scholarship programs should stress quality rather than quantity, graduate as well as undergraduate study, and should be accompanied by a parallel system of grants to the institutions in which scholarship holders enroll.

2. Although Federal support for educational activities already exists in many forms, excessive reliance upon it may weaken other sources of initiative. However this may be, we are in a national emergency, and prompt action of unprecedented magnitude is urgent. The truth seems to be that the Federal Government is the only agency which can act with sufficient speed and on a scale large enough to enable schools, colleges, and universities to accomplish their tasks. Action by the Federal Government need not, and should not, extend Federal controls over education. Further, as a partial attack on a problem of such great size, it need not weaken initiative and action at the State, local, and voluntary levels. Federal support should be considered only as a necessary supplement to action by State and local entities, corporations, alumni, parents, churches, foundations, and philanthropic individuals. The initiative and interest of these agencies and individuals are the greatest asset of American education; they must now be exercised to an extent never before demonstrated.

3. Greatly increased amounts of money must be allocated to fundamental research and other forms of creative and scholarly activity. These can be carried on more effectively in our colleges and universities than anywhere else, because in the academic environment the creativity of central figures is reproduced by students who have worked with them.

4. If American education is to continue to serve the best interests of the Nation, drastic measures to increase the supply of highly trained persons are required in many areas other than physical science and engineering. The need for teachers at all levels and in all fields is a compelling illustration. Continued progress in the humanities, the arts, and the social sciences, as well as in science and technology, is highly essential to our national survival and well-being.

5. Totalitarian methods are not necessary to counter the threats of a totalitarian power. These threats can be countered and overcome by our own American strengths, strengths which in education include academic freedom for teachers, scholars, and scientists; freedom of mobility and choice of programs of study and vocations by college students; diversity of programs, forms of control, and philosophies among institutions. These qualities of American education must receive continuous, vigilant support.

The actions called for cannot be postponed. The priorities must be established immediately. Should we fail to do these things, the deferred costs will be too staggering to be met in time. If the Nation is to survive and prosper, we must start making the basic provisions now.

C/F: Mystery Killer of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, cystic fibrosis is children's foe. It is a disease which should get the attention of all Americans. Once aware of this child killer, Americans will join in a massive effort to get the necessary research underway to find a cure or satisfactory treatment for victims of cystic fibrosis.

The following article appearing in the May issue of Reader's Digest clearly shows why we must declare war on this public enemy:

C/F: MYSTERY KILLER OF CHILDREN

(By James C. G. Conniff)

(Condensed from New York World-Telegram and Sun Saturday Feature Magazine)

Early one morning during last June's heat wave my wife and I woke to find that our youngest child, Robert, was ashen, apparently suffocated. While I worked to restore breath to his yet warm body, my wife telephoned our doctor and the police. They came immediately, and fought hard to save him with oxygen. The battle was in vain.

Afterward our doctor said to me, painfully, "All I can tell you is that if it had to be, then better at 7 weeks than at 7 months or 7 years."

Dazed with shock, I could only nod. But since that bitter morning I have come to disagree profoundly with the idea that "it had to be."

Bobby's killer was a relatively little-known disease which bears half a dozen names. The best known is cystic fibrosis of the pancreas—C/F, for short. Unmasked only 20 years ago, C/F is estimated to threaten the lives of some 6,000 babies a year in the United States—about 1 in every 600 infants born to white parents. (Negroes rarely have C/F, orientals never. Why, nobody knows.) It sets in at birth or soon after, and until about 1950 it meant almost certain death before age five. It is completely noncontagious.

Bobby, I have learned since his death, had a number of symptoms characteristics of C/F. In spite of repeated increases in his formula, he continued to have a voracious appetite while showing little weight gain.

He had loose, frequent, bulky bowel movements—sure sign that his food wasn't getting a chance to nourish him. He had a dry, hacking cough, and frequent, excessive sweats.

But it is not to rebuke our doctor that I am writing this article; even doctors well acquainted with C/F sometimes have trouble identifying it. I write because much progress can be reported in dealing with this disease. Because recently developed laboratory tests are helping practitioners to distinguish C/F from other deceptively similar childhood ailments. Because experts believe that 50 to 60 percent of C/F sufferers can, if diagnosed early enough, count on survival while the crash program to find a lasting cure goes forward.

What, then, was going on in Bobby's tiny body?

Those who know most about cystic fibrosis say it is an insidious raid on an infant's whole exocrine (mucus, tear, salivary and sweat) gland system. As early as 1650 anatomists began to suspect that some mysterious entity now and then invaded the pancreas, the vital gland which empties into the small intestine a clear, watery fluid containing enzymes that break up food for digestion. These early doctors observed that the pancreatic juice sometimes thickened and kept the enzymes from doing their job. But the term "cystic fibrosis" did not enter medical lexicons as formally recognized disease until 1936, when Dr. Guido Fanconi, of Zurich, Switzerland, described three cases and gave what it still their commonest name to the linked symptoms afflicting both digestive system and lungs.

The Fanconi find made no headlines, unfortunately, and it was not until 1938 that Dr. Dorothy H. Andersen, now chief pathologist at New York's Columbia-Presbyterian Babies Hospital, performed parallel studies and alerted the profession. In autopsies of infants who had died of "pulmonary disease," Dr. Andersen was disturbed by the frequency with which she found plugged-up pancreatic ducts. The pancreas had produced not its usual thin, clear fluid, but a thick, gelatin-like substance.

With the pancreas blocked, Dr. Andersen reasoned, no baby can manufacture the enzymes to digest his food. Undernourished, he becomes a pushover for infection. This pancreatic blockage, if unchecked, extends also to the lungs; the same kind of sticky mucus gradually plugs them, too. With less and less air ventilating their honeycomb passages, the lungs become the focus of infection which in a weakened child is almost always fatal.

Dr. Andersen's first thought was: forestall this fatal lung involvement by making up for the pancreatic insufficiency; give extra nourishment to youngsters who show signs of C/F. This she did with a high-protein diet, massive doses of vitamins, rivers of "percomorph oil" (oleum percomorphum)—a G/F regimen still very much in use. To fight infections that already had a lung foothold, Dr. Andersen at first used sulfathiazole. She is still partial to the sulfa drugs, because children seem to take longer than adults in building up resistance to them. But it is to penicillin and the ensuing antibiotics that she credits the phenomenal rise in C/F survival rates.

Where 20 years ago more than 75 percent of C/F victims died before their first birthday (and were diagnosed only at autopsy), today better than 50 percent of nearly 500 fibrocystics diagnosed at Columbia-Presbyterian Babies Hospital early enough to benefit by these treatments are still alive. Fifty-five of them are over 10 years old; the oldest is 22. Most are a bit smaller than average and tend to be nonathletic. But, by and large, they have been able to keep up with normal interests of childhood and youth.

Since Dr. Andersen's first work, medical researchers have learned, step by step, how to make more consistently accurate diagnosis on each of C/F's several frontiers. They have painstakingly mapped the widely differing courses of treatment that C/F calls for when attacking lungs or digestive system, sweat mechanism, or even liver. These treatments, taken together, are essentially a delaying action until a cure is found, but they give solid hope to thousands everywhere.

For all-important early detection, conventional X-raying of chest trouble by experts can help. One of the core discoveries, however—which too few doctors and almost no parents know about—is a fast, 99-percent-foolproof diagnostic procedure pioneered by Dr. Paul A. di Sant-'Agnese, assistant professor of pediatrics at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

Known as the sweat test, this key to C/F owes its discovery to a heat wave in New

York City in August 1948, when heat prostration brought 10 children to Columbia-Presbyterian Babies Hospital. Five were known from previous visits to be suffering from C/F. Di Sant-'Agnese reasoned that since in these patients other exocrine glands were functioning abnormally, perhaps the sweat glands, too, were shirking their job of cooling. So he ran comparative sweat analyses on 4 control subjects (non-C/F children) and on 4 known fibrocystics. The laboratory findings: the C/F children's sweat yielded a salt content so much higher as to indicate strongly that (1) here was a superior diagnostic tool to identify C/F, and (2) by giving extra salt to C/F sufferers it might be possible to save them from heat prostration.

Since 1949 all C/F children at Babies Hospital Cystic Fibrosis Clinic have been given extra salt (up to 2 grams a day) in hot weather. There have been no troublesome cases of heat prostration since.

Anxious to make the di Sant'Agnese sweat test so quick and simple that anybody could use it, Dr. Harry Schwachman, of the Children's Medical Center, Boston, and a group of coworkers devised a scheme for testing hand sweat. They dissolved silver nitrate and potassium chromate in boiling agar (seaweed gelatin), then cooled the combination to a firm red jelly in a shallow glass dish. Onto its surface they gently pressed the palm of a child suspected, for other reasons, of having C/F. A sharply defined yellowish-white handprint appeared at once. The hand sweat of non-fibrocystics left almost no trace at all. This test was repeated and repeated, with identical findings. Now, with subsequent refinements, it can be used to screen large numbers of children for cystic fibrosis.

Meanwhile, via laboratory and bedside studies, researchers are moving rapidly toward isolating the key mechanism which triggers the whole C/F syndrome.

It is now known, for instance, that a defective gene in both parents plays a crucial role in the risk that their children may be born fibrocystic. Something like 1 in 50 persons is believed to have this lurking gene, and its presence cannot be predetected. But even if both parties to a marriage have it, their offspring will not be fibrocystic unless the impaired genes combine in a certain manner—about which relatively little is yet known.

Inroads on the advanced-stage suffocation danger of C/F have been made in recent years by means of improved techniques of inhalation therapy. Almost all C/F authorities now use medicinal detergents in nebulizers (fine-mist atomizers) to loosen and liquefy the deposits of lung mucus; then, by postural drainage—kneeling, with forehead to the floor—the patients cough it up.

As a clearinghouse for information and as a spur to research, the nonprofit National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation was established in 1955 by an attractive young doctor, Wynne Sharples, who has a C/F son and daughter of her own. The Foundation, to which Dr. Sharples today gives most of her time, already has 47 chapters across the country, and it has raised more than $300,000 for research into every conceivable aspect of C/F. It cannot, unfortunately, undertake to provide financial help for stricken families. Realizing, however, that the cost of drugs, vitamins, and protein foods for a C/F child may run as high as $150 a month (average: $700–$900 a year), it has organized committees to get expensive medicines at rockbottom cost from cooperative drughouses for families least able to stand the financial strain.

But the big essential for a C/F victim is early detection. And Dr. Sharples has found that the one who often prompts the correct diagnosis is the mother. "Let her be sure to tell her baby doctor of symptoms that worry her," says Dr. Sharples. "Together they may know the satisfaction of saving a child's life."

NATO and Middle Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle the following editorial from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald:

NATO AND MIDDLE EUROPE

Despite the reaffirmations of solidarity from the NATO Defense Ministers at Paris, it remains evident that NATO is suffering from erosion. Some of this erosion probably stems from the nature of NATO's military task, which is the essentially negative one of providing a shield against aggression in a time of great change in weaponry. But part of it may well arise from a popular feeling in the NATO countries that governments are not doing what they could do to promote a realistic settlement with the Soviet Union.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, who has shown an imaginative grasp of a number of foreign policy problems, suggests that NATO propose a settlement in middle Europe based upon troop withdrawal and German reunification. This is not a new suggestion; it is similar to ideas voiced by George Kennan and taken up variously by Sir John Slessor and Walter Lippmann as well as by political groups in Britain and Germany. Specifically, Mr. REUSS envisages withdrawal of Soviet troops to the Russian border and Western troops to the Rhine, free elections in both parts of Germany, arms limitation in middle Europe, East-West guaranties against aggression, and a deemphasis of nationalism in favor of regionalism.

Regardless of the current practicability of such a program, it is altogether true that the Western Allies have offered the Soviet Union no inducement to withdraw from Germany and the satellites. Western policy in Europe, as Walter Lippmann observes in the April Atlantic Monthly, has been based on the decisions taken at the time of the occupation of a defeated Germany; it has not progressed to the necessary reappraisal. Mr. REUSS properly notes that the West has offered Russia no assurance, in the event of withdrawal, that the liberated countries "would not arm to the teeth and become hostile."

This newspaper has little confidence that the Soviet Union would presently accept such a disengagement. The men in the Kremlin seem satisfied with the division of Germany; and the Hungarian Revolution evidently has whetted Soviet fears of liberalization. Furthermore, we doubt whether it would be realistic to expect a Soviet withdrawal all the way to the Russian border in return for withdrawal of western forces only to the Rhine; the Bug or the Vistula might be a more practicable demarcation. Nor can it be assumed that a reunited Germany could or should stay in NATO. We agree with Mr. REUSS, however, that Germany's own limited military forces could help materially in ground defense, and that with Germany's economic and cultural ties to the West there would be little reason for fear that she would slip into the Communist orbit.

Whether or not a favorable Soviet response could be expected, some positive thinking along these lines is desirable from the standpoint of NATO's own interest. The precise details of a proposal are not the crucial question; what is important is for NATO to move beyond a sterile policy which holds no hope of fulfillment. It is lamentable that there has been no official interest in the possibilities of a modification of the Polish Rapacki plan. A positive proposal would give the NATO countries, at the very least, a program for countering Soviet propaganda, and it would provide a means of exerting pressure on Russia which is now lacking because the western terms are impossible. Moreover, such a program would give a political backing to any serious disarmament negotiations. We commend Mr. REUSS' suggestion that exploration of these points ought to be considered essential western preparation for a summit meeting.

The National Capital Planning Commission Should Serve the Federal City and the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the National Capital Planning Commission, according to the United States Government Organization Manual 1957–58, was, under the 1952 act, created as the central planning agency for the Federal and District of Columbia Governments to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof.

Recently the Director of the National Capital Planning Commission was reported by the newspapers as saying that the Commission had served well the Federal interest but had not given to the District of Columbia the importance that was due it. Many well-informed observers have noted this fact and have commented upon it.

Sometimes, of course, it may be difficult to reach a decision in these matters.

But it should be relatively easy for the National Capital Planning Commission to reach a decision as to the best location for the proposed National Capital Center of the Performing Arts, as proposed in the legislation sponsored by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and myself.

In order to be of some assistance in this matter I include here a letter from the Commission of Fine Arts, and a report by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia:

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1958.

Hon. PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the hearing before your committee yesterday morning, Senator HRUSKA asked if we could supply data showing the height of the stage houses of four opera houses and music halls mentioned in the testimony of Congressman THOMPSON before the committee.

We have accordingly secured data from Mr. Wallace Harrison of New York, architect member of the Commission of Fine Arts, with reference to radio city, where the height is 120 feet from stage to grid; also with reference to the Metropolitan Opera House in New York where the stage house is 125 feet high. Mr. Harrison gives as his opinion that the stage house should vary from 90 to 130 feet, depending on the width and height of the proscenium opening. In the opera house which he is designing for the Lincoln Center in New York, the height of the stage house will be approximately the same as that in the present Metropolitan Opera House.

We also inquired at Indiana University about the height of the new auditorium and were informed that the stage house is 72 feet, 6 inches high. We also made the same inquiries at Purdue University and were told the height of the stage house is 72 feet. In both cases they advised us that these heights were not sufficient to accommodate tall scenery such as used by the Metropolitan Opera Co. when on tour.

The National Gallery is 782 feet in length; the wings are 67 feet in height; the central block is 84 feet in height, and the top of the dome is 137 feet above the ground. It would appear, therefore, that a building for a music center could be designed on the Mall site, whose stage house could be between 90 and 130 feet and which would not be out of scale with the National Gallery of Art.

If there is any further information we can secure for you, I hope you will advise me.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

APRIL 17, 1958.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: The Commissioners have for report S. 3335, 85th Congress, a bill to provide for a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on part of the land in the District of Columbia made available for the Smithsonian Gallery of Art.

The purpose of the bill is to provide a suitable building for the presentation of music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry and to honor and memorialize our great statesmen who have contributed to an increased recognition of the interrelation of the arts and sciences and their basic importance to a true and balanced development of American life. The bill authorizes the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to construct a building to be known as the National Capital Center of the Performing Arts on the land bounded by Fourth Street SW., on the east, Seventh Street SW. on the west, Independence Avenue on the south, and Adams Drive on the north. Title to the land is in the United States. The Regents would have supervision and control of the Center.

The bill provides, among other things, that the Regents solicit funds for constructing, furnishing, and equipping the Center and presenting programs of the arts.

The bill repeals the act entitled "An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center," approved July 1, 1955. The National Capital Center of the Performing Arts authorized by S. 3335 would supersede the proposal contained in the act of July 1, 1955.

The Commissioners recommend generally favorable action on the bill, but point out that there is a need to maintain the Mall vista. For this reason the Commissioners request that the northern boundary of the site be changed from Adams Drive to Jefferson Drive. This would still permit the use by the Center of approximately 12 acres.

In addition to the fulfillment of an important cultural need in the community, the construction of this Center of the Performing Arts will provide a facility which will add materially to the economic development of downtown Washington. We are, therefore, heartily in favor of settling on the site for this project in order that the project may be accomplished in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

The foregoing statement represents the views of a majority of the Board of Commissioners. Commissioner McLaughlin feels that the bill should be passed in the form in which it was introduced.

Time has not permitted the securing of advice from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this report to the program of the President.

Yours very sincerely,

ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

Government Fiscal Policy: Too Much, Too Soon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Gordon Grand, Jr., a trustee of the Tax Foundation, Inc., is a thoughtful and dispassionate analysis of the present recession and our tax structure in general. Mr. Grand was for some years in Washington working with and for the Committee on Ways and Means. While his views are those of an independent citizen with which some people might not agree they have the great merit, at this time in our economic history, of not being tinged by partisan politics.

GOVERNMENT FISCAL POLICY: TOO MUCH TOO SOON?

(By Gordon Grand, Jr.)

For the past 6 weeks, Congress has been gloomily pouring over the economic indexes, which are untrustworthy at best, and coming up with dire predictions of a deepening, lengthening recession. In considerable panic, some Members of Congress even envision a catastrophic depression of the 1930 type.

This unpleasant remembrance of things past has brought about a hasty spate of proposed remedies harking back to the early New Deal make work projects of the WPA and PWA variety, CCC camps, increased Federal subsidies and handouts, and further soak the rich tax schemes.

Interestingly, all of the proposed solutions have one thing in common: tried before, they proved notably inefficient. Conversely, and more recently, a move along opposite lines that cut Federal spending and reduced taxes that sot to restrain corporate activity resulted in a sudden and unparalleled spurt of prosperity. Yet, of the two schools of thought, the former trickle up, or dole, theory seems to be prevailing in a time of stress—a stress incidentally, that is only a short step removed from the highest standard of living that has ever prevailed in the history of the world.

In all the confusion, one thing at least, seems sure: If the current economic recession should indeed turn into a full-blown depression, the resulting government intervention in the private economy would make the 1930's look like an exercise in laissez-faire. A serious depression, in fact, could very well mark the end of the private enterprise system. Given only a slight shove, government, which through heavy taxes and various controls already influences every business and personal economic decision, would end up completely dominating the lives of its citizens.

Will various current pump-priming proposals in fact give our economy a shot in the arm that will halt the recession? Or, on the other hand, start an early resumption of the rise in the cost of living through further inflation? Or even have no effect whatsoever? The fact is that there is more solid evidence that the trend of our times is toward more inflation than there is that the current recession will deepen.

In general, the recession remedies now being pushed in Congress fall into two categories: More spending and tax handouts, with some enthusiasts plumping for both. The idea, in both cases, is to spread more money around quickly in the hope that this purchasing power will step up sales of automobiles and other hard goods, put the economy back on the prosperity track, and create jobs to reduce unemployment.

TIME TO ASK QUESTIONS

Both Congress and the President have done what they can to step up current spending, but the big PWA-like projects are still under discussion, and tax cuts apparently have been postponed for a few weeks. Before we are thoroughly committed to an all-out program, there is still time to face up to a series of important questions, answers to which should determine our course of action. Among the questions are these:

1. Is this recession one that seriously threatens our economic future or is it merely a manifestation that millions of consumers are temporarily bought up on things like cars and refrigerators? Production in February 1958 was about 11 percent below early 1957, a decline slightly greater than those in other postwar recessions of 1948–49 and 1953–54. But the current decline is from alltime highs and the most prosperous years we have ever known. Total personal income remains high and savings appear to be rising. For example, net savings in New York State's savings and loan associations increased 60 percent more in January and February of this year than in the same period in 1957. We should at least consider the possibility that the recession will end at an early date without Government intervention, as the people make their millions of individual decisions to spend the money they are now salting away.

2. Is it part of the responsibility of the Federal Government to try to guarantee an ever-increasing boom, with none of the economic adjustments that characterize even an era of general prosperity? Government must step in to ease human misery in a serious ease even minor economic tremors, we are depression, but if we run to government to inviting the complete domination by government that we profess to abhor in many of the world's other countries.

3. Can the Federal Government or any government end a recession or an inflation by any steps short of complete regimentation and the application of strict controls on every step in the economic process? Government, it is clear, does not have the ability to forecast the economy with any more precision than the weather. And if we take, for example, the experience of the 1930's, it is equally clear that government does not have any special know-how to get us out. In

1940, after 9 years of heavy Federal spending and deficits there were still 8 million unemployed, about a seventh of the labor force. Certainly, current pump-priming spending proposals are minor efforts by comparison and offer little hope. A tax handout, such as the proposed $40-for-everybody might increase purchasing power (which is already high) but it is just as likely to end up in the bank until the sovereign citizen decides he wants to spend it.

4. Should the Federal Government indulge in huge new expenditures or tax handouts at all when the present budget outlook offers nothing but deficits? Tax Foundation estimated recently that, even at current spending rates, a Federal budget deficit for fiscal 1958 and 1959 of some $5 billion to $7 billion is in prospect. Other estimates put the fiscal 1959 deficit as high as $10 billion, even without a tax cut. This would push the Federal debt ceiling, recently raised to $280 billion temporarily, to $290 billion or $300 billion. More important, it would mark a resumption of the policy of grand-scale deficit financing, which has already helped halve the purchasing power of the dollar.

The above questions require hard, nonpolitical answers. Just a few months ago we had to make a hard decision about our national defense and we decided, rightly, that the Federal Government must spend whatever is needed to maintain our international position. Now it is proposed that we add to the cold-war spending unknown billions to combat the recession. Thus for the first time in our history, we would be seeking to use Federal expenditures to fight an economic war against recession while facing the necessity for increasingly large outlays to fight a cold war abroad. Even the greatest national economy in the world is not indestructible. Can we stand such a strain, and just what should government do?

If pump priming, tax handouts, and deficit induced depreciation of the dollar are not the answer, is there, then, nothing to be done? Must we just wait and let events take their course? Such a decision has much to commend it, given the known strength and resilience of our economy. But since action of some kind seems essential for political reasons, if no other, the action we take should be the kind that will eliminate some of the handicaps under which our great economic system has been operating.

TESTED REMEDY AVAILABLE

One clue to action comes from 1953–54, when the Federal Government took two important steps which I believe were the basis for the great prosperity of the succeeding 3 years. They were: (1) cut Federal spending, (2) reduce taxes in such a way as to remove some restraints from the private economy.

Federal spending for fiscal 1955, beginning July 1, 1954, was cut by $3 billion to $64½ billion, $10 billion below the Korean war peak (and about $10 billion below current spending levels). Simultaneously, the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 made important strides in taking the tax wraps off the economy.

Without pump-priming Federal spending, without mere tax handouts of the $20-for-everyone variety, the results were almost instantaneous. Total goods and services produced (gross national product) soared $30 billion in a single year, the growing unemployment problem evaporated, and general prosperity reached new peaks for several years.

The same course would appear sound in dealing with the current recession: cutting sharply, rather than increasing, the proposed Federal budget for fiscal 1959. It is less essential domestic spending, not military spending, that has forced the 1959 budget to a record total of $74 billion.

If we avoid any vestiges of pump-priming, if we reduce less essential Federal spending, and if we insist on getting a dollar's worth of defense for every military dollar spent, billion can be made available for tax reduction that will take more restraints off our economy.

Given this opportunity, where should we start:

1. The present Federal tax structure is a formidable barrier to expansion of industry and jobs. Notwithstanding the tax reductions of 1954, Federal individual tax rates are only slightly below the peak levels of World War II; the first bracket rate is now 20 percent as compared with 16.6 percent in 1948. The corporation income tax rate of 52 percent compares with a 38 percent rate in 1948 and a peak wartime rate of 40 percent. Excise taxes were not significantly reduced after World War II and were raised to new highs during the Korean War. The 1954 excise reductions still left the overall burden well above the 1948 level; in fact, the new and increased highway user taxes imposed in 1956 approximately offset the reductions in other excise taxes of 1954.

Nearly all of us would put the too-high individual income tax rates on individuals at the top of any list of barriers to free enterprise operations. The income tax has become so progressive that it is a drag on economic progress. Ever increasing rates up to 91 percent applied against any additional money they might make, cannot be the way to interest and encourage people to invest their savings in new job-creating ventures. In the top brackets of the individual income tax these rates impair the revenue instead of increasing it. A recent tax foundation study showed that in 1953, taxable income in excess of $100,000 per return was less than half of such income reported in 1916. Reducing the top bracket rates would not only restore incentives but would actually increase the revenues.

INCOME TAX IS ONEROUS

Nor is the weight of this tax purely on the high brackets. The tax is now a broad-based tax and most of its yield comes from persons of moderate or small incomes, for that is where the bulk of the income is. Yet the basic starting rate is 20 percent on the first dollar of taxable income, an onerous rate, only 3 percentage points lower than the wartime peak.

Our present individual income tax structures consists of tax brackets unchanged since 1942. These reflect the wartime effort to exact the maximum amount of revenue. The rates and brackets were devised to restrict private economic activity, to prevent the launching of new private ventures and to discourage expenditures on goods that would compete with our wartime production needs. It is hard to see how such a structure can fill the exact opposite goals that our current situation demands.

Clearly then, the first major step for helping our economy to move ahead would be a revision of the individual tax rates and brackets. The following steps suggest the course we might follow:

(a) Divide the first tax bracket into two $1,000 brackets and subject the first $1,000 to a lower rate. The relative effect would be fairly close to that of an increase in exemptions but it would have the virtue of not relieving several million taxpayers from the burden of any income tax. This lower rate on the first $1,000 should be coupled with a flat percentage reduction in all the other bracket rates. A comprehensive revision of the bracket widths and rates should be the ultimate goal, but pending such a revision, a flat percentage reduction would be a step in that direction.

START WITH RATE REDUCTIONS

A reduction of the tax rate on the first $1,000 to 17 percent from the present 20 percent and a flat 10-percent cut in the rates applicable to all taxable income above $1,000 would amount to tax savings of $4.3 billion for individual income taxpayers. A rate reduction to 18 percent on the first $1,000 and a 5-percent cut in other rates would reduce revenues $2.5 billion.

(b) Make a start in reducing the impact of the confiscatory top rates of the individual income tax, either by extending the bracket reach or by lowering the top rate from 91 percent to about 70 or 75 percent. The revenue effects of such a change would certainly not exceed a loss of $100 million, and more likely would be nil.

2. Reduce the corporation income-tax rate from 52 to 50 percent. The revenue cost would be about $800 million. Corporations provide nearly three-quarters of all the non-Government wages and salaries paid. The corporate sector of our economy is one of the biggest segments of business life that is disciplined by vigorous competition. Yet these artificial entities certainly cannot pay taxes out of their own pockets. It is reasonably clear that the corporate tax is paid either by the stockholder or the consumer. In either event, what justification can there be for taking more than half of their profits (which are now less than they were 6 years ago)? Our taxation of corporation seems designed not only to make it unprofitable for investors to put their savings into corporate enterprise (through double taxation of dividends) but further, to prevent the corporations from themselves accumulating funds needed for growth and modernization (through restricted depreciation policies). The net effect has been to erode away corporate capital, to penalize growth, and to erect obstacles to new risky and competitive ventures that business intelligence dictates.

The first step, a token reduction in the corporate rate, should be followed by further cuts, with the objective of reaching as quickly as possible, at least the peak World War II level of 40 percent.

3. Put into effect President Eisenhower's recommendations for aiding small business. The tax savings to small business would be about $200 million.

4. Reduce the excises that were levied for wartime purposes and that interfere with the current business operations by pyramiding costs. Specifically, the excise on transportation of property should be repealed and the excise on the transportation of persons should be cut in half. In addition, the Federal excises on automobiles, parts, and heavy household equipment should be cut in half. The repeal and reduction of these taxes would have widespread beneficial effects (assuming that the excise cuts would be passed on in lower prices). The tax savings from these excise tax reductions would be approximately $1.3 billion.

The total revenue reduction resulting from the adoption of this program would be between five and seven billion dollars. Such a tax revision program would be a positive step in the direction of permanently improving the entire tax structure by lessening the obstacles to business operations and increasing personal incentives. It would be an important step in the right direction, not a panicky antirecession measure, but its benefits would be felt immediately.

In summary, the present economic situation does not call for panicky pump-priming expenditures and political tax handouts by the Federal Government. Not only would the effect of such actions on the current recession be dubious in the extreme, but a certain result of this course would be more huge, inflationary deficits and a cheaper dollar. What is needed is fiscal sanity and a curtailment of less essential spending. Any tax reduction must be measured by a rigid yardstick: does it remove some of the tax restraints on our economy and will its long-term effect add to our hope of lasting prosperity for all the American people?

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid letter from Mrs. Harper Andrews, 211 East Prospect Street, Kewanee, Ill., president of the Illinois League of Women Voters. This intelligent group of women are active in my district, and I commend them all for their efforts to keep informed about many of the complicated matters before Congress. This is indicative of their interest in our Government at both national and local levels.

The subject of Mrs. Andrews' letter is reciprocal trade. She is specific in what part trade will play in the development of Chicago and the Middle West as a world port as the St. Lawrence seaway is completed and begins operation.

As a member of the Public Works Committee, we have detailed and vast information about the seaway. I first began thinking of the seaway when I was a student, long before I knew I would ever be in Congress helping to bring the completion about. I have endeavored since being here to acquaint the people of my district with the tremendous effect the St. Lawrence seaway will have on Chicago. The completion of the seaway is going to make Chicago a world port, taking her place with the other vital port cities throughout the world. It will complete the building of a truly great city, ranking second to none.

Successful operation of the seaway will be dependent upon world trade and our great fleet of merchant ships. A sound policy on these matters will, I am confident, reflect in an unprecedented economic expansion for our city of Chicago.

The letter follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Chicago, Ill., April 23, 1958.
The Honorable EMMET F. BYRNE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNE: As you see from this picture I am in Atlantic City, attending the national convention of the League of Women Voters, wearing a hat that illustrates what trade means to us in Illinois. There are 1,500 league members here, representing our 128,000 membership in all 48 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and the District of Columbia.

My hat of light blue tulle decorated with small ships represents Illinois' vital interest in water-borne imports and exports. When the St. Lawrence seaway is opened in 1959 and the widening of the Calumet Sag Channel is completed we in Illinois will have easy access to three-quarters of the world's shipping. Already the port of Chicago handles 40 percent of the foreign commerce of the Great Lakes ports.

We anticipate a much greater volume of trade flowing, after 1959, on the waters my hat symbolizes. Then the $260 million the Chicago area is spending for the port and the additional $450 million the United States, Canada, and Illinois have already spent for the seaway will be amply justified.

When the seaway and our new enlarged world port are operating, the real ships, of which those on my hat are only small symbols, will be carrying more of the 40 percent of all United States exports which originate in the Middle West and will be creating more than the 300,000 jobs in Illinois now dependent on world trade.

These are some of the reasons we are hoping for passage by the Congress of a realistic and workable Reciprocal Trade Act which will permit and encourage the undeniable capacities for economic growth of our area.

Sincerely,

ALICE G. ANDREWS.
Mrs. Harper Andrews.

KEWANEE, ILL.

Do You Want To Pay for Needless Projects?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier has expressed support for the President's veto of S. 497, the rivers and harbors pork-barrel bill. In an editorial in its April 17 edition, the Courier properly emphasizes that spending for unnecessary public works—and there are many projects in S. 497 which cannot be justified—means either higher taxes or more inflation.

Having voted "nay" on the bill, as I did on similar legislation in 1956 which also was vetoed by President Eisenhower, I am pleased to include the Courier editorial as part of my remarks:

It takes courage to veto a $1,700,000,000 pork barrel rivers and harbors bill in an election year and during a business recession. Yet President Eisenhower has done so, demonstrating that he puts sound policy above political expediency.

It should be emphasized, as the President did in his veto message, that those public works projects on which construction can be started immediately have already been begun. The additional pork barrel projects in the bill would require months of planning before they could be started. There is every expectation that employment will be on the upturn by then.

The pork barrel bill is an excellent example of the kind of measures that would be adopted if the Democrats were to obtain a big enough majority in the next Congress to pass legislation over a Presidential veto. Such measures would only prolong any existing business recession as did the pump-priming measures of the New Deal in the 1933–1939 period.

What these things mean for the great majority of Americans is a lower standard of living. For spending for unnecessary public works means either higher taxes or more inflation. That fact could be disguised for a time during the early New Deal period by enacting steeply progressive income-tax rates. But with Federal expenditures at the present level no great additional revenue can be obtained by soaking the rich. From now on, additional Government spending will have to come either from additional taxes paid by everyone or additional inflation which merely reduces the value of all savings.

Oliver Wendell Holmes—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is from the lives of the men and women of transcending stature in the past of our country that we derive inspiration for our participation in the present and find the pattern for our course.

Two weeks from this Wednesday, on May 14, there will be held in the city of Chicago the Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Celebration banquet which in anticipation has stirred the interest of the Nation. This event, calculated to refire our people in a time of trouble and worry with the spirit of one of the great jurists and philosophers of the ages, is being staged by the Adult Education Council of Greater Chicago and the Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Celebration committee in cosponsorship with the Harvard Club of Chicago. The general chairman and the dynamic force in making the Holmes banquet the focus of national interest is the Honorable Barnet Hodes, who as corporation counsel of Chicago set the pattern for the conduct of a public law office and now with Col. Jacob Arvey heads one of the largest law firms in the United States. The honorary chairman is Carl Sandburg, the famous poet whose Justice Windom in Remembrance Rock is fashioned in reverence for Justice Holmes.

This is the purpose of the banquet as expressed by Mr. Hodes:

We hope that by virtue of the Oliver Wendell Holmes celebration to reacquaint the people of America with the spirit and philosophy which Justice Holmes so eloquently exhibited by his life and accomplishments. We also believe that it is essentian to call the attention of the present generation to the inspiration of Justice Holes because, in doing so, we will give today's generation a greater understanding of our heritage of freedom and responsibility under law.

The program at the banquet will include addresses by Carl Sandburg and by Mark DeWolfe Howe, professor of law at Harvard University, secretary to Justice Holmes and his distinguished biographer; Songs of America, by Pete Seeger; and the premiere of Triumphant Banner, a new play on Justice Holmes, by Francis Coughlin and William Friedkin, with Maurice Copeland as Justice Holmes and Stanley Gorden as Justice Taft, supported by a cast of 25. Donna E. Workman is the production manager.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it will prove of interest to my colleagues and the country to extend my remarks at this point to include the text of the memorandum on Justice Holmes prepared by the Adult Education Council of Greater Chicago in connection with this historic banquet. The text follows:

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, JR.

Here Is a Yankee, Strayed From Olympus, essay on Justice Holmes by Elizabeth Shepley Sargent in Fire Under the Andes.

Born: March 8, 1841.

Parents: Amelia Jackson; Oliver Wendell Holmes (autocrat of the breakfast table, Harvard professor of anatomy, a founder of the Atlantic Monthly).

April 24, 1861: Joined 4th Battalion, New England Guard, as private.

June 21, 1861: Graduated Harvard, was named class poet.

July 1861: Joined Company A, 20th Massachusetts Infantry, as lieutenant (the so-called Harvard Regiment).

October 20, 1861: Wounded in abdomen at the Battle of Ball's Bluff.

September 17, 1862: Wounded in neck at the Battle of Antietam.

May 3, 1863: Wounded in foot at the Battle of Chancellorsville.

July 1864: Final service resisting Gen. Jubal Early's march on Fort Stevens; mustered out of service, 3-year enlistment over.

December 1864: Law clerk in office of Robert Morse, in Boston, after entering Harvard Law School in September 1864.

May 1866: First trip to England.

Autumn 1866: Joins the law office of Chandler, Shattuck & Thayer in Boston.

March 4, 1867: Admitted to the Massachusetts Bar.

1870: Opens Boston law office in partnership with brother Ned, who graduates Harvard Law School with honors; becomes editor of American Law Review; becomes instructor in constitutional law at Harvard.

July 17, 1872: Marries Fanny Bowditch Dixwell at Christ Church in Boston.

1873: Finishes editing of Kent's Commentaries on American Law; becomes partner in Boston law firm of Shattuck, Holmes & Munroe.

1874: Makes new trip to Europe, again visiting the great and near great.

1876: Appointed overseer (trustee) of Harvard University.

1880–81: Gives 12 lectures at Lowell Institute in Boston, the basis for a book on the common law.

March 3, 1881: His book, The Common Law, is published.

1882: Appointed to the Weld professorship in law, Harvard University.

December 15, 1882: Appointed associate justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court.

July 1899: Appointed chief justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court.

August 11, 1902: Appointed as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court by President Theodore Roosevelt, confirmed by the Senate in December.

December 8, 1902: Sworn in as Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

January 1916: Louis Dembitz Brandeis named to the United States Supreme Court, an old colleague and friend of Holmes from Harvard Law faculty, later to join in many famous dissents.

April 30, 1929: Mrs. Holmes dies in Washington at the age of 88.

January 11, 1932: Justice Holmes resigns.

March 1933: President Franklin D. Roosevelt visits Justice Holmes for advice.

March 6, 1935: Justice Holmes died and is buried next to his wife at Arlington National Cemetery.

Sources of material on Holmes: Max Lerner, The Mind and Faith of Justice Holmes, 1943; Francis Biddle, Mr. Justice Holmes, 1942; Oliver Wendell Holmes, Speeches, Boston, 1913; Harold J. Laski, Collected Legal Papers (editor), New York, 1920; Harry Clair Shriver, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, His Book Notices and Uncollected Letters and Papers, New York, 1936; Silas Bent, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, New York, 1932.

HOLMES ANECDOTES

President Lincoln climbed a parapet at Fort Stevens to witness his first battle. The firing began and a man on the parapet 5 feet away fell. Then a man 3 feet away fell dead. Holmes turned and shouted at the President: "Get down, you fool." Lincoln got down and said, "Captain, I am glad you know how to talk to a civilian."

On a visit to England, General Hanley said to Holmes at a dinner: "Colonel Holmes, can you train your men to fight in line?" Said Holmes: "Why, General Hanley, you can train monkeys to fight in line."

Holmes to his family: "Did you hear what St. Peter said to the Boston man at the pearly gates?" "You won't like it here."

At a dinner party, Mrs. Bell of Boston said to Holmes: "I hear you have been reading Germinal. Boston is still shocked by Zola. What do you think of him, Judge Holmes?" Said Holmes: "Improving, but dull."

Holmes at the age of 90 to a girl of 16: "I won't refrain from talking about anything because you're too young, if you won't because I'm too old."

Holmes was 70 years old on March 8, 1911. In a message to Lady Pollock, he said: "Give my love to Lady Pollock. Tell her the old man swept around the last post to the home stretch going strong."

FDR said to Holmes, calling on him a few days after the inauguration in 1933, and finding him in the library, reading Plato: "Why do you read Plato, Mr. Justice?" Said Holmes, who was 90: "To improve my mind, Mr. President." Said F. D. R.: "You have lived through half our country's history; you have seen its great men. This is a dark hour. Justice Holmes, what is your advice to me?" Said Holmes: "You are in a war, Mr. President. I was in a war, too. And in a war there is only one rule: Form your battalions and fight."

HOLMES QUOTATIONS

"Life is action and passion. I think it is required of a man that he should share the action and passion of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

"If I were dying, my last words would be, Have faith and pursue the unknown end."

"To know is not less than to feel."

"A valid idea is worth a regiment any day."

"To ride boldly at what is in front of you, be it fence or enemy; to pray, not for comfort, but for combat; to remember that duty is not to be proved in the evil day, but then to be obeyed unquestioning; to love glory more than the temptations of wallowing ease, but to know that one's final judge and only rival is oneself. For high and dangerous action teaches us to believe as right beyond dispute things for which our doubting minds are slow to find words of proof. Out of heroism grows faith in the worth of heroism. The proof comes later, and even may never come."

July 4, 1884: "Through our good fortune, in our youth our hearts were touched with fire. It was given us to learn at the outset that life is a profound and passionate thing. While we are permitted to scorn nothing but indifferences, and do not pretend to undervalue the worldly rewards of ambition, we have seen with our own eyes, beyond and above the gold fields, the snowy heights of honor, and it is for us to bear the report to those who come after us. But, above all, we have learned that whether a man accepts from fortune her spade and will look downward and dig, or from aspiration her ax and cord and will scale the ice, the one and only success which it is his to command is to bring to his work a mighty heart."

1897, Brown University commencement address: "A man of high ambitions must leave even his fellow adventurers and go forth into deeper solitude and greater trials. He must start for the pole. In plain words he must face the loneliness of original work. No one can cut new paths in company. He does that alone."

"The law embodies the story of a nation's development through many centuries, and it cannot be dealt with as if it contained only the axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics. * * * The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience. The felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, intuitions of public policy, avowed or unconscious, even the prejudices which judges share with their fellow men, have had a good deal more to do than the syllogism in determining the rules by which men should be governed."

"The very consideration which judges most rarely mention, and always with an apology, are the secret root from which the law draws all the juices of life. I mean, of course, considerations of what is expedient for the community concerned."

April 5, 1905, Lochner dissent: "A constitution is not intended to embody a particular economic theory, whether of paternalism * * * or of laissez faire. It is made for people of fundamentally differing views, and the accident of our finding certain opinions natural and familiar, or novel and even shocking, ought not to conclude our judgment upon the question whether statutes embodying them conflict with the Constitution of the United States. * * * Constitutional law, like other mortal contrivances, has to take some chances. * * *

"The ferment of genius in its creative moments is quickly imparted. If a man is great, he makes others believe in greatness."

"A word is not a crystal, transparent and unchanged; it is the skin of a living thought and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and the time in which it is used."

From opinions delivered on the Massachusetts Supreme Court: "If it is a bad rule, that is no reason for making a bad exception to it." "A horsecar cannot be handled like a rapier." "A boy who is dull at 15 probably was dull at 14." "Civil proceedings in court are not scientific investigations the end of which always must be objective truth." "The mind like any other organism gradually shapes itself to what surrounds it, and resents disturbance in the form which its life has assumed." "All values are anticipations of the future."

1896, Vegalahn dissent: "One of the eternal conflicts out of which life is made up is that between the effort of every man to get the most he can for his services, and that of society, disguised under the name of capital, to get his services for the least possible return."

March 14, 1904, Northern Securities dissent: "Great cases like hard cases make bad law. For great cases are called great not by reason of their real importance in shaping the law of the future but because of some accident of immediate overwhelming interest which appeals to the feelings and distorts the judgment. These immediate interests exercise a kind of hydraulic pressure which makes what previously was clear seem doubtful, and before which even well-settled principles of law will bend."

Abrams dissent: "When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. * * * While that experiment is part of our system I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death."

Letter to Sir Frederick Pollock: "The prevailing notion of free speech seems to be that you may say what you choose if you don't shock me. * * * The whole collectivist tendency seems to be toward underrating

or forgetting the safeguards in bills of rights that had to be fought for in their day and that are still worth fighting for. I have had to deal with cases that made my blood boil and yet seemed to create no feeling in the public or even in most of my brethren."

1899: "We must think things, not words."

Gitlow dissent: "Every idea is an incitement. The only difference between the expression of an opinion and an incitement * * * is the speaker's enthusiasm for the result. Eloquence may set fire to reason. If in the long run the beliefs expressed in proletarian dictatorships are destined to be accepted by the dominant forces of the community, the only meaning of free speech is that they should be given their chance and have their way."

Olmstead dissent: "I think it less an evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part."

Schwimmer dissent: "If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we have. * * * I would suggest that the Quakers have done their share to make the country what it is. * * * I had not supposed hitherto that we regretted our inability to expel them because they believe more than some of us do in the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount."

March 8, 1931: "To express one's feelings as the end draws near is too intimate a task. But I may mention one thought that comes to me. * * * The riders in a race do not stop short when they reach the goal. There is a little finishing canter before coming to a standstill. There is time to hear the kind voices of friends and to say to one's self: 'The work is done.' But just as one says that, the answer comes: 'The race is over, but the work never is done while the power to work remains.' The canter that brings you to a standstill need not be only coming to rest. It cannot be while you still live. For to live is to function. That is all there is to living. And so I end with a line from a Latin poet who uttered the message more than 1,500 years ago: 'Death plucks my ear and says, live—I am coming.'"

February 1913, Harvard Law School dinner: "There is a very important truth to be extracted from the popular discontent. We must * * * try to see what we can learn from hatred and distrust and whether behind them there may not be some germ of inarticulate truth."

"As I grow older I grow calm. If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than working men's disputes and will test whether we can hang together and can fight; if I fear that we are running the world's resources at a pace we cannot keep; I do not lose my hopes.

"I do not pin my dreams for the future to my country or even to my race. I think it probable that civilization somehow will last as long as I care to look ahead—perhaps with smaller numbers, but perhaps also bred to greatness and splendor by science. I think it is not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace.

"The other day my dream was pictured to my mind. It was evening. I was walking homeward on Pennsylvania Avenue near the Treasury, and as I looked beyond Sherman's statue to the west the sky was aflame with scarlet and crimson from the setting sun. But, like the note of downfall in Wagner's opera, below the sky line there came from little globes the pallid discord of the electric lights.

"And I thought to myself the Gotterdammerung will end, and from those globes clustered like evil eggs will come the new masters of the sky. It is like the time in which we live. But then I remembered the faith that I partly have expressed, faith in a universe not measured by our fears, a universe that has thought and more than thought inside of it, and as I gazed, after the sunshine and above the electric lights there shone the stars."

MISCELLANY

Other well-known Holmes dissents: *Baldwin* v. *Missouri*, *Toledo News-Bee* v. *United States*, *Milwaukee Leader* v. *Postmaster Burleson*, dissent on child labor law (June 1918).

Winner of the Harvard undergraduate award for an essay on Plato.

Member of Porcellian Society, Hasty Pudding Club, and Phi Beta Kappa at Harvard.

Editor of the Harvard magazine.

Favorite painter: Albrecht Durer.

Best friends: Sir Frederick Pollock and William James.

Keynote to success: "To want something fiercely and want it all the time."

Goad to success: His father's words: "A lawyer can't be a great man."

Difficulty: Relationship with his celebrated father: "So you are the son of Oliver Wendell Holmes." "No. He's my father."

Oliver Wendell Holmes—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a memorandum on Mrs. Oliver Wendell Holmes prepared for the Adult Educational Council of Greater Chicago on Mrs. Oliver Wendell Holmes in connection with the historic Oliver Wendell Holmes banquet in Chicago on May 14, 1958.

The article follows:

FANNY BOWDITCH DIXWELL (MRS. OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES)

Mrs. Holmes, like her husband, came from a respected and established Boston family. Like her husband, she brushed shoulders with many of America's early literary, civic, and intellectual giants.

Fanny Holmes was a women to reckon with. She was educated to her position in Boston society and was, in a deep sense, the only woman for Oliver Wendell Holmes to marry. She could, and did, puncture his ego when necessary. She could, and did, give him the meaningful daily support that helped him rise above an inner, unspoken conflict with his celebrated father, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr.—the autocrat of the breakfast table.

There was something invincibly distinguished about Fanny Holmes. She paid not the slightest attention to fashion but dressed as she pleased. When everyone else was in bonnets she wore a sailor hat, veiled, set severely on her pompadour, when they wore hats she reverted to her bonnet, tied under her chin with ribbons, perky and fresh. She wore at all times (after a serious illness during her marriage) a high collar of white net, boned. She dressed as she pleased and did as she pleased. Twice one winter, at the age of 60, she and her husband were seen running to fires along Beacon Street.

She urged her husband to leave Boston for Washington and his post on the Supreme Court, even when doubts assailed her as to how she would be received in Washington. A year younger than Holmes, she appeared older than he. She said to a friend: "Mary, look at me. How can I go to Washington—I, who look like an abandoned farm in Maine?"

Arriving in Washington, a coalman refusing coal delivery because of scarce supplies, was told that the coal was for Mr. Holmes. "Who the devil is Oliver Wendell Holmes?" said the coalman. Said Fanny: "After 60 years, Wendell, we have achieved a life where your father's name is of no significance, except as you make it so."

When President Roosevelt held a dinner for Holmes on his coming to the Supreme Court, he escorted Mrs. Holmes to the dinner table. She mentioned that she had been visited by the wives of various Congressmen. Said TR: "You found the ladies pleasant?" Said Fanny: "Washington is full of famous men and the women they married when they were young." T. R. roared with laughter. Later Fanny told her husband: "I find it somewhat easier to go into dinner at the head of all the company."

Fanny was a practical joker, possibly not born so, but developed so, to keep her husband relaxed and free from tension when he was under great strain. She would put some trick item out each April Fool's Day—unlightable matches, false inkspots on freshly written court opinions—even celluloid roaches in the flour barrel. On Washington's birthday, she invariably placed a red and black hatchet at Holmes' place at the dinner table. In March, on St. Patrick's Day, it would be a shamrock.

A high-spirited woman of immense charm and gaiety, her spirits were dimmed after a serious illness, but were restored by the family's later move to Washington. She could say to her husband: "Wendell, I see by the transcript that, if you keep on, you may be almost as famous as your father, some day." Or, "Wendell, I see by the paper that you are the 'laboring man's friend'."

She was imensely devoted to a variety of birds that she kept at all times. Once when one bird got loose and killed a starling, she put him in a separate cage, and isolated thus, hung crepe over the cage door.

Once Justice Holmes created an uproar over a book that had supposedly been lost. He cussed his secretary and there was a great storm. Through it all, Mrs. Holmes just looked at him in the sharp way she had. When Holmes later returned to home from the offices of the Supreme Court the "lost" volume was in its place on the bookshelf. Above it hung an American flag. Below it was a carefully lettered sign that Fanny Holmes had made herself. It said: "I am a very old man. I have many troubles, most of which never happened." Justice Holmes laughed until he cried.

On a visit to Pride's Crossing, Mrs. Holmes was driven to the depot to meet her husband by Larcum of the livery stable. The horse suddenly began running and didn't stop until they got to Pride's Crossing. Mrs. Holmes was imperturbable. She just leaned out and called, waving her parasol: "Larcum, if you kill me, tell him I loved him."

Fanny Holmes said of the many needlepoint pictures on which she loved to work: "I want my pictures destroyed someday. It's dreary for people to feel they must cherish the works of departed aunts."

The marriage of Fanny and Oliver Wendell Holmes lasted 56 years. A broken hip at the age of 88 sent Fanny to bed and soon thereafter she quietly died. She was buried at Arlington National Cemetery in Washington.

For the 6 years that remained to him, Justice Holmes followed an annual ritual on the day of Fanny's death. He would visit her grave and leave a bouquet of a rose, a poppy, and a spray of honeysuckle.

He was buried beside her after his death in 1935.

(Source: Yankee From Olympus, by Catherine Drinker Bowen.)

Unemployment Problem in the State of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, unemployment in New Jersey, as in most other States, is a serious and pressing problem. The latest figures I have been able to obtain show that there are roughly 150,000 unemployed in the State as a whole, or about 9.6 percent of the overall work force.

At the moment the prinoipal labor surplus areas in the State include centers such as Newark, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Trenton, Morristown, and Dover. However, there are three other labor market areas in New Jersey in which economic distress has become virtually chronic. One may feel fairly confident that as general business conditions in the country improve, in most labor markets in the States the employment levels will also improve. But experience demonstrates that in the three areas where serious unemployment has persisted even when the rest of the State was working quite well, there will be no significant recovery unless specific and adequate measures are taken to improve the economac base in these chronic labor surplus markets.

It is because of my conviction that carefully designed legislation must promptly be enacted by the Congress to aid these depressed areas in my State, and elsewhere in this country, that I call to the attention of my fellow Members of Congress a series of studies on the subject now being circulated by the Area Employment Expansion Committee. This committee is headed by former United States Senator Prentiss Brown of Michigan and is composed of a representative group of citizens who have given special study to the problem of the chronically distressed labor area. I attach herewith fact sheet No. 7 (prepared by the Area Employment Expansion Committee which deals specifically with the current situation in New Jersey.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET NO. 7—NEW JERSEY

The State of New Jersey continues to have three labor market areas which have remained distressed and in which unemployment has been chronic. These three labor markets, which include Atlantic City, Long Branch, and Bridgeton, have for many years tried to solve their problems through their own efforts and those of the State. But they have not graduated from the labor surplus status. They require Federal assistance to enable them to create new locational advantages derived from a new economic base.

The problems of these three depressed urban areas are chronic in character. They will not be surmounted by a temporary upswing in business throughout the country. They will not benefit from a general reduction in the level of unemployment. They will be the last to feel the tides of expansion. To hasten the process of recovery and bring them back into the mainstream of American economic life, these communities must receive specific help.

In January 1958, their rates of unemployment were:

Atlantic City, 17.1 percent.
Long Branch, 11.7 percent.
Bridgeton, over 10 percent.

In the present recession, other labor markets in New Jersey have also been classified as areas of substantial labor surplus. These include Newark, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Trenton, and Morristown-Dover. It is hoped that these communities will not become permanently distressed; they are unlikely to, since most have sound industrial structures.

The distressed communities need help in diagnosing their problems, organizing their community leadership in addition to the commercial interests, financial assistance to improve their facilities, and finally, aid in building adequate industrial sites. They can obtain such assistance from the organization and funds which would be available under the Douglas Area Redevelopment bill.

LABOR MARKETS IN NEW JERSEY

The entire State of New Jersey can be placed in 5 major, 5 smaller, and 6 very small labor markets as follows:

Major:
Atlantic City.
Newark.
Paterson.
Perth Amboy.
Trenton.

Smaller:
Bridgeton.
Long Branch.
Morristown-Dover.
Somerville-Plainfield.
Camden.

Very small:
Burlington.
Gloucester.
Phillipsburg.
Salem.
Sussex.
Wildwood.

BASIC CAUSES FOR CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT

The basic causes for the chronic unemployment in these 3 areas must be studied separately, to isolate the types of problems they face and the nature of the long-term aid they need.

Bridgeton, N. J.

This labor market includes all of Cumberland County; part of Atlantic County (Buena Borough, Buena Vista Township, in part); Gloucester County (Franklin Township and Newfield Borough); and Salem County (Elmer Borough and Pittsgrove Township). Its 1955 population is estimated at 113,860 persons. Its principal centers are Bridgeton, Millville, Vineland, Penns Grove, Woodstown, and Buena.

The civilian labor force in this area has increased only slightly. Its numbers, for January of the respective years, were as follows: 1950, 59,350; 1951, 63,400; 1952, 63,600; 1953, 63,500; 1954, 65,150. Subsequently, the Salem area was excluded from the labor market and the figures, exclusive of this area, were as follows: 1955, 46,500; 1956, 47,000; 1957, 48,150.

Actually, unemployment has been consistently high. The rate exceeded 6 percent in all but 2 months of 1950; all but 4 of 1951; half of 1952 and of 1953; all of 1954; all but 2 months of 1955; all 1956; all but 2 months of 1957. Latest figures show an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent for November 1957 and over 10 percent in 1958. At the beginning of 1957, the unemployment rate was 13.4 percent for January and 11.2 percent for March and, except for September when it was 5.4 percent, it has otherwise exceeded 9 percent.

The reason for its difficulties are to be found in the very nature of the area. About 46 percent of its employed force is in manufacturing. A considerable volume of employment has been lost because of the closing of several garment plants. The reduction in dredging, due to the depletion of mature oysters and the lack of demand, has curtailed the fishing industry in this area.

The amount of new employment coming into the area has been insufficient to pick up the slack.

Atlantic City labor market

This labor area includes all of Atlantic County except for Buena Borough, part of Buena Vista Township, Landisville, and Minotola, the townships of Bass River, Shamong, and Washington in Burlington County; Waterford and Winslow Townships and Chesilhurst Borough in Camden County; Uppertownship and Ocean City in Cape May County; and part of Monroe Township in Gloucester County. Currently, it has a work force of some 60,000 persons.

This area has been classified as having substantial unemployment and labor surplus since 1949. The only alleviations were those which occurred during war periods through military withdrawals and war-induced employment expansion in other areas. But, with the end of the war, the labor surpluses have been reestablished.

Actually, unemployment is consistently high except during the 4 or 5 summer months. The reason is quite apparent when it is known that over 80 percent of the nonfarm wage and salary workers are engaged in nonmanufacturing enterprises primarily serving the community, which is a health and vacation resort and a convention center. During the winter months, the rate of unemployment rises, as it did in January 1957 to 17 percent, and in January 1958 to 17.1 percent.

Long Branch

This labor market includes Monmouth County except for Millstone and Upper Freehold Townships and Allentown Borough; and Ocean County except for part of Plumstead Township. It has a labor force of some 114,900 persons.

This area, too, is primarily a vacation resort. Less than 17 percent of the area's employment is in manufacturing. The area houses considerable tourist resort business and employment, therefore, is highly seasonal. The major manufacturing industry is apparel. There is other light manufacturing, in the electrical machinery industry.

Unemployment in this area has not tended to be as serious as in Atlantic City, but it has created a chronic surplus for many years. In 1957, except for the summer months, the rate of unemployment was above 6 percent, with the rate in January 1957 reaching the level of 8.7 percent; this compares with 9.4 percent in January 1956, and 9.9 percent in January 1955. In January 1958, the rate was 11.7 percent.

Both Atlantic City and Long Branch are greatly in need of diversification of enterprises and industry to provide more alternative employment during the nonsummer months.

DISTRESSED LABOR MARKETS

The 3 labor markets of Atlantic City, Bridgeton, and Long Branch have been classified as surplus areas for more than 3 years. They are so classified at present. Their rates of unemployment have been high (table I). They would be qualified for the benefits of such classification under the Douglas bill. Atlantic City has been classified as chronically distressed since 1952. Bridgeton and Long Branch have been so classified since 1954.

Unemployment in surplus areas higher than in remainder of State

The rate of unemployment in these areas has been markedly higher than in the re-

mainder of the State. In 1953, the average for these 3 areas was 5.8 percent, as compared to 3.5 percent for the other areas. The contrast for other years was as follows:

[Percent]

Year	3 distressed areas	Other State areas
1954	7.7	6.3
1955	8.0	5.5
1956	7.7	4.9
1957	7.2	5.3

The 3 surplus areas provided about 16 percent of the unemployed in the State, though they accounted for about 11 percent of the population (table III).

Disproportionate share of unemployment compensation

While the labor force in these 3 chronic surplus areas represents only about 11 percent of the State's population, the residents of these areas account for some 16 percent of the unemployment compensation beneficiaries. In fact, the rate of continued unemployment claims of the covered population tended to be more than double the rate for the remainder of the State (table III).

Unemployment compensation benefits paid to these 3 areas amounted to about 15 percent of the total of benefits in the State (table IV).

Claimants who exhausted their unemployment benefits in these 3 labor markets comprised 13 to 17.5 percent of the total of the State (table V).

The disparity between the unemployment benefits in these areas and the rest of the State speaks strikingly of the chronic conditions which need substantial correction.

TABLE I.—*Usual labor supply classification of areas of substantial labor surplus in New Jersey,* [1] *1953–57*

Labor market area	Year classified as surplus [2]	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
Major area: Atlantic City	1952	D	D	E–D	E–D–E	E–D–E
Smaller areas:						
Bridgeton	1954	NC	NC–S	S	S	S
Long Branch	1954	NC	NC–S	S	S	S

[1] Major areas are classified as follows: D—Unemployment between 6 and 8.9 percent of total labor force. E—Unemployment between 9 and 11.9 percent of total labor force. Smaller areas are classified "S" if unemployment is 6 percent or more. NC—Not classified. NC–S—Classified as labor surplus for part of year.
[2] Current classification system was instituted in 1951.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor.

TABLE II.—*Number unemployed and percent of civilian labor force unemployed in New Jersey, 1953–57, by substantial labor surplus area*

Labor market area	Average number unemployed [1]					Average percent of civilian labor force unemployed				
	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
State total	82,510	142,690	129,258	119,208	128,995	3.8	6.4	5.7	5.2	5.5
Major area: Atlantic City	4,700	5,675	6,033	5,658	4,083	8.2	10.3	10.1	9.3	9.4
Smaller areas:										
Bridgeton [2]	3,775	5,033	3,983	4,300	4,758	5.6	8.1	8.4	8.7	9.7
Long Branch	4,783	7,066	7,433	7,400	7,660	4.7	6.6	6.9	6.6	6.7
3 surplus areas combined	13,258	17,774	17,449	17,358	16,441	5.8	7.7	8.0	7.7	7.2
Remainder of State	69,252	124,916	111,809	101,850	112,554	3.5	6.3	5.5	4.9	5.3

[1] Annual averages for 6 months of each year (January, March, May, July, September, and November).
[2] Salem local office area excluded after July 1954.

Source: New Jersey Division of Employment Security.

TABLE III.—*Average weekly number of continued unemployment compensation claims, and claims volumes as a percentage of unemployment compensation covered labor force, in areas of substantial labor surplus in New Jersey, 1953–57*

Labor market area	Continued unemployment compensation claims									
	Average weekly number					As a percentage of unemployment compensation covered labor force				
	1953 [1]	1954 [1]	1955 [1]	1956	1957	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
State total	38,801	49,440	57,256	62,133	73,573	2.6	3.5	3.9	4.1	4.8
Major area: Atlantic City	2,296	2,053	3,025	3,247	3,901	7.1	6.2	9.1	9.6	11.7
Smaller areas:										
Bridgeton	1,868	2,021	2,376	2,517	3,076	6.3	6.9	7.9	8.0	10.0
Long Branch	2,313	2,683	3,442	4,056	4,787	4.9	5.6	7.1	7.9	9.2
3 surplus areas combined	6,490	6,757	8,843	9,820	11,764	5.9	6.1	7.9	8.4	10.1
Remainder of State	32,302	42,683	48,413	52,313	61,809	2.4	3.3	3.6	3.8	4.4
Percent of total in 3 surplus areas	16.7	13.7	15.4	15.8	16.0					

[1] Data not comparable for 1953–55 because of variations in reporting methods.

Source: New Jersey Division of Employment Security.

TABLE IV.—*Unemployment - compensation benefits in areas of substantial labor surplus in New Jersey, 1953–57*

[Thousands of dollars]

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
State total	56,088	110,482	88,602	92,304	115,573
3 surplus areas	9,496	14,948	13,733	13,828	17,491
Remainder of State	46,932	95,534	74,869	78,476	98,082
Percent of total in 3 surplus areas	16.9	13.5	15.5	15.0	15.1

Source: New Jersey Division of Employment Security.

TABLE V.—*Number of claimants who exhausted their unemployment-compensation benefits in areas of substantial labor surplus in New Jersey, 1953–57*

Labor market area	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
State total	34,022	73,034	69,283	57,640	73,577
Major area: Atlantic City	1,951	3,043	3,562	4,317	4,774
Smaller areas:					
Bridgeton	1,355	2,811	2,702	2,049	3,341
Long Branch	1,937	3,463	3,913	3,457	4,768
3 surplus areas combined	5,243	9,317	10,177	9,823	12,883
Remainder of State	28,779	63,717	59,106	47,817	60,714
Percent of total in 3 surplus areas	15.4	12.8	14.7	17.0	17.5

Source: New Jersey Division of Employment Security.

Senate Bill 3337

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial from the Waterways Journal of April 12, 1958, entitled "Senate Bill 3337," it comments favorably on an amendment to the Medals of Honor Act proposed by Senator CHARLES POTTER, of Michigan:

SENATE BILL 3337

There have been many acts of heroism on the inland waterways over the years. An example of the acts above and beyond the call of duty was the rescue of more than 150 persons by the crews of the towboats *Houston* and *Dallas* of the Coyle Lines, Inc., during hurricane Audrey last year. Unfortunately, most of the inland waterways' heroes have not received the public recognition they deserve.

To correct this omission, Senator CHARLES POTTER, of Michigan, has introduced in the Senate S. 3337 to amend the Medals of Honor Act by authorizing awards for acts of heroism on vessels engaged in interstate commerce on the inland waterways. The Medals of Honor Act was passed by Congress in 1905 to provide for the awarding of bronze medals of honor to persons who, by extreme daring, endangering their own lives in saving or endeavoring to save lives from any wreck or other disaster upon any railroad in interstate commerce in the United States.

Last year Congress passed an amendment to authorize such awards for acts of heroism involving a motor vehicle. In introducing

his bill, Senator POTTER said: "The history of our country is replete with acts of heroism by personnel on vessels and barges of our inland waterways. It is fitting and proper that these courageous people shall also be eligible for awards of honor for their heroic acts." The bill is now before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Senator POTTER deserves commendation for his recognition of the heroism of inland waterways personnel and for his leadership in taking steps to correct the situation. The bill has the support of the Waterways Journal as well as the endorsement of a number of waterways organizations, including the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association.

It is also to the credit of inland waterways personnel and to the inland waterways carriers that the inland waterways have an excellent maritime safety record. With the opening of the navigation season and with the return of thousands of pleasure craft to the rivers it is important that water safety be stressed. Proper observance of the rules of the road will prevent most accidents and education of pleasure-boat owners in the rules of water safety is the first step. The inland waterways carriers and the United States Coast Guard have done much effective work in this field, but it must be a continuing campaign in which all waterway interests should join.

Reynolds County School District Instituted First Vocational Agriculture Course in Forestry in the State of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Wayne County Journal-Banner, Piedmont, Mo., which was a reprint from the December Missouri Conservationist:

REYNOLDS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT INSTITUTED FIRST VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE COURSE IN FORESTRY IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI

(By Jim Keefe)

The consolidated school in Ellington, a small Ozark town of 777 souls in Reynolds County, is composed of several buildings and some people of vision. The buildings, for the most part, are not new. Years of hard use by children are plainly evident on them.

Reynolds is not a rich county. The soils of the southeast Ozarks are stubborn and flinty. Despite a century of toil expended on them, they have not yielded a harvest to create the biggest schoolplant with the latest facilities. Those same soils in the R–2 schoolyard have the familiar rusty red-brown of Clarksville stony loam when it has been bared and exposed to weather. The stones from which the soil takes its name are plentifully in evidence.

But buildings alone do not make a school, just as soil alone does not make a county, and R–2 school has dedicated servants in its staff, people who see hope for better things in the young people frolicking in the yard. These are the real integers of Southern School District R–2.

One of the visionaries of Reynolds County is a vocational agriculture instructor named Luther R. Hilterbrand. With Conservation Commission District Forester Fred B. Whitt, he has set up a course of instruction that may be, in its own way, a quiet revolution in the approach to Reynolds County's resources.

Last year, Hilterbrand got to pondering about agricultural instruction and its hoped-for results in his community. Ray, as he is known, is a son of the region who returned there after he completed his schooling at Missouri University to try to bring out the best in the Reynolds County children. He talked to Fred Whitt, the forester stationed in Ellington, and they discussed the future of Reynolds County and its resources.

Their analysis went something like this: Reynolds is of medium size; 785 square miles. Within its borders is some of the most dissected landscape in the State, with elevations running from 450 feet to 1,700 feet. Its soils are typical of the Ozarks; the bottom lands having narrow strips of medium fertility soils, its uplands composed of stony, eroded soils of extremely low fertility. Only the valley strips are arable, with the uplands left to timber through which fires used to race unchecked and where cattle eked out an existence in open range.

In a Department of Agriculture pamphlet of 1921 vintage, the statement is found: "About one half of the population is engaged in lumbering, including the making of railroad ties * * * stock raising and forestry are the two most profitable industries * * * the county is 90 percent forested." Although those words were written 36 years ago, they describe Reynolds County today.

One other quote from the USDA document is worth citing: "With the rapid decline of the lumber industry, more dependence must be placed on the soil and greater effort made to make it yield larger returns." That statement reflects the ideas of the time, that the forests were to be cut down, exploited, and that timber would then no longer hold any place in the economy. History has exposed the fallacy. Timber is very much with Reynolds County today, but both Whitt and Hilterbrand say that the income from the forests was very low because of the poor timber quality. Ninety percent forested is not enough; there must be good forests.

It was from this reasoning that Hilterbrand went forward. It, he thought, Reynolds County children must grow up in a county 90 percent forested, why not make available to them information they must have about forests and good forestry practices? Agriculture courses they need, but agriculture in Reynolds County must always recognize that stubborn fact of rather poor soil that is best utilized in growing trees. After further discussion with Forester Whitt he was ready to present his case to Superintendent Dr. George DeWoody.

DeWoody is a forward thinking man, too, and he saw Hilterbrand's point. The necessary mechanics of setting up such a course were worked out, and in the fall of 1956 the first group of boys began class and field work in vocational agriculture forestry classes—the first of its kind, so far as is known.

Last fall Cameraman Don Wooldridge and I attended classes with a new group of boys—district R–2 had a brandnew addition to its school plant—a bright shop and classroom, where Forester Whitt was arranging his notes and making preliminary chalk marks on the new green blackboards, Don and I curiously inspected the facilities. (It has been a long time since we were in such classrooms.)

Over Whitt's green blackboard hung the familiar blue and gold Future Farmers of America banner. The local chapter charter hung nearby. Bookcases with books and pamphlets on agricultural subjects occupied one corner, another had a magazine rack with its Poland China World, old copies of Farm Journal, and the like. Around the walls hung idealized portraits of livestock. The emphasis was plainly cattle and crop farming, but for a week the boys were going to be exposed to tree farming—something new in their young lives. Last year's class had made a leaf collection, however, which was displayed. Don nudged me and indicated the multiflora rose fence outside the school building. Wildlife conservation was not unfamiliar to the boys, we noted with satisfaction.

Whitt launched into his class discussion, which that day was silviculture, or the producing and caring for a forest. The course outline, which Hilterbrand had furnished us, stated that the boys would study "Orientation, tree identification, silviculture, hardwood stand management, pine silvics, timber cruising (including methods of estimation and growth measurement), and land measurement (including use of compass, pacing, area estimation)." The first three subjects, and the last, were classroom procedures. All subjects but the first, also had field instruction and were to be practiced on the home farms. In a county like Reynolds there is no lack of outdoor laboratories, for either good or bad examples of forestry. At the town's southwest edge is the Conservation Commission's Deer Run Forest and Refuge, and in northwestern Reynolds is national forest land, for good examples. There is no lack of examples elsewhere of the effects of high grading, overgrazing, fire, and indifference.

While Whitt explained such technicalities as crown dominance, I studied the course outline further. Probably the most valuable bit of instruction was to be the student's own timber project. Each boy was expected to lay out a small tract of timber of his own, estimate timber volume present, and report on what could be expected in the way of future growth. Then he was to put his forestry training into practice by marking cull trees, removing them, make thinning cuttings where indicated, harvest mature trees and practice what he had learned in tallying and scaling. He would be required (as in any FFA project) to maintain an accurate record of his expenses and receipts for labor and materials so as to have an idea of his profit and loss. Hilterbrand would assist him throughout the project. This was putting his learning into practice in the established way.

As I read this, I recalled Fred Whitt's comments on the course as we drove to school. "What these people need is some leadership," he said. "They want to do a good job with what they have, but they need knowledge. The place to begin is with these young fellows who will be farming and working the land. Of course, in my forestry work I spend a good deal of time helping adults make the best use of their timber, but the real, best hope lies with this high-school-age group; they are going to be the inheritors of these resources—such as they are. Let's give them the best knowledge we can, so they'll use these resources wisely and well."

That afternoon, as we motored with the class out to Deer Run for a field session in timber cruising and compass use, Hilterbrand added his own comments.

"I guess you know that many of our high-school boys already have some notion of forestry work from their serving on emergency forest-fire crews. They already have had the lesson of fire drilled into them. What we want to do in this course is give them something more positive. Preventing and fighting forest fires is pretty much a negative thing, but studying, managing, and harvesting your own timber is positive. Their home projects are examples to the community, and it is the entire community that must even-

tually come around to good forestry, at least in Reynolds County."

He paused for a moment, then continued: "There are other values, too. I'm a great believer in carryover. By that I mean things they learn in forest conservation—habits of thinking and attitudes—are bound to be reflected in other things. It's a short step from recognition of good forestry and its reasons to recognition of fish and game laws, and their reasons. From there, the boys can embrace all the ways of good citizens. Maybe I'm hoping for too much," he grinned, "but I visualize this course as having to do with a lot more than just forestry."

He may be right. I'm reporting on what has and is being done, not predicting outcomes. This is fact: Southern Reynolds County School District R–2 has instituted the first vocational agriculture course in forestry in Missouri and possibly the Nation. It was established by Luther R. Hilterbrand and Conservation Commission Forester Fred B. Whitt. The school has 80 acres of timber for experimental purposes and all of Reynolds County for the future. Seven boys have five or more acres in forestry projects now, with more in the offing. This is 1 of 275 vocational agriculture departments in the State, and the State Department of Education is watching this experimental class closely. Hilterbrand says that a high-school-level textbook on forestry is badly needed. In 1957, the second group completed forestry training. That is fact.

What is less clear is what the future holds. One thing is certain; both Hilterbrand and Whitt believe that as this course is permitted to continue and grow, the knowledge young citizens bring to managing Reynolds County's resources is going to be better. They believe their project can be applied to every county in the State with good results, but that forested counties need it most. They believe that, as foresters are patient men who work in terms of 50 to 100 years to produce a beneficial timber crop, so must teachers be patient, but that their beneficial crops of informed young citizens will be remaking the face of their land for the better in much less than 150 years. We believe they are right.

The Challenge of Sputnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written concerning the advent of sputnik and the consequences which its launching presents to the free world. Unfortunately, much of that writing has only served to increase the confusion which initially gripped many Americans when they became aware that the Russians had launched the first earth satellite.

An exception to this situation can, however, be found in a recent article entitled "The Challenge of Sputnik," written by L. A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology. The article appears in the February issue of Engineering and Science, a publication of the institute.

President DuBridge is eminently correct, I believe, when he points out that the real challenge of sputnik is that it forces us to take stock of our intellectual resources and to assess how these resources are being utilized. His realistic response to that challenge is deserving of our close consideration.

I note that Mr. DuBridge endorses the administration's program of assistance for higher education. I must take exception with his position on this point, for I am convinced that the administration's approach to this problem is inadequate. But this is a minor point in the development of President DuBridge's general thesis, and our disagreement in this matter does not seriously detract from the significance of his article. I highly recommend it to my colleagues for their consideration, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SPUTNIK

(By L. A. DuBridge)

On October 4, 1957, the Russians announced that they had successfully launched an earth satellite; that a 180-pound object was circling above the earth at an average height of 300 miles or so. A month later Sputnik No. II was in an orbit.

The reaction of the people of the world to these events was fabulous. To those scientists who had come to take it for granted that earth satellites would someday be launched—by both the United States and the U. S. S. R.—the fact that the Russians launched the first one came as a great surprise. However, it occasioned no more shock to them than having your home team lose a football game. The Russians put one over on us—fairly and squarely. O. K.—we will win the next round.

But to those who had not previously thought much about earth satellites the reaction was about as violent as though Russia had landed an atomic bomb on New York. To some it was more like the landing of a flying saucer from Mars. Astonishment, disbelief, hysteria, anger, recrimination, disillusionment, fear, and a hundred other emotional responses soon became evident. And then followed an unbelievable torrent of outraged denunciation and outrageous proposals for revenge on the Russians, for punishment of the guilty Americans.

In Europe and Asia there was confusion, too, for a great idol had toppled from its pedestal; the carefully nurtured proposition that America was always first in all things technical suddenly collapsed. Europeans waited in vain for a word of explanation, of reassurance. But all they heard from America was the confusion of many voices—some of which declaimed that the end of the free world was now in sight, that Soviet superiority in all things technical, military, and even educational, was now proved; America, it was said, had lost the race for survival. Equally confused were those who treated with contempt of disdain one of the great events of man's history, who dismissed it as a mere bauble.

The Russians have capitalized on this situation by deriding our weakness and confusion, by bragging about their great triumph. They have announced that they intend to send rockets to the moon, that more animal experiments will be carried out, and that someday a manned rocket will be launched. An example of our hysteria was the headlining of a ridiculous rumon that a man had been hurled 186 miles into space in a rocket.

Now, of course, some people have been talking about space travel in this country for years—but they were dismissed as starry eyed visionaries, or just plain nuts (as, indeed, some of them were). But when the Russian Government takes space travel seriously, Americans sit up and take notice. And now our disregarded astronauts are getting the headlines. Suddenly, travel in space has become a subject of everyday conversation. People seriously expect, and some seem even to hope, that their children may someday live on the Moon or on Mars.

Then on December 5 the American Vanguard launching failed—and hysteria broke loose again. I never expected to live to see the day when a leaky fuel pipe would be regarded as an international tragedy. Every engineer knows that accidents of this sort must always be expected in a new venture. Technological advances are not easy. In the early days of aviation, men found the conquest of the air to be a tough business—and scores of hardy pioneers sacrificed their equipment and even their lives to the task of making airplanes more reliable. Modern space rocketry has not claimed any lives yet—but it will. Large rockets are enormously complex devices, and no amount of human ingenuity will ever make them infallible. I am sure the Russians have had accidents. The Germans certainly had many. We have had some and will have more. But we will have successes too. A leaky fuel line or a defective turbine blade can hardly be taken as signs that the whole of our science and technology has suddenly collapsed.

In any case, we find ourselves in a time of great and astonishing events—and hence, inevitably, in a time of great confusion. Many terrible questions must be asked. Are we really in great and imminent military danger? Has Russia assumed technological leadership of the world? Have they proved that a dictatorship is superior to a democracy? Must we then adopt their methods to survive? Is our educational system obsolete? Are we hopelessly outclassed, outstripped, disgraced?

These and many other questions that sputnik has raised have no easy answers. There are too many quantities still unknown. And, even where some things are clear, the question of what we should do about them is often unclear.

The best we can do at the present stage is to bring together the facts and separate the true from the false, the known from the unknown, and the certain from the uncertain. And then we must order our questions. We must recognize that some questions, such as the one, "Are the Russians ahead of us?" have no meaning. Ahead of us in what? As of what date Does being ahead mean they can annihilate us? Other questions are unanswerable because we cannot possibly have the information such as, "Do the Russians intend to attack us with ballistic missiles?" No one can read their minds. But some questions are real and do have answers. We should identify those questions, then seek their answers and try to comprehend their meaning.

FACE THE FACTS

First, however, let us look at a few facts. The Russians have launched the first two satellites. There is no doubt of that. And it is a great achievement. To launch an object into an orbit above the earth, the object must first be lifted well above the earth's atmosphere—say, 200 miles or so—then at that height it must be guided to a horizontal path, parallel to the earth's surface, aimed in the proper geographic direction, and brought up to a predetermined high speed. If an object is made to travel horizontally at 200 miles above the earth at a speed of about 18,000 miles per hour, it will circle the earth indefinitely, because the tendency of gravity to bring it down is exactly balanced by the centrifugal force tending to make it fly away from the earth entirely. A stable orbit is then followed. It may be a circular orbit or, more likely, if the speed is a bit too high or too low, an elliptical orbit getting farther from the earth at one side of its trajectory.

Some people ask: What keeps it going? What keeps it up there? In reply, let us ask: What keeps the moon going around the

earth? What keeps the earth going around the sun? The answer is simple. Nothing. Once an object has been started in motion, it tends to keep going forever—unless something tends to stop it. This great principle was discovered by Galileo in the 17th century, and was enunciated more precisely by Newton 50 years or so later. Every student of high school physics knows Newton's first law of motion (or does he?). Here on earth, of course, friction is always present to make things stop moving—so most people don't really believe that Newton's first law has any practical importance. But high above the atmosphere there is little or no friction, so the satellites keep on going The Sputnik I rocket case lasted about 8 weeks, the satellite itself about 12 weeks. The moon, 240,000 miles away, has been rotating in its orbit for at least 4½ billion years.

ELEMENTARY PHYSICS

So, the questions which puzzle so many about satellite motions are answered by the most elementary principles of physics. And the widespread lack of understanding is sad proof of how few people have learned those simple principles.

There has been some discussion of how to bring down a satellite once it is up there. One Congressman suggested we shoot them down. Other people asked how the little dog in Sputnik II was to be let down. Again, some elementary physics must be recalled.

As I have said, once a satellite is in orbit it will stay there until something changes its motion. Friction will bring it down—very gradually at high elevations and very much faster as it comes into the atmosphere. But it is not easy to slow down a satellite suddenly so that gravity will pull it in at once. Shooting a bullet into it would damage the radio transmitter, but would not stop the motion. If you could make it collide head-on with another satellite going in the opposite direction, that would do it. But to achieve such a collision would be quite a trick. And, of course, a collision of 2 objects, each going 18,000 miles per hour, wouldn't have done the little doggie much good. That doggie was doomed from the beginning, and anyone who thought it could get back alive did not remember his physics.

What about a parachute? Since there is no air up there, there is nothing for the parachute to hang on to. Even if the little dog could jump out of the satellite with his oxygen supply on, he would simply keep on sailing around the earth; he would be another satellite. There is just nothing there to slow him down enough so that gravity can overcome centrifugal force.

If a satellite could be equipped with an extra rocket motor and plenty of fuel so that the rocket blast could be fired in a direction to slow it down—that, of course, would do the trick. It takes a rocket to speed the thing up; it takes a rocket to slow it down. A rocket blast is about the only propulsion scheme we know which will work in a vacuum, above the earth's atmosphere. Maybe someday we will have satellites large enough to carry the slowing-down rocket, together with its fuel and the necessary equipment to fire it at the desired time.

RETURNING SATELLITES

As a falling missile or satellite comes into the atmosphere, a new problem arises. Because of the enormous speed, the friction of the air will generate a great deal of heat. This is the reentry problem. As President Eisenhower said in his first TV science talk, this reentry problem has been solved for a military bomb—i. e., for an object that can stand some heat and that can hit the ground at high speed, or an object that is intended to explode before striking. But we do not yet know how to bring a dog to earth gently enough, and cool enough, so that it will survive. All the energy of the many tons of fuel required to life the rocket originally will now appear as heat on the way down. And thus a returning satellite will usually have the same fate as a meteor; it will probably be burned up—and what is left will strike the ground with a terrific impact.

This raises the question of whether, if you launched a satellite with a bomb in it, you could then drop the bomb to hit any place on earth as the satellite pases over it. The answer, of course, is no. If a bomb were simply ejected from the satellite—say, by a spring or a small charge of gunpowder—it, too, would become another satellite. For the bomb to drop, it would have to be propelled backward by a huge rocket charge to reduce its kinetic energy. And, even then, it would spiral toward the earth in a curious path, and the accuracy of a hit would hardly be great.

Sputnik in itself, then, is hardly a military weapon. Why, then, does sputnik give us such grave concern?

The main reason, of course, is that a rocket and guidance system good enough to put a 1,000-pound satellite into an orbit is certainly good enough to shoot a 1,500-pound hydrogen bomb from Russia to the United States. The guidance accuracy might be only 50 miles. Such accuracy is not good enough to destroy an airbase, but a hit anyplace within 50 miles of New York or Los Angeles would be pretty bad. And the accuracy will eventually be improved.

So the Russians are clearly very good rocket engineers. This is the main thing that sputnik proves. They have put great effort on large rockets, and they were willing to use some of their military rockets for scientific experiments of great propaganda value. That is something we were not willing to do.

Granted they are good rocket engineers, what kind of military rockets do they have? Are they any better than ours? Are they in production, or still in the experimental stage? Will they have 100 next year, or in 5 years? In any case, how big a threat to us is 1 rocket or 10 or 100?

These, of course, are all unanswerable questions—and hence they are the ones that everyone speculates about. Unfortunately, the Russians have not told us precisely just what type of military rockets they have, when they will have them, or how many there will be. They have made a few proud boasts, but only the United States Central Intelligence Agency knows how accurate those boasts are. And CIA is not telling what it knows.

By the same token, in spite of all the press releases, the United States Defense Department has not told the full story of our rocket technology either. The President did say that we have over 30 types of guided missiles in development, and many of them in production. Sputnik alone does not reveal the full military strength of either country. It has revealed simply that the Russians are better rocket engineers than most of us thought. Hence, they may have now, and certainly will have someday, enough military rockets to be a serious threat to us.

UNITED STATES MISSILES

But of one more thing we can be sure: The United States has not been asleep in the guided missile field either. Our Nike antiaircraft missiles, for example, are certainly a powerful protection against the Soviet bomber. Many scientists feel that there have been too many missiles developed in this country. It might have been better to concentrate on a smaller number and not have tried to make them all so perfect. But it is a typical American habit—if there are several ways of doing a thing, we will try them all. And we will push each one to a high state of perfection. We certainly have acquired a very large and diversified missile technology in the past 10 years. And if we wish now to concentrate a large effort on 1 or 2 major projects, we could certainly get them into production fast. In fact, Caltech's jet propulsion laboratory, using existing Army equipment, launched the first United States satellite, the Explorer, less than 12 weeks after the project was authorized.

The notion that Russian rockets could suddenly, tonight, destroy all American bomber bases all over the world and render us immediately defenseless is absurd. Such a feat would require the accurate and simultaneous striking of hundreds of long-range missiles—all making effective hits. To run the risk of not hitting even a few bases would be dangerous, for even a few H-bombs that we could launch can do tremendous damage. Thus our bomber force will be a serious threat to Russia for a long time to come.

But that fact should not give cause for complacency—and I know of no informed person who is complacent. As Dr. Killian, the President's new special assistant, has said, "We need a sense of urgency without despair."

What, then, should we do now? What must we do later?

The first demand which the sputnik situation puts on us, of course, is to examine our military situation. Though the wild statements that the Russians have suddenly zoomed into a position of military supremacy are wrong, it is certain that there are grave dangers. Clearly, everyone now realizes that we need to accelerate our efforts to counter that Russian threat.

At the same time, it is clear that our military strength is only one aspect of our national strength. Military technology is one branch of technology; it can be no stronger than the main structure of technology itself. Rockets, and radar, and atomic weapons are not invented by generals and admirals; they are invented by civilian scientists and engineers working in laboratories—often in laboratories where the Government is paying the bills. These civilians draw on all available knowledge in the world of science and engineering to develop weapons and techniques which the military services require. For a nation to be successful in military technology, it must have two things:

1. Enough well-trained scientists and engineers to man the military-sponsored laboratories; and

2. An active nonmilitary science and technology to supply the new knowledge, and materials and new devices which military technology will require.

The shock to America is that Russia has so quickly attained these two goals. Russia, we now realize more clearly than before, is rapidly attaining a position of great technological strength. Russia is no longer the nation of illiterate peasants that many of us had supposed.

How did they get this way? How did we let the Russians get ahead of us in the satellite game? Paradoxically, it was not the shortage of engineers in this country that was responsible. It was, if anything, a shortage of psychologists. Actually, the possibility of launching a satellite had been under discussion in the United States for a long time. And the Russians had, long ago, also announced that they would launch one—date unspecified. Most people in this country regarded the satellite launching as an interesting scientific project, but it was repeatedly emphasized that it must not interfere with any military project. Hence, it could use no military hardware. So it was not pushed or given any priority. If someone could have visualized the tremendous psychological impact the first satellite would have on world opinion, and if they could have persuaded the Government of its propaganda importance, the project could easily have been accelerated. But not even the

Congressmen who are now shouting for blood ever told the National Science Foundation that the satellite project should be given top priority. Almost no Americans thought there was any rush. In the meantime, the Russians kept their plans secret until, suddenly, the job was done.

THE FIRST STEP

Our first lesson is that we must bring to the top levels of our Goverment better information and judgment about the potentialities of new scientific and engineering achievements, and their possible psychological effects on world opinion and their effects on the United States position of leadership. The appointment of Dr. J. R. Killian is a good step in the right direction—but he will need the help of many scientists, engineers, psychologists, and experts in many areas of world opinion to do the full job.

Our next task is to realize the enormous advances Russia has made in science and technology in recent years.

Now that sputnik has made us look at Russia more closely, we see very plainly—what we could have easily seen long ago—that for 30 years Russia has been systematically building an educational system that would give rigid technical training to a large number of scientists and engineers, who, under the communist system, would then be available to serve the needs of the state.

Soviet leaders foresaw, or soon learned, that you could not force people to be good scientists. There must be powerful incentives for every young person to develop any scientific talents he may have. So the Soviets turned to capitalistic methods and developed an elaborate system of financial incentives to encourage scientific training. Young men and women are paid to go to college—if they qualify. They are paid even more to go to graduate school—if they qualify. They are paid still more when they go into active scientific or engineering work—again if they pass rigid qualifying tests. Finally, the successful scientist or engineer is paid a very high salary, gets a car, a home in the country and extra food rations. And he is showered with medals to recognize his achievements. It's all very simple capitalism—large rewards to the able and the ambitious. And in this country we have been doing just the opposite—seeing to it that scientists, engineers, and teachers do not earn too much.

The net result is that the U. S. S. R. has attained a position of great technological strength, and by concentrating large resources of men and money on military technology—nuclear bombs, submarines, aircraft, and missiles—she has attained a position of great military strength, too.

No longer is it true—if it ever was—that automatically and inevitably and forever is the United States technically superior to the U. S. S. R. in the military field. Whatever the exact balance may be today, the Russians are certainly moving ahead very fast.

This is a sobering thought and requires sober attention. For this fact profoundly affects our foreign policy, our military posture, the nature of our defense effort and the distribution of our resources.

And if Russia can achieve these results in the military field, can she not attain similar goals in industry, in agriculture, in public health? Can she not, in short, attain in time a standard of living for her people comparable to ours? Can she not thus challenge throughout the world the superiority of a democratic system of government in providing for the welfare of its people?

That is the real challenge of sputnik. It is not a question of how good Russia's rockets are, compared to ours. We can have good ones, too. The question is whether Russia has now, before all the world, challenged us to an intellectual contest which we are not prepared to win. Can the Communist system develop and use the brains of its people to a better advantage than our system?

OUR INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES

The challenge of sputnik is that we must now take stock of our intellectual resources and how we are using them.

Arnold Toynbee, the historian, has advanced the proposition that the survival of nations and of civilizations depends on how they meet the challenges which they face. Blindness or complacency in the face of danger leads to collapse from without. Hysteria may lead to collapse from within. But foresight, courage, and determination may conquer and challenge.

Can we, as a nation, bring these qualities to bear on the challenge we face?

Even though the challenge may not be in the form of an immediate military danger, it is clear that a rival power is surging ahead so rapidly on so many fronts that we must begin now to accelerate our pace.

How do we start? First, we must remember that back of any great new military, industrial, or technological achievement, back of any nation's material strength, lie the minds of many people. The most important resources of any nation are its intellectual resources. New developments come from new ideas. New ideas develop in the minds of men. Any single new idea, in fact, develops in the mind of a single man; the pooled ideas of many men constitute a nation's intellectual resources.

Our first task, then, is to strengthen our intellectual resources. The one great overpowering question which we need to ask is whether we are now developing and utilizing to the maximum extent, consistent with democratic principles, the full intellectual and spiritual strength of our people. If we are—we need have no fear. If we are not—we are risking grave danger.

Is America fully utilizing its intellectual resources? The answer is "No."

Not one of us can honestly say that he is using his own intellectual resources fully. From the time we are children, until we die, most of us use only a fraction of the mental powers we have. We do not drive ourselves to use them; we do not encourage our children or friends and neighbors to use theirs. Oh, yes, we want our children to do well in school—but not too well. Johnny mustn't be different. And he mustn't be frustrated.

INSTEAD OF INCENTIVES

Instead of offering every possible incentive to intellectual achievement at all levels, in all fields, by all people, from the cradle to the grave, we offer—what? Tolerant amusement? Indifference? Or antagonism? (Don't be an egghead.)

That is the challenge America faces now, today—that all of us (citizens, taxpayers, parents, teachers, workers) shall be aware of the importance of intellectual achievement. This challenge existed long ago, of course. But now a great question mark has been projected high in the sky for all the world to see. Are American intellectual resources going to be brought to life in a great surge of dynamic enthusiasm? Or is another more monolithic type of society going to be able to drive its people to a pace we cannot match?

I think many of our people have now become aware of the importance of raising the intellectual level of our attainments. They now seek guidance: Where shall we start? What shall we do? Unfortunately, there is no single move, or even any small group of moves, which will solve this problem.

The intellectual resources of our people are developed and nourished in many places—in our homes, our churches, our schools; in the universities, in libraries and museums; in industrial and government laboratories; in newspaper and magazine editorial rooms, and (we hope) in radio and TV broadcasting rooms.

In all of these places, higher intellectual standards must be encouraged and achieved. Better teachers' salaries alone are not enough, but they are necessary. More classrooms and laboratories in schools and colleges are not enough, but they too are necessary. We need to insist that every course our children take in school has a good solid intellectual content and that Johnny and Mary are held to the highest standards of which they are capable, even if they get frustrated once in a while. To say that all our schools have been destroyed by the philosophy of John Dewey is unfair to many schools and is too flattering to Mr. Dewey. But it is equally wrong to say there is no room for improvement. Our task is not to return to the 19th century little red schoolhouse, but to find a new and vigorous educational climate which will fit our children of today to meet the problems of the 21st century—which most of them, and not many of us, will live to see.

To meet the challenges of the year 2000 A. D., our Nation will need to attain an enormous new surge of intellectual vigor.

How can we hope to achieve this when those engaged in intellectual pursuits find themselves at the bottom rung of the economic ladder? I do not claim it is wrong that a movie actress should earn 100 times as much as a professor because her bust and waist measurements have the correct ratio. But I do worry about the future of a society where the best brains are held in low esteem. I know that, to a teacher, other things are more important than salary. But, just to prove to our young people that a life of intellectual endeavor is important to our Nation, let's increase our teachers' salaries—at least a little.

A LITTLE EMPHASIS

Then, too, how can we have a vigorous intellectual climate when so few high school students get any adequate exposure to mathematics and science? Yes, I know people will insist that we must not have overemphasis on science. And I agree. But, before we complain about overemphasis, let's have a little emphasis. The fact is that science and mathematics, in many schools throughout the country, have been all but ostracized as legitimate subjects of study. They are too hard, or too technical, or too remote from life. Bad counseling, bad administration, and bad teaching have all helped in this decline—and I think now is a good time to reverse the trend. It's time to give every youngster a chance to test his mettle on some good tough subjects—mathematics, language, economics, science—so he can find out where his talents lie and choose his future interests accordingly.

Today we are confronted with the political issue of what role the Federal Government should play in rejuvenating the vigor of our educational system. There are those who believe in no Federal activity at all; others believe in very large Federal subventions. Actually, I believe the recently proposed administration program is about right. It is large enough to underline the Federal interest in education; it is small enough to avoid Federal control. It will, by no means, solve all problems, but it will stimulate States and local communities to get busy on a few. It emphasizes the importance of the student and the teacher and seeks to help both.

The Federal Government can take leadership in other aspects of an intellectual reawakening. It can encourage improved higher education and graduate study; it can stimulate and support research and scholarship in many fields; it can make more efficient and effective use of manpower in its own activities.

But, in America it is the people themselves—not the Government—that determine

their future. They set the intellectual standards; they create the intellectual climate; they determine relative values of intellectual and nonintellectual pursuits; they support the educational system; they are responsible for their own children; they pay the bills. They will determine whether or not America responds adequately to the challenge we face. I hope the American people will now get busy.

A TRIPLE RESPONSIBILITY

Finally, I should like to suggest that the universities of America must play a critical role in responding to this challenge. They have, in fact, a triple responsibility.

They have a responsibility, first, to assist the Government in immediate technological problems. They carry on research and development in many fields related to national defense and national welfare.

Second, they have a responsibility in seeking new knowledge. It is the new scientific understanding gained today which is the foundation of our strength of tomorrow. The Nation's relatively few centers of basic research in the country are precious assets indeed. It is essential that they be kept strong and made ever stronger. The universities are dedicated to the task of maintaining centers where the best minds in the country can effectively attack the deepest and most profound problems in every scholarly field.

Finally, the universities have a responsibility in educating men—men who will be leaders in pure and applied science, in education, in business, in politics. The research men, the university teachers, the leaders in industrial technology must be men of high ability, superbly trained. If it is an intellectual challenge that this Nation faces, our success in meeting it will be determined by our success in producing great intellectual leaders.

A former officer of a Rockefeller Foundation board used to say that the most important task in American higher education was to make the peaks higher. Where high quality is found—make it still higher. Where strong leadership is developing—make it still stronger. Where outstanding men are found, help them work to the full limit of their talents. As the grandeur of a mountain range is determined by the height of its highest peaks, so we must give most devoted attention to those institutions at the pinnacles of scientific and educational achievement.

Every citizen in the Nation can join in this endeavor.

Two Thousand Five Hundred Fans Attend Tournament—Game Is Science, Not Basketball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the science faculty at Iowa State Teachers College in Cedar Falls began to sponsor a northeast Iowa science fair for the purpose of stimulating interest in science among high school students. This year, 282 young people demonstrated science projects, and the fair attracted a turnaway crowd of some 2,500 persons.

As the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier points out in an editorial in its April 15 edition, it is significant that the fair was started long before the launching of the Russian sputniks, which created a national uproar on the subject of science.

I join the Courier in congratulating the winners as well as those in charge of the fair, and as part of my remarks I desire to include the Courier editorial, which follows:

When they say that American schools emphasize sports to the exclusion of academic subjects, they cannot be talking about northeast Iowa. This was demonstrated at the northeast Iowa science fair last Saturday at Iowa State Teachers College, when 282 students demonstrated science projects of amazing ingenuity, originality, and complexity. And the estimated attendance of 2,500 persons (a turnaway crowd) would have been a respectable gathering at a district basketball tournament.

The Courier salutes the champs, Janice Herman, of George Washington High School in Cedar Rapids, and Anthony Dingbaum, of Xavier High School in Dyersville. Both won all-expense-paid trips to the National Science Fair at Flint, Mich.

But, while the stimulus of competition adds interest at the fair, the real value of the event lies in the fact that some 282 outstanding young people have developed an intense and, no doubt, abiding interest in science. Many of these participants will become science teachers or will pursue some scientific field as a career.

And it is worthy of emphasis that the science faculty at Iowa State Teachers College began to sponsor the science fair long before the Soviet launching of artificial satellites created a national uproar on the subject. The event this year was the fifth annual fair, showing that the ISTC faculty needed no external threat to comprehend that the United States in the future would need far more emphasis on science training.

American educators, facing demands for more emphasis on science, often say, "We don't want to adopt the Russian system of forcing students to follow the professional careers which the Government picks for them." The public would agree. But the science fair is one example of the way educational leadership can be exerted to arouse interest in the vocational fields on which the national interest requires more emphasis.

We congratulate Dr. Leland Wilson, chairman of the fair this year, and his committee. Educational leadership of this kind demonstrates what can be done to correct American educational deficiencies in a dangerous world.

The Heikkila Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of April 24, 1958:

THE HEIKKILA CASE

The United States Immigration and Naturalization Service committed a grievous error when it failed to give the public all the facts at the outset of the abrupt William Heikkila deportation last week. As do all too many Federal agencies, it ignored the public's right to know. The penalty it is paying is justifiably heavy. It fostered public misunderstanding of its conduct, contributed to the belief that it violated due process of law and laid itself open to the charge that it acted like a Gestapo though in fact it did not.

With belated wisdom the Service is returning the alien Heikkila from Finland. In this it is not only showing obedience to a court order, it is preventing a possibility that Huikkila might have been transformed into a propaganda martyr.

Two other equally important results will follow, we hope. There can now be a determination as to whether the abrupt deportation of Heikkila actually was a violation of due process of law. And the public will have an opportunity to observe whether the interminable delays of "nicker in the slot justice," as a Federal judge once characterized the legal mockeries in the Caryl Chessman case, are preventing the deportation of dangerous aliens.

To say, as some have, that the Service kidnapped Heikkila and that it denied him his day in court is extremist nonsense. Heikkila was taken into custody and deported on a valid warrant. That warrant was executed only after Heikkila, a man of confessed Communist leanings, had had more than 10 years of his days in court.

The warrant was issued December 30, 1947. Heikkila was given full administrative hearings. Thereafter he appealed to the Federal courts, carrying his case to the United States Supreme Court. In 1953, he lost there. Heikkila then married the woman now his wife and reopened his case on the grounds he was married to an American citizen.

Again the case was carried through full administrative hearings and again through the courts to the United States Supreme Court. Again he lost. Thereafter he started a third round of court appeals. On April 8 he was turned down by Federal Judge Murphy. On all previous occasions when he was turned down he immediately got the protection of a restraining order to prevent deportation. Certainly, this time he did not. Instead he filed a routine motion to amend the finding of fact in the case.

The Immigration Service asked the United States Attorney's office whether a legal restraint was pending, was told there was none, then carried out its "swift" deportation—10 years, 3 months and 18 days after it had started deportation proceedings.

Now Heikkila is being brought back. How many more of these appeals is he entitled to? At what point does the public's right to prompt justice begin to operate.

Let us quote from an opinion of United States Court of Appeals here in the case of Martin Jimenez, an alien pro-Communist deported to Mexico on February 11 in the same abrupt fashion as Heikkila. Jimenez was represented by the same counsel as Heikkila.

"More than 5 years have passed (said the court) since the initial hearing officer recommended that Jimenez be deported. * * * This delay has been occasioned solely by appellant's resort to administrative and court proceedings to assert contentions which have been found to be without merit. * * * Nor has he always proceeded with diligence, * * * The appeal is dismissed as frivolous."

Translated into plainer English, the alien was using the courts to stall.

But even as the Immigration Service was deporting Jimenez swiftly by plane, his counsel was trying to sue out another writ. When, oh when do they come to an end?

We repeat that the Service erred grossly in the manner of its handling of the Heikkila case. Had it within hours of the Heikkila deportation, supplied the public with the full facts reviewed above and with its legal basis for acting, the storm never would have blown up. The service is a vital arm in the protection of the Nation from subversive and

criminal aliens. For the sake of the Nation and its own future usefulness it must avoid meticulously the semblance as well as the fact of totalitarian conduct.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter to constituents of April 26, 1958. Between the time of writing this newsletter and this insertion in the RECORD, I have received additional and more interesting information, which I shall add after this reprint of my newsletter:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 26, 1958.

House floor work included the oleo bill permitting the Navy to serve oleo or margarine (but only when butter stocks are not available or are impractical) and the Federal aid for schools in impacted areas bill. Both bills passed. The aid for school construction and operation makes more permanent the existing law, which helps those areas where local tax revenue is insufficient to provide educational facilities because of Federal tax-free installations and added school attendance (Federal employees' children). I protested the Davis-Bacon provision which permits the Secretary of Labor to set the local wages paid on school construction, in practice a serious violation of collective bargaining, the local economy, and States rights. But Federal aid means Federal control. In this wage-setting provision there is no recourse to the courts from the arbitrary final decision of the Secretary of Labor, hardly the American way. The committee chairman agreed with my position in debate, but he and I are badly outnumbered. My bill to correct this, now pending before the Education and Labor Committee, has little chance of ever being considered.

Criticism over the summarily deported Communist, William Heikkila, prompted Chairman WALTER of the Un-American Activities Committee to present us some interesting background facts. This man, a Communist since 1926, received a deportation judgment with final ruling by the Supreme Court in 1953. Then a new loophole was found, the 1952 Walter-McCarran Act permitting suspension if an alien was married to an American (Heikkila had married after receiving deportation charges, so his wife knew). More delays, more Communist activities, and then a final deportation warrant in March 1956. On April 14, 1958, a final court dismissal of his petition. Did he have his day in court? In all this time, 22 years, engaging in Communist activities, how much damage did he do?

An illuminating study of Congress in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman RALPH GWINN deserves everyone's attention. His thesis simply was that while business people were electing a president, the AFL–CIO was electing a Congress. His facts were in an itemized summary of campaign contributions showing that 300 (of the 435) candidates were given help and 175 were elected in the House (and in the Senate the same situation). Further, that 216 Representatives and 45 Senators voted a majority of the time with the liberal-labor dominated ADA (Americans for Democratic Action). His conclusions after much analysis of legislation—that little, if any, legislation can pass either House or Senate without the AFL–CIO blessing; that the businessman and all clear-thinking citizens had better act in taking part in politics or this Nation will succumb to socialism. Rather, thought provoking. Union monopoly power, the violence and abuse, graft and corruption, and now the control of legislation. Even union members should recognize the danger. What will it take to stir businessmen to political action?

The proposed small-business capital loan bill sponsored by WRIGHT PATMAN and LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas to provide equity and investment capital for small business (how to define small business?) is recognized as another of the do anything, but do it now antirecession spending schemes politically appealing and, therefore, favorably considered by some. Can you imagine using taxpayers' money to finance capital sums for businessmen? Who gets these chunks of money? Do you? Does your competitor? Or is it the political campaign contributor or party member? Is this Government's role? Can our debt-ridden Federal Government afford it? Of course not. Can our taxpayers afford it if he doesn't receive one of the loans? Of course not.

Nor is the only danger the already-known legislative spending bills. Conservatively speaking, there are many other pending spending measures. In the Senate, 23 bills totalling $48 billion over the next 5 years are sponsored by Democrats with Republicans duplicating 7 of them. Simultaneously, tax cuts of $10.5 billion are ready. Now I believe in a balanced budget. My own bill, a constitutional amendment, would force Congress yearly to balance the budget. Now let's look at the facts. In 44 years, since 1913, Democrats controlled Congress for 28 years, Republicans 16 years. Democrats had 22 years of deficits; for example, the national debt rose from $20 billion in 1932 to $266 billion by 1952, all Democrat years except 2, and Republicans, then controlling Congress, cut the debt $5.5 billion. In 16 years controlling Congress, Republicans produced surpluses 14 years totaling $19 billion.

As to taxes, since 1913, Democrats enacted 14 of 15 tax increases, Republicans only 1. Republicans enacted 7 of the 10 tax cuts. To me these facts are significant. Just as facts must come before politics, so do I intend to oppose unwise spending programs of either political party.

The Nation can learn lessons from the Dallas prosperity campaign and auto-buy program. This independent self-confident program is more typical of Texas and earlier American spirit than the Federal handout of recession—fear legislation. I'm proud to represent such a district.

Mr. Speaker, the additional information to which was alluded at the outset of this statement is the result of the public appearance at Southern Methodist University in Dallas of John Gates and Herbert Philbrick. Mr. John Gates is the former Communist and now avowed Socialist. Herb Philbrick is the gentleman who led three lives working for our FBI within the ranks of the Communist Party. Elsewhere in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be found a transcript of their questions and answers, the questions being directed to them by professor and student panel and audience.

The particular information to which I shall limit myself is the statement of John Gates when asked, "Do you see a place for you to go, a party or a group to join?" The answer, "I would like to be identified with the great labor movement. There cannot be a new American radicalism without labor."

Now, referring to the paragraph of my newsletter containing information about the AFL–CIO was electing a Congress, I want to reemphasize the danger of the avowed socialism of John Gates to the great labor movement and to the American system of government and free society. Unfortunately the facts referred to in this newsletter show that the Socialist influence has already been greatly felt within the ranks of organized labor and its influence on congressional legislation.

The conclusion to this trend is not a pleasant picture. Again I quote from Mr. Gates to the question, "Why has communism, as found today, not taken over any advanced western civilization?" The answer was "because a great many of the gains Communists fought for have been achieved under capitalism." This reminds us of Norman Thomas' statement of the mid-thirties when he said that most of the provisions of his 1928 Socialist presidential candidcacy were then already in effect.

Mr. Speaker, should anyone doubt the gains of communism or socialism, a more acceptable name for communism, one has only to list the legislation before this Congress, to read the debate, study the reports and then compare all this with traditional constitutional government. The difference between socialism, called public welfare, interstate commerce, or some other, and original constitutional law can readily be observed.

A National Seashore on Cape Cod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a resolution adopted by both branches of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national seashore on Cape Cod:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national seashore on Cape Cod

Whereas there exists on the outer reaches of Cape Cod a magnificent beach, unbroken for 33 miles and constituting a unique natural wonder of the United States; and

Whereas this shoreline has been a landmark for mariners for nearly 1,000 years; and

Whereas this shoreline is hallowed in the beginnings of our country, its hinterland being the first land trod by the Pilgrims of the *Mayflower* and having yielded to them their first drink of fresh New England water; and

Whereas this vast sweep of sand, moor, forest, marsh, and pond fosters hosts of birds, fish, animal, and plant life; and

Whereas this shoreline has been immortalized in paintings, verse, and prose by American artists and writers for nearly 200 years; and

Whereas this shoreline is a source of inspiration and recreation to all the people of the United States and to visitors from other countries; and

Whereas the survival of this shoreline as a natural wonder is imperiled by developments which are inconsistent with its inspirational and recreational value to the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts request the Congress to establish a national seashore to be designated as the Cape Cod National Seashore in the area from Race Point in Provincetown to Nauset Inlet in Orleans, bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean and on the west by a line to be determined by the Government of the United States and other such areas adjacent as may be deemed necessary, for the use and enjoyment of all the people of the United States, said national seashore to be preserved as nearly as possible in the state in which it was created by Nature, to be a source of health and inspiration to all the people of the United States and their descendents forever; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts further requests the Congress to enact legislation providing for the purchase and establishment of the national seashore as heretofore described lest this great historic and scenic New England landmark be lost forever to public use by rapidly growing manmade encroachments; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, April 7, 1958.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 9, 1958.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Address by President of Northwest Public Power Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it was my privilege on April 18 to address the Northwest Public Power Association at its 18th annual membership meeting at Spokane.

This association comprises 104 consumer-owned electric systems of Alaska, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, serving 2 million people.

In the meeting room I saw the 1-cent power achievement awards which had just been given to 23 outstanding public and cooperative electric systems "for achieving an average cost of electricity to its residential consumers during 1957 of 1 cent or less per kilowatt-hour."

It is estimated 55 percent of the homes served by consumer owned utilities in the Pacific Northwest now enjoy average rates under 1 cent per kilowatt-hour in contrast to the national average of 2.56 cents per kilowatt-hour.

The distinguished president of the Northwest Public Power Association the past year has been Mr. P. C. Spowart, assistant superintendent, Seattle City Light.

Starting his utility career as a laborer in 1911 he progressed to the position of commercial manager in 1934, including responsibility for public relations. He became assistant superintendent in 1951.

He has been active in the American Public Power Association. He is a member of Seattle's Retirement System Board. He will retire this year.

On April 16 Mr. Spowart in his presidential address outlined to the association the opportunity for a $12 billion investment program for the Columbia River.

His Axel of Progress is an allegory for our dual economy with its dependence on a balance of public investment and private investment to achieve optimum benefits in the public interest.

Because his address is broad gaged and thought provoking, I wish to call it to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY P. C. SPOWART, NORTHWEST PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING, APRIL 16, 17, 18, 1958

Where there is life there is change. An oriental king seeking a motto suitable alike in prosperity and adversity, received at long length from his own daughter a ring on which was engraved the words "This, too will pass."

Whether today be good or bad, we know tomorrow will be different. Change is in the air this morning as we greet one another in this, our 18th annual membership meeting of the Northwest Public Power Association.

For nearly 47 years I have worked in this State, in the same city, in the same kind of business, for the same employer—serving consumers with electricity. You might think I have lived a settled life. Actually, it has been a life of change, a very interesting change.

The average annual use of electricity in the homes has increased from 206 kwh in 1910 to nearly 9,000 kwh in 1957, and with this increased use has come all the changes and living habits that only electricity can bring. A similar change has occurred in the factories with our workers following the national trend of using more electricity. The kilowatt-hour consumption of electricity per worker has increased from 7,000 in 1929 to 20,000 in 1955 with a proportionate increase in productivity.

And if there is one lesson in 50 years of electric utility experience that is more obvious than others, it is that we are in for more and greater changes.

Seattle City Light pioneered the use of the electric range and water heater and this was a great change.. But today we know that the heat pump and other heating methods and appliances yet to come will provide as great a change as television was over the radio.

Each new appliance will bring on another wave of expansion in use of electricity, demonstrating over and over again the unending variety of ways in which electricity affects the lives of all of us.

I want to be on guard this morning against the temptation of mere reminiscing. You and I are not going to be able to rest on any laurels.

The point I wish to make is that there will be change, and that you are helping to make the change. We should direct our efforts to make tomorrow's world a better world.

We can help achieve this by promoting more and better jobs. Because we, as public bodies and electric utilities, are in a position to do something about this, we have as the theme for our annual membership meeting "More power for more jobs."

The importance of more jobs already has been well said by Congress in the very important Employment Act of 1946. It reads:

"The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential conisderations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

This is the national policy. This is the goal of full employment. This is the policy which has been on the law books for the past 12 years without much need for anyone to figure out how to get the law put into practice. However, in the last 3 months Congress has started working on implementing the full employment goal. We already have seen the highway program accelerated, the housing program expanded and, of most importance to us here today, Congress has been taking a new look at hydroelectric power dams and water resources in particular, and our national attitude toward natural resources in general.

Why this change in our Congress in the past few months? I am inclined to believe it is due to our dual economy. We have an economy which depends upon both public and private enterprise. We, as a nation, do not have an exclusively private free enterprise economy and no amount of propaganda will make it so. If you doubt that statement just take a look at whom the Government is subsidizing.

I would compare the working of our economy to the axle of progress. If we are to progress we must have an equal-sized wheel at each end of the axle. One is the wheel of private investment in the business which we normally regard as appropriately private. The other wheel has to do with public investments in schools, roads, post offices, flood control, reclamation, and hydro projects. The two wheels must match. If one is smaller than the other we will go around in circles.

In 1939 we deliberately turned off or choked down the flow of public investment. We first encouraged, then stimulated and finally forced fed the private investment economy to do the war production job. Then after the war we removed the price ceilings and provided accelerated amortization, liberalized depreciation and other incentives in order to force an ever greater flow of funds into the private fields; in some fields we have excess capacity.

On the other hand, public investment has lagged. We do not have adequate capacity in our school and college systems, nor in our flood-control reservoirs or inland waterway channels. We do not have the soil-erosion problem licked. And coming back to the Pacific Northwest we continue to sit by while 80 percent of the region's power potential goes down to the ocean unused.

This should not go on. The public investment wheel is an essential part of the axle of

progress. Right now it is too small and we find ourselves going in the wrong direction. Several things have happened to make Congress cognizant of the need for more public investment.

The first thing I believe, was the Hells Canyon battle which symbolized the broad public acceptance of the fundamental principles of conservation, that natural resources should be developed to achieve the greatest good for the largest number of people for the longest time.

A second factor was the gradual slippage of the national economy. In the Northwest it has been especially so from about 1949 onward and with a further and deeper cut last summer. Because of this, today we have well over 100,000 unemployed in our 4 Northwest States.

Sputnik, I would list as the third factor in jarring Congress out of its complacency. Then came Senators ELLENDER and JACKSON with their reports of 40 big new dams under construction in Russia, 4 of them larger than Grand Coulee. They told of their visit to an exhibition in Moscow where the guides proudly told them that Russia was declaring war upon the United States in the field of peaceful production—that by 1975 or 1980 Russia would surpass us in certain fields of production.

The Northwest Public Power Association also has done its part in making Congress cognizant of the need for more public investment.

Our association submitted testimony at a recent congressional hearing making reference to a statement in the 1955 Dewhurst survey of the Twentieth Century Fund. This is a comprehensive book entitled "America's Needs and Resources." This conservative study points out that the United States has been neglecting its stewardship over its natural resources and that we need several billion dollars investment in land, forest and water resources for their proper development and conservation.

Our testimony pointed out that the major part of the expenditure would be largely a revenue producing investment; it would be a self-liquidating capital investment to stop the destruction of floods, the loss of topsoil and to stop the waste of waterpower.

As a result of all these factors I believe Congress is becoming increasingly aware of the necessity for bold imaginative action to remedy this unbalance betwen public and private investment. The $30 billion—15-year—highway program is one such move, one which we all wanted. We got it, however, not because we wanted it, but because the huge automotive, oil, and cement industries made themselves felt in the right places. We have seen Congress finally go ahead on the St. Lawrence seaway and the Niagara power developments. Again these actions were taken when special interests were willing. But, the public does not always want government by special interests. They want a program based on what is best for the Nation's economy. This was demonstrated in Canada a few weeks ago.

On March 31, Canada had a national election in which the Conservatives won by a landslide, winning over 75 percent of the seats in Parliament. The Liberal leader, Mr. Pearson, had promised a $400 million tax cut. The Conservative leader, Prime Minister John Diefenbaker promised a billion dollar public works program. In doing this Mr. Diefenbaker was merely carrying out an old tradition of the Conservative Party in Canada. It was the Conservative Party in Ontario that had the foresight in 1906 to create the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario which has become one of the greatest low-cost power systems in the world.

Canada is a large country with a small population so you must realize that an equivalent public works program in the United States would be slightly over $10 billion.

The public mandate was against a tax cut and in favor of a dynamic public works program. That philosophy is catching on in the United States. A $10 billion public works program for America would be a wise investment as well as job producing.

The lesson of the Canadian election serves to underline the recommendation that a great economist, Prof. John Galbraith, of Harvard, made to the Joint Economic Committee 2 months ago in testifying on the Economic Report of the President. He clearly favored public works instead of tax cuts.

He said, "In the present situation, however, there is a good deal to be said on the choice between lowering taxes and increasing public outlays. And the choice is very strongly in favor of the latter." He gives a number of reasons and then emphasizes: "But the most important reason for favoring an increase in civilian public outlays as the principal protective device is that we now have so many things that need doing."

All of us agree that we have many things that need doing. One of our most important jobs is to develop our natural resources and put them to use.

In the face of this need we have over 5 million unemployed. We could have work for all. We are wasting both our human resources and our natural resources. By good planning, by establishing the proper procedures, by establishing the proper governmental machinery, we could insure that these wasted human resources and these undeveloped natural resources would be brought together. As a result we would have a strongers, happier, and healthier Nation.

What the Canadian voters approved seems expecially applicable in the Pacific Northwest. We have need for a $12 billion investment in the development of the water resources of the Columbia River for navigation, flood control, irrigation, fish and wildlife facilities and for power production. A 20-year program.

This investmet to a great extent must be public investment in order to insure that the resources are harnessed on a comprehensive, multiple-purpose basis. Many of the projects will not be economically feasible unless they are constructed with the lowest available financing. The more low-cost money we can get into the Columbia River development program, the fuller will be the development achieved.

For the past 4 years our association has been developing and promoting a bill that would improve the administration and financing of the Columbia River power system—removing it farther away from politics. Seven drafts of the Columbia River Development Corporation bill have been drawn up.

Finally on January 23, 1958 the bill was introduced as S. 3114 by Senators JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MORSE, MAGNUSON, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, HILL, and SPARKMAN. It has been referred to the Senate Public Works Committee.

We have requested preliminary, exploratory public hearings this year for the purpose of developing a public record for the bill and for the purpose of finding the weak spots so that next January we can introduce a revised bill that will have the support of the majority of the people in the Pacific Northwest. To achieve all these things I have mentioned for our region, we must push for the adoption of necessary legislation.

It is what we do as utilities. If you do an efficient job as a utility operator, provide your area with an adequate supply of low-cost power, give good service, promote community development, contribute in every way to the economic welfare of your community, the favorable attitude and support which you personally develop among the voters and governmental representatives in your area—that will ultimately decide the passage of vital legislation—legislation that will provide more power and more jobs.

What you learn here to help you do a better job in your community will benefit the entire public power movement. And by public-power movement, I do not mean some selfish ideology, but comprehensive development of our natural resources that will make the Pacific Northwest a wonderful place to live and be a great asset to the rest of our country.

As I said at the beginning, we have the human resources and the natural resources to build a better America, but it is up to each of us individually to do his part in building it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Alamo Belongs to the Whole World, Not Just to Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on April 21, San Jacinto Day in Texas, Lt. Gen. J. H. Collier, commanding general of the Fourth United States Army, spoke in front of the Alamo, in San Antonio, at a ceremony honoring the brave men who gave their lives there 122 years ago.

"The Alamo belongs to the whole world," General Collier said, "not just to Texas."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of General Collier's moving and meaningful address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. J. H. COLLIER, COMMANDING GENERAL, FOURTH UNITED STATES ARMY, PILGRIMAGE TO ALAMO, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., APRIL 21, 1958

We are here today to honor the brave men who gave their lives at the Alamo 122 years ago. These were men who had the fortitude and backbone to fight, to fight for what they believed to be right.

The defense of the Alamo is a heroic chapter in the history of Texas. When men perform such deeds, they achieve an immortality by becoming symbols to the world as heroes of the cause for which they fought. So the Alamo belongs to the whole world, not just Texas.

The struggle in Texas did not start as a war for independence. The men who took their stand here at the Alamo were fighting to secure the rights granted them in the 1824 constitution of Mexico. The government which abrogated that constitution was determined to subjugate the people of Texas. Events led to an uprising of the colonists, and a war for independence then became inevitable.

This is the pattern set by the Thirteen Colonies against George III. The same pattern has been followed by peoples who have gained their freedom all over the world, and in all times in history. It takes shape from a situation in which men have accepted an established order of affairs—a political situation which permits them to live with their fellowmen and maintain their self-respect. The despot, however, will always resort to force and violence to gain personal power and to replace free government with dictatorship.

Fortunately, there have always been men who will rise to fight such acts of tyranny; men who refuse to give up their personal freedom into the hands of a dictator. It is obvious that compromise with tyrrany is impossible, so the struggle changes to a fight for independence, as it did here in Texas.

The Alamo, a shrine to all Texans, belongs to all people who have fought, or are willing to fight, for freedom. It stands as a great symbol, not only of freedom but of this willingness to fight and die in its cause.

Freedom is not a gift; it has its price. That price can be paid in two ways: on the pay-as-we-go basis of eternal vigilance and preparedness, or it can be paid for as it was here 122 years ago, in the blood of a few determined fighters who set an inspiring example for the rest of Texas.

The requirement to pay for our freedom is constant. The manner in which we pay is left to us, but the necessity to pay, if we are not to lose it, is ever present. It is a hard fact that we get nothing for nothing. We must pay for value received, and we value our freedom very highly. The need is even greater today becaues the struggle is worldwide. There is now communism, a cynical, brutal force with the avowed objective of extending its authority over the whole world.

Russia of today was built on the ruins of an outdated autocracy. The power of the czars and their fuedal lords had been absolute. When the people of Russia finally rebelled, the architects who seized control to build a new order did not follow the ideal pattern which produces free people. Instead, they built the most cynical, vicious dictatorship the world has ever known. The blood of the revolutionaries and the ideals and slogans of democracy were exploited and twisted to enslave the people. Not content with robbing their own people of any semblance of freedom, the Communist Party set as its main objective the extension of its authority to encompass the whole world, and perhaps beyond, since the advent of the sputnik.

Can moral enslavement exist, without danger to itself, alongside free-thinking people? They don't think so, and coexistence from their point of view reminds me too much of what happens when a bear and a man are placed together in a cage. Life in the cage is easy enough for the bear, but very rough on the man.

Like the man in the cage, too many people today have become overawed by the strength of the Russian bear. There is too much of a tendency to allow the Communists—because of their sheer persistency—to dictate the terms of world peace. This is a time when every individual who believes in freedom must work for peace—as we know it—just as vigorously as we would wage war.

The situation we face today is quite as real and threatening as the one defied so bravely by Travis, Bowie, Crockett, Bonham, and others in 1836. Our way of life, our personal and national ideals of liberty, stand as a block in the path of Soviet world conquest. The oceans which separate us have been shrunk by aircraft and missiles almost to the size of the Rio Grande. The protective barriers the oceans once formed must be replaced by new walls. We have learned from past experience that appeasement and complacency merely smooth the road for aggressive nations. What is required from each of us is an active faith in freedom and a sense of individual responsibility for its perpetuation.

It is imperative that we do not permit the Communists to make the same mistake made by the Nazis. Hitler and the Japanese were convinced that democratic governments produced weak individuals. It took a war to prove them wrong. None of us wants to fight another war just to prove the same thing to the Communists.

A long time ago George Washington said that, "to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual ways of preserving peace." This is an effective national policy today; to be strong enough to deter any war of aggression. But our strength must consist of more than strength of arms. A combination of military, political, and moral strength is necessary to combat the spread of communism. A strong nation is the composite of strong individuals.

Today let us question ourselves. Do we have the courage and love of liberty to defend the heritage left us by the heroes of the Alamo? Only by showing this fortitude and determination can we pay real and lasting honor to the memory of those valiant men who fought and died here.

Questions and Answers of John Gates and Herbert Philbrick, Before Student Forum of Southern Methodist University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Dallas was the scene of an interesting event this past week when former Communist John Gates and former FBI Agent Herbert Philbrick appeared together before a panel of professors and students to answer questions. The former Communist and the former counterspy gave some interesting and revealing answers which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues for their further information.

The following is a transcript from the Dallas Morning News of April 24, 1958:

QUESTIONS, ANSWERS OF GATES, PHILBRICK

Following is the substance of the questions and answers asked of John Gates Wednesday during the question period of the student forum of Southern Methodist University.

Dr. Lloyd Manning Wells, Southern Methodist University government professor, asked the first five questions:

Question. Have not the gains made in America during the last 20 years been made in spite of the Communist Party and not because of it? Is not Communist backing of any issue the kiss of death?

Answer. I don't think so. First of all, in the early thirties, the Communists did pioneer certain issues and help make progress. Since then, they have dissipated their gains. It is true that association and identification as Communist with any movement is the kiss of death.

Question. How do you respond to the charge that the party uses particular peoples and causes to forward the party's aims?

Answer. I was much more successful in furthering causes than in furthering the Communist Party. It disappeared, but the causes endured and are growing.

Question. You are not trying to say that you sought social progress more than the demise of the capitalistic system?

Answer. I sought both. It was not unusual for any political party to fight for the people and for the party. That's what the Republicans and the Democrats do.

Question. Do you believe the triumph of socialism is possible? Probable? Inevitable?

Answer. I do not equate the triumph of socialism with the triumph of the Soviet Union. I believe it is possible, probable, and inevitable.

Question. How can you say socialism is inevitable if you also say the world will be blown up in an atomic war?

Answer. That's why I agree it's possible. I'm confident we're going to avoid an H-bomb war. I'm optimistic. War would be the end of politics and everything else. I don't think the politicians will allow war.

Dr. Douglas Ewing Jackson, Southern Methodist University associate sociology of religion professor, asked the next seven questions:

Question. Are you a religous man?

Answer. I am not a religious man in that I do not believe in the supernatural or a supreme being. But I believe in religious ethics, right and wrong, and I don't believe it necessary for a person to have a formal religion.

Question. Do you have a name for this position?

Answer. Atheism. I'm not a militant atheist, and I do not fight against any religion.

Question. To what ethical system do you subscribe? How do you determine what is right and wrong?

Answer. If I could answer that question I would be the world's greatest philosopher. I just try to distinguish between good and bad.

Question. What is your basis for saying America takes an immoral position when it imprisons Communists?

Answer. It's just like the Yugoslavs' Djilas (author of The New Class) and the Hungarian writers who were imprisoned for writing books. I don't think anyone should be sent to prison for his ideas.

Question. Isn't there a difference between holding ideas privately and expressing them publicly—like calling fire in this crowded theater?

Answer. True.

Question. Would you classify yourself as a Marxist?

Answer. No, I do not want to be classified as a Marxist. I do believe in some Marxist ideas.

Question. De you hold with the Marxist belief that all evils, caused only by the class struggle, will disappear when classes disappear?

Answer. I don't think all evils will be eradicated. Many causes of evil will be eliminated, however.

Dr. J. Claude Evans, Southern Methodist University chaplain, asked the next seven questions of Gates:

Question. Do you still follow the party line on the Negro question? That the only way the Negro can get self-determination is the establishment of a Negro state in two-hundred-and-twenty-odd counties of the South?

Answer. No, I never followed it. It is one of the biggest mistakes of the party, and it alienated the party from the Negro.

Question. Why did the Daily Worker soft-pedal this issue from 1930?

Answer. We soft-pedaled it because it was such a fantastic idea.

Question. Why didn't you defend the execution of the Hungarian premier in 1949? Isn't this an example of what happens to good Communists who deviate from the party line?

Answer. It was a typical act of communism in the past. It is not exactly typical today. A leader will be deposed, but not killed; he will be made a dogcatcher somewhere.

Question. Do you still follow the party line and oppose the Marshall plan?

Answer. One of the biggest mistakes the party made was to oppose the plan. Russia should have applied for Marshall plan aid when it was first started. But Marshall plan aid has been used to build up West Germany, which is throwing the other European countries in deathly fear of a militant Germany. How many times will we let Germany attack the world?

Question. When you resigned from the Communist Party, you said you wanted to rejoin the American people and find out what they were thinking because the party had isolated you from the people. Are you disillusioned with socialism?

Answer. I am not disillusioned with socialism. But I believe some Marxian concepts are outdated. For example, his invalid statement that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. The United States has proven this invalid.

Herbert A. Philbrick, former counterspy for the Federal Bureau of Investigation inside the Communist Party and now a staff writer for the New York Herald Tribune, asked Gates two questions:

Question. You said you would give your life for the religious freedom of others. When the Communists killed 11 Jews in 1952, why did you not speak out?

Answer. In 1952 I was in Atlanta penitentiary. I have protested in public and print against thesse unjustifiable and criminal executions. I have demanded that the Soviet Union change its policy on Jews. As long as they don't change that stand, they are morally wrong.

Question. Your introductory speech and Khrushchev's speech in 1956 sound very similar to me. Do you have any disagreements with him?

Answer. I have many disagreements with him, as I have stated in public and in print. I disagree with him on the lack of democracy in Russia * * * and the lack of opportunity for the Russian people to make up their own minds. I disagree with his sending the Soviet Army into Hungary and in many other ways.

Moderator Glen Costin then asked 17 of the 700 to 800 questions sent up from the audience. Gates answered most, but Philbrick also answered a few. Unless otherwise noted, Gates was questioned:

Question. If you have really quit the party, why don't you testify for the Government against Communists?

Answer. I have testified at many hearings and trials. I will not be a stool pigeon or an informer.

Question. Do you think the Russian progress under communism could have been greater under capitalism?

Answer. It is possible but not probable. Russia is developing at a more rapid rate than the United States is today.

Question. What is the difference between Russian socialism and the kind you propose?

Answer. I propose a democratic socialism which will retain all the great features of our Government.

Question (to Philbrick). Do you think fighting communism is still a matter of concern today?

Answer. Yes, for many reasons. There is no such thing as an American Communist Party. It is directed by the Soviet Union. Khrushchev is the most dangerous man we ever faced.

Question (to Philbrick). Do you believe Christian capitalism has a monopoly on truth, or can communism have some truth?

Answer. In my 9 years in the party, I found not one single truth. There can be no truth based on falsehood.

Question (to Gates). Is the Communist Party still carrying on espionage in the United States?

Answer. I have no doubt it is conducting espionage in the United States just as the United States conducts espionage in the Soviet Union.

Question. Did the Daily Worker's editorial policy come as directive from Moscow?

Answer. For 10 years that I was editor there was never any direction of any kind from the Soviet Union. But we didn't need directions, we believed any policy of Russia was right and we gladly followed it.

Question (to Philbrick). Don't you think this kind of affair is good in order to bring communism out in the open?

Answer. Yes, I think so.

Question (to Philbrick). What is your reaction to "democratic socialism?"

Answer. I haven't the faintest idea what it is. I know the satellites are called people's democracies, so I'm afraid of what democratic socialism might be.

Question (to Gates). How do you support yourself now, since breaking with the party. Do you see a place for you to go, a party or group to join?

Answer. I have no affiliations at the present or any immediate intentions. I am not satisfied with anything on the scene now. I would like to be identified with the great labor movement. There cannot be a new American radicalism without labor.

Question. Do you believe the individual should exist for the state?

Answer. No. The individual should exist for himself and for society. The state should serve the individual.

Question What do you think the fate of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union is?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. If you had been convicted of trying to overthrow the U. S. S. R. would you have been treated as fairly as you were here?

Answer. I did not receive a fair trial here. Soviet injustice, though much harsher, does not excuse American injustice.

Question. Who is the "we" in your statement, "We tried to change the party three times"?

Answer. The party itself the first two times. The third time it was a group called "revisionists" of which I was identified as leader.

Question. What is your reaction to the names party leaders called you? Do you fear for your person?

Answer. Sticks and stones may hurt me, names may make me mad. I don't have the slightest fear for my safety.

Question. Why has communism, as found today, not taken over any advanced western civilizations?

Answer. Because a great may of the gains Communists fought for have been achieved under capitalism.

Question (Dr. Jackson to Gates). Name a single gain the party made for a single Negro.

Answer. The party itself never made a single gain for any Negro. But it did participate in pioneering some advances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial of Friday, April 25, 1958, from the Dallas Morning News commenting on this interesting discussion:

GATES TALKED A GOOD GAME

Three hours before Communist John Gates' appearance at Southern Methodist University, the courageous anti-Communist, Herb Philbrick, lunched quietly with a few friends and predicted almost to the letter what Gates would say and how he would perform.

He would say the American Communist Party is dead—to lull suckers into belief that domestic Reds are no threat. He would parrot the latest Communist line—but call it socialism. He would get in good licks against capitalism and Secretary of State John F. Dulles, to the delight of certain collegians who may have heard the same in their classes.

First of all, Philbrick predicted, he would not obey the rules of fair play. "He will take twice as much time as allotted him, wearing out the perspiring crowd and forcing me to take far less than the agreement calls for."

Sure enough. The moderator plainly gave him 20 minutes. Gates took 40. And nobody even tried to stop him. Not even the moderator. Southern Methodist University's advertised debate of free ideas turned out to be 40 minutes for communism, 15 for Americanism—just as Gromyko, Vishinsky et al., have monopolized United Nations sessions with ambiguously vague generalities.

Philbrick nobly acquitted himself. His answers were crisp. He refused to dignify the shameful personal attack by Gates.

It is to be hoped that impressionable young collegians will reflect calmly on what Gates said, that they will read Witness, by Whittaker Chambers, and Masters of Deceit, by J. Edgar Hoover for an accurate insight into Communist techniques.

If enough Americans can be duped into believing that nuclear tests should be stopped, without proof the Soviet Union stops them, this Nation can be destroyed.

If enough Americans can be duped into thinking the Communist Party of America is dead, then more Americans can be led into Communist fronts under respectable guises to further the Red line. It doesn't matter to Khrushchev whether Russian objectives are promoted through the American Communist Party or through the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

If communism can be promoted in America under the more appealing name of democratic socialism, so what?

Gates did perform one real service. He thoroughly disillusioned sincere Socialists by calling himself one. But socialism or communism—both are ruled from the top. Both degenerate into tyranny. That is the basic nature of those systems. Both are repugnant to the real American. Either, if followed, will wreck America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose some of the questions which come to me as a result of Mr. Gates' statement:

First. Are not socialism and communism economically here confirmed to be the same?

Second. How does the professed atheist tell right from wrong?

Third. How can democratic socialism retain the features of our constitutional form of Government, as he says?

Fourth. Has the American labor movement, now influenced by liberals and ADAers, become the result of the earlier efforts of Communists and Socialists whom Mr. Gates would like to join?

Fifth. By what philosophy of constitutional government do we now justify the many legislative bills we are now considering that are being sponsored by the AFL–CIO?

Finally, is it not obvious that Senator KNOWLAND's, or anyone else's, valiant efforts to establish a workingman's bill of rights or any conservative legislation is doomed to failure unless agreed to by the politically potent labor leaders?

Eulogy of Former Gov. Paul A. Dever, of Massachusetts, Delivered by Lt. Gov. Robert F. Murphy, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in Boston, Mass., on April 19, 1958, the greater part of the evening was spent in eulogizing our beloved former Governor, the Honorable Paul A. Dever, who died on April 11.

The one chosen to make the principal tribute was the present Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Robert F. Murphy. While I was the speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, I had the pleasure of serving with Bob Murphy, who was then the majority leader. Later he served as minority leader and in 1954 was the Democratic nominee for Governor. In 1956 he was the nominee for Lieutenant Governor, the position which he now holds in the Commonwealth.

Bob Murphy is a man of exceptional talents and qualities. He is an excellent speaker, well versed in the field of public service; a former newspaperman, and a lifelong Democrat. On this specific occasion he rendered glowing tribute to Paul Dever in remarks which came from the heart and which echoed the sentiments of those assembled. I am proud and honored to include his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EULOGY OF FORMER GOV. PAUL A. DEVER DELIVERED IN BOSTON, APRIL 19, 1958, BY LT. GOV. ROBERT F. MURPHY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Tonight, while grief locks the heart, and sadness throttles the tongue, and there is an overwhelming emotion of complete loss, this particular occasion is unique.

This annual dinner with its productive elements for the Democratic Party can well be called Paul Dever's party, because it was the function closest to the heart and mind of our late and lamented and never-to-be-forgotten friend.

But he would want it, I think, not as a tribute to himself.

He would want it so that the means can still be procured to perpetuate the record of achievements, which his philosophy of life translated into a long, litany of deeds, in the interests of the poor; the lowly; the sick of mind, heart, and body; the homeless; the little ones and, indeed, all those forsaken and forgotten.

JEFFERSON-JACKSON

Paul Dever stood forequare and always for the old-fashioned civic integrity of an Andrew Jackson.

Time after time, from this very rostrum, he held that "the principles of Thomas Jefferson are the definitions and the axioms of a free society."

The late, great governor was first and foremost for the people, because he was of the people.

BUSINESS

Paul Dever destroyed the falsehood that democracy was hostile to Massachusetts business. While he was pilloried as the enemy, he lifted the economy and, today we defy those detractors to name him or any other Democratic governor, as an enemy of business.

He gave us 318 miles of better roads, greater safety on the highways, an expanded tourist trade; he increased our commerce, and he lowered automobile insurance rates.

He built us new homes: In 2 short years he took them out of the blueprint stage and started 115 projects, that provided 12,240 apartments.

When he took office, not a single project, not even a single apartment, had been completed.

Today, over 50,000 veterans and their families are living in healthful, respectable, low-cost dwellings.

And he sparked job opportunities when he developed the port of Boston and made Logan one of the premier airports of the world.

PUBLIC HEALTH

In the field of public health, once Disraeli said: "The health of the people is the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state, depend."

Massachusetts made her greatest advances, in the science of public health, under Paul Dever.

Lemuel Shattuck, the finest chronic disease hospital, is, today, a reality. The new wing of the Chelsea soldiers' home now stands majestically for all to see.

The Holyoke soldiers' home came into being while he provided annuities for our paraplegic veterans.

MENTAL HEALTH

"Paul Dever did more in 1 year in the field of mental health than other governors did in a hundred years," once said Dr. Clifton Perkins, the long-time commissioner of mental health.

Under Dever, for the first time in years, Massachusetts' mental hospitals discharged, as cured, as many patients as they admitted. He segregated mentally ill children from the adult insane.

He provided special training for the feebleminded, afflicted with blindness, and he separated the physically well insane, from those others, ravaged with tuberculosis.

RETARDED CHILDREN

For a century, others talked about the need for a program to help retarded youngsters. They needed help and under Paul Dever they got it.

For lasting cure replaced neglect.

Myles Standish Hospital was born in Taunton, to care for 2,000 exceptional children.

Today, thanks to a compassionate heart, there are no more commanding waiting lists. Firetraps were replaced with seven other new mental-health schools and hospitals. Underpaid attendants were made whole. Understaffed institutions were strengthened.

Myles Standish, Paul Dever always claimed, was his greatest achievement—and, as longtime legislator myself, I know that the present general court will eargerly respond to the suggestion of Governor Furcolo, that the name of Myles Standish be changed to the "Paul Andrew Dever School."

Then, indeed, there will be a lasting memorial in respect to his memory.

Someday, through the succession of governors, the time will come when his portrait will be removed from the walls of the executive chamber where it now hangs.

And when that day comes—when that moment is here—it is my fond hope, that it will be moved to Myles Standish where it will hang from, and adorn the walls of that institution, in, immortality, and in respect—yes, in reverence to the memory of one possessed of a lofty ideal and a benevo-

lent heart. For he once said this regarding retarded children:

"You can have what I have provided; the roadways which lace the landscape—you can build your bridges and tunnels above and under our rivers—you can have your modern buildings with towers piercing the clouds—and all of that.

"And in my welcome days of future, private citizenship, I can look back to all of those with great pleasure.

"But if there is one thing that will warm my heart, and which I am sure, will be an endorsement on a passport by St. Peter, it is that, which I have been able to do, for the mongoloid youngsters of Massachusetts."

LABOR

He was one of the most devoted friends the workingman and woman ever had.

He broadened the workmen's compensation law.

He doubled compensation for the loss of an arm.

He tripled compensation for the loss of an eye.

He raised the minimum hourly wages of the lowest-paid Massachusetts worker.

He gave long-overdue increases to those in the State service, who were caught in the spiral of inflation.

He enacted a new anti-injunction law.

He insisted that maritime workers be made eligible for unemployment compensation.

To labor, a stalwart has gone.

EDUCATION

"It was in making education common to all," once said Russell Lowell, "that the destiny of the free Republic of America was practically settled."

Paul Dever's contributions to public education were legion. He turned his attention to repairing and refurbishing our many State teachers' colleges which had been in bad disrepair for years.

He powered the physical plants at our textile institutes at Lowell and Fall River and New Bedford. Today, they are the best of their kind in the world.

He never stopped trying to provide needed new facilities at the University of Massachusetts.

New instructors were added to the teachers' colleges to train more teachers; and to man, and to staff, our understaffed schools.

In one stretch of 2 years under Paul Dever, 270 public-school buildings were erected in 212 cities and towns, with the State underwriting the cost up to as high as 65 percent.

Regional school consolidation came into being that made it possible for our very smallest communities to grant education comparable to that given by our largest cities.

He approved scholarships to 100 worthy boys and girls at the University of Massachusetts.

He increased scholarship benefits for children of veterans killed in war, and devised a State-aided, vocational-education program for 13,000 handicapped youngsters.

CONCLUSION

I shall always think that Paul Dever was less than enthusiastic about it, but he bowed to the wishes of his friends and associates when he ran for reelection in 1952, after completing two terms as Governor of Massachusetts.

He probably was not too well physically, but he did not complain. Instead, he responded to their urge with his usual vigor.

This followed his choice as the keynoter at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, and the unfortunate incident that occurred there. He went there to help our cause. He went there, true to his character, to aid his friend Adlai Stevenson, and to proclaim that democracy is inseparable from the liberties of men. Democracy that had given a Jefferson, a Jackson, a Wilson, a Roosevelt, and a Harry Truman, to the service of mankind.

He was not defeated by the Eisenhower sweep. Instead he was crucified by the assaults on his character and by the attacks on his personal probity.

For Paul Dever went down in 1952 by the cowardly and the poisonous thrusts of those who vilified him, as no other man had ever been so debased before.

I have many times thought that he became so crestfallen, so downcast by a succession of untruths and slurs and outright attacks on his honesty, his integrity, and his moral uprightness—and by one, I might add, that he thought would show some essence, some atom of fairness—that his illness began and became so accentuated, as to lead to his ultimate, and to me, his most untimely death.

But our zeal, our admiration for his goodness of character, and for his sincerity will never waiver.

Our admiration for the cold, even light of his brilliant mind, will never cease.

For he was, in fact and in truth, the leader here in Massachusetts of our party. And his influence for the common good will remain long after his assailants have gone.

To them, to them, I say that our faith in him shall never end. To them I say we shall always remain inspired by his precepts and by his example.

To them I say that Paul Dever was the builder, the architect, who while he lived, lifted us to such heights of moral grandeur as we had seldom known before.

For his name and his purpose made hearts beat a little faster in lowly places. And today his name and his good deeds and his charity are being sung in every nook and cranny of this Commonwealth.

And now that he is gone, his spirit soars. For, with his death and with his passing, he has left for history and humanity and eternity for all mankind the everlasting and immortal memory of Paul Andrew Dever.

For the spirit of Paul Dever lives on.

The spirit of Dever will never die.

The spirit that slowed a week ago lives again.

For he has bequeathed to us the unfinished fight to aid the jobless; to strengthen our economy; to care for the aged and the sick; to build our highways; and to go forth to battle for the cause of man.

Yes; he has left to us, too, the legacy of helping the Mongoloid kid, and providing the new techniques for the retarded child.

And, as it always was with Paul Dever, so may it always be with us.

May his immortal soul rest in peace.

Disabled American Veterans of Wisconsin Sponsor Junior Achievement Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the achievement of a young Wisconsin man in winning second place in a national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has focused a dramatic spotlight on the very fine work being done cooperatively by two excellent organizations in Wisconsin.

About 18 months ago, the Department of Wisconsin, of the Disabled American Veterans, a veterans' organization well known for its outstanding work, undertook the sponsorship of a Junior Achievement Co., in Milwaukee. Junior Achievement is also an organization that is well known for its outstanding and unique work in giving America's youngsters a chance to learn about our system of capitalism at its best, by actually forming and managing business concerns of their own. But this particular Junior Achievement Co. is unique, in that it is made up entirely of youngsters who are physically handicapped.

This year, the Wisconsin DAV organization is again sponsoring a Junior Achievement Co.; but this one is comprised of both physically handicapped and physically fit youngsters. The program is so successful that the DAV is making plans to sponsor several chapters next year.

Wayne Stanley Gardner, a high-school senior from Granton, Wis., a community of about 300, in central Wisconsin, won second place in the national contest. He will come to Washington next week, to accept his award from President Eisenhower. All of Wisconsin is tremendously proud of this young man for winning this honor. The Wisconsin Department of the DAV has taken an active part in promoting this essay contest in our State.

Mr. President, Mr. Harold Wellnitz, of Oshkosh, Wis., the department commander of the Disabled American Veterans, has prepared an excellent statement telling of his organization's good work in sponsoring Junior Achievement companies in our State. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HAROLD WELLNITZ, COMMANDER, DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN, INC., DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

In October 1956, the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Wisconsin, undertook the sponsorship of a Junior Achievement Co., and affiliated with the Junior Achievement of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc., at 3800 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee. Junior Achievement itself is nothing new, but this company, as far as is known, was unique in that it was made up of all handicapped teen-agers. Our purpose in this was to give these youngsters some of the advantages and help that a grateful country gave the disabled veteran in his rehabilitation to again become a useful and productive citizen.

Advisers were recruited, and the company was put under the leadership of Mr. Howard Fairbanks, of Brookfield, Wis., himself the handicapped man of the year in Wisconsin. Insurance was provided for every minute these youngsters were with Junior Achievement, and transportation was furnished by the Milwaukee County Red Cross Chapter. The youngsters elected their own officers, sales manager, and board of directors. Stock was issued at 50 cents per share with no one being allowed to own more than 5 shares.

The members met one evening a week at the Junior Achievement center in Milwaukee and manufactured a household product that was not in competition with industry. The success of the company was such that at the end of the school year they dissolved, buying back the stock, and paying a dividend of 10 cents a share. Operating in the same manner as any large corporation, these children learned the meaning of American free enterprise as well as furthering their education toward a useful and productive life.

This year's company sponsored by the DAV Department of Wisconsin is different in the fact that we have mixed the handicapped youngsters with physically fit teen-agers. This experiment is proving to be successful, and it is hoped that in the next season we will be able to have similar companies in other localities in the State. The company this year is the Rod & Reel Co. and manufactures fishing rods—a hollow glass fly rod 7½ feet long and 2½ ounces in weight, a bass action fly rod, and 2 different spinning rods. These products, of course, are very important in the State of Wisconsin.

On May 8, an awards dinner will be held in the Milwaukee Arena with about 1,500 in attendance. Our company will compete with all others for recognition. The various companies are rated on five basic principles of good business—product, production management, sales, and understanding to determine the outstanding companies in the varied fields of endeavor. The judges are the National Association of Accountants, the Sales Executives Clubs and Engineers Society of Milwaukee, and the Milwaukee Advertising Club.

Junior Achievements teaches to American youth confidence in the American system and sound business principles. Many Milwaukee companies are now using Junior Achievements as an essential part of their executive training program.

As far as we know, these companies of handicapped teen-agers, sponsored by the Department of Wisconsin Disabled American Veterans, are the first such groups to be organized. Our satisfaction is the knowledge that we have helped these handicapped youngsters on the way toward contributing to the economic welfare of our country.

At the essay contest awards dinner in Milwaukee on March 17 at the Allis Chalmers Clubhouse, a switch was pulled. The department commander of the DAV accepted a citation for the department from Junior Achievement of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc., in recognition of its pioneering in this almost neglected field.

The Columbia: Mightiest Power Builder on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the manner in which water and power resources of the Columbia River Basin are correlated for maximum production of energy has a fascination for engineers and laymen alike. The transmission grid of the Bonneville Power Administration and the multiple-purpose dams of the United States Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation form the backbone of the network of powerlines and powerplants which make possible this electrically and hydraulically integrated operation of Columbia Basin water resources. Management by the Federal Government has been a major factor in turning the turbulent Columbia into one of the world's mightiest power producers.

Operation of this vast interconnected system of publicly and privately owned power facilities is vividly described in an article in the May 1958 issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "The Columbia: Mightiest Power Builder on Earth," by Wolfgang Langewiesche. I ask unanimous consent that the Reader's Digest article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLUMBIA: MIGHTIEST POWER BUILDER ON EARTH

(By Wolfgang Langewiesche)

Cruising my little airplane over the Pacific Northwest, I got my first good look at the Columbia River. That river, with its tributaries, is now the biggest power river on earth. It dwarfs the Tennessee. And on its power is built a regional development that dwarfs the TVA. It has brought to the Northwest the Hanford atomic works; it powers the giant Boeing aircraft factories and the shipyards on Puget Sound; it has attracted aluminum mills and smelters. Already it has brought a million new people to work in the Northwest, so that, in the State of Washington, 1 out of 3 persons is now a newcomer.

Throughout this region I had seen a brand-new answer to those who are afraid that we are going to run out of food, land, wood, oil, or whatnot. On the plains of Oregon I had seen rich wheat farms on land that used to be almost desert. The climate has not changed, and there is no irrigation; men have learned how to grow wheat with less rain. In the mountains of Washington I had seen modern forestry grow 50 percent more wood per acre than nature would grow unaided. I had seen the gas pipeline coming in from the four corners region, 1,000 miles away, bringing fuel to this region that lacks coal and oil. The answer to the fearful is: We can now create resources—land, trees, fuel.

Now, on the Columbia River, I was seeing men, in effect, create water.

We think of the Northwest as rainy, and full of tall, dripping pine trees, and mountainsides sloping down to the sea. That's true for the coast—Seattle, Tacoma, Portland. But inland rise the Cascades, a mountain barrier about as high as the Alps. And inland of that, in its rain shadow, lies the inland empire—a vast plain, flat or rolling, without trees. Most of it is too dry for agriculture, and some is outright desert.

Across this barren plain the Columbia wanders almost unseen, most of the way in steep-cut, somber canyons hundreds of feet below the operating level of the country. A river usually appears from the air as a strip of high-intensity civilization. But the Columbia for most of its course has no cities on it, no roads or railroads following it. For long stretches, there's not a house, not a ranch, not a field.

The cause of this strange situation is not hard to discern. The Columbia is fed by the glaciers, rains, and heavy snows high up in the Rockies. So it has plenty of water, plenty of power to cut its bed deeper and deeper. But the country it flows through gets little rain, has almost no streams, and is not being cut down by erosion. So, through the ages, the river has dug down, while the country has stayed up. And there's your problem: a big fat river flows through arid country; and millions of acres are useless because you can't get the water on the land.

That's what Grand Coulee Dam is all about. It lifts the water up onto the plain—economically.

From the air, Grand Coulee Dam, biggest concrete structure on earth, looks small, graceful, even fragile, down there in its canyon. Actually, it is a goliath among power dams: it develops almost 3 million horsepower. It feeds its power into the regional network of high-tension lines. But a small part of its power is used to pump river water out of the canyon up to the level of the country. The water flows up the canyon side through a bundle of 12 pipes that look like organ pipes, each one big enough to supply all of New York City with water. On top, the water goes into a vast storage lake, several miles wide, 27 miles long.

The pumping up is done in the spring, when the river runs high, and in the dead of night, when the region's power requirements are lowest. The rest of the time, irrigation draws on that storage lake, while the dam devotes full time to powermaking.

On an impulse, I left the river here and followed the irrigation water, to see where it was used. I followed the lake, then a canal, a length of pipeline, a canal again. It led me across one of the strangest landscapes on earth. It's lava country, mostly black, through which run canyons that make no sense because they have no rivers in them. I saw a Niagara Falls, only 3 times as high and 5 times as broad. The horseshoe shaped precipice, the gorge—it was all there, except the water. It was a dead waterfall, along a ghost river.

This region is called the channeled scablands of Washington, and it explains why Grand Coulee Dam is where it is.

The country has been devastated twice: first by fire (liquid lava boiling up out of cracks in the ground), then by water. During the ice age a glacier dammed up the Columbia River until it overflowed its canyon and started off sideways, across the plains of stiffened lava, seeking a new channel to the sea. This overflow is what tore up the country, dug those canyons, made that waterfall.

When the ice age faded, the Columbia went back into its old course, leaving the dry river courses. The canyons are called, locally, "coulees." The biggest of them all, Grand Coulee, is now the storage lake for irrigation water. The old watercourse in general now serves as an easy cross-country route for the irrigation water. Out of old devastation we've made a natural resource.

On the plain where the water is used I expected to see a nice expanse of green. I was wrong. The soil worth irrigating lies in patches only, interlaced with black lava flows, hills, stretches of sand. Here and there, a settler's house stands on the vast somber plain, no driveway leading to it, as if it has only just been set down. The landscape looks unfinished and uninviting—because it is. To put new land under irrigation is a tough job. You have to drain as well as irrigate. If the soil gets waterlogged, it goes wrong—in texture or in chemistry. The first years, all you can grow is alfalfa. Its roots dig deep down and loosen up the soil and bring it to life. All this takes money. People here say you must go $25,000 in the hole before such a farm begins to pay off.

It is true that you get the land, itself, practically free—under a successor to the famous Homestead Act, signed by Abraham Lincoln, which once offered to any man on earth a farm in America, free. But the settler must pay off, through the years, his share of the irrigation system. And what he gets is just raw land, with water delivered at one corner by the Government. The rest—the ditches and drainage, the house, the machines—is up to him. It takes guts to succeed here.

Now, for many, the toughest part is over. Farmers are beginning to make good crops of high-value products: peas, sugar beets, canning vegetables. They are paying old bills and buying new machines. I circled the town of Othello, Wash.—once a mere nothing along the highway—and found it an impressive little place: big school, big agencies for cars and farm machinery, a motor court, and a landing strip within walking distance of

everything. Clearly a lot of people are betting a lot of money on the future of that plain.

I went back to the Columbia River and flew its whole length. The more I saw, the more I was astounded. I had known about Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. But these are prewar. Since World War II a dozen new dams have been built or set underway. Even since the Korean war the power on the Columbia River system has doubled. Soon the river will look like a string of lakes, with one dam backing the water right up to the foot of the next dam above. Many of the dams are remote, and seldom seen even by northwesterners. But their names pop up continually in local talk: Hungry Horse, Ice Harbor, Priest Rapids, Chief Joseph (generally called Chief Joe). The Dalles, McNary. For the last 10 years half a million dollars has been spent every day to build new dams on the Columbia. In the next 10 years a million dollars a day will be spent for more dams, to keep up with the power needs of the country.

Who does all this? That's just the point. This is a TVA without the A. No central allwise authority runs the development. Some dams are private enterprise; some are United States Government; some belong to cities, some to public utility districts, which means essentially counties. The development runs by argument, hearings, quarrels, lawsuits, compromise. "But this interferes with my power." "It hurts my fish." "It floods out my Indians." In every aspect, involved are the Federal Government, with various of its agencies—Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife, Army engineers, the Bonneville Power Administration, Indian Affairs; five States, each with several bureaus and commissions; plus Canada (the Canadian part of the river, in British Columbia, is still mostly wild). Senators from the Northwestern States also make their wishes known. And beneath the surface there is a life-and-death struggle between public power and private power.

Despite the multiplicity of interests, the river is operated as a single entity. I say "operated." Once you have a string of dams on a river, you can't just let the water run. You have to open and close the gates and spillways to take care of floods and droughts and the varying demand for power. Main tool of operation—the Northwest power pool.

What's that? There is no organization of that name, no office, no letterhead. It's simply the fact that all the power producers of the region work together. A four-State grid of high-tension lines connects all the dams. Each dam feeds its power into the grid; each city, industry, rural electrification district draws its power from the grid. Electrically, therefore, the Northwest is one pool.

Here's how it will work, for instance, once the new dams in Idaho are completed: In the early summer, when farmers in Idaho draw a lot of current to run irrigation pumps, the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, has a good flow of water. The simple thing to do would be to supply the local demand with locally made current from the local river. But, at this same time of year, power requirements downriver and along the coast are fairly low; the dams down there have more riverflow than they need and must let water run over the spillways, which means waste. Pool operation combines these two situations. Idaho Power shuts down its turbines, closes its dams, and supplies its local farmers with power drawn from the grid. At the same time, the dams downstream open up their turbines and supply to the grid the extra power to make up for what Idaho draws. In this way waste of water downstream is reduced, and up in Idaho, as the water level rises behind the dams, a reserve builds up.

So water has been, in effect, created. There is now a mass of water upriver, ready to work, that would not have been there without this trick of management.

Imagine the bookkeeping. Both water and electric energy are borrowed back and forth between the dams, power companies, Government agencies. When extra water builds up behind dam A because dam B works extra hard, that extra water belongs to dam B. It is valuable property. It is stored in layers you don't see when you look at a reservoir. The topmost 2 feet of water may belong to the XYZ company, the layer of water next below to the Army Engineers, the next foot under that to the United States Bureau of Reclamation, or the city of Tacoma. A string of dams, working a river as a whole—here is a brilliant new creation of man.

The trouble with the Columbia is—its water comes at the wrong time of year. It runs highest in spring and early summer while the snow is melting in the Rockies. The power needs are greatest in the winter, when all the lights and electric heaters are on. So in fall and winter, until a few years ago, when Chief Joe Dam went to work, the region had brownouts.

Even now the aluminum plants, attracted to the region by the cheap electricity, have to close down every winter because there isnt enough power. This is as planned; they get their power cheap on the condition that they may be cut off. But power that isn't firm—that is, available year round—is for most industries and households not worth having.

The best way to get more power is to doctor the river to flow more evenly: to build more storage reservoirs up river. Each gallon you can hold up river in the spring, at high-water time, becomes valuable when you let it run down the river in the fall, at low-water time.

And now comes the miracle of downstream benefits. Suppose you build a dam and powerhouse high up on the upper part of the river. Behind your dam you have a reservoir which you filled in the spring. Now, at the low-water season, as you draw on your own storage to keep your own turbines running, you release a lot of water which flows down the river and runs through everybody else's turbines also. At each dam downstream your water comes as extra water. It would not be available had you not built your dam. So your water does extra work which that dam could not do before your dam was built.

Again water has been created where there was none before—or rather at a time when there would have been none before.

Downstream benefits are also a political headache. They are worth money. When the Army engineers analyze a new dam project, they always take its downstream benefits into account. On the books of the Federal Government the lower dams then pay the upstream dams for benefits received. This is, of course, merely a bookkeeping transaction, but without it many a Federal dam would show a loss to the taxpayer. But a private-power dam cannot collect for downstream benefits from Government-owned dams. The Federal Government claims it owns the river anyway, and all improvements become its property ipso facto. This is part of the grim struggle between private and public power.

The Columbia, with its tributaries, was the last place in the country where big, unused waterpower was still left. Now, the good dam sites are all taken up, or spoken for. And dam building becomes more expensive as the country develops. Sometime after 1970, building of dams will have become so expensive that it will be more economic to add steam powerplants, possibly with atomic heat. Is this the end of the line of river development?

No, there's still another twist. Steampower needs waterpower as a sort of backstop. The demand for electric power goes up and down violently through the day and night. But steampower, to be economical, wants to run at a steady pace. Waterpower, on the other hand, lends itself to operation in spurts. When you shut it down, you lose nothing; the water rises behind the dam, and is available for your next run. And a water turbine requires no warmup; just open up, and let her spin. So, in most of the United States, waterpower is used now to firm up steampower and make it more economic. When the Northwest finally goes to the same regime, it will mean that more turbines can be installed in each dam. And more power can be got from each dam, in short spurts, than it now produces in steady operation. Used that way, Columbia River power will be more valuable than ever.

Thats what I saw on the Columbia: man can create resources. There is no end to our resources as long as there's no end to our ideas.

Automobile Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by Richard L. Strout, entitled "Cars and a Price Jungle," and published in the Christian Science Monitor for April 24. Mr. Strout points out the need for a law requiring labels giving the actual manufacturer's list price on automobiles offered for sale.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 24, 1958]

CARS AND A PRICE JUNGLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

We were all seated at the end of the long press table in the Senate restaurant talking, of course, about the automobile industry. Everybody these days talks about the slump, and then about Detroit.

"Do you know," observed a reporter, "that there isn't a new-car salesroom in this city where you can find the actual manufacturer's list price of an automobile to the dealer? When a consumer sets out to buy a car he's just operating in the dark."

"There don't seem to be any fixed prices any more," said a disgruntley voice. "You take in your old car and from there on its like haggling in an oriental bazaar."

I was surprised at the agreement that followed. Several speakers said they wanted new cars but were holding back. I am sure the same discussion is going on over the country. A lot of people, it appears, not only don't like the length, looks, or price, of news cars but are also upset by the details of the deal that sells their old car and gets the new one.

"It's a price jungle," testified John L. O'Brien, president of the Better Business Bureau of Akron, Ohio, before the Senate Subcommittee on Automotive Marketing Practices, headed by Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma. "The plain price tag on an automobile offered for sale today is so rare a thing as to be almost nonexistent. You can find out almost anything about an automobile except what the darn thing costs."

It's a queer situation. Hundreds of millions spent for automobile advertising, and yet at the salesroom when the doubtful cus-

tomer enters he, or she, is expected to engage in the Levantine sport of bargaining in which a ballyhooed over allowance for the trade-in is taken care of by an inflated price of the new car.

On a Mexican street corner a tourist smiles at the need to haggle for some common commodity, but back in the United States he now often engages unsmilingly in much the same practice in what may be the biggest single investment he makes outside of his home.

Four spokesmen for the National Automobile Dealers Association, which represents some 25,000 franchised dealers throughout the Nation, testified in favor of a proposed Monroney bill requiring manufacturers' wholesale prices to be displayed on new cars. The association, they explained, had tried and failed to police the industry themselves. Price "packing," they said, was common—marking up or adding charges over and above normal recognized markup from the wholesale price at which a dealer acquires an automobile from a manufacturer.

William M. McCune, representing the State of Pennsylvania on the NADA, said the manufacturers hadn't been of much help. The practice of "packing" really hit hard in 1954 when the big three competitive race got intense. Indeed, a Pontiac dealer of Albany, N. Y., testified before another committee that "packing was condoned and encouraged by General Motors," and a Lincoln-Mercury dealer from Reno, Nev., testified to like effect in his own line.

In large part, it appears, the fault is that of gullible customers looking for fantastic bargains, who think they are somehow beating the system when they get preposterous trade-in allowances. They do not realize that they are paying as much, or more, for their purchase because of "packed" prices of the new car. Sometimes there is outright fraud through the device of a faked factory invoice; sometimes the trick is done more subtly by including a long list of optional equipment and accessories at inflated prices; items which do not occur to the customer as price factors until the deal is all but closed.

"There is a tremendous reservoir of car buyers who are refraining from buying at this time," testified Morgan R. Purdy, Pontiac-Buick dealer of Van Wert, Ohio.

He, like Roland Hughes, Lincoln-Mercury dealer of Jonesboro, Ark., thought the proposed bill would extinguish some of the foolishness engaged in by the disruptive minority who persist in false and misleading claims in advertising.

Salmon Are Only "Pinks" in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, recently, for reasons completely beyond my comprehension and the comprehension of all Alaskans, allegations have been made that if communism is not rampant in Alaska it might be acceptable there later on. This is simply fantastic. No part of the United States contains citizens more loyal than does Alaska. The April 19 issue of the Valdez Breeze commented on this editorially.

The editorial is offered here:

WASHINGTON, D. C., SEER PREDICTS "PINK" FUTURE FOR ALASKA

Once again Alaska and its residents have been put through a siege of name calling.

We are not arguing party politics, the pros and cons of statehood—we are only wondering why such learned people keep expounding along the same lines?

Surely there has never been a suggestion of rumor as to any of our schools being hotbeds of communistic activities—none of our citizens have appeared before Senate investigating committees because of questionable affiliations. Can the gentlemen who are our accusers say the same for their own States?

To point an accusing finger toward the north and west and say "There lay the future homes of communism" is fantastic.

To infer that should the time ever come that we could elect our own governor we would all blithely vote a straight Communist ticket—is like saying California is going to be exiled from the United States because Harry Bridges lives there.

The founders of our country would only shake their heads in wonder if they could see such ignorance and greed for power as is displayed by those who formulate the laws that govern us all.

Please, gentlemen, before you make any more rash statements get out your reference books and see just where the so-called strength of the Communist power is—for it surely isn't and not likely to ever be Alaska.

Senator Russell Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the people of Georgia are exceedingly proud of the deserved honor which is being paid their beloved and distinguished senior Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, in the presentation to him on Wednesday of one of the two 1958 George Washington Awards of the American Good Government Society. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "A Statesman Honored," from the April 26, 1958, issue of the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, which aptly expresses the sentiments of Georgians in this regard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATESMAN HONORED

Come the evening of April 30 and a great Georgian who has demonstrated down through the years that there is no substitute for statesmanship in holding the esteem of his constituents will receive a signal honor.

We speak, of course, of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, who is to be the recipient of 1 of the 2 1958 George Washington awards of the American Good Government Society. The other will go to Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND of California, also a great champion of intellectual honesty.

The presentation to Senator RUSSELL will be made by Erle Cocke, Jr., former national commander of the American Legion. Properly enough, Dr. Felix Morley, author and educator, will deliver an address entitled, "President George Washington."

The people of Senator RUSSELL's home State should be proud indeed that he has been selected for this honor, which has been reserved for such other great Americans as Robert Taft, Herbert Hoover, and the late Senator Walter F. George. The award indicates that throughout the Nation our senior Senator's talents and contributions are being recognized by those who come closest to symbolizing the integrity and courage of the man who was first in war, peace, and the hearts of his countrymen—George Washington.

Foremost Catholic Farm Policy Expert Endorses Direct Payments Method

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the Nation's Greatest minds and greatest hearts in the field of farm policy is Msgr. Luigi G. Ligutti, director of the Catholic Rural Life Conference. He is loved and respected by farm people of all faiths and parties and organizations for his humane and understanding view of the problems of agriculture. He is highly esteemed even by those who disagree with his views.

As for me, for many years I have greatly admired Monsiegneur Ligutti's work in farm policy and with farm people. I have the highest esteem both for his recommendations about what should be done to help our farmers, and for his fundamental objectives—which is to preserve, protect, and promote the family-type farm as the basic pattern in our agriculture. I am proud, indeed, to endorse this objective as my own.

In a recent interview in the Register Times-Review, published by the Catholic Diocese of La Crosse, Wis., Monsiegneur Ligutti's views on present farm programs are presented with unusual clarity and force. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the interview with Monsiegneur Ligutti printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so it may come to the attention of all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse (Wis.) Register Times-Review of April 18, 1958]

PRICE SUPPORTS RIDICULOUS—RURAL GROUP CHIEF SLAMS FARM PROGRAM

(By Robert G. Hoyt)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—America's farm program, in some aspects, lacks both commonsense and common justice, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference's executive director said here.

In an interview that touched on a large number of farm-related topics, Msgr. Luigi G. Ligutti declined to comment on President Eisenhower's veto of the recent farm bill, or on the bill itself. But he considers the idea of price supports ridiculous.

"The farmers are producing a great abundance of goods—too much, the Government says," he said.

"So the Government enters the market, buys some of these goods, and puts them away. It costs $1 million a day just to store this surplus, as they call it, not to speak of the cost of buying it.

"Because these goods are taken off the market, naturally prices are higher. So what does this mean? It means that we are pay-

ing taxes so that we can pay higher prices for our food."

He added: "The Rural Life Conference does not mean that the farmer should be left at the mercy of the market, when he has so little control over it. We simply oppose the illogical and doubly expensive system now being used to give the farmer a fair return."

A better way to accomplish this end, he suggested, would be to let the farmer produce what he wants to and market it without controls.

The farmer then would receive, directly from the Government, the difference between the cost of production and a reasonable rate of return on his investment and labor. Such a plan would bring an immediate and sharp drop in prices, and the price reduction would in turn have these effects:

Consumers would benefit financially.

Consumption would increase, especially among poorer families. This would bring a rise in the standard of living—the natural response to abundant production, now artificially prevented. It would also tend to reduce surpluses.

The cost of administering the Government farm program would be materially reduced, because the system of paying directly to farmers would be far simpler than the present arrangement. By a provision limiting the amount payable to any one producer, the system would also allow the Government to put into actual practice the frequently expressed but never implemented policy of favoring family-operated farms.

"Farmers certainly aren't getting sufficient income now to justify their investments and recompense them for their labor. Their income is down by perhaps as much as 30 percent, while prices have gone up 10 percent," the monsignor estimated.

If price supports are to be retained, he argued, they should be administered with an eye to the realities of farm operations. He took issue sharply with the theory, frequently advanced by Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, that reductions in price supports will automatically reduce production.

Monsignor Ligutti believes that the general public is not learning the facts of the farm problem or the attitudes held by most farmers. Farm publications and some farm organizations—including the Farm Bureau—defer to the interests of big commercial farmers, do not adequately represent the views of those on family farms.

Though he doesn't insist that all persons now living on the land should stay there, he is critical of the proposal to take 2 million small producers out of agriculture and into industry.

The proposal gets a good press, but Monsignor Ligutti doubts that it would solve the surplus problem.

Befuddled Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Befuddled Critics," from the Arizona Republic.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFUDDLED CRITICS

Four staff members of the Washington University Law Quarterly have undertaken in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat to refute a series of editorials published in the Arizona Republic pointing out the need to curb the runaway United States Supreme Court.

The conclusion of the Republic's editorial series, as readers of this page may remember, was that some way must be utilized to bring the Supreme Court back to its historic functions without altering its constitutional position. We did not attack the Supreme Court. We defended it against the misuse which the majority of present Justices are making of its prerogatives.

Our Washington University critics devote their first 16 paragraphs to convincing their readers that the Republic claimed the power of judicial review is unconstitutional. We eventually discover the reason for their misapprehension: They themselves are firmly convinced that the Court's legitimate power to rule laws unconstitutional when they are in fact unconstitutional is the same as the power to make new laws or even, if the whim moves, to amend the Constitution. Of all people, attorneys should be able to see the difference, and of all atorneys, those connected with a university law faculty should be acutely aware of it. If they are not, heaven help the law students.

The Republic maintained, and others such as the distinguished Judge Learned Hand have maintained, that the Supreme Court does not have the power, and must not be allowed to usurp it, to make law. Throughout its history that has been the Supreme Court's own position, expressed as late as 1936 in an opinion which declared: "The Constitution is the supreme law of the land ordained and established by the people. All legislation must conform to the principles it lays down. When an act of Congress is appropriately challenged in the courts as not conforming to the constitutional mandate, the judicial branch of the Government has only one duty; to lay the article of the Constitution which is invoked beside the statute which is challenged and to decide whether the latter squares with the former. * * * The Court neither approves or condemns any legislative power. * * *"

Our Washington Law Quarterly critics next charge the Republic with blatant misstatement of rulings handed down by the Supreme Court. In what way? Well, they say, first you must understand that a court decision applies only to the case which is decided. In kindergarten language they explain what attorneys call the law of the case. In essence this is a very sound doctrine which holds that a court judgment has the effect of law against the person to whom it is applied, but nowhere else. The Republic's basic misstatement is supposed to have been that Supreme Court decisions could possibly apply to any but the actual case under consideration.

What are the facts? The Supreme Court's decision in the Nelson case knocked out antisubversive laws in almost half the States of the Union. Of course the States could go to court 1 by 1 if they wanted to spend the money, but in this 1 decision the Supreme Court said the Federal Congress had preempted the antisubversive field by enacting the Smith act, and State laws in the same field were null. The language of the decision was purposely broad enough to cover all States. Of what use is the law of the case when the Supreme Court itself disregards it?

In this matter of preemption, too, our critics disregard the whole truth for the sake of influencing opinion. They say the decision in the Nelson case was not unconstitutional because the preemption doctrine is based on the Constitution, and the decision was based on the preemption doctrine. The truth is that the doctrine was twisted entirely out of shape by the present Supreme Court, which even disregarded a plain statement in the Smith act itself that it was not intended to crowd States out of the antisubversive field.

The Washingon Law Quarterly quartet proceeds in much the same vein, and by much the same methods, in an attempt to discredit all other criticism of the present Supreme Court majority. Despite a constitutional clause which says, "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," they manage to convey the idea that the power to investigate "was granted to Congress (by the Supreme Court) only upon condition that investigations have legislation as an object."

How far off base can counselors get when they attempt a defense at any cost? Perhaps a clue is that at one place in their criticism, they attribute Thomas Jefferson's remarks about the Supreme Court directly to the editorial. Flattering, but hardly honest. We wonder what Jefferson's reaction would have been to the law editors' remarks that his words contributed to an ultimate absurdity.

The attack on the Republic's editorials is more confusing than enlightening until we come to one small paragraph. It says: "If the Court decided it could not overrule past decisions, the only other way of changing them would be by amending the Constitution. This is a burdensome process requiring the agreement of three-fourths of the States. Is this change desirable?"

Change? We have been under the impression all along that the only proper way to change the Constitution is by amendment. We most assuredly are not willing to leave it to five members of the Supreme Court. And despite the final exhortation of our Washington Law Quarterly critics, we shall continue to resist the Court's usurpation with every legitimate power at our command.

Idea With Wings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 27:

IDEA WITH WINGS

Washington will lose a wholesome and constructive voice today when Ambassador Gonzales J. Facio of Costa Rica returns to his native land. Senor Facio is a young man from a small republic, yet in his 2-year tour of duty he contributed an idea which already has made an impact on the hemisphere. In looking at Latin America's problems, Ambassador Facio was struck by the paradox that a peaceful area of the world should pour so much of its treasure into armaments when the region is already largely protected from outside aggression by the shield of the United States. Why shouldn't Latin America profit by the changing nature of warfare, the Costa Rican asked, and reduce its arms expenditures in an orderly manner? When Senor Facio presented the Council of the Organization of American States with a plan aimed at trimming arms budgets and diverting the money saved to beneficial public projects, he ruffled the

feathers of some of his older colleagues. The OAS voted to shelve the proposal and doubtless some Latin diplomats hoped that it would be forgotten entirely. It has not been forgotten; instead, it has taken wing and is still alive in much of the hemisphere. Ambassador Facio's hard-headed idealism may yet prove a catalyst for a sensible and hopeful change.

The Tenth Anniversary of the Establishment of Israel as a Free and Independent Nation

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel is an occasion of worldwide significance because it represents the application for a decade of the same persevering spirit that inspired the God-fearing American Colonists to found a new nation dedicated to the cause of liberty and freedom.

According to the Hebrew calendar, April 24, 1948, marks the establishment of the State of Israel with full sovereignty among the nations of the world. During the ensuing 10-year period, Israel has demonstrated to the world its ability to develop and expand its agricultural and industrial economy at a rate of progress that has astounded those who were skeptical that Israel could accomplish its avowed purpose of developing its economy and becoming a highly respected member of the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, when you consider the marked progress made by Israel in the short space of 10 years, it confirms the observations of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who in writing from New City, Jerusalem, in June 1955, revealed the gift of prophecy when he wrote:

> From my window in the King David Hotel in Israel, I can look out over Mount Zion to the Mount of Olives in Jordan beyond the Old City of Jerusalem for a distance of about a mile.
>
> But in the contrast that exists between the Arab and Jewish sides of Jerusalem it is like passing through the ages from the primitive past to modern western civilization. • • • The heart of the old walled city of Jerusalem where lies the tomb of Lord Jesus Christ and the sacred shrines of the three great religions are typically Arab. By this I mean its streets are crooked and narrow and cobblestoned.
>
> The contrast between the medieval walled city and hustling modern metropolis which the Jews have made of their part of Jerusalem is more than just striking. One cannot escape the conclusion that despite, or perhaps because of, the difficulties placed in their way by the Arab world, which refuses to accept the existence of the Jewish national home, these people are going to be successful in their determination to develop a new and dynamic nation.
>
> On arrival on this side of the city one is immediately impressed by the spirit of vitality and modernity that is reflected in the appearances and actions of a people of many races with only their religion in common, who have come here from all parts of the world to help make their dreams of a homeland come true.
>
> Streets are wide and clean. The shops are many and attractive. New housing developments are spotted all over the rolling countryside. There is an atmosphere of strong will to work and strength of purpose.
>
> From what I have seen in the few hours I have been here, I would say that it is going to take more than the Arab economic blockade, frontier incidents and the resentful ill will of the 40 million people in the Arab world to make the Jewish people abandon fulfillment of the centuries-old aspiration to have a place they can call home.

Mr. Speaker, the Israelis have justified the confidence placed in them for today Israel stands as a beacon of hope for peace in the Middle East because of its ideals of freedom, its devotion to the encouragement of mutual cooperation, and its deep sense of spiritual values without which no nation can long endure. Truly it can be said that Israel represents the addition of a new voice to the symphony of human freedom.

As a practical example of humanitarianism, Israel opened its doors to more than 900,000 destitute and homeless men, women, and children from the ghettos of Asia and Africa and the concentration camps of Europe. Thus the State of Israel has become a sanctuary to these hapless thousands by giving them the opportunity to regain their self-respect and in truth enjoy for the first time in their bleak lives the priceless privilege of being able to look up at the stars as they are restored the right to gain a livelihood unfettered and unchained.

By providing a haven of refuge for nearly a million of persecuted human, beings, Israel has given a ringing and conclusive answer by its exemplary conduct to the biblical question: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Bereft for ages of a national homeland, the heritage, culture, character, and religious faith of the Jewish people have never been in eclipse for they have outstanding contributions to the advancement of civilization down through the centuries. There is not a nation in existence today that has not benefited from the influence of the Jewish race for it has produced leaders of thought for centuries in the arts and sciences, in religion, politics, philanthropy, and in the wholesomeness of family life.

A persecuted and homeless race that through its proud history was subjected to cruel attacks by bigots and traducers, the Jewish people for centuries were literally hounded from pillar to post and scattered to the four winds with no sovereign nation to call their own.

The Jewish people share the views of Christendom to the extent that they, too, regard Palestine as Judaism's holy land, yet for the first time in history a flag bearing the star of David flies over their spiritual home.

It is evident that the spiritual wellsprings that since biblical times have nursed the Jewish people through adversity and persecution and which account for their deep faith in Almighty God have proved to be their unfailing source of strength down through the ages.

Today their centuries of devout prayer and earnest supplication have been answered, for Israel is truly the promised land for a race who never despaired of God's love and mercy. As a result, while Israel as a nation is still in swaddling clothes, it has become to a persecuted people literally a land of milk and honey because human dignity is restored and guaranteed to a race that had no national homeland but was forced to seek asylum in the other nations of the world. In Israel the Jewish people have a sovereign nation of their own that today has a voice in the United Nations, where the quest by free nations for universal peace is the major objective.

The 10 years of phenomenal progress made by Israel despite its unfriendly neighbors is an indication of the self-determination by an ancient race to survive as a free and independent nation.

Israel has shown positive signs of its desire for peace in the Middle East through repeated public pronouncements by its able Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, who offered disarmament as being highly acceptable to Israel if the neighboring countries would adopt the same conciliatory attitude and cooperate in making it a reality.

Mr. Speaker, the action by the United States Senate and House of Representatives in adopting resolutions on April 23 extending greetings to the State of Israel on its 10th anniversary exemplified the admiration of the American people for this infant nation.

I am happy to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in approving the resolution saluting Israel on its progress during the difficult and struggling 10 years of its existence and to wish this highly respected new nation of the Middle East continued success in its growth and development as a free and independent nation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to make part of my remarks the beautiful prayer offered at the opening session of the House of Representatives on April 23 by Rabbi Israel Goldstein of Congregation B'nai Jeshurn, New York, chairman of the American Committee for the Celebration of Israel's 10th anniversary.

The prayer follows:

> Lord, Creator, Shepherd, Father, if a thousand years are but as yesterday in Thy sight, 10 years are but as a moment. Yet there are great moments in the human drama which attest to the divine spark in man and to Thy finger in history. Such was the fashioning of these United States of America into a new society of human freedom and dignity. Such too has been the restoration and rededication of an ancient people to nationhood upon its ancient soil thrice hallowed by religious inspiration.
>
> It was meet that our beloved America reared in the spiritual heritage of ancient Israel's timeless book, helped the modern State of Israel come into being, and strengthened it during its infant years. And little Israel has given as well as received. It has given an example of how to reclaim the soil and how to redeem human beings, of how to provide homes for the homeless, and boons of freedom and dignity for the underprivileged. It has shown how to overcome fear with faith at a time when the world is filled with apprehensions. And its hand of fellowship and peace is extended. "Shalom, shalom la'rachok v'lakarov," peace, peace to those that are far and to those that are near.

Grant, O God, that the bonds which make us feel a sense of spiritual kinship with Israel may grow with the years.

In the words of Israel's ancient prayer we pray today and every day: Spread Thy tabernacle of peace over the habitation of men everywhere, so that in peace and in comity men and nations may build a world worthy of Thy blessing, O Lord, Creator, Shepherd, and Father. Amen.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator TALMADGE's Farm Plan," from the April 25, 1958, issue of the Albany (Ga.) Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR TALMADGE'S FARM PLAN

Striking in its simplicity and bold in its approach to the complex farm problem which has plagued the Nation for two decades is the program outlined to the United States by Georgia's energetic junior Senator, HERMAN E. TALMADGE. Convinced that the Nation's economy is dependent in large measure on the formation of a realistic approach to modern agriculture, and wearied of the patchwork of discredited programs with which the national economy is now burdened, Senator TALMADGE has charted a future course which would enable the Government and the American farmer alike to begin again on the simple basis of free enterprise farming bolstered by a system of compensatory payments.

At the outset, it is apparent that his plan embodies all of the best elements of the advocates of a fully free farm market and those who propose that the Government has an obligation to support all farmers. In brief, the TALMADGE plan would (1) eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans; (2) assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota to be expressed in pounds, bushels or bales which would be the same percentage of the national consumption of basic commodities that the farmer's historic acreage base bears to the total national acreage base; (3) guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the differece between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity; (4) require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales price support payments, and (5) impose a maximum of $25,000 on sales price payments which any individual farmer could receive.

The Talmadge program would cost an estimated $1.28 billion, compared to the present cost of $3.25 billion now paid to farmers under the price-support plan. However, the individual farmer would not suffer, as the Senator pointed out, in that only $1.2 billion of the $3.25 billion now being paid by the Government goes to farmers for direct price props. The Senator's plan would have the added benefits of reducing the enormous amount of redtape through which a farmer must now wade to qualify for price supports, eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls, and free the farmer to plant and sell as he pleases. It would also take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and with private enterprise, instead of with the Government.

Small wonder it is, then, that the Talmadge farm plan has elicited immediate support from many important farm groups, as well as from the Democratic majority in the Senate. Such farm State legislators as Senators STENNIS, of Mississippi; PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; and JOHNSTON of South Carolina have praised the proposal in such glowing terms, seldom accorded a freshman colleague, as the soundest, best plan I know of. Certainly it deserves the studied consideration of both farmers and legislators, and could provide a base on which a more realistic agricultural policy could be constructed. In the meantime, Senator TALMADGE's program stands as a monument to clear thinking in an arena often clouded with partisan politics and catch-as-catch-can schemes designed more to trap votes than to better the lot of the American farmer.

The Disintegration Tactic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from National Review of February 22, 1958, entitled "The Disintegration Tactic" by James Burnham.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISINTEGRATION TACTIC

(By James Burnham)

The troubles of the Indonesian islands and the Caribbean Basin, through multiple causes, have been whipped to their present acute stage by one of the most practiced and most baffling of communism's standard operating procedures: the distintegration tactic.

The disintegration tactic is based on a simple, two-part theory: (1) It is good to louse up the workings of an enemy (i. e., non-Communist) institution—trade union, school, factory, or nation, or whatever, (2) If the functional collapse is deep enough, then it becomes easy for a small, disciplined group—such as the Communist cadre—to seize control.

Well planned, the disintegration tactic is a low-cost revolutionary gambit that can yield a maximum result for modest investment. It can be handled by small professional units that rely on the mass aid of unwitting, or unheeding, volunteers. Just wrap a synthetic McCarthy-image in the properly charged magical symbols, and you can count on the drugged liberals to carry through the demoralization of a security system. Spread ideologically fashionable lies about an anti-Communist union leader, and relax while the crowd pushes him out of your way.

MARE NOSTRUM

Often the disintegration tactic includes a sort of social sabotage. You need to throw sand in only one set of critical gears, or weaken one small electrical connection, to ease the whole factory or rocket into a breakdown. Analogously, you may start the disintegration off by, say, shooting just the right man: Castillo Armas of Guatemala, for example, key symbol of a serious United States intention to maintain control of its Caribbean strategic threshold.

Look at the map of the Caribbean—our Mediterranean—and you will see how it is geographically dominated by Cuba, Hispaniola (the Dominican Republic and Haiti), Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala. (How many hours do you imagine the Kremlin strategists have spent studying that map?) A few years ago these nations were stabilized to a degree seldom precedented in their histories. With the exception of Costa Rica, whose President was a Washington-tamed leftist, they were ruled, as Latin American nations have usually been, by strong, brutal despots. These particular chiefs were, however, bringing to their countries not merely dictatorial order but material progress. They worked closely with United States military and business interests; and fairly closely, most of the time, with the United States State Department.

AFTERMATH OF THE DICTATORS

Today the entire Caribbean Basin is stumbling toward turmoil. Remón, of Panama; the elder Somoza, of Nicaragua; and Castillo Armas, of Guatemala have been assassinated either by Communists or by local fanatics spurred on by Communists. Rójas Pinilla, of Columbia, and Pérez Jiménez, of Venezuela, who made the fatal error of antagonizing the church as well as the Communists and liberals, have been overthrown by amorphous, disintegrative revolts without program or perspective. Batista, of Cuba, is harassed by guerilla bands financed, supplied, and politically supported by vengeful exiles, Soviet agents, and United States leftists, liberals, and concession hunters. Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, is the target of a united front assault that has mounted higher month by month since the mysterious event that seems to have opened this present Caribbean disintegration campaign: the disappearance of Jesús de Galíndez.

There are two immediate consequences of the overthrow of these dictatorial regimes: First, a general instability and confusion in which a Communist-trimmed anti-Yanqui imperialism is offered as the safest raft for riding the popular currents; and second, an influx of leftists and Communists—not only native exiles, but Spanish civil war veterans who were grafted onto the Kremlin's Latin American apparatus, and Soviet agents in Mexico, the United States, and the Communist-riddled British enclaves (Jamaica, British Honduras, and British Guiana).

ORDER AND DISORDER

Our liberals, almost to a man, support this disintegrative process; indeed, not only support it, but finance, organize and arm it, propagandize and conspire for it, even delude themselves into thinking they direct it. Their influence is entirely negative, and thus a perfect supplement to the Communist disintegration tactic. As as alternative to the dictators the liberals propose nothing but ideological platitudes; they are unwilling to support any of the existing internal social forces that might keep these precarious nations from flying apart.

Fortunately such forces still exist, so that the Communists are not yet unopposed on the field. Chief among these forces are the church and the military, and it is these two that hold things together as the regimes crack. Interestingly enough, the ordinary citizens seem more resistant than our liberals to the Communist operation. In the two most recent free elections (in Guatemala and Costa Rica) the candidate of the right has in each case won a clear plurality. If Senores Ydigoras and Echandi lead the kind of orderly, procapitalist, pro-United States

regimes, resting on church and arms, that their electoral positions promised, then we may predict with certainty that our liberals, swinging like dutiful needles to the turning Communist lodestar, will rail as bitterly against them as they have done against Rójas, Jiménez, Batista, and Trujillo.

The liberals, by their own principles of antiorder, cannot rest until, the chaos having become complete, the Communists take over. Then at last, as with China, the liberals can sit back. One must, you see, accept the inevitable.

Statement of the National Education Association of the United States

SPEECH
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor is holding hearings on various bills for Federal assistance for school construction and payment of teachers' salaries.

Testimony has been presented showing that the shortage of teachers is increasing and that we are neither filling the present classroom shortage nor meeting the increasing needs of our growing population.

Dr. Walter W. Heller, economist at the University of Minnesota, presented persuasive reasons why we should immediately take steps to relieve the classroom shortage and increase teachers' salaries. A part of Dr. Heller's testimony related to the antirecession impact of Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries.

Dr. Heller is eminently qualified to analyze the antirecession results of Federal aid. He is serving as tax adviser to the Governor of Minnesota and is a consultant to the Committee for Economic Development. In addition to acting as chairman of the department of economics of the University of Minnesota, he is a member of the board of directors of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Dr. Heller was tax consultant to Gen. Lucius B. Clay in Germany in 1947–48 and subsequently served on the tax advisory staff of the United States Treasury.

That portion of Dr. Heller's statement relating to the antirecession impact of Federal assistance to build schools and pay teachers an adequate salary follows:

ANTIRECESSION IMPACT

The long-run case for Federal participation in the financing of public education for our children, powerful and persuasive as it may be, is strongly reinforced by short-run considerations. The present deterioration, if not outright crisis, in State-local finance has already been reviewed. I refer now to the timely and appropriate role than an immediate program of Federal school support, especially for school construction, could play in the Federal Government's antirecession policy. At no time since World War II has the business and economic situation been more favorable for a decisive attack on the persistent shortage of elementary and secondary classrooms.

To be sure, we agree wholeheartedly with the basic philosophy expressed by Secretary Marion Folsom last year (in the paper prepared for the Congressional Joint Economic Committee's compendium, Federal Expenditure Policy for Economic Growth and Stability, Nov. 5, 1957, p. 881):

"School construction * * * should be accelerated in spite of the fact that privately financed construction and employment in the building trades are at record levels for peacetime. The child who is ready to enter school should start now—he cannot be put on a shelf until a depression comes and supplies the impetus of an economic emergency to the building of more new schools."

Today we have a golden opportunity to eliminate our classroom shortage—a responsibility that we as a nation have been neglecting for over two decades—and with the added benefits of putting idle men, materials, and equipment back to work. A school-construction program is exceptionally well adapted to reabsorb into productive employment precisely the types of unemployed labor and unutilized industrial capacity that characterize the present recession.

Let us examine some criteria that should be applied to Government expenditure programs to determine whether a program deserves a priority position as an antirecession measure.

1. Does the program meet an established need and thereby represent an efficient use of the country's productive resources?

2. Can its stimulative effects take hold quickly and exert their main force before the economy again reaches boom levels?

3. Does it have a high direct and indirect job-creating impact per unit of expenditure?

4. Are its stimulative effects directed at those areas of the economy most acutely suffering from slack demand in the private sector?

5. Does it abate, rather than intensify, the longrun threat of inflation?

Analyses and surveys made by the National Education Association demonstrate decisively that a program of Federal grants for school construction merit a high rating on all five counts.

1. NEED

The need for additional classrooms has already been so unequivocally established and is of such magnitude that further discussion is unnecessary.

2. TIMING

With appropriate Federal grants, the need for schools could be translated into early and effective economic activity that would not otherwise take place. This conclusion is confirmed by the results of an NEA survey of State superintendents of education 3 weeks ago. The survey found that if Federal funds were made available on a grant basis by July 1, 1958, an estimated minimum of 2,759 classrooms could be put under construction within 1 month, 16,325 within 3 months, 43,979 within 6 months, and 68,113 within 12 months (figures are cumulative). These figures do not include estimates from such populous States as New York and Illinois. These classrooms represent needed construction that will not otherwise be undertaken in 1958–59. Details of this survey are presented in exhibit D–1.

The estimated cost of ready-to-go construction reported by these 30 States would amount to a total of approximately $650 million in 3 months and $1.5 billion in 6 months.[1]

[1] These figures were obtained by applying the national average of approximately $40,000 per classroom, as reported by the United States Office of Education, to the total number of classrooms the States estimated they could build. This figure covers the total cost of school plant including the cost of auxiliary facilities, purchase, and preparation of site, furniture, equipment, and all other costs.

Past experience indicates that construction of classroom additions to existing school plants can be completed in 4 to 10 months. Construction of new elementary schools can be completed in 12 to 18 months, and construction of new high schools in 12 to 24 months. These figures cover only the construction period, not the time required for voter approval of bond issues, planning, and site acquisition.

The speed with which additions to existing facilities can be completed is particularly impressive. For example, a four-classroom addition to an elementary school in the Roseville School District of Minnesota was given voter approval on March 25, bids were opened April 24, construction will start about May 15, and the project will be completed by the opening of school on September 1.

Such additions to existing facilities constitute a large part of total classroom construction. The State education agencies have reported to the United States Office of Education that in the fiscal years 1951 through 1956, 62 percent of classroom construction represented additions to existing facilities and the remaining 38 percent, new facilities. In projecting their needs for instructional rooms for the period 1956 through 1960, the States reported 43 percent as additions to existing school plants, and 57 percent as part of completely new school plants. In other words, in a sizable proportion of school construction projects, no lengthy preliminary steps of planning, site acquisition, and the like are necessary. Such projects could be quickly activated by Federal grants, and the construction period would be far shorter in most cases than it would be for entirely new school plants.

Available economic data strongly suggest that recovery from the present recession will be a slow, fairly prolonged process. As a member of the staff of the congressional Joint Economic Committee put it in a speech on April 14:

"In view of the prospect that the severe capital goods decline may continue into 1959 and that consumer spending on goods, services, and houses will depend on employment and income changes generated by business and Government spending, it would be dangerous to assume that total demand will rise significantly any earlier than the fourth quarter, or perhaps in the first half of 1959. Certainly, it would be very risky to base policy decisions on the assumption of an early strong recovery to full employment of labor and capital.[2]

When we add to this warning the evidence brought forward by Prof. Sumner H. Slichter from past business fluctuations that the jeriod from the bottom of recession to the peak of the boom is at least 2 years,[3] we can safely conclude that a large supplementary school construction program could not only be launched swiftly but also be carried through to substantial completion before the economy is again in a boom phase.

3. JOB-CREATING EFFECTS

Each additional $100 million spent for school construction will create approximately 15,000 man-years of work. This work would be distributed as follows: 6,000 man-years of direct on-the-site labor; 6,000 man-years of indirect labor in building-material industries such as basic metals, lumber, glass, and plumbing manufacture; 1,500 man-years of labor in the architectural, drafting, engineering, and earth-moving oc-

[2] Statement by James W. Knowles, economist, Joint Economic Committee, U. S. Congress, in a speech, The Economic Outlook and Its Implications, before the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, April 14, 1958.

[3] In an interview published in U. S. News & World Report, April 4, 1958, p. 441.

cupations and professions; and 1,500 man-years of labor in the school furniture and equipment industry.

Although these figures are conservative, they compare quite favorably with the estimate of approximately 11,000 man-years of labor created by $100 million of highway construction reported to another congressional committee.

The 15,000 man-years of labor were computed on the basis of the experience of the Community Facilities Administration and upon an analysis by the CFA of 1,083 school-construction projects financed under Public Law 815.

4. DIRECTION OF IMPACT

Not only in its overall effect, but also in the closeness of its fit to the present patterns of unemployment and excess capacity, an accelerated school-building program ranks high on any list of antirecession projects. This can readily be seen by comparing the types of demands created by the construction program with the types of labor, services, and basic materials now in oversupply. Apart from obvious demands for labor and services in the construction industry, school construction involves large demands for steel, cement, lumber, bricks, copper, glass, aluminum, and the like. Underemployment and overcapacity are concentrated in precisely these areas.

Industrial production by March 1958 had dropped 13 percent from its recent highs as against 10 percent in the 1948–49 and 1953–54 recessions. New housing starts in March 1958 were at their lowest point in 8 years. Industrial production as a whole was at its lowest level since late 1954. Steel output was lower than at any time (except for strikes) since mid-1949. Manufacturers' new orders in February sank to a level $4.3 billion below a year earlier, and their unfilled orders dropped $16 million during the same period. Yet, in all these areas, capacity to produce has risen so sharply that the ratios of output to capacity, especially in heavy goods, have dropped to new postwar lows.

Staff studies by the Federal Reserve Board show that for the 17 major materials covered by its indexes of capacity and output, March 1958 output was running at only 68 percent of capacity.[4] The combined Federal Reserve index for pig iron, steel ingots, primary aluminum, and refined copper showed March output at only 56 percent of capacity.

Unemployment figures are equally striking. From March 1957 to March 1958, the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment rose from 3.9 percent to 7 percent. Manufacturing jobs were down 1.5 million from a year ago, with more than 1.2 million of this drop concentrated in the durable goods industries. Employment in contract construction had dropped 250,000 from a year ago. The workweek in manufacturing dropped from 40.1 hours in March 1957 to 38.5 hours in March of this year, with weekly earnings dropping $1.35 during this period.

Turning specifically to the construction industry, we find that although new construction activity in March 1958 (seasonally adjusted) was down only 1.3 percent from its peak in October 1957, construction employment (unadjusted) in March 1958 was down 16.6 percent from its August 1957 peak, and 9.1 percent from its March 1957 level. New contract construction awards (as tabulated by F. W. Dodge Co.) were down roughly 10 percent in the first 2 months of 1958 as compared with a similar period a year ago. A figure of related significance is expenditure for private investment in plant and equipment, which dropped 13 percent from $39.96 billion in 1957 to an estimated $32.07 billion in 1958. In brief, the recession has already hit construction activity, and the contract award figures make it clear that without added government stimulus, the construction industry will be in a depressed condition for some time to come.

Although comprehensive and current data on the distribution of the school construction dollar among various types of basic materials are not available, exhibits D–2 and D–3 provide some important clues. Exhibit D–2 shows the estimated consumption of selected construction materials per $1 million of educational construction compared with various other types of construction as of 1947. Although prices have risen substantially, and construction techniques have changed considerably in the past 10 years, the price rises and construction patterns since 1947 have probably affected different types of buildings more or less similarly. If this is true, the 1947 data strongly suggest that a school construction program provides a considerably better fit, in terms of materials consumed, to the pattern of slackening private construction demand than do such alternative public construction programs as highways and military and naval projects.

Further confirming evidence of the highly appropriate focus on school construction demand in terms of resources idled by the 1958 recession is provided by exhibit D–3. It presents a detailed breakdown of school expenditures among 71 labor and materials categories for a current elementary-school construction project in the Roseville School District of Minnesota. The figures under the electrical, plumbing and heating, and general contracts for this new school show that, roughly, 35 percent of the total cost of $478,000 will be for onsite labor and 65 percent for materials.[5] Although the building standards of the school in question no doubt differ in some respects from the national average, it is illuminating to convert the figures on an illustrative basis to the demands that would be created by $100 million of similar school construction. This is shown in exhibit D–4. Using this computation, we find that $100 million invested in school construction contract costs would create $6.1 million of demand for electrical material; $12.7 million for plumbing and heating materials; $6 million for structural steel, steel joists, and steel roof decking; $2.6 million for brick and tile; $5.1 million for concrete and concrete block; $3.9 million for millwork; $3.5 million for sheet metal, roofing, and roof insulation; $3.2 million for metal windows, glass, and glazing; $3.9 million for kitchen equipment; and $1 million for composition floor covering.

The foregoing facts make two conclusions inescapable: (a) It will take considerable time and very sharp increases in demand to bring construction and basic materials industries back up to par, let alone put them back on the path of economic growth; (b) the types of demand created by the school-construction program are particularly well suited to aid in this process of restoration.

Effect of teacher salary increases: Although the preceding analysis of Federal financial support for schools in relation to the recession has emphasized the construction aspect, increases in teachers' salaries should not be overlooked as a stimulus to a depressed economy and an incentive for sustained economic growth.

One of our pressing needs in this period of recession is for increased purchasing power for durable goods. The production of consumer durable goods has suffered an especially sharp drop in the current recession. Production dropped from a seasonally adjusted index of 132 in March 1957 to 105 in March 1958. If the Congress were to provide the substantial increases in teachers' salaries, such increases would have the double-barreled effect of providing more purchasing power in every American community and of lifting the economic status of the American school teacher to a competitive position for competent manpower.

At the present time there is a backlog of needed durable goods among members of the teaching profession. Although gains in teachers' salaries in recent years have kept pace with general wage increases for all employed persons, the gains in teachers' salaries have not been sufficient to offset the lack of gains in the 1940's. The level of teachers' salaries is still substantially below 1939 levels in comparison with the average earnings of all persons working for wages and salaries. In 1939, teachers' salaries were 12 percent higher than the earnings of the average wage or salary worker. But in 1957, teachers' salaries were only 6 percent above the average for all workers. As a result of this lag, teachers have been spending a disproportionate amount of their income for food, clothing, and shelter, and less of it for the purchase of durable goods such as automobiles and washing machines. It is only reasonable to expect that with a substantial salary increase, teachers would purchase many of the items that they have not been able to purchase in the past. In addition, a raise in salary for teachers would also increase other types of consumer expenditures. A teachers' salary increase at this time, therefore, would offer a particularly beneficial stimulus to the economy, and at the same time, would help to upgrade the quality of the teaching profession.

5. LONG-RUN INFLATION PRESSURES

Our best hope of maintaining a relatively stable price level in the longer run is to generate rapid growth in productivity. If we can increase the rate of output per unit of input rapidly enough, we can satisfy the rising income claims of the participants in the productive process by sharing an expanding product rather than by pushing up prices and eroding the value of the dollar.

Here, education stands head and shoulders above most competing programs. As we have shown earlier in this statement, education as an investment in human beings pays rich dividends in greater productive capacity. It develops not only the skills and understanding needed on the production line, but also the brainpower needed to break through technological barriers and reach new heights of human accomplishment. Given the creativity of educated minds, the returns on our educational investments are more than worthwhile—they may be infinite. We can erect no better advance defense against creeping or grinding inflation than the expansion of the producive and creative power of our children through education.

An important comment about the antirecession impact

Although large-scale school construction would create many jobs, the construction of classrooms should not be considered a make-work project. The construction of classrooms for our children is not make-work, it is catchup work. We must not ignore it any longer, regardless of economic downturns or upturns. The same is true for substantial increases in teachers' salaries.

In light of the decisive advantages of a school construction program as an antirecession measure, combined with the com-

[4] The 17 materials are pig iron, steel ingots, primary aluminum, refined copper, cotton yarn, synthetic fibers and yarns, cement, woodpulp, paper, paperboard, petroleum products, coke, and 5 industrial chemicals.

[5] The cost of materials and equipment used in this particular school building are somewhat higher in proportion to the total labor involved in building the school since the heating plant, electrical equipment, and related materials are of sufficient size to accommodate the future addition of classrooms. This practice is common in communities with rapidly expanding school populations.

pelling case for Federal support in the longer run, one may well ask why it has not been at the forefront of our planning and action to overcome the recession. It is, in a sense, an accident of legislative history that preferment is given to highway, post offices, and housing. Without meaning to depreciate these programs either intrinsically or as antirecession measures, one may note that had a Federal school support program been enacted in 1957 or 1956 or earlier, more and better schools for our children would very likely be at the head of the Federal Government's list of antirecession projects today. But caught in the coils—mistakenly and unnecessarily, in my opinion—of misunderstanding and shortsighted reasoning, Federal support for schools has been forced to give way to programs which cannot match either its long-run or its short-run contributions to notional welfare and economic stability.

EXHIBIT D–1. TELEGRAPHIC SURVEY OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS REGARDING CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION AND LEGAL INDEBTEDNESS LIMITS

On April 5, 1958, the National Education Association sent the following telegram to each of the chief State school officers in the 48 States:

"Urgent, need estimated answers to two questions by noon Tuesday. Wire reply collect.

"1. If your State were to receive nonmatching Federal funds for public-school construction on July 1, 1958, how many classrooms could your school districts have under construction within 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, 12 months? The four answers should be cumulative. Question refers to classrooms that otherwise would not be constructed next year.

"2. What percent of your districts have for all practical purposes reached legal indebtedness or millage limits?

"J. L. McCASKILL,
"*Director, Legislation and Federal Relations.*"

Replies were received from 46 States. A total of 30 States reported that if nonmatching Federal funds were available as stated in the first question of the telegram, they could have an estimated 68,113 classrooms under construction within 12 months. These are classrooms that would not otherwies have been constructed in 1958–59.

The time schedule for beginning this construction in the 30 States follows:

	Classrooms
1 month	2,759
3 months	16,325
6 months	43,979
12 months	68,113

Ten States were unable to make an estimate because data were not available. Six States reported that Federal funds were not required this year.

The following is a tabular summary of the replies to the first question of the telegram:

Estimated number of classrooms which could be under construction with Federal funds after July 1, 1958

State	Within 1 month	Within 3 months	Within 6 months	Within 12 months
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Alabama	500	5,000	10,000	11,200
Arizona	0	178	357	715
Arkansas	0	400	600	850
California	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Colorado	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Connecticut	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Delaware	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Florida	300	900	1,500	5,222
Georgia	0	150	600	1,500
Idaho	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Illinois	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]

Estimated number of classrooms which could be under construction with Federal funds after July 1, 1958—Continued

State	Within 1 month	Within 3 months	Within 6 months	Within 12 months
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Iowa	0	25	100	200
Indiana	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Kansas	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Kentucky	200	800	1,600	5,000
Louisiana	0	150	400	600
Maine	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Maryland	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Massachusetts	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Michigan	0	1,000	8,000	10,000
Minnesota	400	800	1,100	1,400
Mississippi	100	300	600	1,200
Missouri	194	1,206	2,744	3,524
Montana	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Nebraska	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Nevada	27	193	223	271
New Hampshire	5	25	75	175
New Jersey	0	100	500	2,000
New Mexico	0	0	250	557
New York	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
North Carolina	75	225	700	1,800
North Dakota	0	25	75	250
Ohio	0	150	1,500	4,000

Estimated number of classrooms which could be under construction with Federal funds after July 1, 1958—Continued

State	Within 1 month	Within 3 months	Within 6 months	Within 12 months
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Oklahoma	0	200	450	900
Oregon	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Pennsylvania	0	1,600	6,500	8,000
Rhode Island	0	0	107	209
South Carolina	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
South Dakota	0	0	200	400
Tennessee	254	950	1,615	2,178
Texas	0	100	700	1,000
Utah	192	268	602	714
Vermont	12	30	81	223
Virginia	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Washington	500	1,150	2,000	2,500
West Virginia	0	350	700	1,165
Wisconsin	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Wyoming	0	50	100	300
Total	2,759	16,325	43,979	68,113

[1] Federal funds not required this year.
[2] No data available.
[3] No reply.

EXHIBIT D–2.—*Estimated consumption of selected construction materials per $1,000,000 of each type of construction in 1947*

Construction [1]	Material consumed					
	Lumber (thousand board-feet)	Cement (thousands of barrels)	Clay sewer pipe (tons)	Bricks (thousands)	Concrete blocks (thousands)	Steel (tons)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Private residential	1,948	6	62	579	129	174
Private, nonresidential: [2]						
Industrial	402	11	30	404	51	1,241
Commercial:						
Warehouse, office buildings	519	10	8	315	43	1,573
Stores, restaurants, and garages	589	8	16	489	85	801
Other nonresidential buildings	484	7	15	422	56	776
Public:						
Educational	440	5	12	435	34	589
Military and naval	930	27	53	297	51	160
Highway	223	23	26	23		303
Educational	440	5	12	435	34	589
Average private industrial and commercial	499	9	17	408	59	1,089

[1] Adapted from: Margolis, Julius, Public Works and Economic Stability, Journal of Political Economy 57: 299; August 1949.
[2] Excluding farm and public utility construction.

Source: For all but residential construction, worksheets of the Construction Statistics Division, Department of Commerce. Residential derived from Department of Commerce, Construction and Construction Materials, January 1948, pp. 8–15.

EXHIBIT D–3. ROSEVILLE SCHOOLS, INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 623, STATE OF MINNESOTA

LABOR-MATERIAL BREAKDOWN,[1] BRIMHALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Facilities

Sixteen classrooms, 28 by 32 feet each.
Combination lunchroom-gymnasium, including storage rooms, stage, 52 by 94 feet.
Kitchen and auxiliary rooms, 30 by 52 feet.
Office suite, 30 by 32 feet.
Lavatories, 30 by 32 feet.
Auxiliary rooms for library, and so forth, 16 by 104 feet.
Boiler room, 30 by 42 feet.
Corridors, 12 by 604 feet.
Total, 38,696 square feet.

(NOTE.—Office suite, gymnasium, kitchen, boiler room, and auxiliary spaces planned for eventual sized school of 30 classrooms plus 3 kindergartens and primary playroom. It should be noted that the costs detailed in this exhibit do not include such items as site acquisition, furniture, and architects' fees. On the other hand, bond and preliminary expense and site improvement (the latter involving 5 percent of the total cost) are included.)

	Labor	Material
ELECTRICAL CONTRACT		
1. General and special conditions (legal, insurance, etc.)		$500
2. Conduit and fillings	$4,226	3,680
3. Outlet boxes and fillings	1,039	507
4. Power and lighting panel	340	2,519
5. Wire and cable	1,768	2,140
6. Motor and equipment connections	179	229
7. Electric service	526	3,863
8. Wiring devices	319	465
9. Lighting fixtures	2,094	9,563
10. Lamps	317	752
11. Clock and program system	233	1,870
12. Fire alarm system	234	1,504
13. Sound system	125	1,678
Total	11,400	29,270
PLUMBING AND HEATING CONTRACT		
1. Exterior utility service	1,584	1,703
2. Sanitary drain system	4,950	3,000
3. Rainwater drain system	2,000	1,828
4. Water supply	2,350	4,300
5. Water heater	320	1,240
6. Hot water circulating pumps	240	200

[1] Supplied through the courtesy of Emmet D. Williams, superintendent of Roseville Schools.

	Labor	Material
7. Gas piping	$160	$280
8. Thermal insulation	1,718	2,186
9. Plumbing fixtures	2,776	3,600
10. Boiler and breeching	1,695	3,864
11. Oil burner	1,650	6,850
12. Vacuum pump	200	1,200
13. Radiation	2,500	3,600
14. Unit heaters	400	1,000
15. Valves, traps, and strainers	200	1,500
16. Piping	400	5,259
17. Insulation (piping)	1,350	900
18. Temperature controls	5,100	9,900
19. Refrigeration	425	1,345
20. Sheet metal work	4,100	1,300
21. Registers, grills, and diffusers	80	218
22. Fan units	375	4,900
23. Painting	695	385
Total	35,268	60,558
GENERAL CONTRACT		
1. Bond and preliminary expense	1,628	4,229
2. Excavations and ground and site work	11,460	12,900
3. Forms in place	6,228	7,907
4. Reinforcing of steel and mesh	1,262	8,271
5. Concrete	4,521	19,019
6. Structural steel	$3,126	$11,980
7. Steel joists	2,168	8,858
8. Steel roof deck	2,397	8,000
9. Acoustical desk	3,366	6,251
10. Dampproofing and waterproofing	783	783
11. Face, common, and glazed brick	6,238	4,451
12. Standard concrete block	9,230	5,358
13. Glazed tile	10,380	8,228
14. Miscellaneous metal	2,412	4,484
15. Ornamental metals	1,238	4,218
16. Aluminum vent house	1,059	1,241
17. Hollow metal frames and doors	912	4,955
18. Metal windows	4,530	9,592
19. Sheet metal, roofing, and roof insulation	5,638	16,909
20. Carpentry	4,112	1,290
21. Millwork	18,840	18,851
22. Caulking and weather stripping	628	942
23. Lathing and plastering	2,180	2,702
24. Ceramic tile and marble	1,150	1,102
25. Composition floor covering	2,098	4,894
26. Glass, glazing	1,859	5,567
27. Accoustical treatment	3,010	6,193
28. Finish hardware	2,160	5,897
29. Miscellaneous equipment	368	1,334
30. Folding door	$40	$165
31. Folding stage and stairs	310	1,789
32. Basketball backstops	92	602
33. Insulated storage room	268	751
34. Kitchen equipment	2,078	18,602
35. Painting and decorating	4,164	1,302
Total	121,933	219,702
Grand total	168,601	309,530

NOTE.—Since the heating system and lead-in wiring for electrical service for the initial 16-classroom Brimhall Elementary School Building are sized for an eventual 33-room school, the heating and electrical work costs are somewhat higher than normal. Superintendent Williams states: "Additional construction to this building would run about $1 a square foot less than the initial construction due to the fact that the heating and electrical work would be a smaller proportion of the total. The general construction cost per square foot would be very comparable to the cost of the original building and the cost percentages for the material used would be similar" (letter to the National Education Association, dated Apr. 15, 1958).

EXHIBIT D–4.—*Conversion of labor-material cost breakdown, Brimhall Elementary School (Minnesota) into an illustrative expenditure breakdown per $100,000,000 of school construction* [1]

Item	Labor		Materials		Total	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Electrical contract:						
1. General and special conditions			$104,574	0.16	$104,574	0.11
2. Conduit and fillings	$883,858	2.50	769,663	1.19	1,653,521	1.65
3. Outlet boxes and fillings	217,305	.62	106,038	.16	323,343	.32
4. Power and lighting panel	71,110	.20	526,843	.81	597,953	.60
5. Wire and cable	369,773	1.05	447,576	.69	817,349	.82
6. Motor and equipment connections	37,437	.11	47,895	.08	85,332	.09
7. Electric service	110,012	.31	807,938	1.25	917,950	.92
8. Wiring devices	66,718	.19	97,254	.15	163,972	.16
9. Lighting fixtures	437,955	1.24	2,000,079	3.09	2,438,034	2.44
10. Lamps	66,300	.19	157,279	.24	223,579	.22
11. Clock and program system	48,731	.14	391,106	.61	439,837	.44
12. Fire alarm system	48,941	.14	314,558	.49	363,499	.36
13. Sound system	26,144	.07	350,950	.54	377,094	.38
Total	2,384,284	6.76	6,121,753	9.46	8,506,037	8.51
Plumbing and heating contract:						
1. Exterior utility service	331,290	.94	356,178	.55	687,468	.69
2. Sanitary drain system	1,035,281	2.94	627,443	.97	1,662,724	1.66
3. Rainwater drain system	418,295	1.19	382,322	.59	800,617	.80
4. Water supply	491,497	1.39	899,335	1.39	1,390,832	1.39
5. Water heater	66,927	.19	259,343	.40	326,270	.33
6. Hot water circulating pumps	50,195	.14	41,829	.07	92,024	.09
7. Gas piping	33,464	.09	58,561	.09	92,025	.09
8. Thermal insulation	359,316	1.02	457,197	.71	816,513	.82
9. Plumbing fixtures	580,594	1.65	752,932	1.16	1,333,526	1.33
10. Boiler and breeching	354,505	1.01	808,147	1.25	1,162,652	1.16
11. Oil burner	345,094	.98	1,432,662	2.21	1,777,756	1.78
12. Vacuum pump	41,830	.12	250,977	.39	292,807	.29
13. Radiation	522,869	1.48	752,932	1.16	1,275,801	1.28
14. Unit heaters	83,659	.24	209,148	.32	292,807	.29
15. Valves, traps, and strainers	41,830	.12	313,722	.49	355,552	.36
16. Piping	83,659	.24	1,099,908	1.70	1,183,567	1.18
17. Insulation (piping)	282,349	.80	188,233	.29	470,582	.47
18. Temperature controls	1,066,653	3.02	2,070,562	3.20	3,137,215	3.14
19. Refrigeration	88,888	.25	281,304	.43	370,192	.37
20. Sheet metal work	857,506	2.43	271,892	.42	1,129,398	1.13
21. Registers, grills, diffusers	16,732	.05	45,594	.07	62,326	.06
22. Fan units	78,430	.22	1,024,824	1.58	1,103,254	1.10
23. Painting	145,358	.41	80,522	.12	225,880	.23
Total	7,376,221	20.92	12,665,567	19.56	20,041,788	20.04
General contract:						
1. Bond and preliminary expense	340,402	.97	884,486	1.37	1,224,978	1.23
2. Excavations and ground and site work	2,396,833	6.80	2,716,829	4.20	5,113,662	5.11
3. Forms in place	1,302,572	3.69	1,653,731	2.56	2,956,303	2.96
4. Reinforcing of steel and mesh	263,944	.75	1,729,861	2.67	1,993,805	1.99
5. Concrete	945,557	2.68	3,977,780	6.14	4,923,337	4.92
6. Structural steel	653,796	1.85	2,505,589	3.87	3,159,385	3.16
7. Steel joists	453,432	1.29	1,852,630	2.86	2,306,062	2.31
8. Steel roof deck	501,327	1.42	1,673,182	2.59	2,174,509	2.17
9. Accoustical desk	703,991	2.00	1,307,382	2.02	2,011,373	2.01
10. Dampproofing and waterproofing	163,763	.46	163,763	.25	327,526	.33
11. Face, common, and glazed brick	1,304,663	3.70	930,917	1.44	2,235,580	2.24
12. Standard concrete block	1,930,433	5.48	1,120,613	1.73	3,051,046	3.05
13. Glazed tile	2,170,953	6.16	1,720,867	2.66	3,891,820	3.89
14. Miscellaneous metal	504,464	1.43	937,815	1.45	1,442,282	1.44
15. Ornamental metals	258,925	.73	881,139	1.36	1,140,064	1.14
16. Aluminum vent house	221,487	.63	259,552	.40	481,039	.48
17. Hollow metal frames and doors	190,743	.54	1,036,327	1.60	1,227,070	1.23
18. Metal windows	947,439	2.69	2,006,145	3.10	2,953,584	2.96
19. Sheet metal, roofing, and roof insulation	1,179,175	3.34	3,536,478	5.46	4,715,653	4.72
20. Carpentry	860,015	2.44	269,801	.42	1,129,816	1.13
21. Millwork	3,940,343	11.17	3,942,643	6.09	7,882,986	7.89

See footnote at end of table.

EXHIBIT D-4.—*Conversion of labor-material cost breakdown, Brimhall Elementary School (Minnesota) into an illustrative expenditure breakdown per $100,000,000 of school construction* [1]—Continued

Item	Labor		Materials		Total	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
General contract—Continued						
22. Caulking and weather stripping	$131,345	.37	$197,017	.30	$328,362	.33
23. Lathing and plastering	455,942	1.29	565,117	.87	1,021,059	1.02
24. Ceramic tile and marble	240,520	.68	230,481	.36	471,001	.47
25. Composition floor covering	438,792	1.25	1,023,569	1.58	1,462,361	1.46
26. Glass, glazing	388,805	1.10	1,164,325	1.80	1,553,130	1.55
27. Accoustical treatment	629,535	1.79	1,295,252	2.00	1,924,787	1.92
28. Finish hardware	451,789	1.28	1,233,344	1.91	1,685,103	1.69
29. Miscellaneous equipment	76,966	.22	279,003	.43	355,969	.36
30. Folding door	8,366	.02	34,509	.05	42,875	.04
31. Folding stage and stairs	64,836	.18	374,165	.58	439,001	.44
32. Basketball backstops	19,242	.06	125,907	.19	145,149	.15
33. Insulated storage room	56,052	.16	157,070	.24	213,122	.21
34. Kitchen equipment	434,609	1.23	3,890,566	6.01	4,325,175	4.33
35. Painting and decorating	870,891	2.47	272,310	.42	1,143,201	1.14
Total	25,502,007	72.32	45,950,168	70.98	71,452,175	71.45
Grand total	35,262,112	100.00	64,737,488	100.00	100,000,000	100.00

[1] It should be noted that the costs detailed in this exhibit do not include such items as site acquisition furniture, and architects' fees. On the other hand, bond and preliminary expense and site improvement (the latter involving 5 percent of the total cost) are included.

NOTE.—Since the heating system and lead-in wiring for electrical service for the initial 16-classroom Brimhall Elementary School building are sized for an eventual 33-room school, the heating and electrical work costs are somewhat higher than normal. Superintendent Williams states: "Additional construction to this building would run about $1 square foot less than the initial construction due to the fact that the heating and electrical work would be a smaller proportion of the total. The general construction cost per square foot would be very comparable to the cost of the original building, and the cost percentages for the material used would be similar." (letter to NEA, dated Apr. 15, 1958).

Restrictions for Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Valley Times, North Hollywood, Calif., by George Todt, entitled "Restrictions for Supreme Court."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTRICTIONS FOR SUPREME COURT

(By George Todt)

"At last I perceive that in revolutions the supreme power finally rests with the most abandoned." (Danton.)

Are there those in our Republic who dream that the Supreme Court is so sancrosanct that it may overstep its bounds circumscribed by the Constitution with impunity?

Do some imagine that the opinion of nine appointed officials should supersede the will of the American people as expressed by their duly elected representatives in Congress and the office of the Chief Executive?

Have we so little regard for our traditional system of checks and balances within the framework of three equal and coordinate branches of American Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—that we are close to becoming docile enough to permit usurpation of extravagant new power by one of these branches at the expense of the others?

While the superliberals may hail the aggressive new look of the Supreme Bench in legislative matters as progress, I think it is, in reality, quite reactionary in the worst sense of the word. If the unprecedented trend continues in the present vein, the United States might one day find itself under the rule of an oligarchy of nine men, in actual practice—and Congress can vie with Hermann Goering's Reichstag for the unwanted honor of being named the all-time legislative dud.

There is extreme and widespread dissatisfaction with the social revolution of High Court has produced in our country over the past several years. One important news magazine, U. S. News & World Report, recently summed it up as follows:

1. The South is agitated over racial integration in the schools.

2. Congress is aroused over limitations on the powers of its investigating committees and the Government's right to fire employees accused of subversion.

3. Law-enforcement officials complain of decisions that make it harder to obtain the conviction of admitted criminals.

4. State authorities are displeased over rulings that make Federal enactments supreme over State laws in the field of subversion.

5. Lawyers assert that long-standing precedents have been struck down, that the Court has been writing its own laws and its own amendments to the Constitution.

This just about covers everybody except the people, themselves. The last look I had at a competent poll on this subject reveals that the confidence of our citizenry in regards to the present composition of the Supreme Bench is at an all-time low.

If Congress does not do something about this matter in the present session, it will, to a large extent, have abandoned its responsibility to the American people.

At present, a very modest and limited bill has been introduced by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER in the upper house which would prevent Supreme Court review in the following fields: (1) the antisubversion program for Federal employees; (2) the admission of lawyers to practice in State courts; (3) cases arising from congressional investigations and citations for contempt of Congress; (4) school-board regulations having to do with subversive activities by teachers; and (5) State laws dealing with subversion.

But even this moderate attempt to preserve some congressional prerogatives may be foredoomed to failure. While the Senate Judiciary Committee didn't reject it last Monday, most competent observers think that this will be the case on this coming Monday.

If so, Congress will have thrown away a golden opportunity to place a brake on the runaway social-political ambitions of the Court. Of course, that is its own business if it does. Who knows? Maybe life in Hermann Goering's Reichstag wasn't so bad after all.

Results of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a public opinion poll throughout the 11 counties of Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

A questionnaire, covering 14 of the major issues facing Congress, was sent to nearly every family in the congressional district. Names and addresses were taken from the telephone directories. To date the response, totaling more than 9,300 replies, has been most gratifying.

Many people added constructive comments or qualifying remarks and explained that on some issues a straight yes or no answer was not fully descriptive of their views. I am sure these people can more fully appreciate the frustration sometimes experienced by a Congressman when he faces an important vote on a complex issue.

A Congressman might like to vote 70 percent in favor of a particular bill and 30 percent against it; or he might wish that the bill were amended or presented in a somewhat different form. But, of course, when the time for decision arrives, he is always required to vote either yes or no—just as if each bill were either all good or all bad.

The overall response to the questionnaire and the thousands of comments received on a wide range of legislative subjects reflect a deep understanding and keen interest on the part of my fel-

low citizens in western Michigan in the problems and affairs of our Government.

Although the job of reading and processing thousands of questionnaires was not an easy one, it was not without an occasional lighter moment. For example, in the interest of preserving domestic tranquility, we were frequently called upon to dispatch an extra questionnaire into households where the husband and wife differed sharply on some of the issues.

I believe the results of the questionnaire are particularly revealing and noteworthy on several issues. For example, 65.5 percent of the farmers (or their wives) who responded, favored a gradual elimination of all farm price supports. It is interesting that a slightly smaller percentage (64 percent) of the total return (farmers and nonfarmers) voted to eliminate farm supports.

Among union members (or their wives) who responded, only 44.9 percent favored outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, while 75.3 percent voted for stronger laws to prevent the use of their dues for partisan political activities.

In analyzing the responses to question No. 3; relating to Federal aid to education, it should be kept in mind that respondents were offered the opportunity to check one or more of the suggested approaches to the problem. Since only 39 percent checked (e) "Leave all education finance problems to States and local districts," it appears that at least 61 percent would favor one or more of the several forms of Federal assistance for education.

While 68.9 percent of the responses to question No. 5 were in favor of higher postal rates, it should be taken into account that a great many qualified their answers with such comments as "4 cents on first-class mail," "increase third-class only," or "eliminate junk mail," and so forth.

In a similar manner, a great many of the 67.3 percent favoring continuation of the mutual security program qualified their replies with such remarks as: "reduce economic aid", or "cut out aid to India", or "eliminate aid to Tito", and so forth.

Perhaps the most interesting response was that to question No. 14, indicating that President Eisenhower continues to enjoy very strong support in my district, with 70.7 percent indicating that, in general, he is doing a good job. For comparison purposes, it might be noted that in 1952 President Eisenhower received 62.8 percent of the vote in the ninth district, and in 1956 he received 62.3 percent of the vote.

Some of those who replied to the questionnaire thoughtfully cautioned that they do not believe the results of such an opinion poll should be substituted automatically for the considered judgment of their Congressman. With this comment I agree.

In the last analysis, while such a poll is both interesting and helpful, there are proper limitations upon its function, which were probably best described by Edmund Burke, the 18th century British statesman, when he said:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a Representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs, and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own.

"But a Representative's unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure—no; nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your Representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

A tabulation of the questionnaire results follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. So far as farm price supports are concerned, in which general direction should Congress now proceed? (Check one.)

	All returns	Farmers only (or wives) [1]
	Percent	*Percent*
(a) Increase farm price supports	9.1	13.6
(b) Continue flexible supports at present levels	26.9	20.9
(c) Gradually eliminate all price supports	64.0	65.5

[1] Actual vote of farmers (or wives); (a), 192; (b), 298; (c), 930.

2. In the field of labor-management relations: Do you favor:

	All returns (percent)		Union members (or wives)[1] only (percent)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
(a) Repealing the Taft-Hartley Act	23.2	76.8	44.9	55.1
(b) Applying antitrust laws to labor unions	82.3	17.7	62.5	37.5
(c) Extending the minimum wage law (now $1 per hour) to include employees of retail, service, and other businesses not now covered	75.0	25.0	89.5	10.5
(d) Stronger laws to prevent use of union dues for partisan political activities	85.5	14.5	75.3	24.7

[1] Actual vote of union members (or wives): (a), 950 yes, 1,166 no; (b), 1,262 yes, 757 no; (c), 2,171 yes, 254 no; (d), 1,770 yes, 580 no.

3. Please check proposals which you favor (if any) to indicate your general views concerning action Congress should take in the field of education (check one or more).

	Percent
(a) Federal aid for school construction	47.5
(b) Federal scholarships for top students	38.9
(c) Science Academy to help train scientists for defense	45.8
(d) FHA-type loan program for college students	51.3
(e) Leave all education finance problems to States and local districts	39.5

4. Please indicate, in general, your views toward Government pensions for veterans who were not disabled in military service.

	All returns	Veterans only (or wives)[1]
After retirement age, such veterans should be entitled to:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) A pension, without regard to need	18.5	26.4
(b) A pension based on financial need	36.1	31.3
(c) No pension (unless disabled in service)	45.4	42.3

[1] Actual vote of veterans (or wives): (a), 1,026; (b), 1,218; (c), 1,645.

In general, do you favor:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
5. Increasing postal rates to reduce the huge postal deficit	68.9	23.7	7.4
6. Permitting pay TV to operate on a trial basis	21.6	66.9	11.5
7. Continuing our mutual security program of military and economic assistance to friendly nations	67.3	22.1	10.6
8. Statehood for Alaska	84.0	7.1	8.9
9. Statehood for Hawaii	81.3	9.5	9.2
10. An extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as requested by President Eisenhower	65.8	13.0	21.2
11. Recognition of, and trade with, Red China	15.1	72.5	12.4
12. Balancing the budget even if it means reducing or cutting out some nondefense programs of direct benefit to you	62.0	28.0	10.0
13. Increasing social security benefits with a corresponding increase in social security taxes	55.3	36.6	8.1
14. In general, do you believe President Eisenhower is doing a good job?	70.7	22.4	6.9

The Trade Agreements Act—Article From Bulletin of the Economic Research Department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the March 1958 issue of Economic Intelligence, issued by the Eocnomic Research Department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, contains an interesting article entitled "The Trade Agreements Act."

Although I do not always agree with the position taken by the chamber of commerce, I think the article is of particular interest and importance in connection with the debate which has already begun over extension of the reciprocal trade law.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee to consider the extension of the Trade Agreements Act have been underway since mid-February. The final act which emerges from Congress vitally concerns many parties. This legislation will largely determine the role that United States industry will play in the expanding world trade and will substantially affect the overall economic, political and military relations of this country with the other nations of the free world. Seldom does an issue so loaded with potential international repercussions come before Congress.

The purpose of the original Trade Agreements Act was to give the President authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign governments to bring about mutually beneficial reductions in import restrictions. This act, since its inception in 1934, has been the keystone of our foreign economic policy.

Some argue that the act gives the President unlimited power to agree to reductions in import protection while it ignores adverse effects upon domestic import-competing industries. To answer this charge, it is only necessary to review the safeguards for domestic industry which are included in the present act and in the administration's proposed extension.

1. The peril-point provision requires the Tariff Commission to determine the duty level below which the sales of a product produced by domestic industry would be injured or threatened with injury. Congress included this provision to prevent overzealous administrative reductions in protection. However, the President is allowed to reduce a duty below the peril point, provided that he notifies Congress of his intent and explains his action.

2. The escape clause requires the Tariff Commission to institute an investigation upon a complaint that production of a particular product is threatened or has been injured, at least in part, by a previously granted reduction in protection. By law, the Tariff Commission is directed to consider only whether or not the sales of a particular imported product injure or threaten to injure that portion or fraction of a domestic industry producing like or similar products. At present, the Commission does not gage injury in relation to the effects upon the total production of the industry appealing for protection. After fact-finding hearings, a report is sent to the President, substantiating or denying the petition of the complainant.

3. The act provides also for a Presidential review of the Tariff Commission's recommendations in light of the national interest. That is, the President considers the Commission's recommendations, weighing the probable effects on consumers, the total domestic industry appealing for protection (rather than just that fraction of the industry producing an import-competing product) and the indirect effects on United States export industries. Finally, the President considers the recommendations of the Commission in light of the possible (and probable) international political and economic repercussions and retaliations. Thus, the President, on such grounds, may accept, modify, or reject a Commission recommendation to raise import barriers.

One thing should be clear: without the power of Presidential review which takes the national interest into account, the narrowly based Commission's recommendations would be final; the act would become a strongly protectionist device.

4. There are numerous other legal provisions and amendments to the act which protect import-competing industries against competition, both fair and unfair. Among them are the buy-American provisions, the agricultural protection provisions, the anti-dumping law and the countervailing (anti-subsidy) duties. There is also a strong national security amendment designed to protect United States industries considered essential to the defense effort.

In fact, the Trade Agreements Act has become so loaded with protective amendments that it is difficult to understand how it can, even as it now stands, be an effective instrument for liberalizing trade. Any success in attaching additional protectionist amendments may well destroy the intent of this legislation. The passage of a badly crippled law would be as desirable as allowing the present act to expire.

IMPORTS AND THE ALTERNATIVES

Obviously, receipts from merchandise trade are only a part of any country's international financial relations. It is true that recently the free world in total has been able to add substantially to its international reserves of gold and dollars. But it is also true that United States foreign aid and loans (plus international loans) have been largely responsible for improving the dollar gap.

However, the fact that for many years we have had a surplus of exports above imports cannot be avoided. There may be other ways to finance this gap. But to continue the present level of our exports or to allow our efficient export industries to grow, we must allow a gradual increase in our imports. Many of the products we presently import are not produced domestically. Only a minority of our imports are strongly competitive with domestic industry products. Actually, only through increased imports can we capture the real benefits of international trade—a higher level of output and per capita real income. Yet there is great concern over the effects of allowing increased imports into our economy.

THE IMPACT OF IMPORTS

One way to assess the impact of reductions in tariffs and other protective devices is to examine the shifts in employment such policies have incurred in the past and will create in the future.

From April 1948 to March 1957, the Tariff Commission reported a finding of injury involving 23 domestically produced commodities. During the 1947–56 period, the Commission found peak employment in the plants producing these 23 commodities to be 113,000 workers. And at the low point of employment in each industry, the total number of workers employed was 85,000. Thus, over these many years there was, at most, a drop of 28,000 workers in the companies involved. And increased imports, of course, were only partially responsible for this drop. Low employment figures in some instances occurred during a period of general economic recession. These figures, of course, do not reflect all the adjustments necessitated by previous foreign competition, but they do indicate that the total drop in employment in industries seriously affected by imports in any one year was fairly small.

EFFECTS OF A 50 PERCENT TARIFF REDUCTION

In 1954, estimates were made of the potential worker displacement if tariffs were reduced by 50 percent. It was estimated that such a policy would cause a potential displacement of 109,000 workers, or less than one-fifth of 1 percent of our total labor force. Of course, displacement does not necessarily mean unemployment. More foreign-held dollars will mean increased employment in our export industries. Moreover, the total impact of a 50 percent tariff reduction would be felt gradually. Only a fraction of the production and employment adjustments would have to be made in any 1 year.

Economic adjustments of much larger magnitudes than those noted above occur constantly due to internal factors. Domestic changes in demand, technology and new products almost continuously create employment and production displacements.

For instance, in the United States, over 3 million people on the average enter the labor force each month; almost the same number leave. Also, about 800,000 workers in the labor force shift from employed to unemployed status and vice versa each month. In 1956, there were almost 600,000 hirings and separations per month in manufacturing alone; such employment shifts are a normal process in our dynamic economy.

On the other hand, over 4.5 million workers owe their jobs today to United States foreign trade. Over 3.1 million workers are employed in our export industries and over 1.3 million workers are employed in handling and processing imported goods. Any reduction in our trade volume would throw some of those workers out of jobs. It should be clear that any change in trade policy, whether directed toward increased or decreased trade, will involve shifts in our export, import, and import-competing industries and will cause temporary displacements and dislocations. Thus, the problems created by import liberalization are relatively small in total. And if reductions in trade restrictions are made in a gradual and equitable manner, the adverse effects on particular groups can be minimized.

THE CRUCIAL CHOICE

Through the Trade Agreements Act we cannot legislate an excess of exports over imports. Such legislation, by itself, will only determine the level of our international trade. Thus, the important question today is: Are we going to avoid all injury and threat of injury or inconvenience to domestic producers, or are we going to allow United States imports to increase? To restrict the flow of trade by import restrictions is to engage in economic warfare, particularly against our allies. To deny markets abroad to United States producers would certainly restrict our economic growth. To follow a path of Government protection and subsidization of a few United States producers would be economic folly. To prevent the free world from earning dollars in the face of the Soviet economic offensive would be disastrous.

CHEAP FOREIGN WAGES

Perhaps the most emotionally appealing plea for protection from imports is that domestic producers face unfair competition because of the low wage rates which prevail abroad. Numerous groups are anixous to perpetuate this sophistry.

No one will deny that unemployment and idle resources are a distressing problem, whatever the cause. However, economic adjustments are occurring every day within the economy as a result of numerous forces far more important and pervasive than changes in the composition and level of imports. In most instances we do not regard these inevitable and desirable adjustments in our system as sufficient cause for massive Government controls and subsidies. Why, then, should imports be singled out as a whipping boy?

Clearly, the United States enjoys a relatively abundant and cheap supply of capital, a high degree of technological competence, and efficient and effective managerial talent. Still it is argued that high wage rates make the United States economy particularly vulnerable to import competition from cheap wage rate producers. Protectionists point out with great relish that while the average hourly earnings in United States manufacturing are a little over $2 per hour, the comparable Japanese wage rates are only 20 cents per hour.

However, any attempt to compare wage rates in different countries by using the same monetary unit—dollars, for instance—

is a very difficult problem. Using official exchange rates to translate foreign wages into dollars is misleading, if not completely erroneous. Such figures may not be representative at all of the relative wage-rate structures in different countries.

WAGES AND EFFICIENCY

Even if such comparisons in dollars could be made accurately, differing wage rates would be a completely erroneous guide upon which to determine competitive advantage or disadvantage in international trade. What low wages do suggest, by themselves (if anything), is that productivity per worker is low in that particular country. Thus it shouldn't be surprising that in Japan output per capita—a rough measure of productivity—is roughly one-tenth of output per capita in the United States. Also, one only needs to look at wage rates within the United States to see that high wages, in general, indicate high productivity per worker and low wages indicate low productivity per worker.

Thus in the production of a particular product, high wages in general indicate relatively low per unit labor costs and low wages indicate relatively high per unit labor costs. Furthermore, if relative wage rates do indicate competitive advantage or disadvantage, how can one explain the fact that United States products sold abroad (often in cheap labor countries), are often produced by our highest wage rate industries?

But even labor costs (wages in relation to productivity) cannot determine competitive advantage or disadvantage in world trade. Labor costs are only one part of the total cost of producing any product. In fact, many of the so-called cheap labor countries are relatively capital poor and incur high capital costs in the production of many goods. India, for example, is a relatively capital-poor country and potentially labor-rich. But productivity per worker is, in general, still low, so that the production of many goods involves both relatively high labor costs and high capital costs.

Even if one geographic area enjoys low total costs in producing many or all products, it is to the advantage of the particular country to produce only those goods in which its cost advantages are relatively greatest and import those products in which its cost advantage is relatively the least—that is, to import the products which the less efficient country produces most efficiently. For instance, we would agree that if the best lawyer in a particular town were also the best secretary, it would still be of advantage to him to concentrate on, or specialize in being a lawyer and hire (import) a less efficient secretary.

THE REAL SOURCE OF COMPETITION

The real wage competition that import-competing industries face is not from across the seas, but from more efficient domestic industries. Through trade, high wage, but low labor cost, domestic export industries compete with low-wage, high-labor cost import-competing firms for the use of workers. But this basic relationship is indirect, so the complaints are more easily misdirected at foreign product competition.

Thus, Government restrictions on trade negate one of the most important competitive forces—internal competition for factors of production—the process by which resources are employed in their most productive uses.

In view of the high level of United States exports relative to imports and the relative technological superiority and efficiency of our economy, the evidence indicates that the United States is, in general, safe from large-scale competition from low-wage-rate countries. Moreover, allowing an increase in our imports would probably induce an expansion in our export industries involving a shift of workers from low-wage rate United States industries to the high-wage rate export industries and improve in the long run our level of real income.

To argue that protection of these less-efficient domestic producers should be continued indefinitely is to argue that competition itself is unfair. It is indeed strange to hear that in fairness the inefficient domestic producer should and must be protected from the efficient producer. Conversely, is it fair to deny markets abroad to efficient United States export industries by protecting inefficient import-competing industries?

SCIENTIFIC PROTECTION

Many groups have demanded tariffs on particular products to equalize the differences in the relative labor costs or total costs between foreign producers and United States import-competing producers. If this argument were carried to its logical conclusion, all international trade would cease.

One economist has stated:

"The business of equalizing costs of production * * * is essentially a proposal to throw away all the basic economic advantages that come from international specialization. I would not argue from this that we should automatically refuse protection to any domestic industry, but I think we have to be clear that the reason for the protection should not be that wages are lower abroad than they are at home. There may be other valid reasons, but the low-wage argument is a phony."—Irving B. Kravis, chairman, Department of Economics, Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania.

Of course, there may be valid economic considerations that make protection necessary in particular cases. Also there may be military, social, and political considerations that must be carefully weighed. But the cheap foreign labor argument is clearly inadmissible in these deliberations.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the statement made by Maurice Splain, Jr., past grand worthy president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, on the campaign now being waged by the Eagles for Jobs After 40.

This organization has contributed much to social progress in the United States during its many years of existence. I am sure their activity to secure employment for men who have been refused work because they are 40 years of age and over is a signal to the American people, through their elected representatives, to do something about it as we are depriving men of employment who in their prime years of life—have the experience and family responsibility which makes them good, conscientious workers.

I feel certain that the Members of the House shall be very much interested in Mr. Splain's remarks:

STATEMENT OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES BY PAST GRAND WORTHY PRESIDENT MAURICE SPLAIN, JR., BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 24, 1958

It is my privilege, as a spokesman for the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in the capacity of secretary to the board of grand trustees, and as a former national president, to represent before your committee an organization which has devoted throughout its 60-year history, considerable of its energies and resources to improving the social welfare status of our fellow Americans. The record of our fraternity, with its 1,552 aeries or lodges, and a membership of 1,300,000, including the Auxiliary affiliates, is a proud one of pioneering for social legislation which has become an essential fabric of the American way of life. We have often been called the common man's fraternity, and as such, we believe we represent a typical cross section of the people of America, and that our thinking incorporates the desires and opinions of these average men and women.

Permit me to acquaint you gentlemen, briefly, with some of the highlights of our social legislative history. Some years ago, the Eagles embarked on a nationwide campaign to rid America of its poorhouses. The first State old-age-pension law, in Montana, was sponsored by an Eagle legislator, under the initiative of his fraternity. It was signed by an Eagle Governor who presented the pen used in affixing his signature to the bill to the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Subsequently in most of the States Eagles introduced old-age-pension bills which are now laws. The various Governors who signed these laws, in acknowledgment of our campaigns, presented the Eagles with the pens with which they signed the measures, and these pens are now a part of our Eagle archives. Early in 1920, the Eagles undertook in conjunction with its State old-age-pension activities, a nationwide drive for a National Social Security Act, and spent more than a million dollars, it has been estimated, to blaze the trail for this legislation.

When the late President Roosevelt, a life member of our fraternity in Buffalo, N. Y., signed the act, he invited an Eagle delegation, headed by former Republican Congressman John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania, a former national president of the Eagles, to be present, and he turned one of the signatory pens over to this delegation with the remark that "our countrymen owe the Eagles good will for their unselfish service."

The Eagles sponsored the first mothers' pension law in Missouri, and jointly with labor, initiated the first workmen's compensation act in Wisconsin. I give your committee this background to project before you our long continuing concern for the well-being of our fellow Americans.

At present our principal objective is to assure equal opportunity of employment for all regardless of age. We believe that men or women, qualified and physically able to perform useful work, should have equal access to jobs, and that it is time that arbitrary age barriers set up unwisely and without justification, be removed by industry and other employers. To achieve this end, we are currently engaged in a jobs after 40 campaign to end age discrimination in employment through legislative channels. Our local aeries and membership have overwhelmingly through resolutions and other means given enthusiastic endorsement to the jobs after 40 campaign. We are committed to support in Congress and in State legislatures, any measures which will bring about through feasible legislation the opening of employment opportunities to older workers, who have experience, skills, and physical vigor to offer. The placing of such workers on the human scrap heap by employers is a tragic and senseless policy that should be ended, not only for the personal welfare of those involved, but also for the good of all America.

Recently our fraternity brought to Washington approximately 700,000 petition signatures obtained by Eagle circulators in various communities throughout the United States in connection with the jobs after 40 cam-

paign. These petitions call upon Congress to enact legislation to end age discrimination in employment. We had set our goal at half a million signatures. The response was truly amazing. Our petitions were circulated for about 3 months, but a number of labor organizations joined our campaign, and this tremendous total of signatures was obtained. There is little doubt that this number could have been augmented many times over had the campaign been longer and reached into other untouched segments of our population. Impressive as are the number of signatures, equally impressive are the hundreds of letters we received pledging support of the jobs after 40 campaign, some of them very personal, and revealing the family heartbreaks and despair because a physically vigorous and able head of a household with dependents could not find work because under 40 only or similar prejudices existed. Here is a major source of discontent and unhappiness in America, and one that becomes worse with time as greater numbers of our people reach middle age. Remember, we are not dealing with men and women of more advanced age who have become infirm or lost much of their physical vigor. We are dealing with persons in the prime of life, at the peak of their productive capacities, and in good health. Unemployment for them has an important bearing on the problem of sufficient income in later years. Obviously, if a person over 40 can't find a job because of his age, he will be unable to save for his elderly period, and in many instances goes into debt. So, elimination now of age barriers in employment will do much to diminish in future years the problem of adequate income and a decent standard of life for our elderly people. May I earnestly ask, therefore, on behalf of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, that you gentlemen of this committee give every support, and prevail upon your colleagues in Congress to favor legislation which will remove age discrimination in employment?

Turning to the welfare problems of the elderly, or those in social-security beneficiary ages, we find many hard put, in their declining years, to provide even a minimum of needs, because of curtailed incomes. There are two important questions every person ought to think about relative to his later years. One is: Am I going to enjoy a decent standard of living? The other is: What will happen to me if I should get sick?

The Fraternal Order of Eagles has subscribed in the action taken at its last grand aerie convention, to easing the first problem, that of adequate incomes for the elderly, by recommending removal of the annual ceiling of $1,200 earnings for a social-security beneficiary, and increasing it to at least $2,000, or $2,400. As to the second problem, that of illness, our fraternity favors medical and surgical protection for the later years through a prepaid program under the social-security system.

We all know that social-security payments are not sufficient in themselves, particularly with rising living costs, to provide a decent standard of living. But, unfortunately, many persons in the lower income group, including those who have been industrious and well meaning, reach social-security age with little savings, because they have reared large families, and have had other expenses. These people are limited to earning only $100 a month and they draw social-security payments. But those who have been more fortunate, and have been able to accumulate stocks and bonds and real estate, can draw unlimited amounts of dividends and rents, as indeed it is their right. But we have said to the other social-security beneficiaries: "You have not done so well, but you no longer have the right to earn sufficient money to enable you to enjoy a good standard of living." This is unfair; it is un-American, and alien to our concept of individual liberty. With respect to the $1,200 annual earnings limitation, the social-security laws should be amended as quickly as possible. Such action would be a notable contribution to a better way of life for our elderly citizens.

Medical bills are the bane of advanced years, because such expenses are apt to increase at a time of life when income is lessened. A prolonged illness can often pauperize anyone with modest savings, and make the final period of life a tragic existence. Most people in employment have medical protection through group policies, union-negotiated coverage, workmen's compensation, or individual prepaid health policies. The elderly, no longer employed, have lost this protection when it is needed most, and when their incomes have become fixed.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles believes that prepaid medical care payments in the employable years, through social security, provide the most inclusive way to protect workers against medical bills in their elderly years. We favor a 2-percent additional payroll levy on wages and earnings, with 1 percent contributed by the employee, and 1 percent by the employer, in conjunction with the social security levy. The Social Security Administration could contract for the actual operation of this retirement medical service program, with 1 or more nonprofit health agencies in the 48 States, such as Blue Cross, as an example. A man earning $4,200 a year would have an extra $42 deducted from his pay check during the year, equivalent to about 80 cents a week. We believe that an overwhelming number of Americans would welcome such a deduction, knowing that he or his wife would have no medical worries when they become eligible for social security.

The Eagles have long recognized the inadequate housing for elderly men and women living on social security or old age pensions, and indeed, we are in the vanguard of a movement to do something about it. Our order advocated changes in the FHA financing regulations to facilitate construction of homes for the aged, and with legislation now passed enabling the Government to loan 90 percent of the amount for construction to nonprofit organizations, we have taken definite action. A special Eagle study committee on low cost housing for the elderly has recommended to the grand aerie that the Eagles take advantage of this legislation to provide housing projects for elderly Eagles, and has specified Florida as the most likely location. We are prepared to finance our share of these projects with loans from our memorial foundation fund, which is an intact trust fund established by the Eagles to provide, from the interest, physical welfare services and college educations for the children of Eagle fathers who lost their lives in military service

But great as is our zeal in this regard, we recognize that limited Eagle projects would only touch the surface. We believe that the Government itself, in addition to encouraging nonprofit organizations, like the Eagles, to undertake housing projects for the aged, could well sponsor projects of its own. We favor the type of undertakings that have become a model in Sweden, the motel type of housing, with ground floor, hotel clubrooms, and center hall for entertainment and recreation. Above all, any such projects should inculcate the occupants with a sense of their individual dignity and worth, and in no way should be suggestive of largesse or welfare.

The Eagles believe that because the problems of the elderly touch upon many facets, and because constant review and readjustments will always probably be necessary in view of economic changes, a bureau of older persons, within the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be set up for special attention to the needs of the retired.

In conclusion, I should like to summarize what the Eagles believe will be major programs toward solving the problem of our elderly citizens: (1) Elimination of employment barriers against persons over 40 so that our present citizens in this age grouping, will reach their senior years with more ample economic means; (2) Medical care and protection for social-security years under a prepaid program of the Social Security Administration; (3) Government low rental, nonprofit housing projects for the aged.

I would like to express to the members of this committee the thanks of the Fraternal Order of Eagles for your labors in seeking a solution to the social welfare problems of our elderly. It is a noble task upon which your committee has embarked. We all know that these are problems becoming more acute each year as the number of our senior citizens increases. These problems demand solution within the democratic framework of our society. Their solution will do much to remove the anxieties and fears that exist among all age groups within our country. The Fraternal Order of Eagles is dedicated to this solution, and we want to assure you the support and good will of our organization, and we pledge to continue to give our best efforts in helping to achieve a happier and better life for our elderly citizens.

San Francisco Call-Bulletin Says "Trinity Plan Good Bargain"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Call-Bulletin adds some more good economic fuel to the fire under the Trinity partnership proposal. Already, reams of facts and figures have been presented on the economic assets of joint development of the Trinity River project. In savings to the Federal Government, in maximum revenues from Trinity, as well as the greatest taxpayments to Federal, State, and local Governments, partnership has proved itself a bargain.

Now, the San Francisco Call-Bulletin adds another economic feather to the partnership cap. It points out that whoever develops Trinity power, standby steam plant equipment must be provided to assure firm power commitments to Trinity customers. The Federal Government does not have this equipment. And if it built the Trinity powerplants, it would in addition have to construct standby plants—all paid for of course by the burdened taxpayer.

Contrast this waste and duplication under an all-Federal power operation, with the fulfillment of these firm power commitments at no extra capital cost under partnership. Not only would partnership save the Federal Government $60 million in putting up Trinity power facilities; but the available standby steam plants owned by Pacific Gas & Electric could increase Trinity's power supply when a firm-up is needed—without added building costs.

As the Call-Bulletin asks:

Why should the Government, merely for the sake of a doctrinaire theory, essay a project which a private utility company can do better and more efficiently, and at a multi-million-dollar saving to the taxpayers?

It should not. I hope we assembled here will not let it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the San Francisco Call-Bulletin editorial referred to above, entitled "Trinity Plan Good Bargain":

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of March 25, 1958]

TRINITY PLAN GOOD BARGAIN

Efforts have been and no doubt will be made to inject the so-called Trinity River partnership plan into California's election campaigns as a political issue.

It shouldn't be. It is not a question of politics, but, as Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton again has explained it, a simple question of dollars and cents.

This is the plan wherein the Federal Government would build the necessary water storage facilities on the Trinity River, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would provide the plant for generating power.

The utility company would pay generously for the falling water, and would spare Uncle Sam the expense of erecting powerplants. The end result would be beneficial to water users, to power users, and, above all, to the taxpayers.

Seaton also made another point which shouldn't be overlooked. If the partnership plan is rejected, and the Federal Government handles the project alone, it will have to provide standby steam plant equipment in order to be sure of fulfilling firm power commitments.

In any natural hydroelectric development, such standby arrangements are essential because the amount of power is governed by the amount of water available. This varies according to seasonal weather conditions.

It is possible in some areas, because of the nature of their industries (aluminum is an example) to sell a maximum load of power at given intervals, and to shut off some customers when the output of power declines.

This is not the case in the area to be served by the Trinity project. Here, the customers will need a steady or firm supply of power at all times, and to insure that the standby plants are necessary.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. already has these facilities in being. It can use them to augment its supply of Trinity River power.

The Government, on the other hand, would have to build them, and the taxpayers would have to pay for them.

Why should the taxpayers, already burdened with huge Government expenditures, be asked to pay for a project which isn't even necessary?

Why should the Government, merely for the sake of a doctrinaire theory (i. e., all power facilities should be publicly owned), essay a project which a private company can do better and more efficiently, and at a multi-million-dollar saving to the taxpayers?

The advantages of the proposed plan are so manifest that they should be apparent to everyone, no matter on which side of the political fence.

It offers the cheapest, easiest, and best way of developing the Trinity project with maximum benefits to all concerned, and it is, we repeat, strictly a dollars-and-cents issue, and not a political one.

Lincoln Commission Seems Bogged Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Ben Cole which appeared in the April 16, 1958, edition of the Indianapolis Star in regard to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission:

[From the Indianapolis Star of April 16, 1958]

LINCOLN COMMISSION SEEMS BOGGED DOWN

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Fear was expressed yesterday that the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission is heading for failure.

"It certainly got off to a good start in that direction," said Congressman PETER MACK, Democrat, of Illinois, one of the Commission members. "I think it's already gone."

Mack's gloomy view of the Commission's work was disputed by Victor M. Birely, a Washington businessman and vice-chairman of the Commission's executive committee.

Birely declared that the Commission is ahead of the Civil War Centennial Commission and "I think we've made a lot of progress."

Inquiry into the troubles the Commission is having disclosed its chief obstacle is selection of an executive director. Some Commission members want an administrator, others want a Lincoln scholar.

Congressman F. JAY NIMTZ, Republican, of Indiana, author of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial law, wants John Allen, a prominent Washington Republican and leader of a Lincoln group here. NIMTZ is vice chairman of the Commission.

Birely and others, however, see the directorship requiring a man such as Carl Sandburg, Dr. Louis Warren, founder of the Lincoln Foundation, or Eli Lilly, Indianapolis philanthropist and Lincoln scholar.

Lilly was recommended for membership on the Commission by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER (Republican of Indiana) at the time the President named 12 Commissioners. JENNER called attention to the Indianapolis man's scholarship, devotion to Lincoln's ideals, and his experience with the successful Stephen C. Foster Memorial some years ago. President Eisenhower did not appoint him, however.

The Commission will meet Saturday to name a Director. It will be the third meeting since the Commission was organized. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER (Republican of Kentucky), Chairman, was reluctant to call the 24 members together frequently because lack of funds made it impossible to reimburse members for their travel.

Congress authorized the Commission to spend an initial $40,000 on its work, then adjourned last summer without providing an appropriation. COOPER, Nimtz, and others appealed to the White House for interim funds but were told that these could not legally be provided.

Finally, with the cooperation of the Budget Bureau, the Commission asked Congress for $31,000 early this year. The funds were quickly voted, with Congress increasing the amount to $37,500 and authorizing reimbursement of Commission members for past travel expenses, an almost unheard of courtesy.

Nyle M. Jackson, administrative assistant to Senator JENNER and the Senator's representative at Lincoln Commission conferences, said it was erroneous to blame Democrat partisan politics for the Commission's troubles. Jackson, a devoted Republican, said he has seen no evidence of political foot dragging on the part of Democratic members of the Commission.

"If there has been any politics in this, it has been so subtle we haven't noticed it," said Lee White, one of Senator COOPER's staff members closely in touch with the situation.

MACK, however, charged partisanship in the selection of Mrs. Bertha Adkins, vice chairman of the Republican National Committee, to head the executive committee of the commission.

COOPER was forewarned that Mrs. Adkins' selection might lead to complaint from the Democrats, but he held to the opinion that her executive abilities overcame any handicap she might have because of her GOP office.

MACK said his objection to Mrs. Adkins stemmed from his concern that the Lincoln observance might become confused with the GOP's annual Lincoln Day dinners.

"Actually, the Republicans probably will have their own celebration of the Lincoln anniversary, and that is as it should be," MACK said yesterday. "But this national observance should be removed even from bipartisanship—it should be entirely 'nonpartisan.'"

Commission members are agreed on one thing: The Lincoln sesquicentennial calls for the best the country can give.

"It would be an insult to the memory of one of the greatest Americans who ever lived to do less than our best," Birely insisted.

MACK has been seconded in his efforts to get a Lincoln scholar to direct the Commission by Republican Governor William G. Stratton of Illinois, also a Commission member.

One of the objections MACK has raised to the Commission work, he said, was the selection of COOPER and NIMTZ to be Chairman and Vice Chairman. He said he thought it was "poor judgment" for two Republicans to fill these places. When Mrs. Adkins became executive committee chairman and Allen was advanced for the job of director, MACK viewed the situation as entirely too political.

The Illinois lawmaker said he felt that Democrats had shown good faith by helping to press through the Nimtz bill creating the Commission. MACK recalled that he told the House Judiciary Committee that he wished no honors as author of the law and raised no protest against acceptance of Nimtz's bill instead of his own. He also cited the speed with which a Democrat-controlled Congress voted the money needed by the Commission.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, many of our fellow citizens of Polish ancestry will

celebrate, on May 3, the 167th anniversary of the enactment of Poland's Constitution by the Polish Diet in Warsaw, in 1791. Exercises in commemoration of that historic action will be held in most of the Polish communities throughout the world—outside of Poland itself. I doubt that the Communists who rule there will permit any public demonstrations but I am certain that their constitution day will be honored in the minds and hearts of the Poles now, unhappily, living under the Communist yoke.

I suspect that the average American of non-Polish background believes that Pulaski and Kosciusko, heroes of the American Revolution, provide our principal links to Poland. Those two distinguished soldiers gave substantial help in the founding of our Republic, but the contribution of men and women of Polish blood did not end with them by any means. Over the years Polish brains have enriched our literature, our science, and our art; Polish valor has strengthened our fighting forces; and Polish skill and brawn have helped build our cities and our industrial plants. And, although Polish immigrants brought with them a passionate love of individual liberty, they left in their homeland as much dedication to freedom as they brought, and that dedication was forcefully expressed in the constitution enacted more than a century and a half ago. On the eve of their constitution day anniversary we should express our appreciation and gratitude to the Polish people for their long devotion to liberty.

Poland has a long and glorious history. Since it emerged as a nation in the middle of the 10th century a number of attempts have been made by aggressive neighbors to assimilate it. But the spirit of free Poland outlasted the Czarist, Hapsburg, and Hohenzollern Empires. As we now congratulate our friends of Polish blood on their constitution day anniversary, we do so with confidence that free Poland will outlast the Communist Empire and eventually resume its place in the family of nations under a government of its own free choice.

Legislation To Extend Unemployment Compensation Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following telegram I received from Alan Williamson, the South Dakota commissioner of the employment security department, regarding the pending legislation to extend unemployment compensation benefits.

Possibly the proponents of this legislation hope to solve the unemployment problem by adding a small army of employees to administer the new plan:

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., *April 28, 1958.*
Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 12065, soon to be voted on, is an administrative montrosity for the States. It would entail additional staff in South Dakota of from 50 to 100 people. If enacted it will be the first step toward destruction of State-Federal unemployment insurance program.

ALAN WILLIAMSON,
Employment Security Commissioner.

Tenth Anniversary of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the resolution of congratulations and best wishes from the House of Representatives to the people of Israel on the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

These have been 10 years such as few nations have known. Created as a new homeland for the Jews on the territory of their ancient kingdom, Israel was forced to fight for its existance almost from birth. But despite the threats of annihilation from its neighbors, Israel preserved its independence, established its society, and developed its nation.

As in the early years of our country, much of Israel's energies in this decade have been devoted to opening up the land. In Israel, however, the job has been made far more difficult by the scarcity of water and the necessity of irrigation. But just as they successfully defended themselves, the Israelis also are successfully opening up the land and making the arid hills and plains bloom again as they did 2,000 years ago.

Though agriculture is the mainstay of its economy just as in the ancient days, Israel is not neglecting industry and trade in building a strong, modern economy. Ancient skills and modern technology are being combined to create a healthy, well-balanced economy.

Israel also has established and maintained a stable, representative government in its first decade. It is closely allied with the West and remains a friend of the West.

Though all of these triumphs over adversity have been almost miraculous, Israel's most admirable achievement has been its success in providing a home for almost a million refugees who have flocked to the little nation from all over the world. Almost half of the nation's population are refugees who have come in the first decade. These refugees are being successfully assimilated into the community and in turn are making their contributions to the nation.

But Israel has no desire to rest on the accomplishments of its first decade. It still faces many problems—financial, political, economic—but its people have demonstrated the determination, ruggedness, resourcefulness, patience and wisdom to meet these problems. Its leaders have declared that this is not now the climax, only the prelude. We wish for Israel future decades as outstanding as its first one.

Representative Walter Is Prejudiced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News, Wednesday, April 16, 1958, page 42, carried an article written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt entitled "Representative WALTER Is Prejudiced," reading as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER IS PREJUDICED

NEW YORK.—Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER'S attack on the Fund for the Republic is a threat not just to this fund but to all educational foundations. If he succeeds in getting the Treasury Department to revoke the fund's tax exemption there is no reason why many other educational foundations should not find themselves in the same predicament.

Great good has come to this country because of the fact that men who have made a great deal of money have seen fit to establish funds which can be used to do things for which other money might not be available.

There is much that Government itself cannot do; and it is rather rare that private individuals can foster certain studies or initiate certain research as lone individuals. The various funds, which free a certain amount of capital from taxation, have made it possible to do things that needed to be done.

Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has shown himself narrow and prejudiced in this matter. I hope that commonsense will prevail and we as a nation will be able to go on enjoying the benefits that come to us from having educational foundations able to perform the kind of work that the Fund for the Republic has been doing.

In other words, Mrs. Roosevelt says that Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER is narrow and prejudiced because he has dared to suggest that the Tresury Department revoke the tax exemption of the Fund for the Republic; also, Mrs. Roosevelt hopes that our Nation will be able to go on enjoying the benefits that come from educational foundations performing the kind of work that the Fund for the Republic has been doing.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems when a Congressman lifts his voice in defense of the taxpayers, or in defense of constitutional government, or speaks out against unrestricted immigration which has permitted hundreds of Communists to come into this country, not for the purpose of preserving our country but to destroy it, that Congressman is immediately condemned as being narrow and prejudiced.

I am not shocked or surprised to read that Mrs. Roosevelt condemns Congressman WALTER. On January 5, 1956, I called attention to the fact that Mrs. Roosevelt, along with 41 other persons, petitioned President Eisenhower to grant

a Christmas Amnesty to Communist Party leaders jailed under the Smith Act, and also sought postponement of more than 100 similar cases pending or under appeal. The Communists for whom amnesty was sought were 16 Communists who had been convicted of teaching or advocating the forcible overthrow of the United States Government.

The petition also recited that the motive for this appeal was their attachment to the democratic way of life and because they thought the trials of these Communists were conducted in an atmosphere often marked by hysteria.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, Congressman WALTER did not feel that pardons should be granted to those Communists and he did not feel that the democratic way of life would be helped by making favorites of Communists. Some may think that Congressman WALTER was narrow and prejudiced, but thank God the people of the United States agree with him, and so do I, and one who does not agree with him does a distinct disservice to the Democratic Party, to our Nation, and to the world. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the national Democratic Party owes Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER a high debt of gratitude, for few men, if any, have worked harder to maintain respect for our party than has Congressman WALTER. It would seem that Mrs. Roosevelt would be cognizant of that fact.

Then too, Congressman WALTER does not agree with the statement of Mrs. Roosevelt that these Communists were tried in an atmosphere of hysteria. As a matter of fact, these Communists had every right accorded them that the Constitution guarantees to anyone, and that despite the fact that these Communists wished to destroy the Constitution. Judge Medina can tell Mrs. Roosevelt about the conduct of the Communists in our courtrooms, and I sincerely hope that Mrs. Roosevelt does not condone what was done to Judge Medina, for that judge and that court were insulted every step of the way in a manner unparalleled in court history in this country. I wonder what kind of trials would be conducted under a Communist regime?

No, Mr. Speaker, I was not shocked over the criticism of Congressman WALTER by Mrs. Roosevelt, for on August 8, 1957, I called attention to an article by her wherein she maligned the South and said that the whole point of the Southerners' fight for the jury trial amendment (civic rights legislation) is that they know a white jury will not give Negroes the right to vote. That dissertation by Mrs. Roosevelt was entitled "Southern Juries Will Ignore Negro Rights."

That statement by Mrs. Roosevelt was not exactly new, because the Communist Party had said the same thing about the South before Mrs. Roosevelt said it. Once upon a time, the South did not expect that of Mrs. Roosevelt inasmuch as in other days Mrs. Roosevelt and her husband were fond of saying that Georgia was their second home, and no people were ever more cordially and courteously received and treated than they were in my native State of Georgia. Now the South expects nothing from Mrs. Roosevelt except prejudice, abuse, and advocacy of things designed to bring about race mixing, which will never occur in the South, and Mrs. Roosevelt might as well understand it.

We well understand in Georgia now that if we needed bread we would only receive a stone from Mrs. Roosevelt. Mrs. Roosevelt would deny to the people of Georgia and the South the right of trial by jury, but was not satisfied with the conviction of Communists by juries, although the verdicts were approved by the trial courts and the appellate courts. Probably it would be sacrilege to intimate that Mrs. Roosevelt might be a little narrow or a little prejudiced, although Mrs. Roosevelt thinks that Congressman WALTER is narrow and prejudiced because he thinks that the tax-exempt status should be removed from the Fund for the Republic, while she thinks it is all right to malign an entire section of loyal Americans.

On February 3, 1958, I called attention to the fact that Mrs. Roosevelt was seriously disturbed over the fact that our country was foregoing the services of J. Robert Oppenheimer, and assumed the position that Dr. Oppenheimer was never accused of anything except his feelings that progress and science should be shared regardless of nationality. I pointed out that despite what Mrs. Roosevelt said, Dr. Oppenheimer had admitted that his brother and sister-in-law were members of the Communist Party, and that he knew it; his wife was the former wife of a Communist Party official and she at one time was a member of the Communist Party; also, the notorious Steve Nelson, who was the Communist convicted by the sovereign State of Pennsylvania, but whose conviction was upset by the United States Supreme Court on the premise that a State could not legislate to protect against violent overthrow, had visited with Dr. Oppenheimer and had befriended his wife; that prior to Dr. Oppenheimer's marriage he had courted a Jean Tatlock, whom he knew to be a member of the Communist Party and that through her had become acquainted with a number of them; that he contributed money to Communist causes, and so forth. I doubt seriously, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman FRANCIS WALTER is disturbed over the decision to remove Dr. Oppenheimer from a position where he would acquire full knowledge of all our atomic bombs, hydrogen bombs, intercontinental missiles, and satellites, and thereby have the information that could be used to utterly destroy this country. The good people of this country likewise feel that they can get along without the services of any person who is not dedicated to constitutional government.

It is noted, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere does Mrs. Roosevelt attempt to answer charges made by Congressman WALTER against the Fund for the Republic, but expresses her hope that we will be able to go on enjoying the benefits that come from educational foundations able to perform the kind of work that the Fund for the Republic has been doing. On March 30, 1958, Congressman WALTER released a statement laying down a bill of particulars against the Fund for the Republic. I will give you a few:

1. The program of the Fund for the Republic has been principally one of action and not of education. Among its chief targets have been congressional investigations of communism. Government security procedures, loyalty oaths, and regulation of immigration.

2. The fund has spent several million dollars opposing the denial of employment to security risks in Government and defense and other industries. The fund has financed attacks upon newspapers, magazines, and individuals expressing positions with which it disagreed. It has financed preparation and distribution of books, magazines, and articles to influence legislation.

3. The fund has also financed attacks, unsupported by competent evidence, upon the loyalty, integrity, intelligence, and mental stability of all confidential informants of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have testified in public trials or proceedings.

4. While some projects of the fund for the republic appear to be objectively presented, the majority of its operations are based on the biased investigations and result in findings which not only fail to present both sides of a given question, but even further, actually conceal facts necessary for an honest understanding of the subject matter.

5. The Committee on Un-American Activities made inquiry of the Fund for the Republic, and while the facts did not establish that the Fund for the Republic is a Communist-controlled or influenced organization, it is clear that the Fund's activities in toto indict it as a hindrance in this battle against communism.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman WALTER is entitled to the friendship, affection, and support of every true American in his attempt to remove the tax-exempt status of the Fund for the Republic and for other tax-exempt organizations attempting to influence legislation, in violation of section 501 (c) 3 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Fund for the Republic has a bad record, and it is absolutely amazing that this country would permit this organization to have a tax-exempt status, knowing that they have engaged in opposing congressional investigations of immigration, and have spent several million dollars opposing the denial of employment to security risks in government and defense and other industries. It makes one shudder when he thinks of the things that have been done in the name of democracy. Of course, Russia contends that its government is the only democratic government on the face of the earth. Our Government is that of a republic and not of a Russian democracy. Congressman WALTER is assailed because he is effective. He happens to be chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and also chairman of the subcommittee dealing with immigration and naturalization. Our country was built upon philosophies of Congressman WALTER, and will endure under those philosophies. Our country does not stand a Chinaman's chance under the philosophies of Mrs. Roosevelt.

The Case for Alaskan Statehood Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Alaska has been knocking at the door of statehood since 1916, when the first bill for Alaskan statehood was introduced. In the 42 years since, similar bills have been proposed periodically; but it was not until 1950 that substantive action was taken on any of these measures. In that year the House passed an enabling bill, but it died in the Senate.

Four years later a combined Alaskan-Hawaiian statehood proposal was approved by the Senate, but this time the House failed to concur. A year later, another dual measure was recommitted by the House, and statehood was rendered moribund once more. Currently, separate bills for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood—S. 49 and S. 50, respectively—are on the Senate Calendar; in the House, an Alaskan bill—H. R. 7999—was reported favorably last June, and is now on the House Calendar.

IT IS TIME TO ACT

It is high time that Congress opened the door and admitted our great northwestern Territory to the sisterhood of States. It would seem that Congress, as it has so often in the past, has not caught up with public opinion. Let us look back over the years at the Gallup Poll findings relative to this issue. Since 1946 the Gallup investigators have posed this question to the American people: Would you favor or oppose having Alaska admitted as a State in the Union?

The response was as follows:

[Percentage]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1946	64	12	24
1950	81	8	11
1952	78	10	12
1955	82	9	9
1956	74	10	16
1957	71	8	21
1958 (March)	73	6	21

In other words, as far back as 1946 the margin in favor of Alaskan statehood was more than 5 to 1; and today it is more than 12 to 1. These ratios must be somewhat impressive, at least, even to those who scoff at the validity of opinion polls. And remember, Dr. Gallup was off by fewer than a handful of percentage points in that celebrated election of 1948.

ALASKA DESERVES STATEHOOD

Other reasons, too, demand early action. First, Alaska, as 1 of our 2 incorporated Territories, has long been promised statehood, by implication at the very least; second, it deserves such status; and third, the Nation as a whole and the Pacific Northwest in particular would profit thereby, as would Alaska itself.

Of the 31 incorporated Territories in our history, all, except Alaska and Hawaii, have graduated to statehood. Constitutionally, Alaska is no different from its more fortunate predecessors. The Federal courts repeatedly have said that incorporation leads to statehood. In 1883 an incorporated territory was defined in Ex Parte Morgan as an "inchoate [or embryonic] State." In Balzac against People of Porto Rico, among many similar cases, Supreme Court Justices asserted, in 1922, that "incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." And although the organic act of 1912, which served to confirm the incorporation of 1868 and made Alaska a full-blown Territory, did not explicitly promise statehood, precedent and judicial dicta alike have maintained that an incorporated Territory is destined for statehood after a reasonable period of tutelage. It would seem that 90 years constitutes a long enough apprenticeship.

EXPANSION FOLLOWS STATEHOOD

In no instance has the granting of statehood to an incorporated Territory proved ill-advised. In every case the Territory experienced a marked expansion in both population and industrial development following its admission into the Union. More importantly, the citizens of each new State became their own masters.

As a rule, the principal qualifications demanded of a Territory aspiring to statehood have been these: First, the sympathy of its people for the traditional ideals of American Government; second, the expressed wish of the electorate for statehood; and third, sufficient resources and population to meet the cost of statehood. It is my considered opinion that Alaska has passed these tests with distinction.

As for the Americanization of Alaska, that Territory from the beginning has been populated to a large extent by citizens from the States, particularly from our great Northwest; the interests, the culture, the politics of Alaskans are fundamentally the same as those held by statesiders. And as Americans, they have unmistakably signified their desire for fullfledged citizenship. In 1946 they voted for statehood by a 3 to 2 margin; 10 years later the ratio was 2½ to 1. And in March 1957 both houses of the Alaskan legislature passed unanimously a resolution urging Congress to grant immediate statehood.

STOREHOUSE OF RESOURCES

Heavily endowed with natural resources and boasting an incredibly rapid rise in population, Alaska laughs at the third of the traditional requirements for statehood. Our great northern Territory constitutes this Nation's most magnificent storehouse of virtually untapped-raw materials, from scarce minerals to petroleum to products of forest and sea. Since 1867, when Alaska was purchased from Russia, more than a billion dollars have been realized from its mines. Among known natural resources are gold, silver, coal, iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, platinum metals manganese cobalt nickel, titanium, cadmium, petroleum, natural gas, and construction materials, as well as such strategic minerals as tin, antimony, mercury, and chromite.

The most important industry in Alaska, nevertheless, is still that of fisheries. Since 1867 the value of fisheries products shipped to the United States has totaled more than $2 billion. Unfortunately, the industry is controlled by absentee financial interests and only a tiny portion of the profits remains in Alaska. The monopolists have been able to maintain their tight control primarily through favors bestowed by the Federal bureaucracy, not the least of which is the latter's sanctioning of the use of fish traps. It is interesting to note that such traps were outlawed long ago by State authority, in Washington and Oregon. With statehood, the small, resident operator would be able to make his voice heard, with a consequent outlawing of the ruinous fish traps and the ultimate dissolution of the fisheries monopoly.

A FEDERAL RESERVE

An even more onerous handicap borne by Alaskans is the incubus of national ownership of the land. The Federal Government now owns approximately 98 percent of the total land area of Alaska, which embraces some 365 million acres. H. R. 7999 provides for a grant to the proposed new State of 182,800,000 acres. Such an award would make it possible for Alaska to revolutionize the development of its unrivaled natural resources. Under the heavy hand of Washington bureaucrats, who have tended to regard Alaska's magnificent forests as permanently virginal, the economic progress of the Territory has been retarded both unnecessarily and tragically.

As for population advancement, the Alaskan story is a phenomenal one. From 1950 to 1956 the civilian population increased from 108,000 to 161,000, a rise of 48.6 percent. According to Gen. Nathan Twining, the military personnel constitute an additional figure of between 45,000 and 50,000. In any case, Alaska has a larger population than one-third of the States had at the time of their admission, whether the military figures are included or not.

WOULD STRENGTHEN DEFENSE

Now, what about the advantages to the Nation as a whole should Alaska be admitted? First, statehood would strengthen in considerable measure our defense posture. In April 1950 the Secretary of Defense strongly endorsed statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii:

> It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack. There can be no question but that in the event of an attack any State would be immensely aided in the initial stages of the emergency by the effective use of the State and local instrumentalities of law and order. By the same token it would seem to me that, as persons in a position to assist the Federal garrisons which might exist in Hawaii or Alaska, the locally elected Governors, sheriffs, and the locally selected constabulary and civil defense units all would be of tremendous value in cases of sudden peril. Therefore, my answer to your question is that state-

hood for Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense of both areas in event of emergency.

And we all remember the warning of the late Billy Mitchell, who asserted that: "He who holds Alaska holds the world." We also are aware that Russian soil is separated from our own by fewer than 60 miles of water.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL BOOST

From the standpoint of military tactics, of course, statehood would not immediately affect the military situation in Alaska. Geography and climate, after all, would remain unchanged; and the Armed Forces would fight allout to defend Alaska without thought as to its political status. But the people of Alaska would be given an immeasurable boost psychologically, and would be inspired to work and fight over and beyond the call of duty.

A second major national benefit resulting from the economic development promised by statehood would be a greatly widened diffusion of Alaskan products—many of which are in short supply in the States and some of which are strategically important—to both military and commercial outlets. As for the Pacific Northwest, Seattle, and other Pacific commercial centers have been the gateways to Alaska. Seattle remains the great distribution center for Alaskan salmon; and this mart, along with Portland and others, would enjoy a rise in business well-being commensurate to no small degree with Alaskan prosperity.

EIGHT ADVANTAGES FOR ALASKANS

As for the advantages of statehood to the citizens of Alaska, I can think of at least eight. First, the people would have the right to full voting representation in the national Congress. Second, they would have the right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States. Third, they would have the right to choose their own governor and to have the functions of government administered by their elected officials instead of by Federal bureaucrats. Fourth, they would have the right to determine the extent of the authority of their own legislatures. Fifth, they would have the right to have their judiciary selected under local, rather than Federal, authority. Sixth, they would have the right to an equal share on a per capita basis in Federal grants for education, health, highways, and other public benefits. Seventh, they would have the right to a voice in determining the amount and kinds of Federal taxes they must pay. And eighth, they would have a choice in the consideration of any proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution.

As for the antistatehood arguments, I submit that they are not impressive. One of the most frequently enunciated is that Alaska and Hawaii are noncontiguous to any of the present States. It is an old argument; it was bandied about in 1850 when California, separated by some 1,500 miles of wild land from the nearest State, was applying for admission. Later, when the issue of statehood for Oregon was raised, the same old argument was dusted off and used again. Let us listen to the refutation of Senator William H. Seward, of New York:

In coming to this conclusion (to support the admission of Oregon as a State), I am determined by the fact, that, geographically and politically, the region of country which is occupied by the present Territory of Oregon is indispensable to the completion and rounding off of this Republic. Every man sees it, and every man knows it. * * * There is no Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, and, probably, no man in the United States who would be willing to see it lopped off, fall into the Pacific or into the possession of Russia or under the control of any other power; but every man, woman, and child knows that it is just as essential to the completion of this Republic as is the State of New York, or as is the State of Louisiana, on the Mississippi. It cost us too much to get it, we have nursed and cherished it too long, not to know and feel that it is an essential part.

Well, then, she is to be admitted at some time, and inasmuch as she is to be admitted at all events, and is to be admitted at some time, it is only a question of time whether you will admit her today, or admit her 6 months hence, or admit her a year or 7 years hence. What objection is there to her being admitted now? You say she has not 100,000 people. What of that? She will have 100,000 people in a very short time.

* * * * *

For one, sir, I think that the sooner a Territory emerges from its provincial condition the better; the sooner the people are left to manage their own affairs, and are admitted to participation in the responsibilities of this Government, the stronger the more vigorous the States which those people form will be.

Another major argument in opposition has been that the recent rise in population stems primarily from a marked increase in military personnel. Assuming that this be true, it must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that the military in Alaska are there to stay for some time: no man can foresee the lifting of the cold war. The military, moreover, serve not only to defend Alaska and the Nation; they also constitute a future as well as present market for Alaska's industries and services. Like other population groups, they help to maintain Alaska's economy.

As for the charge that Alaska's representation in the Senate would be grossly disproportionate to its population—in comparison with such States as New York and California—so what? It would seem that this question was answered quite effectively back in 1787.

WHAT IS COMMONWEALTH?

Let us now examine the glorious goal advocated by the happiness boys—the commonwealth advocates. There's just one thing they have forgotten—the imposition of such a plan would be unconstitutional.

Alaska and Hawaii are incorporated Territories, and as such have been adjudged to be incipient States. As States in embryo, all provisions of the Constitution, the formal as well as the fundamental, apply. Only the fundamental parts of the Constitution, on the other hand, apply to unincorporated territories.

Puerto Rico is a commonwealth, whatever that means. It is quite likely that the Federal judiciary will hold that Puerto Rico is still, constitutionally, an unincorporated territory, and that commonwealth status necessarily connotes unincorporation. If such prove the case, it would seem that Alaska and Hawaii could not legally, constitutionally, assume such inferior status.

A POLITICAL PHENOMENON

In *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S. 271, 1901), the Supreme Court declared that "where the Constitution has been once formally extended [in all its parts, both fundamental and formal] by Congress to Territories neither Congress nor the Territorial legislature can enact laws inconsistent therewith." Mr. Justice Brown, in *Rassmussen* v. *United States* (197 U. S. 536, 1905), stated that "the exten[sion of] the provisions of the Constitution * * * once done, is irrevocable." It follows, then, that those who would remake Alaska and Hawaii in the image of Puerto Rico are either disingenuous or uninformed when they extol the benefits Puerto Ricans derive from Federal tax exemptions. As incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii are subject to section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which provides, in part, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It is doubtful, to say the least, that Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to exempt the citizens of Alaska and Hawaii from the applicability of this uniformity clause.

It should be remembered that Congress did not see fit to make Puerto Rico even an unincorporated Territory until 1917. In all probability the island is still unincorporated, despite its new title of Commonwealth.

This new phenomenon in political science leaves the Alaskans completely cold. The endorsements and the arguments for Alaskan statehood are overwhelming.

The time to act is now.

Discrimination in Employment on Account of Age Is Indefensible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would prohibit employers engaged in interstate commerce from discriminating in employment against individuals on account of age.

We are being confronted with an increasingly aggrevating and deplorable situation in the labor market today whereby middle aged and older workers are being denied the right to work and to earn a livelihood solely because of their age. Sometimes the specified age limit set for employment is as low as 35 years, sometimes it is 40 years, or 45 years of age. When such individuals become unemployed through no fault of their own, or lose their jobs for any rea-

son, they face severe hardships in seeking reemployment. And because of these arbitrary age barriers set up by employers, the older the unemployed worker is, the more difficult it becomes for him to find a job.

This situation constitutes a grave danger to the people of our Nation. The Congress should face up to it and take immediate steps to counteract these discriminatory, demoralizing employment policies and practices on the part of many leaders of commerce and industry. Discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of age is contrary to our principles of justice and equality of opportunity. Such practices deprive our Nation of the fullest utilization of our human resources for production and endanger our general welfare.

Mr. Speaker, in order to comprehend more fully the urgent need for my bill, I should like to recite a few facts and figures concerning the growing importance of the middle aged and older classes of persons in our population.

During the past half century a tremendous gain has taken place in the life expectancy of our people, due to progress in the reduction of infant mortality and the prevention of epidemic diseases of childhood. Fifty years ago males at birth had a life expectancy of 46 years and females 48 years. Today the life expectancy of males at birth is 67 years and for females it is 73 years. The prolongation of life may be expected to increase further as a result of new medical advances, and early diagnosis and treatment of chronic diseases of middle and older ages.

Because of the remarkable increase in longevity during the past half century, and the low birth rate in the 1930 decade, the middle aged, that is, 45 to 54 years, and older, that is, 55 years and older, segments of our population have increased proportionately at a faster rate than the total population. While the total population has doubled since 1900, the segment of our population between the ages of 45 to 54 years has increased 171 percent, those people between the ages of 55 to 64 years have increased by 235 percent, and those 65 years old and over have increased by 298 percent.

The United States Department of Labor tells us that by 1965, assuming the rate of growth in production we have experienced in recent years will continue, we shall require a labor force of 74 million people, or 10 million more workers than we had in 1955. The Department further advises us that, because of the age composition of the population, the largest sources of manpower needed to meet this 10 million expansion in the labor force will have to come from those individuals under 24 years of age and from those who are 45 years old and older. In other words, industry and commerce will have to rely on the older workers to meet these manpower requirements. It is of utmost importance, therefore, for the leaders of industry and commerce to change their thinking and reverse their personnel policies and practices of firing middle-aged and older workers and discriminating against them in the hiring of help. The old-fashioned notion that a person becomes too old to work when he reaches the ages of 35 or 45, or any other age, for that matter, is ridiculous on its face. Every intelligent person knows that it is an individual's ability to meet the specific requirements of the job that counts. There is no fixed age at which a person becomes too old to work.

In surveys made by the United States Department of Labor, the contentions most frequently made by employers for not wanting to hire older workers are: First, they are too slow; they cannot meet production requirements; second, they lack skills and flexibility; third, they cannot meet the physical demands of the job; and fourth, pension and insurance costs of older workers are prohibitive.

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts with respect to these contentions? The facts are that none of these reasons has any merit upon careful examination. On the contrary, older workers are generally equal to, and in many respects are more desirable than younger workers. Older workers are often more highly skilled, and have wider experience than younger workers. They are often more dependable and more stable in their jobs, and usually have a lower rate of absenteeism than younger workers. In many cases they are more responsible workers, and often they exceed the average output of the younger workers. With the tremendous technological advances which have been made in industry and commerce, there are now fewer jobs which require great strength and heavy lifting, which formerly put age at a disadvantage. There is considerable evidence that older workers are flexible; that they are willing and able to learn a new job which may be better suited to their abilities. Pensions and insurance experts will confirm the fact that there is no significant basis for the argument that pension and insurance costs of older workers are prohibitive. The costs to the employer of providing pensions usually are in proportion to the services rendered. The man who is hired at a later age has fewer years in which to accumulate pension rights, and therefore receives less in pension benefits than the employee with many years of service.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of industry and commerce should hire employees on the sole basis of an individual's ability to do the job, without regard to his age, sex, or race. These leaders should recognize that this policy is in their own self-interest, not to mention the interest of the country at large. Employers who do not follow this policy are denying themselves access to about one-third of the available labor market, and an even higher proportion of the available usable skills. They are depriving this Nation of the services of millions of experienced and highly skilled workers at a time when we need to utilize the best available men to cope with the increasing danger to our national security and welfare. They are depriving older people of the dignity and status of self-support.

My bill is designed to rectify these deplorable conditions.

Tenth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, 10 years have elapsed since the State of Israel was proclaimed. It was born as the embodiment of the hopes and prayers of countless thousands who did not live to see their dream realized. The toil and sweat of other thousands are making of this small, poor, and in some ways unpromising land an example to all the world.

It would be hard indeed to discover anywhere a more formidable challenge than that faced by this energetic and courageous people. About half of their country is arid desert. Much of the rest is wasteland. And since the proclamation of independence a decade ago a human flood of immigration has swelled the population.

Here we find a heart-warming saga of modern times. The newcomers—most of them penniless with their few small belongings in packages and bundles carried by their side—come from over 60 countries. They come from different social strata and different civilizations. They speak different languages. But all of them have the same objective—to live and work and die in the land of their fathers, the land of Israel. They have found in this land an open door and a welcome and a willingness to share what little there is to share. The people and the Government of Israel are united in affirming that that door will remain open.

The people of this new state are meeting their difficulties with imagination and phenomenal industry. Through major irrigation and drainage projects they have greatly increased the land under cultivation. Agricultural and industrial output have risen by fantastic percentages. A pioneering spirit animates both city and farmland and miracles of production are accomplished with scanty equipment and meager supplies.

While the people plough and build and create their industries they must be ever watchful. Although they are not at war with the Arabs, the armistice which prevails is an uneasy one. Hostilities could break out again at any time, and indeed breaches of peace along the borders are frequent and sometimes serious. Despite their numerical inferiority, however, the Israeli are confident that they could repulse any attacks launched against them. Thir army is well trained and well equipped and in the border regions the people are taught to fight as well as work, with a true pioneer versatility.

The difficulties amidst which Israel has grown have not been confined to questions of internal economics and the everpresent threat of inimical neighbors. Its government has had to steer a cautious course in world politics. Several million Jews are at present in the Soviet

Union and in eastern European countries. Any move which might arouse the enmity of these states would prejudice the fate of many peoples. Yet a fundamental identity of interests with the western world has led the government to stand ever more openly on the side of the West.

The inspiring story of Israel offers new proof of the power of the creative spirit of a people who are in every sense free. All who are familiar with the history of the past decade cannot but believe that it presages a future of evergrowing achievements.

Atomic Energy in the Field of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania section of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers held at State College, Pa., Friday, April 25, 1958, it was my privilege to deliver the following address on the subject of The Peacetime Uses of Atomic Energy:

THE PEACETIME USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

(Address delivered by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Pennsylvania section of American Society of Agricultural Engineers, Friday, April 25, 1958, at State College, Pa.)

Mr. Chairman, you honor me by your invitation to participate in this meeting of the Pennsylvania section of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers.

This idea of bringing together experts in agriculture throughout Pennsylvania is highly commendable because it permits personal growth through exchange of opinions and ideas.

The sponsors of this conference are to be congratulated for such a worthwhile contribution to the agricultural advancement of our State.

In keeping with the spirit of the time, and in recognition of the theme of this meeting, I have selected as the subject of my discourse The Peacetime Uses of Atomic Energy, with particular emphasis upon the use of radioactive isotopes in agriculture.

In discussing this important subject, in my capacity as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, you have my assurance that there is a definite feeling of adventure in exploring the nuclear field.

On the one hand, we are exploring the unknown in sciences—physics, chemistry, metallurgy, biology, and so forth—as well as unknown fields in engineering and construction and the knowledge as to how they are managed.

More recently, with the advent of the sputniks and our own satellites, we all have a great interest in the exploration of space, and our committee is particularly interested in the promising uses of nuclear propulsion of satellites and space vehicles.

On the other hand, there must be applied sound scientific engineering and business principles to solve unprecedented problems arising from unique and sometimes impossible situations.

To date, the American people have spent nearly $15 billion in the field of atomic energy and the surface has been barely scratched.

The great bulk of this money has been spent on military application of nuclear energy.

Several years ago, however, the rate of spending on peacetime uses of the atom started to climb considerably.

The result has been that today we are faced with a vast new science that affects the lives of all of us and which is having a marked influence on the industrial life of the Nation.

Since this meeting represents a true cross-section of the agricultural leaders of our State, I wish to tell you the story of atomic energy in down-to-earth language.

It is my hope that when this conference terminates you will have a clearer concept of the atomic revolution that is enveloping mankind.

Atomic energy—or nuclear energy as the scientist calls it—is everywhere around us with the sun pouring out great quantities of atomic energy which come to the earth in the form of heat, light, and other kinds of radiation.

Atomic energy as we know it today results from splitting atoms of heavy element uranium and its by-product plutonium.

Uranium which is sometimes called a critical or operational mass is radioactive material and is used to produce a chain reaction.

The splitting of the atom or fission as it is called releases great amounts of energy, thus permitting man to tap the almost inexhaustible source of nature's energy which can then be used as a curse or a blessing to mankind.

In any serious consideration or review of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, one significant starting point suggests itself in the form of a question: What do we expect to get out of atomic energy?

From a military standpoint, there is no question that the development of nuclear weapons has served as a deterrent to war and a great contributing factor to our national defense.

But even the military applications of atomic energy are very obviously bound to intersect, affect, and concern the peaceful uses.

This appraisal is principally concerned with, and directs its attention to, these intersections and peaceful applications of the atom.

Returning to our question: What do we expect to get out of atomic energy in its peaceful uses?

Let me tell you what we very definitely are not going to get out of it.

To begin with, Thomas Edison points out that a better idea may be had of what a thing is if first you know what the thing is not.

There are some who expect atomic energy to be the cure-all, a sort of universal panacea, for both the economic and physical ailments of the world.

Some others—who may be called plungers, with their eyes on the making of a fast dollar—view the atom as an easy road to fame and fortune.

Well, let me make it perfectly clear; atomic energy is not yet any of these things.

On the other hand, there is room for a good deal of optimism for, in my opinion, we have made a great deal of progress since the Atomic Energy Act was first passed in 1946.

Considerably more progress has been made since the act was amended in 1954.

This progress is mainly due to:

1. A civilian Atomic Energy Commission responsible for the program and carrying out its activities through industrial and university contractors with administration in the field.

2. The more recent policy of encouraging greater private ownership and participation in the development of an atomic energy industry free of Government monopoly.

3. Greater declassification of technical information.

Great progress has been made in this field in recent years.

For example, all of the information pertaining to the use of radioisotopes in agriculture is unclassified, and there is a storehouse of valuable information available to the technical expert who has the time, the energy, and the spirit to go after it.

4. The basis for the international atoms for peace program.

A giant step in achieving a working international atoms for peace program was achieved last fall with the creation of the new International Atomic Energy Agency.

As some of you may know, my good friend and colleague for 10 years on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, former Congressman W. Sterling Cole, of New York, has been appointed the first Director General of the international agency.

Last fall I attended the opening meeting of the new agency as a member of the United States delegation to the meeting.

After attending the opening in Vienna, I also made an inspection tour, with other members of the Joint Committee, to atomic energy centers in Western Europe, including Russia.

While in Russia we visited the Soviet nuclear research center at Dubna, about 80 miles north of Moscow, and we were greatly impressed by the great emphasis which the Soviets are placing on pure research and long-range development.

Frankly, we are going to have to keep on our toes and looking to the future, including the promising new peaceful uses of atomic energy, if as a Nation we are going to outsmart the Soviets in the constant struggle for the minds and the following of the peoples of the uncommitted nations of the world.

5. As the fifth and final point, having mentioned the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it plays the role of a watchdog for the entire atomic program.

It provides encouragement—and sometimes the spur—for the executive branch—to develop basic technology and to provide both the necessary supplies and the services contributing to the sound growth of the atomic energy industry.

The time and scope of this presentation forbid a detailed exploration of the atom's steadily mounting peaceful use, or of its impact on (1) agriculture, (2) radiation preservation of foods; (3) medicine and public health; (4) power generation; (5) the insurance industry; (6) the coal and mining industries; (7) commercial shipping and airlines; (8) and many other segments of our economy.

One aspect which is deserving of a little more specific treatment is the matter of radioactive isotopes, the miracle tool of the atomic age—the so-called byproducts of our atomic reactors.

In the past several years, there has been a dramatic upsurge in the number and variety of things for which isotopes are being used.

For an illustration, existing applications include everything from clinical examination to oil drilling, from agricultural experiments to spot welding.

Yet the surface has been barely scratched.

Then, too, the annual savings to American industry from the many different isotopes are estimated at one-third of a billion dollars annually.

By 1960, it has been estimated that isotope savings will amount to $5 billion, at an annual cost to the Government of $20 million.

Therefore, it is possible, over the long run, that benefits from isotopes will more than repay the huge investment we have made in our atomic-energy program.

This, by way of anticipation, could prove a very reassuring and comforting answer to our original question: What do we expect to get out of atomic energy?

The role of isotopes in the peacetime uses of atomic energy is revealed in the following authoritative words of atomic-energy Commissioner Dr. Willard F. Libby:

"In the field of the atoms-for-peace program, isotopes will play a very great role, for they can be put to work immediately without extensive training and heavy investment, and can serve for years to reconvince people the world over of the atom's great promise for peaceful uses when they become impatient waiting for the other great peaceful use—atomic power—to arrive."

Now, let me say a few words about the uses of atomic energy in agriculture, which I know is of particular interest to you.

Radioactive isotopes are obtained in atomic reactors as a byproduct, and they are finding increasing uses in applications which are very promising for the future.

I would like to quote in my remarks from a publication of the Atomic Energy Commission entitled "Uses of Isotopes in Agricultural Studies."

Radioactive isotopes, as you probably know, are of great value because they can be used as tracers.

They act in all respects like their nonradioactive brothers, but through the use of instruments the movements of radioactive isotopes within plants can be followed.

Let me quote from the Atomic Energy Commission study on the use of radioactive isotopes in the uptake of fertilizers:

"The most extensive use yet made of isotopes in agriculture has been concerned with studies on the uptake of fertilizers.

"This was one of the first and most important uses in agriculture.

"Now, even after 8 years, fertilizer uptake studies are still yielding valuable information.

"With radioactive tracers it is possible to study not only commercial fertilizers, but green manures as well.

"Although most of the investigations are designed to determine the proper type, placement, and efficiency of various fertilizers, the data obtained provide many other answers since the studies can be carried out under a wide variety of soil and climate conditions.

"American farmers are spending more than a billion dollars a year for commercial fertilizers, and isotope research has found many ways to get greater returns in crop yields with this money.

"With radioisotopes, it is possible to tag a certain material such as phosphorus in the fertilizer, and tell how much moves into the plant.

"The effectiveness of different methods of placement of the fertilizer such as below the seed, broadcast, or foliage application can be easily compared.

"In the past, requirements of a crop on a particular soil for a specific fertilizer usually have been measured by crop yield, but variations in rainfall, temperature, disease, and other factors also affect yield and confound the evaluation of the fertilizer.

"Through the use of radioisotopes many years are being saved in evaluating fertilizer materials and methods of application, and sound conclusions about fertilizer practices are being drawn.

"The capacity of the soil to supply a plant nutrient can be measured by adding a labeled fertilizer as a partial source of the nutrient to the growing plant.

"The plant will draw upon both the natural supply and the added fertilizer in proportion to the availability of each.

"In some soils, most of the plant nutrient will come from the added fertilizer, in other soils most of it will come from the nutrients already present in the soil.

"The isotope dilution analysis is used to obtain this information.

"Thus the plant itself, which is the best judge of availability, is used to give the answer.

"Although measurement of crop yield is satisfactory and in some cases preferable, the new techniques permit an evaluation under varying field conditions and at any stage of the plant's growth through the season.

"Through the use of isotopes, it has been proved conclusively that plants absorb nutrients not only through the roots but also through the foliage, the fruit, the twigs, the trunk, and even the flowers."

Radioactive isotopes have also been used in studies of soil fertility, the use of growth regulators and herbicides, and in controlling plant diseases and fungicides.

Let me quote again from the Atomic Energy Commission study:

"Radioisotopes are of great value in studying plant diseases and devising means for their control.

"Carbon 14 has been used to study metabolic changes in tobacco plants induced by virus infections, mealy bug wilt of pineapple, and effects of the virus of 'little cherry' disease.

"Sulfur 35 has been used to measure the difference in absorption of sulfur by parasites and the host in plant diseases caused by fungi.

"Phosphorus 32 and calcium 45 have been used to compare absorption and movement of phosphorus and calcium in pole blighted and healthy western pines.

"Wheat stem rust and most other rusts can be controlled if plants can be dusted often enough with sulfur.

"But to dust, 70 million acres of wheat in the United States with the minimum amount of sulfur that would be effective in years when weather favors rust would require nearly 2 million tons of sulfur.

"Cheaper fungicides, therefore are badly needed and radioisotopes are helping to find them."

Also, isotopes are being used to achieve higher yields from plants through a better understanding of root systems and their rate of growth and I quote again from the Atomic Energy Commission study:

"To achieve higher yields from plants, a better understanding of root systems and their rate of growth is important.

"An insight into this important aspect of plant growth is gained during fertilizer uptake and soil-fertility studies with radioisotopes.

"For example, tracer studies show that corn plants which have extensive root systems during maximum growth cannot get a major share of the phosphorus from a surface application made at planting time.

"The roots are predominantly below the plow depth when the corn is maturing.

"Therefore, radioisotopes show that the crop feeds largely on phosphorus already in the soil.

"Other interesting points observed in tracing fertilizer include the comparatively shallow feeding of cotton plants and the heavy uptake of nutrients from immediately beneath the peanut plant during the first 7 weeks of growth.

"Research of this kind is leading to a better understanding of the volume of soil utilized by various crop plants.

"In the soils of the Southeast, which are naturally low in fertility, plants are usually expected to subsist on nutrients supplied in the top 6 inches, or plow depth.

"It may be possible to raise the ceiling on yields by providing a deeper zone of nutrients more in keeping with the needs of the plant.

"If heavy rooting could be induced in a number of crop plants to the depth of one additional foot, the bad effects of relatively brief droughts would be materially reduced.

"In studies of root-system growth, radioactive phosphorus was placed in the ground at various depths and positions around the base of the plants.

"The appearance of radioactivity in a plant indicated that roots had reached the fertilizer and permitted making a detailed pattern of root growth as the plant grew.

"Information was obtained on how much each zone of the root system contributed to the phosphorus nutrition of the plant.

"Radioisotopes will certainly play a prominent role in further fundamental research on rooting characteristics in relation to soil properties."

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy constantly receives reports from the Atomic Energy Commission on both the military and the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In 1954, our Subcommittee on Research and Development, of which I am a member, held a hearing on the contribution of atomic energy to agriculture, and much valuable information was obtained during these hearings.

In addition, the same subcommittee held another set of hearings in 1956 entitled "Progress Report on Atomic Energy Research," which accumulated a 375-page record on atomic energy research in medicine, biology, agriculture, and food preservation.

The most up-to-date report to the Joint Committee, consists of the 23d semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission, and pages 60 to 68 contain a summary of achievements in the last 3 years in atomic energy agricultural studies.

The Joint Committee has a supply of most of these materials which it will gladly make available to you.

If you would like some of these materials, please write a letter to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Capitol Building, Washington, D. C., and you will receive whatever materials are available on the peaceful uses of atomic energy in advancing our agricultural program.

In concluding this discussion on peacetime uses of atomic energy, let me repeat again that even though we have spent $15 billion to date, we have barely scratched the surface in developing the ultimate benefits to be derived by mankind.

Fifty years from now, barring an atomic war, atomic energy will be as common as electricity and coal are today.

Atomic planes, atomic rocket ships, automobiles, locomotives, farm tractors, etc., will be in everyday use and an accustomed sight on the world scene.

Homes will be heated and cooled by the atom.

Food, clothing, medicines, and crops will be improved and in general our way of living will be completely revolutionized.

Regardless of what the future holes in this great atomic age, the businessman, industrialist, and the farmer will surely "miss the boat" if they fail to keep abreast of rapid developments in the field of atomic energy.

As one of the original members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, in the beginning we found it necessary in the best interest of the American people, to do the research and development on a socialistic basis by giving the Government a complete monopoly in the field of atomic energy.

Such a monopoly is no longer necessary and as an ardent disciple of the American system of free enterprise, it was a pleasure to play a part in amending the law to give

industry the right to participate in our Government's effort to harness the atom for the benefit of all mankind.

The problems of agriculture tomorrow, in this atomic age, will tax your ability, ingenuity, energy, and imagination if you, as leaders of that industry, seize the opportunity to keep moving forward to ever-new frontiers.

In accepting this challenge you and the agricultural industry will not only derive mutual benefits, but you will likewise aid in strengthening our Nation's effort to enjoy the blessings of this atomic era.

From Chhajalwadi to the United States Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest, as well as one of the finest Members of the Congress is the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND]. He has developed in the minds of his colleagues a profound feeling of respect. He is a great credit to the people of his district. The people of his district are justified in feeling proud of the distinguished Member of the Congress.

In the Life International magazine of May 12, 1957, appears a splended and deserving article about our friend from California [Mr. SAUND], written by Robert M. Glascow.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include this article:

FROM CHHAJALWADI TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS—INDIA-BORN DALIP SAUND HAS WON UNIQUE PRESTIGE IN AMERICA

(By Robert W. Glasgow)

In the social and political hierarchy of Washington, new Members of the Lower House of Congress are usually far less conspicuous than the United States Capital's second-string bureaucrats or many of the tourists for whom they are often mistaken. Among these freshman arrivals in the House of Representatives last year was a dark-complexioned man from southern California's 29th District. As he conscientiously went about his homework of studying new legislation and attending committee meetings, it soon became apparent that he would not long share the other newcomers' anonymity.

He stood out because of his name, DALIP SINGH SAUND, because he was a Hindu born Asian immigrant, first ever elected to the United States Congress. The manner of his election gave him further distinction: running as a Democratic Party candidate in a traditionally Republican Party district in a year of a landslide Republican presidential victory, SAUND had won a nationally publicized race against the famous, glamorous aviatrix, Jacqueline Cochran.

SAUND's congressional colleagues quickly realized that he was not going to be content to rest on the publicity he had gained from his unusual background and his spectacular election victory. When he was given an almost unprecedented honor for a freshman, appointment to the powerful House Foreign Affairs Committee, he made effective use of it. Not long afterward he embarked on an extensive tour of Asia as a one-man subcommittee to help improve relations between the United States and Asia—and also as a one-man symbol of the workings of United States democracy.

High point of DALIP SAUND's 6,000-mile trip through his native India was his return after 37 years to his native village of Chhajalwadi in the Punjab and because he was the first in the Punjab. There, to the piping of flutes, the beat of drums, and the cheers of flower-bearing villagers, he held a tearful reunion with a sister and brother who had stayed at home. And there, as he had in scores of other Indian towns, he stood up before a huge crowd to explain his feelings about India and America.

In such speeches SAUND did not ignore unpleasant aspects of American life as he had lived it. "I explained," he said recently, "that in the earlier years the people of California had not wanted Chinese, Japanese, or Indians in their communities—at least they did not want them as equals. I recalled that there had been laws denying some of us citizenship and prohibiting others from owning land for farming purposes. I made it clear that we had been severely discriminated against.

"But," he adds, "I also explained that these abuses are largely in the past, that all of this has changed since World War II. I cited my own case as an illustration of how much things had changed. I emphasized that one of the remarkable things about a democracy is that it does permit people to change and to make changes. I noted that the fact I was an Indian and had fought my way up, instead of working against me in my campaign for Congress, had worked for me. The minorities—such as Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and Indians—constituted a very small fraction of the voters in my district, so that it took far more than the minority vote to put me in office. This could not have happened 10 years ago."

Chhajalwadi, SAUND's birthplace, is near the city of Amaritsar and about 16 miles from what is now the Pakistan border. He was born there on September 20, 1899, the son of a well-to-do family of government contractors, builders of canals and railroads. They were Sikhs, members of a reformed Hindu sect which, among other things, rejects the idea of caste. Young SAUND, following grammar and high school in Amaritsar, attended and was graduated from the Sikh college there.

Though he never met or saw Gandhi, SAUND soon came to know the writings of this great man. He knew little about the United States of America until World War I, when he began to read stories in Indian newspapers about Woodrow Wilson, his 14 points, and his slogan, "Make the world safe for democracy." When one of Wilson's speeches referred to another American statesman, Abraham Lincoln, SAUND made an overnight trip to the University of Punjab to borrow books about Lincoln.

SAUND graduated from college in 1919, and his parents prepared to line up a career in Britain's Indian civil service for him. As a Gandhi disciple and a fervent Indian Nationalist, SAUND turned down the proposal, as his means of boycotting the British Government. Instead, he decided his place was in private business. He had noticed that almost all canned foods in India were either British or American and decided that there probably would be good opportunities in an Indian canning industry. SAUND had heard that the University of California at Berkeley was an outstanding place to prepare for such a career. This, plus his old interest in Wilson and Lincoln, led him to leave for the United States in 1920.

SAUND came to the United States by way of London, where he stayed only 2 or 3 weeks, unable to enjoy the customary sights because of his impatience to get to America. He entered his new country through the once-traditional gateway for millions of immigrants: Ellis Island in New York Harbor. There the long lines of pushing and shoving people waiting to be processed were a momentarily dismaying experience. "I'll never forget," he says, "there was a long table with food on it, and there were immigrants from everywhere sitting at this table eating. I had been brought up to be polite, and I was shocked at the way these people were grabbing food from each other's plates."

On the long train trip from New York to California he was equally bewildered by the stares of fellow passengers and the strange foods. "I wore a turban and everybody just looked at me," he recalls. "The food was new to me, so I mostly lived on milk." In San Francisco at first things were not much better. "I went to a Travelers Aid station in the ferry building and explained to them I wanted to go to Berkeley. For some reason they sent me to a downtown mission where I was given a small room. I soon found the bed full of bedbugs, so I tried to sleep on the floor. I was alone, and I didn't know where I was. It was the most terrible night I ever spent."

The following morning SAUND found his way to Berkeley and the University of California. At the university he was told that there were about 80 Indian students on the campus and a Hindu students' association, which had its own residence clubhouse.

Established in the clubhouse, SAUND promptly enrolled in some agricultural courses. At the same time he learned that if he were to take courses in mathematics, it would be fairly easy for him to obtain a master's degree. This he did, subsequently going on to take his doctorate in mathematics. By the end of his first year at Berkeley the Ellis Island dining table had become only a wry recollection. SAUND had made many American friends and was appearing often before the Young Men's Christian Association, church and student groups to talk about India.

To this day SAUND is not quite sure when he abandoned the idea of getting into the canning business. But during the summer following his first year at Berkeley he tried his hand at it by taking a job at a California Packing Corp. plant in nearby Emoryville. He was placed in charge of the sirup department. Near the end of the summer the plant superintendent invited SAUND to his home for dinner. SAUND recalls the evening well.

"After we had dinner this man started asking me questions as to what I was going to do in life. I was so confused and undecided at the time that I told him that I didn't know whether to write a history of India, to be a teacher, to go back to India, and be a political fighter, or to go into the canning business. A few days later he told me, "Young man, you talked yourself out of a job the other night. I had decided to offer you the job as assistant plant superintendent. But I wasn't interested in training a man who might quit the next day to write history of India.' "

Though he still did not know what his ultimate plans were, SAUND continued to study at the university and to work in canning plants during the summers to finance his education. Reading French and German mathematics texts gave him considerable difficulty, but he finally got his doctor of philosophy degree. (Title of his thesis: "On Functions Associated With the Elliptic Cylinder in Harmonic Analysis.") He promptly received offers of teaching jobs from a college in Indiana and an engineering school in Pennsylvania. Still undecided, he turned them down.

But already forming in his mind was the decision that was to shape the rest of his life. It stemmed indirectly from his devout observance of his religion. "I used to go to a Sikh temple in Stockton to celebrate re-

ligious days," he recalls, "and would meet other Hindus who had immigrated to California. Some who couldn't even read and write were driving big Cadillacs. I asked where they made their money and was told that they were farmers from the Imperial Valley. So I decided to go down there and make money, too.

The Imperial Valley is a vast former desert area in the extreme southern section of California which has been turned into a great natural hothouse through irrigation. Fortunes are constantly being made—and, as SAUND soon learned, lost—in such crops as cotton and in the highly speculative business of growing carrots, lettuce, and other greens for the winter markets in cities of the eastern United States.

SAUND went to the Imperial Valley in the fall of 1925, and was given a job by a Hindu farmer as foreman of a cotton-picking gang. "That's about the only use I ever made of my mathematics," he says. "I checked the weights of the pickers' cotton bags and I made good money—$17 or $18 a day—and was soon able to save up enough to lease a piece of land of my own." He brought in a fine lettuce crop. But so, it seemed, did everyone else that year.

"There was just too much lettuce. I lost everything," he says. Nevertheless, he remained in the Imperial Valley, trying to farm on leased land. "I was getting by, that was all," says SAUND.

Despite the hard work of farming, SAUND had not given up his intellectual interests. In 1927, in fact, he was inspired to start work on the book about India which he had long thought of writing. His inspiration came from what he considered a grossly unfair portrait of his country in a sensational best-seller of the time, Katherine Mayo's Mother India. Incensed, as were most of his countrymen, by what he considered the book's exaggerations of India's backwardness, SAUND began to write a rebuttal called My Mother India.

The next year SAUND briefly left the valley to go up to Los Angeles and work intensively on his book. One evening after he had spoken before a meeting of the First Unitarian Society in Hollywood, a tall American came up and invited SAUND to visit him at home. SAUND politely declined, but later bumped into the same man—Emil Kosa, Jr., a young artist—in a cafeteria. Again Kosa invited SAUND to visit his home. This time SAUND accepted.

Kosa's father was a well-established artist and the family had a pleasant home on Sunset Boulevard. There SAUND met other members of the family, including Emil's pretty, blond 19-year-old sister, Marian, who was a student at the University of California at Los Angeles. SAUND and the Kosas took to each other at once. Mrs. Kosa was interested in international relations and loved to listen to young SAUND's views. Marian was fascinated by SAUND's ability to recite the English poets and by his own English translations of Indian poetry. The two were married within 6 months after their first meeting.

With his bride SAUND returned to the Imperial Valley. In Westmoreland he renewed his farming efforts. His book, which appeared in 1930, pleased his fellow Hindu nationalists, but was not a commercial success. He managed to make a living on his farm during the early depression years, then in 1934 hit what looked to him like the jackpot: he made about $7,000 from an alfalfa crop. "Then I plunged into alfalfa," SAUND sadly recalls, "and the price went to nothing. I was broke again."

"By this time I had 3 children and found myself owing about $10,000. My prospects were terrible. Several of my neighbors filed bankruptcy proceedings. The fertilizer and seed companies and my other creditors advised me to do the same. I was very sensitive about bankruptcy. My father's people had a custom that when a man takes out bankruptcy, he must set a kerosene lamp burning in his window in the daytime as a mark of his shame. If I had filed for bankruptcy I would have felt just as if I had that lantern in my window."

Some creditors got judgments against SAUND, but he did not file for bankruptcy and continued to pay a little at a time on his debts. After several years he was at last in the clear. As World War II came along, creating a new demand for foodstuffs, he began to prosper.

Though the 1930's were hard years for SAUND, there were pleasant aspects. He began to participate in community life—as a member of service clubs, a worker and leader in charity-fund drives. He also became interested in politics and joined various Democratic Party organizations.

But there was a rankling obstacle. SAUND could not vote. He was not a citizen and could not become one because of the complex United States immigration and naturalization laws.

Instead of simply bemoaning this situation, SAUND helped start an organization called the India Association of America to press for legislation that would give his countrymen citizenship. Through a bill which the House and Senate passed and which President Truman signed in 1946, the objective was achieved. SAUND immediately applied for citizenship and, after delays because of bureaucratic redtape, received his final papers in 1949.

No sooner had SAUND been granted citizenship than he was named to the central committee of the Democratic Party in Imperial County. In 1952 he was elected justice of the judicial district court in his own town of Westmoreland.

The small town of Westmoreland had for years been wide open for prostitution as masses of agricultural day laborers swarmed into the area at peak crop periods. SAUND began handing out tough sentences against prostitutes and bawdyhouse operators, and Westmoreland was cleaned up.

Meanwhile SAUND'S agricultural ventures had brought him enough money to set up a successful fertilizer business. With one son and one daughter in college and another daughter married, he now had more time to devote to politics. After advancing to the chairmanship of the Imperial County Democratic Central Committee, in 1956 he was ready to make his big jump into national politics: a bid for the United States House of Representatives.

United States congressional elections are held every 2 years, and in California each party chooses its nominees in a primary election in the early summer. The Democrat and the Republican who receive the most votes in the primaries become their parties' candidates in the November general election. This meant that SAUND had to campaign in the primary almost as hard as he did in the subsequent election. After beating his Democratic Party national opponents in the primary, he found himself squared off against the victor in an equally hard-fought Republican primary, Jacqueline Cochran.

He could scarcely have faced a more famous or formidable opponent than this handsome, 47-year-old woman whose background was as remarkable as SAUND'S own. From a childhood as an orphan in a poverty-stricken southern town she had risen, through remarkable aviation exploits, to a vital wartime position as head of the WASPS, a group of women fliers who ferried planes from manufacturers to the Nation's airfields. Moreover, she was head of a large cosmetics manufacturing firm and the wife of Floyd Odlum, one of the Nation's most important financiers.

If SAUND lacked such fame, wealth, and prestige, he was an equal match in energy for the indefatigable "Jackie" Cochran. While she zoomed around the 29th Congressional District in her Lockheed Lodestar, SAUND whipped across the desert in his 1956 Buick.

ISSUES AND INNUENDOES

As in many United States congressional races, party issues were not nearly so important as personalities. In his campaign SAUND generally stressed issues that were closest to the valley's farmers and small-business men, particularly Federal aid to agriculture. Although Mrs. Odlum professed concern for the increasing centralization of the Federal Government, she too emphasized the valley's own problems and strongly backed President Eisenhower's farm program.

Not unexpectedly, racial and religious issues were injected during the campaign. Some supporters of Mrs. Odlum were heard to refer to Judge SAUND as "that Hindu" and there was some innuendo that Hinduism was probably not much better than communism. Some of SAUND'S supporters retaliated in kind with reference to Mrs. Odlum's being a Roman Catholic. But neither of the principals in the campaign considered such tactics worthy of notice, and apparently most voters did not either.

As against Miss Cochran's fame and glamor, SAUND'S main advantage was the fact that many in the 29th District seemed to feel that he was closer to the voters than she was. For despite his foreign birth, Asian religion, and darker skin, many voters identified him first as an Imperial County farmer who had shared the good times and the bad and who had participated actively for years in the town affairs of Westmoreland.

Yet as election day neared, few people thought SAUND had much of a chance. It was a presidential as well as congressional election year, and President Eisenhower was at the peak of his popularity. Every Republican candidate stood to share a bit of the President's luster. Yet when the votes of California's 29th District had been counted, things did not turn out that way. Eisenhower had carried the 29th overwhelmingly against Adlai Stevenson, but DALIP SINGH SAUND had defeated Jacqueline Cochran. Many voters had crossed party lines to vote for SAUND. It was a tremendous personal victory.

In his postelection assessment SAUND decided that the greatest thing in his favor had been the simple fact that he was of Indian extraction. "I think there were many, many people who liked this opportunity of demonstrating that they believed in democracy and fair play."

This November the voters in SAUND'S district will have another chance to demonstrate that they feel the same way. For then SAUND will be up for reelection, and since no Congressman, regardless of past successes, can take his office for granted, SAUND must regularly interrupt his congressional chores to shuttle back and forth to California.

Between meetings with constituents, SAUND spends much time quietly at home with his family, some members of which have settled elsewhere around the United States but often return for family reunions. SAUND still reads Indian literature and tries to keep up with news from his homeland. But mainly he is concerned with the future of his district, his State and his new country. For, as he told his relatives and friends in Chhajalwadi last year, "I have become part of American life."

SAUND ON AMERICA

"As a student in India, all that I knew about America was what I read in the British textbooks. I knew all about George III

but was kept in ignorance concerning one of the greatest historical events of all times. I refer to the American Revolution—an incident which, in my opinion, has done more to bring joy and dignity to the lives of men than anything before or since in the annals of man."

Unionism: Past and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, considerable propaganda has been spread regarding right to work bills being written into law, both on the State level as well as on the national level.

I believe that the story on Unionism: Past and Future, by Leland Hazard, is a very enlightening one which appeared in the Harvard Business Review. It should be read by every Member of Congress as it approaches the problem in a very forward manner:

[From Harvard Business Review of March-April 1958]

UNIONISM: PAST AND FUTURE

(By Leland Hazard)

In every age of rapid change and upheaval, it is only natural for men to raise questions about the roles of existing institutions. In the past 20 years of rapidly mounting labor power, business management has been subjected to a good deal of public scrutiny. Should we managers give up even more power to the unions? Is our significance to the country declining? These questioning glances have naturally made many business leaders feel uneasy.

Fortunately, however, history seems to be on the side of management. Numerous episodes from the past establish its indispensability, but I doubt that any has been so conclusive as the Russian experience:

"Communists, for a short time only, proceeded as if there was no distinction between the functions of management and labor. For a few years following the 1917 revolution, minuscule Soviets in the Russian factories undertook the work of foremen and supervisors. The record discloses a naive and futile attempt to abolish the managerial function.

"Decision making got lost in debate. Every comrade's views about what tool to use, what size to employ, what placement to make, or what arrangement to set up—every comrade's views were considered, all to the end that production diminished as rapidly as discussion increased, and new facilities lagged as Bolshevik promises mounted. In the early 1920's Lenin himself took account of this industrial failure. In a stern reprimand to workers—a long reprimand in the manner of Communist harangues—he summarized: 'You must work, not chatter.' [1]

The attempt to implement the ideal of "from each according to his ability; to each according to his need" through an amorphous industrial maze, in which management was deprived not only of its historical rewards but also of its traditional authority, failed. The Russian dictatorship of the proletariat moved quickly to the reestablishment of the authority and rewards of management. It is now common knowledge that this shift from sovietism to authoritarianism was essential to industrial survival.

Footnotes at end of table.

I have mentioned this Russian failure as the most obvious proof of the significance of management in an industrial system. Despite all of their rapid advances we can take comfort in one thing: while Russian Communists have been learning about management, we in the United States have been developing a more mature understanding of labor. It is my purpose to look at the record and make a prophecy. To be more specific: How much does any forecast of the future of unionism depend on events from its past, and what factors from the past determine the present labor situation? Is the power of unions likely to increase or diminish greatly?

UNIONISM'S HISTORY

Labor's history can be interpreted in many ways. Who is to say what single date, decade, event, or person is to be taken as more significant than another in a movement as long established and as firmly rooted as our labor movement? One might attach special importance to early events and dates such as:

(a) 1827, when the Mechanics Union of Trades Association was founded in Philadelphia.

(b) 1834, when the National Trades' Union was founded "to promote the moral, physical, and intellectual condition of the working classes, and to advance their pecuniary interest."

(c) 1866, when the National Labor Union with a full-time president at $1,000 a year was established.

(d) 1878, when the Knights of Labor became a national organization, with the slogan, "An injury to one is the concern of all," and with its membership open to all "except lawyers, bankers, stock brokers, professional gamblers, and anybody who had anything to do with the sale of intoxicating beverages."

(e) 1881, when the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, patterned on the British Trades Union Congress, got its start and lived to sponsor the famous movement for the 8-hour day.

(f) 1886, when the American Federation of Labor was born at Columbus, Ohio; elected Samuel Gompers its first president; lived to attain by 1920 a membership of over 4 million (which was to decline by 1933 to little more than 2 million but to rise again to over 10 million in 1955); and then merged with the Congress of Industrial Organizations in an honorable organic unity of more than 15 million organized workingmen.

I cannot presume to judge the relative importance of these or other past events. Yet I must point to the mountain peaks of the past if I am to assess the present and predict the future. Let me continue the history into more recent—and even more formative—periods.

BREAD AND BUTTER

One of the chief determinants of the direction labor was to take was Samuel Gompers' firm insistence that our problems are primarily industrial, and his stout rejection of all temptations to form a labor party.

The long shadow of Gompers points the continuing philosophical course of American labor: "bread and butter" unionism—and at the same time of course, cake.

On July 6, 1892, two barges moved up the Monongahela loaded with Pinkerton agents. At the end of the bloody day 10 were dead, 3 agents and 7 strikers and 60 were wounded. Later, 8,000 Pennsylvania Guard men came to keep the peace.

Then on November 21, Frick cabled Carnegie the news:

"Strike officially called off yesterday. Our victory is now complete and most gratifying. Do not think we will ever have any serious labor trouble again." [2]

Footnotes at end of speech.

"Ever" was too long and Carnegie himself knew it. Nevertheless he replied to Frick from Rome:

"Think I'm about 10 years older. Europe has rung with Homestead, Homestead, until we are all sick of the name; but it is all over now. Ever your pard, A. C."

And yet Carnegie knew it was not over. In later life his writings show his ambivalence. One pamphlet brought a letter from Grover Cleveland, who defeated Harrison—some say because of the Homestead strike. Cleveland said to Carnegie:

"You must capture and keep the heart of any workingman before his hands will do their best." [3]

In the last decade of the 19th century, however, American management did not understand Grover Cleveland's prescient comment—William James was sowing the seeds for a deeper psychological knowledge at Harvard University, but the social sciences were not yet in flower.

It was to be another two decades before the phase "human relations" was generally employed. Indeed, as late as 1933, the picture of the coal mines and steel mills of western Pennsylvania and West Virginia was a melange of NRA, Roosevelt, Phil Murray, John L. Lewis, insurgent workers, tear gas, deputies, and some deaths. But the workingman's heart was not captured, nor his union recognized.

THE WAGNER ACT

Then came another important peak: The National Labor Relations Act (July 5, 1935), popularly known by the name of its author, Senator Robert Wagner, of New York. This New Deal law marked the first major intervention by Government in the long struggle between management and labor over union claims of right to bargain for employees. The act was unequivocally in support of labor. It asserted the right of workers to organize, established procedures for selection of bargaining units and for elections in these units, gave to a union which had a majority of the workers in any unit the right to represent all of the workers in that unit, and required management to bargain collectively with such a union. On April 12, 1937, the United States Supreme Court, still composed of the nine old men, sustained the act. On that day an old order ended.

Results: The act led to such results as Myron Taylor's decision, in March 1937, that United States Steel would recognize the steelworkers' union-organizing committee (SWOC). Meanwhile sitdown strikes, though ultimately held illegal by the United States Supreme Court, had softened General Motors. After these milestones union membership mounted, particularly in the CIO, and surprised industrialists everywhere found themselves looking for industrial relations directors.

The Wagner Act made collective bargaining an instrument of American national policy. The wisdom of this policy may be debatable. Other nations, while practicing collective bargaining, do not rely so heavily on its processes; for example, in Australia and in the Scandinavian countries industrial courts are involved in wage determination. But since we are committed almost exclusively to collective bargaining, any discussion of the future of unionism must begin with the Wagner Act.

This law does not permit a union to bargain only for its members. It requires that the union bargain for all of the employees, even nonunion workers, in the bargaining unit that, under the terms of the act, has been found appropriate. This fact was a shock to employers, and its full significance is not yet perceived by either employers or unions—or, if perceived, is not yet fully accepted.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Reaction: Unions had thought of themselves as brotherhoods—as men banded together and set apart—an injury to one being the concern of all. Management also thought of the membership of unions as a special category of workers to be distinguished from our loyal employees. It was a slow, long fight to impress the inevitability of unions on management; but once it was recognized that unionism was an earnest fact management began saying: "We don't care whether our employees belong to unions any more than we care whether they belong to the Elks or the Masons or the Bapitist Church." What was really meant by such statements in the late 1930's was that management wanted the unions to have as little to do with wages and working conditions as the other cited organizations.

Management is not given to full analysis or completely logical scrutiny of the phrases which express its feelings. It was not so much that management felt that employees who belonged to a union were disloyal, but, rather, that employees who had not joined a union had demonstrated a special brand of loyalty to management.

The Wagner Act, therefore, produced an acute emotional reaction in management—and in union leadership as well. The employer found himself powerless to reward a loyal nonmember with a larger pay envelope, and the union found itself powerless to discriminate against the nonmember. Obviously, even if law had permitted, it would never have been feasible to maintain two rates of pay, one negotiated with a union for its members and another, presumably higher, voluntarily granted to nonmembers.

There are only four ways in which wages can be fixed: (1) by the employer, (2) by the employee or his union, (3) by the Government, and (4) by collective bargaining. In the United States, Congress elected collective bargaining, and the Supreme Court approved the decision.

Perhaps Congress did not realize the full scope of public responsibility which the Wagner Act delegated to management.[4] When all or almost all labor-mangement issues must be determined by collective bargaining, management finds itself confronted with decisions of public as well as private significance. For example, take the big issue of our present wage inflation. Is it the responsibility of management to resist wage increases and suffer the private cost of long, bitter strikes in order that the public may be spared the adverse consequences of inflation? This is a difficult question, although I believe there is perhaps a stronger case for management to put up with strikes today than is generally recognized.[5]

In any event, it is doubtful that the Congress of 1935 fully perceived all the implications of a decision to leave wage determination solely to compulsory collective bargaining. It is significant that questions quite as difficult as the current wage inflation issue arose immediately following the passage of the act. Let us see what happened in the 1930's and early 1940's.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM?

The term "free rider" was quick to emerge. Unions, pointing to their legal responsibility to represent all employees in the lawful unit, asked why nonmembers should receive all of the benefits of union representation and bear none of the cost; that is, be exempt from payment of initiation fees and dues.

The union's charge against a free rider was and still is countered with the charge of compulsory unionism. Shortly following the Wagner Act, managements often resisted union demands that all employees be required to join the union and pay dues, giving as a reason, "loyalty to our loyal employees." In many cases, this was a good reason, but not the real reason. The real motive was to fight a holding action. Many people in the late 1930's believed that the excesses of the New Deal, including unionism, would some day abate.

But now, 20 years later, a philosophical argument over compulsory unionism continues with such vigor that one must not question the sincerity of the participants on either side. There are 19 States with laws or constitutional provisions, often called right-to-work laws, which protect in various ways the privilege of an employee to work whether or not he is paying dues to a union. These laws attest to the vigor of the conviction that union membership should not be a condition of employment.

The arguments in support of the alleged free rider and of the liberty for the individual to take employment free of a tax in the form of union dues are impressive. The unions are challenged on their own ground. It is said that the term "free rider" is applicable only if the union is in fact getting something for the nonmember which he would not have obtained without the intervention of the union. This argument is buttressed in two ways:

1. Unions often charge that wages in this or that unionized industry are not so high as in some nonunion industry—or that union wages have not kept up with cost of living or profits or some other standard. These union arguments are played back to prove that unions have not in fact gained any benefits which would not have accrued without unionism.

2. It is said that learned economists find that unions have had no effect on the general wage level, that instead blind forces such as market, monetary, and fiscal factors determine the general wage level.[6] For this reason, too, it is argued, there is no bonus for the alleged free rider.

In any case, so the argument runs, it should be the individual free American citizen who decides whether the union has benefited him and, therefore, whether he chooses to pay dues. Any factor other than his subjective determination is branded as an invasion of his liberty.

There is no doubt but that the proponents of liberty have a good philosophical argument. But a fact of real life intervenes. True, one cannot remain unconcerned if unionism actually does involve a tax on the right to work. On the other hand, one cannot ignore another important possibility: Fifty-one percent of the employees of a plant, paying dues, could stop working altogether in protest if the other 49 percent are not paying their dues. I would now like to discuss this dilemma as it appears in action and show how it contributed to the Taft-Hartley Act.

THE DUES DILEMMA

Let me draw on my own experience in this area, since it does lead strongly to my concluding generalizations:

In 1940 picket lines were formed around the plants of the company I represented. "Dues picketing," it was called. Employees who had paid their dues were admitted; all others were excluded. In many cases, this was the equivalent of closing the plant. Heavy industries such as steel or glass, where high melting temperatures compel continuous operations, depend on many specialized functions. A few dozen men, kept out of the plant for nonpayment of dues, would leave certain crucial functions unmanned; and so the whole process would stop even though thousands of dues-paying employees had entered the gates.

Fred Keightley, formerly secretary-treasurer of Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, and later conciliator in the United States Department of Labor, had come to the company in 1935 as director of labor relations. He knew the depth of feeling between dues-paying and nonduespaying employees. He conceived and I articulated a form of cooperation between company and union which spread and ultimately became the law of the land as part of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Our plan required neither the closed shop, under which management may hire only such employees as the union designates, nor the union shop under which management, while free to hire anyone, must fire him if he fails to join the union, or, having joined, loses his good standing.

I would have been against the closed shop or the union shop because of the requirement that the employee be in good standing with his union. Good standing can mean anything; not being black or white, or not being a Methodist or a Catholic, or—of equally great economic consequence—being to energetic in the shop or too vocal on the union floor. I would not willingly contract such power into union hands or such restrictions on management's ability to select and keep necessary manpower.

But it is quite another matter to require an employee to pay reasonable and limited sums to the union as initiation fees and monthly dues, if he is a member; or, if he is not a member, to require him to pay equal amounts as a fee by virtue of the fact that the union is his legal representative in collective bargaining. Employers have all kinds of necessary rules which govern the employee's access to a job. Some of the rules, such as those requiring special clothing, do cost the employee money.

I saw no difference in 1940, nor do I see any difference now, between such rules and one requiring an employee to keep peace in the shop by paying to an organization, empowered by law to represent him, certain sums of money bearing a reasonable relationship to his pay. Our plan required the union to agree with the company on the size of the dues; a typical amount was $2 for the initial payment and monthly payments of 1 percent of gross earnings.

Is this a violation of individual rights? It depends on your viewpoint. Conceivably nudists might claim the right to come to work unclothed, or food-processing girls might object to maintaining washed and manicured hands, or stenographers might insist on wearing evening gowns to the office—all, and many others for many reasons, might scream to high heaven about invaded liberties and denial of their right to work. No one would feel obligated to pay any serious attention to such complaints, even though a case could be made for each of them—a case as doctrinaire as the right-to-work case.

There is such a thing as overinterpretation. When a concept like the right-to-work is meticulously applied to all levels of thought and behavior, its original meaning is perverted. In one sense, requiring a worker to pay dues to a union which he does not belong to is unfair. In another, more practical, sense it is fair. It is simply one of those workaday compromises that we ask him to make so that we can run the organization as smoothly as possible.

Thomas E. Shroyer, now a practicing lawlawyer, represented the National Labor Relations Board at Cleveland in the mid-1940's. When one of our employees questioned the company's right to discharge for failure to make payments to the union, Shroyer wrestled hard with our "cooperation clause" and became thoroughly familiar with it. In due course he became legal adviser on labor matters to Senator Robert A. Taft and his Senate Committee on Labor. During the drafting of the Taft Hartley Act, Shroyer laid the cooperation plan before the committee. It appealed to Senator Taft and

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ultimately was incorporated in the Taft-Hartley Act. I doubt that the Federal law will change on this point of labor-management relations.

WILDCAT STRIKES

There were innumerable labor-management problems in the 1940's (many of which still persist), but none was more serious that the quickie strike. A dispute involving a few men, often one man only, would arise in some corner of a plant of 3,000 or 4,000 workers. With tempers mounting and the provision for orderly processing of grievances soon forgotten, the few fellows in the corner would walk out and quickly the whole plant would "go down." These little strikes, sometimes called wildcat strikes, are enormously costly because mass production is efficient only if it is uninterrupted. They were the principal reason for the widespread conviction of management that a union's word was no good.

For a long time labor and business leaders were unable to agree on a contractual solutin of this problem. The top union officers, who had charge of the treasuries, were reluctant to contract not to strike and thereby risk liability for strikes which they knew might be started by rank-and-file members despite the no-strike clause and contrary to to top officers' intentions. Management on the other hand, believed that a no-strike agreement by the top union officials would be useless because they, while secretly fomenting the strike, could always claim that it was unauthorized.

Until after World War II there were a good many no-strike clauses in labor agreements, but they commanded slight respect and little confidence. In 1947 I drew one which is in effect in our company today—and substantially unchanged. Like most inventions it was surprisingly simple:

The union agrees not to strike, sit down, slow down, or stop work during the life of the contract—a conventional stipulation. The innovation was that if any employee or group of employees represented by the union violated the no-strike clause, the union agreed to disapprove the action in a published writing. If the union failed to disapprove, its treasury became liable for the damage; if, on the other hand, the union did disapprove, the company was then free to discipline the offending employee or employees.

The results have been gratifying. There have been some unauthorized violations, and the top union officers have disapproved as the contract requires. Discipline of individual employees, including some discharges, has stood up in arbitration. More important, in 10 years there has been a vast reduction in the number of 2-hour, 2-day, 10-day little strikes which were formerly so costly in production, workers' pay, and stockholders' profits.

The success of the provision is due in no small part to the fact that in 10 years' time no violation has been condoned. Management has filed several suits based on the clause, but it has never been necessary to bring one of them to trial. This raises a point of procedure that I consider important. I think management has often made the mistake of considering litigation with a union useless. It is true that there are some difficulties about bringing legal action against a union, but it can be done. And, particularly when management has accorded full recognition to a union and the union knows that it has been accepted in the full sense of that term, no stigma should attach to litigation. Indeed, it is one way for management to prove that it considers the union a responsible organization.

UNIONISM'S PERMANENCE

The newspapers have for some months been reporting much shocking skulduggery, and some big names in labor appear suspect of clay feet—not too good clay, at that. Will this be the end of the labor movement? Of course not. There are thousands of unsung, unknown, workaday management-labor agreements functioning fairly well—not perfectly, but fairly well. Unionism is built into the American system. It has had its ups and down in the past, as it will be in the future. But the labor-management relationship is as much a part of modern capitalism as are the machines and the stockholders' savings.

I have seen more than one case—in truth, far too many cases—of miserably inadequate union leadership. Incompetence, stupidity, paranoia, megalomania—I could multiply the nouns; I could add some adjectives. But I have rarely had occasion to modify the axiom: "scratch a labor problem, and you will find a management problem."

There are some fundamentals which, once understood, make for harmonious relationships, but management and labor itself have sometimes failed to perceive them.

POINTS TO REMEMBER

Labor no less than management wants some power. By labor I mean in this connection not just the leaders but also the little people, those in the shops and at the benches. It is not enough that wages are good and working conditions are right. The worker often wants good wages and good working conditions not as a voluntary grant from management but as an ego-boosting involuntary yielding by management.

The point was never made better than in an episode reported by Clinton Golden. He relates that during the early days of organizing activities in the Pittsburgh area, a request came in for an organizing committee to come to a Pittsburgh plant that was well known as having excellent wages and working conditions, and supposedly had almost perfect employee relationships. Ultimately, however, a meeting was held. A thousand workers came to that first meeting. It lasted 5½ hours and would have gone on longer but for the promise of the chairman to hold another meeting soon. One attractive girl summed up the general sentiment:

"It's about time something like this happened. We have got to stand on our own feet. They do everything for you but provide a husband, and I even know girls who they got a husband for. And them what ain't got time to get pregnant, they get foster kids for."[1]

Another factor which should be recognized is that a labor leader is necessarily a politician. His people are so many individuals, and each feels justified in demanding his fancied special due. Our 20th century capitalism—so utterly different from that which Karl Marx saw about him—has unleashed individual wants and aspirations which only a politician can reconcile. He is compelled to seek out solutions that are both expeditious and capable of bringing general satisfaction to a large number of people.

RESOLVING CONFLICTS

Neither management nor labor has any inherent rights. Richard E. Danielson in an article 10 years ago made that plain:

"We may fairly base our definition of rights on the theory that they were and are privileges, granted to us at one time or another as the result of all kinds of pressures and forces, which—if justified in experience—become embedded for a short time or a long time in our fundamental law as rights."[2]

Rights exist only as they are exercised. If a union claims the right to strike, it must strike now and then. If management claims the right to manage, it must manage now and then. Managerial, like kingly, prerogatives will be more respected if they are exercised rather than just claimed as if they were of divine right. Rights are not self-enforcing. They ensue from assertion in practice, and this means conflict.

It is the special genius of labor-management relations in America that a process of accommodation for resolving conflicts is constantly working. We do reconcile seemingly irreconcilable differences. This is accomplished by collective bargaining, which means in one of its facets arbitration; and in still another, the strike. The strike at the expiration of a contract is a proper way of resolving the conflict. It is a test of power. But there is nothing wrong with reasonable power; too much will corrupt its holders and bring them to ruin; but too little makes mice of men.

Our genius for solving conflicts by collective bargaining is now buttressed by the power of taught traditions. Scholars like Sumner H. Slichter and George W. Taylor, to mention only a few distinguished names, have shuttled between theory and practice, using each to enlighten the other. Their pupils, and those of their colleagues, are now a goodly force, armed with the theories, skills, and techniques for resolving conflicts.

WILLING HANDS?

Therefore, I predict enduring unionism. Its power should not be feared or resented. I think of unionism, rather, as a technique which has helped to humanize the industrial revolution, and I expect its power neither to increase greatly nor to diminish substantially.

In another century the prediction might have been otherwise. Even in this century it is necessary to add a footnote. The belatedly accepted but now snowballing concepts of personnel practices tend to demonstrate that unions may become unnecessary. But lingering and bitter memories, such as those of Homestead, will tip the scales in favor of unionism—at least for some generations to come.

In the last analysis there is a power greater than all the others. That is the power of the individual human being to withhold his hands, to refuse to work. This force will continue to have its effect, no matter how highly developed automation becomes. What brings forth the power of the human hand in one century differs from what may bring it forth in another. In the 12th century men sought heaven by carrying stones for the great cathedrals. In the 17th century men listened to their Puritan preachers and sought salvation in close application to trade and business. In the 20th—of course it is too early to be sure—men tend to gather in councils to decide the conditions on which they will work.

Management, whose aptitudes for conception, planning, and execution are so essential to industrialism, so important to the good life, must make its influence felt in those councils—lest our economy die of unwilling hands.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Ferdynand A. Ossendowski, Lenin, God to the Godless (New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1931), p. 250.

[2] Harvey O'Connor, Steel, Dictator (New York, the John Day Co., 1935), pp. 90ff.

[3] Haniel Long, Pittsburgh Memorands (Santa Fe, N. Mex., Writers' editions, 1935), p. 19.

[4] Prof. John T. Dunlop, of Harvard University, who read the manuscript of this article, suggests that my discussion "really refers to some major mass-production industries. Collective bargaining was well established long before 1935 in many industries—printing, construction, garment, coal mining, glass bottles, flints, and even branches of

industries like foundries; also the railroads, etc. The discussion applies particularly to firms in all initial transition to collective bargaining in the important—but not all significant—mass-production industries."

[5] See Mr. Hazard's article Inflation and Strikes, the Atlantic Monthly, February 1958, p. 56; also his letter on page 21 of this issue of Harvard Business Review. (The Editor.)

[6] For a fuller discussion of this point, see Mr. Hazard's article What Economists Don't Know About Wages, Harvard Business Review, January-February 1957, p. 48. (The Editor.)

[7] Clinton S. Golden and Harold J. Ruttenberg, the Dynamics of Industrial Democracy (New York, Harper & Bro., 1942), p. 15.

[8] Richard E. Danielson, Right to Strike, the Atlantic Monthly, February 1947, p. 28.

A Bill To Control the Distribution of Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Judiciary Committee reported a bill aimed at controlling the distribution of obscene literature. In the absence of a more direct method of combating the growing evil that has become the No. 1 enemy of the morals of American youth, I shall vote for this measure. I am not certain that it will be as effective as desired, but I intend to support it if only to serve notice on the purveyors of obscenity that Congress resents their diabolical business and is determined to put a stop to it.

From time to time, an aroused citizenry has undertaken campaigns in local communities to rout out the licentious printed materials sold at newsstands. While such action is commendable and should be encouraged, the effort often falls short because of inadequate legal standards on which to convict the guilty. H. R. 6239 would permit prosecution where obscene literature is received as well as where it is mailed. It is my hope that through this legislation the Federal Bureau of Investigation, postal inspectors, and other law enforcement agencies will be better equipped to get the job done.

To emphasize the perfidious nature of obscene material, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has explained that lewd photos and books—unlike a narcotic cigarette which becomes ashes after degrading a single victim—can be transmitted on an endless round of moral destruction.

In some areas of the country, a number of book dealers have cooperated—whether because of a desire to accept a community obligation or for fear of business reprisals—in removing objectionable material from their shelves. Unfortunately, the effort will fall short so long as there are selfish, ruthless book merchants whose greed for profit supersedes moral responsibility. We need not go far from the Halls of Congress for substantiation of this premise.

Within the very shadows of the Capitol, you will find shelves of licentious material openly displayed to tempt the youth of the city of Washington. Other victims include young visitors whose parents, in cooperation with schools and community organizations, permit them to come here in the hopes that hallowed shrines within this area will serve as an inspiration to make better citizens of these youngsters. Yet here at their disposal are the seeds of corruption and degradation to which even the strongest characters are vulnerable.

No, I am afraid that voluntary action by the smut merchants cannot be relied upon. Recently, as I walked from the Press Building along 14th Street toward my local residence, I noticed a display of knives in the window of a drugstore. Advertised for sale is an arsenal of weapons that included lethal instruments wielded by Nazi storm troopers plus a variety of other fetching blades available to one and all. The only item lacking in this exhibit is a signboard with the words Invitation to Crime. Here, then, are a miscellany of gadgets poised for killing and maiming. On the newsstands are the mediums for stimulating lust and crime. Together, these wares constitute a compounded disgrace to the Nation's Capital.

Perhaps, through H. R. 6239, we shall at least make a start toward driving from our society those degenerate peddlers of moral and mental disease in printed form. Soon thereafter, we trust, legislation to deal with "pushers" of deadly weapons will also be forthcoming.

Costly Omission in Defense Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Sylvester, chief of the Newark News' Washington bureau, has called attention to the fact that President Eisenhower's defense reorganization proposals fail to deal with a major problem. This is the problem of developing a truly unified procurement system. As Mr. Sylvester points out, one of the key recommendations of the second Hoover Commission dealt with this question.

In the hope that the article may encourage Congress to take another look at the matter, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Arthur Sylvester from the Newark Sunday News of April 20, 1958, entitled "Costly Omission in Defense Plan":

COSTLY OMISSION IN DEFENSE PLAN—UNIFIED PROCUREMENT SIGHTED AS REORGANIZATION'S MISSING LINK

(By Arthur Sylvester)

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower's program for reorganization of the Defense Department omits one of the key recommendations for greater unification and increased savings advanced by the second Hoover Commission.

This group, named by Mr. Eisenhower and led by former President Herbert Hoover, put its finger on the activities of the three different buying groups for the Army, Navy, and Air Force as the source of some of the greatest military duplication and extravagance. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a nonpartisan group dedicated to inducing Congress to implement Hoover Commission recommendations, had set its sights this year on passage of legislation to bring about unification in the services of supply.

The committee today approved the President's program as being in line with the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission set up by former President Truman. But it gave no official expression of its chagrin at Mr. Eisenhower's failure to grapple with one of the basic and costly defects of the Military Establishment.

President Eisenhower's omission in his message to Congress on defense reorganization, in his proposed legislation and in public comments since, of any reference to the overlapping, rivalry, and waste in procurement practices has been remarked because he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors Thursday that safety and solvency is the basic aim of his Pentagon plan. Yet for the last 10 years, since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, unifying the military services, civilian critics of military inefficiency have been trying to set up an integrated supply system as a money saver.

Not only the Hoover Commission, but House and Senate committees have turned up dismaying evidence that these 3 procurement services in the 3 military departments exercise overlapping jurisdiction, cause the purchase of more material of common supply like food, clothing, and other items than needed by the Army, Navy, and Air Force and so run up defense costs. These are reflected in the Defense Department budget, which takes 60 cents of each taxpayer dollar.

When the combined defense establishment was created in 1947 the Air Force was an arm of the Army. Once it became an independent unit it set about building up facilities duplicating those of the Army and Navy. Its purchasing arm was one, and a costly one, too, particularly where common use items are involved.

SECRETARY OF SUPPLY

As a result of House committee investigations in 1951, deficiencies in purchase functions especially in automotive material were revealed. Inefficiencies in the procurement, standardization and cataloguing were shown. The picture was one of waste and extravagance running into hundreds of millions of dollars.

At the time Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, offered legislation to create an undersecretary of defense for supply management. His task would be to develop standardized procedures and forms and service function. He would be expected to eliminate duplication and overlapping within and among the supply activities of the military departments in production, procurement, warehousing and distribution.

As Senator DOUGLAS envisioned the official, he would establish and operate depots for common items and other common supply and service installations in the United States. He would develop unified logistics organizations overseas. He would set up a program to systematize scrap recovery, redistribute excess material and surplus disposal, coordinating his operations with other executive agencies. Also he would be expected to develop a corps of professional civilian supply personnel within the Defense Department.

INORDINATE SLOWNESS

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, revealed to the Senate that

when the 1947 unification legislation was being framed, a proposal similar to Senator DOUGLAS' was considered. But it was rejected on the same ground that objection is now being raised against some of President Eisenhower's reorganization program. That is the fear it would concentrate too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense. Since then Mr. SALTONSTALL has changed his mind.

Despite constant congressional prodding, improvement in military supply management is distinguished by inordinate slowness, in the words of one committee. The Military Services agree with the need for improvement. They ask time for further study. They say the suggestion for change apply not to them, but to one of the other services.

Then they proceed as fast as possible to revise their stock management systems in a fashion to widen the differences between the services rather than bring them into harmony. Triplification rather than unification is the result. With it lessened security and greater waste result.

Secretaries of defense come and go and also service secretaries. New Congressmen and new congressional committees try to bring order out of chaos. The Eisenhower administration succeeding the Truman administration started out with promises to bring about a new top-level reassignment of powers.

Now 5 years later President Eisenhower has moved for a major reorganization. But he doesn't propose to touch the separate buying powers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Even his new Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy, declared, at his first public appearance 2 weeks ago at the National Press Club he opposed the Hoover Commission's integrated plan.

All of which goes to show that the one constant in the flurry of surface activity and facade of reform is that each of the uniformed services is dedicated to its own system and procedures, particularly when it comes to spending money and even in the purchase of common items.

An Invocation by Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, D. D., gave the following invocation at the National Conference on the Foreign Aspects of United States National Security at the Hotel Statler on February 25, 1958. I bring it to the attention of Congress at this time because this beautiful prayer is one which men of any religious belief may use in seeking divine guidance for the proper fulfillment of the role of leadership in which the Congress of the United States is cast in these crucial days.

As we approach a summit conference, let us hope that the reality of the brotherhood of man under one God, and the universal desire for peace which exists in the hearts of most men, will become so evident that real strides will be made toward disarmament and ultimately the establishment of a permanent peace.

The prayer is as follows:

"Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us? Why, then, do we deal treacherously each man against his brother profaning the covenant of our fathers?"

O Father of all, through these words of Thy prophet messenger, we would renew our awareness of our duty to emulate Thy love, Thy mercy, Thy loving kindness, in our relations with Thy children everywhere, all of them, by Thy will, our brethren. Impart unto us, O God, an increase of that understanding which would lead us to be worthy and willing instruments of Thy will in bringing hope to those of our brethren whose lot and circumstances are less fortunate than ours. May ours be the wisdom and the honesty to validate their hopes by our sharing with them of Thy benevolence with which we are so richly blessed.

Father, we pray Thee, use us to the end that our brethren everywhere be not saddened and humiliated as they turn trustingly unto us for enlarged encouragement, for a revaluation of our sense of dedication as Thy coworkers, for a generous demonstration of our sense of responsibility as stewards of Thy bounty.

Give us, O Lord, eyes that see the needs of Thy children, ears that hear their pleas, hearts that respond with love for our brethren.

Bless us, O God, as we foregather here to strengthen each other for compassion. Bless them whose words and deeds summon us to duty.

World War I Pension Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared recently in the Plainfield (Ind.) Messenger. The editorial, Have You Considered? was written by the newspaper's editor and publisher, Mrs. Ellen Cochran Curtis, and I know many of my colleagues will agree with me that Mrs. Curtis has ably presented the growing viewpoint among American citizens that veterans of World War I should be granted a Federal pension. Certainly, World War I veterans have not received from the Government the consideration granted to those who served in World War II. With many of them now in actual need because of advanced years and declining health, Congress should give early consideration to a pension bill. The editorial follows:

HAVE YOU CONSIDERED?

There is a movement on foot by veterans of World War I to ask Congress to grant them pensions after they reach the age of 60 and opposition is quite vocal among—of all people veterans of World War II and the Korean police action. The movement is nationwide and attempts are being made to have an organization in each State to be known as Veterans of World War I with no other matter in mind and not in any way opposed to already organized groups such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, or Amvets.

Those who are opposed to such a plan perhaps have not considered all the facts. We have seen men leave for war upon three occasions during our lifetime and it was no different in 1917 when men marched off to serve their country than it was in later years insofar as offering their lives was concerned; the care of those who were wounded did not compare, in the slightest degree, with that provided for subsequent wars; the pay was much less; the facilities were meager; training was inadequate and clothing and supplies were barely sufficient to keep them from suffering; their parents suffered the same losses as parents of World War II; they were denied college education to fight in Europe; they left jobs with no assurance that they would be reinstated upon their return; they were, in addition to being soldiers, flu victims of the 1918 epidemic; they were the victims of the 1931–38 depression; they were the fathers of World War II veterans; they have been the heaviest taxpayers in these years of such fabulous spending; they have paid the bill and have neither sought nor received anything for their service to their country.

Their ages now range from 60 to past 70 and their days are numbered. Many of them are retired and living on fixed incomes which are not sufficient to meet their daily needs.

Many, who seem so horrified at the idea of giving World War I veterans pensions, are those very ones who went to college on the GI bill, who bought their homes on GI loans, who have had preference in many job situations; whose employers were forced to reinstate them in the jobs which they left; they are the ones who received $20 per week for 52 weeks after they were discharged under the 52–20 plan; they have been paid while learning under the GI training bill; they have had magnificent hospital care whenever needed. They are all still young men. Of course, not all of the younger veterans are opposed to the idea.

The cost of all this has been paid by the taxpayers, including World War I veterans. They have not complained. They have wanted their sons and the sons of their buddies to have every consideration.

Now, doesn't it seem just a little selfish to begrudge pensions to these remaining veterans of World War I, all of whom are on the shady side of life? At most, the program would not last many years. Thousands have already died and those who are left are still paying the bill to help educate and house these two younger groups.

With the number involved and their present age, the cost of pensions for them would not be a drop in the bucket compared with that spent on the others.

Money for foreign aid has been poured into other countries to help their people and whether it helps or not, still remains a mooted question. Why not withhold some of the foreign aid and give these older veterans a pension for their declining years?

If you'll give the matter an honest appraisal, we believe you'll agree that veterans of World War I have had pretty shabby treatment in comparison to those of other wars and to that given our foreign neighbors.

Impressions of the TCM-University Contract Project for Agricultural Research and Education in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said on the floor of this

House and in the press regarding our technical-assistance programs to certain friendly nations. One phase of the program, the Technical Assistance Mission in India, is under the direct auspices of Kansas State College, Ohio State University, the University of Illinois, and the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Arthur D. Weber, dean of agriculture of Kansas State College, has made a personal inspection of the program and its effectiveness in India.

I am including this report of this inspection in my extension because I feel it is of interest to the Congress. Dr. Weber is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on agricultural matters in the United States.

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE TCM-UNIVERSITY CONTRACT PROJECT FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN INDIA

(By Arthur D. Weber, dean of agriculture, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.)

It was my privilege to be in India from December 13, 1957, to January 28, 1958, for the purpose of reviewing the work of members of the Kansas State College technical assistance team and observing other phases of the technical assistance contract programs being conducted by the University of Illinois, Ohio State University, and the University of Tennessee. These contacts also afforded me an opportunity to become acquainted with the organizational setup for India's agricultural research, resident instruction and extension service activities. From these observations and through the acquaintances I made among India's agricultural leaders in government and in higher institutions of learning, I gained the impressions which are the basis of this statement. As a further introductory comment, I wish to state that since I concur heartily with the views expressed by Director C. Peairs Wilson in the report he submitted following a visit to India during the summer of 1957, I shall concern myself here primarily with policy matters and an overall critique of the project. His report contains an excellent appraisal of the institutions where Kansas State College team members have been stationed and of administrative and other problems with which they were confronted.

At the outset, I wish to express as my deep conviction that members of the college contract technical assistance teams and the TCM staff, and their wives, deserve high commendation for their good work, which is being carried out under unusual, and in some instances, difficult circumstances. Everywhere I went I found evidences of respect and appreciation for the technical assistance program and those working with it.

In this connection, I feel that I would be remiss if I failed to mention that Dr. Frank W. Parker, chief agriculturist, TCM, New Delhi, is held in the highest regard by Indian agricultural scientists and administrators. His broad outlook and clear understanding of India's basic problems and the role research and education must have in the solution of these problems, have brought to the technical assistance effort the vision and leadership which are essential to the attainment of the objectives agreed upon by the Governments of India and the United States of America.

It was also heartening to observe the support and overall administrative guidance being given to the TCM-university contract project by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Minister-Director Howard Houston.

Interest in and concern for India and the direction she will take in solving her problems also are being manifested by other great world powers. The intensity of this interest and concern is being revealed in numerous ways, not the least of which is by official visits to India by heads of governments and other high officials. Effects of such visits are plainly evident in many places; so much so, in fact, that I keep asking myself whether it would be presumptuous to suggest—even urge—that the President of the United States lend encouragement and strength to our technical assistance program by visiting India.

Impressions gained on my visit to India are forceful reminders of the importance of understanding why the United States is furnishing technical assistance to India and other underdeveloped countries. Such understanding is especially important to those who are directly responsible for technical assistance projects, irrespective of whether their responsibility is that of administrators, technicians, or in some other capacity. For obligations assumed for technical assistance can be discharged most effectively by those whose sense of urgency has been sharpened by an awareness of the issues involved.

Then, too, impressions gained since my return from India have served to emphasize that citizens generally, and especially Government officials and Members of Congress, must have a sympathetic understanding of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries if the best interests of the United States are to be served abroad.

Yet it is not easy to state clearly and in simple terms what are the right reasons for technical assistance. Nor is it worthwhile to belabor the matter by repeatedly defining objectives, especially by public statements in the countries where assistance is being given. There the program—what it is, how it is administered, and what it accomplishes—should be the main public relations effort. Nevertheless, back of the program are the reasons for it; and too frequently, it seems to me, these reasons are not clearly understood either in the United States or India.

Whatever means are used to acquaint people with the reasons for technical assistance, the basis for understanding the program, in my judgment, is that the interests of the United States are promoted when an underdeveloped country resolves its problems and remains democratic and free. It is significant that India has chosen democracy and freedom. China, with many of the same problems as India—food production being the key to most of them—has chosen another route. The implication is crystal clear: Technical assistance has become freedom's first line of defense.

Those who doubt that it is in the best interests of the United States to help underdeveloped countries in their struggle to maintain and increase the food supply would do well, I believe, to ponder on this statement made by Sir John Boyd Orr in his book The White Man's Dilemma: "People will exist on a meager diet if they have never had, and do not know that a better can be made available. But when the food position deteriorates, and food becomes scarcer and dearer, or when hungry people learn that more food can be made available, they naturally blame the government and are easily induced to overthrow it."

Basically, India's problems stem from the mores and the social and economic conditions responsible for a woefully inadequate food supply. In the long run, research and education, as has been demonstrated in many countries, offer the best permanent solution to these problems. Fortunately, India has intelligent, well-educated leaders who appreciate this fact and want to effectuate needed changes and improvements. It is because the problems are so far reaching and the difficulties so great that outside assistance is welcomed by these men, dedicated as they are to the concepts of democracy and freedom.

The ultimate goal must be, it seems to me, a degree of literacy throughout India commensurate with the need for general understanding of the country's pressing problems and of the ways and means of solving them. But the food production problem is so critically urgent and so basic to the solution of all the others that it warrants immediate and special attention.

Here again it is fortunate that India has in its colleges of agriculture and veterinary medicine and in its agricultural research, community development, and extension service setups the basic ingredients for an integrated and coordinated system of research and education—a system that could have a tremendous impact on Indian agriculture by providing a sound basis for greater and more efficient production. I would be less than frank, however, if I failed to record my disappointment in observing that thus far existing agricultural institutions and agencies have contributed little to the well-being and economic advancement of India's farmers and stockmen.

On the other hand, I found that Indian institutions and officials recognize this shortcoming, and, as a consequence, consider the TCM-university contract project for agricultural research and education useful in promoting Government of India interests. I do not wish to imply that Indian cooperation leaves nothing to be desired. In some instances, complacency and satisfaction with things as they are were plainly evident. And occasionally it appeared that cooperation was regarded as the price that had to be paid for equipment and commodities. I am happy to be able to report, however, that these were exceptions; in the vast majority of cases Indian cooperation appeared to be wholehearted and satisfactory.

It is not easy to measure the progress that is being made in the attainment of this project's objectives. It is significant, it seems to me, that ways and means of attaining objectives are being discussed and implemented. There is growing understanding and appreciation of the reasons for the success of the land-grant college system in the United States. Throughout India, agricultural leaders, largely, I believe, because of our technical assistance effort, are beginning to realize that agricultural research, resident teaching, and extension service activities are not unrelated, separate programs with incompatible procedures and objectives to be guarded jealously by their respective proponents. Instead, there is an increasing awareness of the urgent need to integrate these activities at all levels, from top administration to the farms, where in the final analysis progress in the attainment of the basic objectives of technical assistance will be measured. How to effectuate such integration presents many knotty problems, owing to the fact that marked administrative and working realinements will be necessary to assure real progress.

How to apply the results of agricultural research is being demonstrated by members of technical assistance teams in such things as grassland improvements, poultry, and dairy production, crops and soils test plots, and the training of extension leaders and specialists. Participation of team members in research and teaching conferences is another important contribution to the overall project.

Training of Indian participants in American colleges and universities deserves special emphasis in any appraisal of the progress being made toward the attainment of basic objectives, in my estimation. For these men will bring enhanced technical competence to their home institutions and a better understanding of how to identify and solve farm problems. They will also have observed the operations of a land-grant college or university and thus will appreciate why the integration of agricultural research, resident teaching and extension are so essential in

attaining greater production and improved efficiency.

The most important consideration with respect to the TCM-University Contract Project, as I view it, is whether India will realine her agricultural institutions and agencies within the rural university concept. I shall not dwell on what this would entail since several publications are available on the subject. Suffice it to say that it is my deep conviction that this development, more than any other, will assure the attainment of basic objectives which promote the interests of both the United States and the Government of India.

I also gained the impression that this realinement is something that will have to be worked out for each institution in accordance with broad guiding principles but without adhering to any fixed or stereotyped pattern of organizational structure. This is necessary, it seems to me, because each institution has its own unique situation, resulting from the circumstances of its origin and development and from its relationships with other institutions, including those of government.

Recent developments at the Coimatore Agricultural College illustrate how rural university status can be attained through compromise and adaptation to the institution's own special needs and requirements. And the proposed U. P. Agricultural University at Tarai State Farm would provide an excellent opportunity to demonstrate how an institution of this kind should be organized and run. It would also serve as a key university or model for new development and even for realinements elsewhere in the country.

As one becomes acquainted with this project, the possible need to extend it for a number of years—perhaps 10 or even longer—takes on added meaning. The guiding principle in this regard, in my estimation, should be the extent to which the basic objectives have been attained, and India's ability to carry on without outside technical assistance.

It seems to me that allotments of funds for the purchase of commodities, except books, could be withdrawn first. Equipment and other commodity purchases should be handled by TCM instead of by the colleges and universities, as at present, in my judgment.

Allotments for training of participants in American universities and colleges probably should be withdrawn last; but even after such training has been discontinued, funds might well be made available for maintaining professional contacts among these men in India and for continuing relationships with their American counterparts and American institutions.

It will be important in the years immediately ahead to follow through with technical assistance to specific projects; otherwise, apparent gains could easily be lost. A good example is the grassland improvement project at Rajkot.

I have recommended that the Kansas State College contract be extended to 1960, and that extensions thereafter be considered in the light of needs and the ability of the college to continue to release key personnel to the project.

It is important that staff members assigned to work on TCM-University contract projects be considered as partners in the total technical assistance effort. Fortunately, working relationships are improving as a result of the establishment of a contract coordination unit in TCM. It is to be hoped also that group leaders, and officials of TCM and of the Government of India will see to it that insofar as possible team members will not have reason to complain because advance arrangements were not made for their families' personal living accommodations. Similarly, it would appear that frustrations arising because of program difficulties and misunderstandings could be minimized by careful, initial planning with the Indian college before the team member's arrival in India. Yet it should be made crystal clear to the prospective team member, it seems to me, that his success will be determined to a large degree by his own resourcefulness and patience. A man's personal attitudes and psychological fitness for a foreign assignment should count heavily when team members are being recruited.

Finally, I should like to observe that, in my judgment, tangible results from technical assistance when expressed in terms of increased production and improved efficiency of Indian farm operations will come very slowly. The magnitude of the difficulties to be overcome and the nature of the problems to be solved are such as to cause one to wonder whether changes can be brought about in time to attain basic objectives of the TCM-University contract project.

Yet I believe that there will be time enough to get the job done because: (1) Indian farmers love the land and possess the inherent qualities of interest and intelligence necessary to bring about significant changes and improvements; (2) technical assistance, through coordination of agricultural research, resident teaching, and extension service activities, can reach the Indian farmer and cause him to change his viewpoints and practices; and (3) India's academic, scientific, and political leaders will meet this challenging opportunity to advance their country's interests by providing the administrative framework, organizational structure, and support necessary for the evolutionary developments that have been envisioned for the institutions primarily responsible for the destiny of Indian agriculture.

Something Wrong in Brussels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Chicago Daily News of April 26, 1958, I came across a dispatch from Brussels by William H. Stoneman that I feel should be brought to the immediate attention of the House. If agriculture and labor have been shoved into the background at the exhibition in Brussels, and the life of the average American man and woman obscured from view to make way for tinseled glamor, something is wrong in Brussels.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include Mr. Stoneman's article as follows:

(By William H. Stoneman)

BRUSSELS.—Americans attending the Brussels World Fair have been asking themselves a question that might merit general consideration at home:

"What are the things about the United States of which Americans should be proudest, and for which they should be most grateful?"

The question arises because the American section of the Brussels Fair fails to emphasize those very things which make the United States the finest country on earth in which to be born, grow up, and spread one's wings.

Thinking Americans, who have seen here the pitiful tribute to their country, have responded with many ideas for those who plan future American exhibits at international expositions.

Perhaps the most convincing suggestion doesn't seem to have occurred to the planners on this occasion, and it may not occur to many people in Washington.

It is that the United States differs from most others because it is the country where an ordinary citizen, starting life from scratch, can make the most of all the talents that he has inherited.

Equally important—if those talents do not permit him to rise to the top and he remains—like most of the 173 million Americans—just an ordinary citizen, he can still live a free and decent existence, with a vastly higher material standard than ordinary people in other countries of the world.

The fact that the United States is primarily a country of ordinary people seems to have escaped the officials who planned our exhibit at this fair.

It seems incredible but it is true that our pavilion here has a Wall Street exhibit but (as far as we could tell from several hours of wandering around the premises) no exhibit to advertise the accomplishments of trade unionism in boosting the American worker's standard of living.

You might think that trade unionism was considered un-American.

The foolish suggestion has even been made that somebody in Washington, name unknown, has decreed that "we must not advertise our material well being because it will make Europeans jealous or dissatisfied."

Whatever the cause, the fact remains that the Russians in their immense pavilion right next door advertise the spurious delights of life under socialism without any real competition from us.

Their preposterous claim, "every Russian worker gets a free vacation of at least 3 weeks at the seashore," is not countered by anything to illustrate the fact that most American workmen are able to tour the country in their own family cars at vacation time paying their own expenses out of their own decent wages.

There is likewise little or nothing in the way of a tribute to one of the key factors in the development and continued prosperity of the United States—the skill and hard work of the average American.

American farm organizations also merit certificates for missing the ball in not helping give Europeans a good picture of the American farmer and his work.

Ditto the trade unions themselves.

You have the idea as you wander around here that all too many citizens connected with the performance haven't the slightest conception of what makes America click.

You are bound to wonder whether the people who chose them had any better idea.

The Medical, Legal, Literary, and Political Status of Ezra Weston (Loomis) Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1957, I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 403, calling for a full and complete investigation of the almost legendary Ezra Pound case to determine where there is justification for his—Mr. Pound's—continued incarceration in St. Elizabeths Hospital.

A week later, a Senator and I—acting independently of each other—asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to undertake for us a thorough study of the medical, legal, literary, and political status of Ezra Pound.

During the past 7 months I have watched with great interest the unfolding of the Pound story. The Library of Congress report, which I had requested, was completed in March and submitted to me at this time. I was happy to see that this authoritative report was used by Mr. Pound's attorney, Thurman Arnold, and his associates of the Arnold, Fortas & Porter firm, and by poet Robert Frost in their presentation of Mr. Pound's case to the court on April 14. The report was prepared by Mr. H. A. Sieber, of the Legislative Reference Service, and to him I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness, and to express my deep appreciation of the meticulous work he did on it, the extra hours of work he put in on careful research and the authentic documentation he gave it.

As you know, on April 18, the 15-year old indictment against Ezra Pound was dismissed in United States District Court by Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws.

When late last summer Mr. Sieber first examined the court records of the Pound case, he noted that the docket had been stamped in red: "Case closed." Of course, it was not really until a few days ago, after Judge Laws had dismissed the charges against the old poet, that the case was indeed officially closed.

As a teacher of poetry to the 20th century—and whatever centuries are lucky enough to follow—Ezra Pound will be long remembered by the literary historians. As a poet himself and as the discoverer of poets and inventor of poetry for our time, he will not be forgotten.

I do not know very much about Mr. Pound's economic theories and his views of history, but I do know this much; he should not have been in a mental institution for 13 years without good medical reasons. If he is sane enough to live in the community, as the psychiatrists have been saying, he should be living in the community—and I am pleased that the Attorney General and the court agreed.

Because of the intense public and scholarly interest in the Ezra Pound matter, I am placing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in five instalments, the Legislative Reference Service report by H. A. Sieber, Senior Specialists Division. The report, issued earlier in March, has been revised as of April 14, 1958. The first part here follows:

THE MEDICAL, LEGAL, LITERARY, AND POLITICAL STATUS OF EZRA WESTON (LOOMIS) POUND (1885-)—SELECTED FACTS AND COMMENTS—PART I

(By H. A. Sieber, Research Assistant, Senior Specialists Division, the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, March 31, 1958, Revised April 14, 1958)

This report was prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress pursuant to a congressional request in August 1957 for as much information as is available on the literary, political, legal, and medical status of Mr. Pound.

The report presents a superficial chronology of Mr. Pound's career, 1885 to date, and a brief discussion of some of the considerations entering into the Pound case.

Many of the phases of the Ezra Pound case have remained quite controversial throughout the 13 years since Mr. Pound was apprehended in Italy in May 1945. This report does not attempt to resolve these controversies; however, it does reflect a thorough search of the available primary and secondary source materials at the Library of Congress.

The Government's case against Mr. Pound is fairly well-known. It appears that some of the arguments, and the admittedly fugitive facts supporting the arguments presumed to be favorable to Mr. Pound's release from St. Elizabeths Hospital, are not quite so well-known.

THE BEGINNINGS: FROM IDAHO TO POETHOOD

Ezra Weston (Loomis) Pound was born on October 30, 1885, in Hailey, Idaho.

His father was with the United States land office at Hailey; his paternal grandfather was a Member of Congress from Wisconsin;[1] and poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow—by way of his mother—was a distant relative.[2] The Hailey Times of November 28, 1957, commented: "Pound left Hailey as a baby, grew up to poethood and one of the most controversial careers of our time."[3]

At the age of 15, Ezra Pound entered the University of Pennsylvania, and a year later, "to avoid irrelevant subjects," he enrolled as a special student. At the university, young Ezra and William Carlos Williams became friends. In 1904, Williams wrote his mother:

"Pound is a fine fellow; he is the essence of optimism and has a cast-iron faith that is something to admire. * * * He is just the man for me. But not one person in a thousand likes him, and a great many people detest him and why? Because he is so darned full of conceits and affectation. * * * His friends must be all patience in order to find him out and even then you must not let him know it, for he will immediately put on some artificial mood and be really unbearable. It is too bad, for he loves to be liked, yet there is some quality which makes him too proud to try to please people. I am sure his only fault is an exaggeration of a trait that in itself is good and in every way admirable. He is afraid of being taken in if he trusts his really tender heart to mercies of a cruel crowd and so keeps it hidden and trusts no one. Oh what a common fault it is—this false pride."[4]

At 18, Pound transferred to Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. A member of the Hamilton faculty described Pound's work as a student as "often brilliant, but erratic."[5]

Pound was graduated at 20 and, as a Fellow in Romance languages and literature, became "Instructor with professorial functions" at the University of Pennsylvania. Louis Untermayer, in his Makers of the Modern World, has described the next brief period of Pound's career as follows:

"Seemingly destined for an academic career, he took his master's degree at 21, went to Spain, France, and Italy, and spent a year on research for a thesis on the Spanish dramatist, Lope de Vega. Upon his return toward the end of 1907, he was invited to be on the faculty of Wabash College in Crawfordsville, Ind., "the Athena of the West," Pound satirically recalled, "a town with literary traditions, Lew Wallace, author of Ben Hur, having died there." He was dismissed after 4 months, charged with "unconventionality," "bohemianism," and other more ambiguous misdemeanors, "all accusations," said Pound, "having been ultimately refuted save that of being the Latin Quarter type."[6]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Osborn and Gronert, in their centennial history of Wabash College, observed:

"[Pound] came in 1907 to take over from Professor King's department of Modern Languages the classes in French and Spanish. * * * From the hour of his first class there was no doubt at Wabash of his scholarship nor of the brilliance of his mind. Nor was there any doubt that he on the one hand and the rest of Wabash College on the other were to find one another extraordinary, and at certain points funny."[7]

AN AMERICAN IN EUROPE

Pound took off for Europe. His first book, A Lume Spente, was published at Venice in 1908. In London and Paris, he befriended and helped many young writers—including Robert Frost, Ford Madox Ford, T. S. Eliot, James Joyce, W. B. Yeats, Jean Cocteau, and Ernest Hemingway—and earned a reputation as a poet and critic of the first order. It is generally considered that Mr. Pound played an important, if not the most important, role in articulating the new poetry of the 20th century, and he has been called the discoverer of poets and inventor of poetry for our time.

Carl Sandburg wrote in 1916:

"If I were driven to name one individual who, in the English language, by means of his examples of creative art in poetry, has done most of living men to incite new impulses in poetry, the chances are I would name Ezra Pound.

"Let some of those thrusting spears and inkpots at Ezra Pound try to be fair enough to read him. * * * He is worth having."[8]

In 1957, Carl Sandburg reiterated his view of Mr. Pound's poetry:

"The man in the hospital for the mentally retarded—there has been no money in what he has written though there's a high importance attached to it. * * * In Poetry Magazine in the year 1915 [sic] I had an appreciation of him, one of the most affirmative pieces of writing that I ever did. I'm sorry for Ezra but I go on reading him and will as long as I live. * * * Oh Greek and Latin and Shakespeare and Ezra Pound."[9]

In 1925, Mr. Pound moved from Paris to Rapallo, Italy, a resort on the Lugurian Riviera. There he made his residence for 20 years.

Mr. Pound's preoccupations during these 20 years have been described as follows:

"In the comparative peace of the Rapallo of those days he intensified his creative and critical activities. Never had his energy been more unflagging. Never had his concern for the arts been deeper or more embracing. He worked on an opera on Cavalcanti; he wrote a book on economics; several on literary subjects; he delivered lectures; he continued his Cantos. In the town hall of Rapallo he held concerts where, by means of programs of skillfully arranged contracts, he succeeded in drawing attention to the works of composers, such as William Young and Vivaldi, who was not then performed as he is now. First-rate executants played at these concerts for a division of the gate. They considered the work Pound was doing worth doing. After the first concerts held in the local cinema the municipal authorities allowed Pound to use the town hall free of charge. [The fact that the municipal authorities backed the Rapallo concerts was not calculated to prejudice Pound against the regime; but it must be emphasized that he never accepted the regime on its face value. He thought it had a better record of achievement, in certain respects, than any other government of the time; but that was all.] Pound's Chinese studies, started in 1913, began about the middle thirties to bear fruit. In numerous pamphlets and prose books the pragmatic Confucian ethic took its place, interlocking in Pound's thought, with Social Credit, the teachings of Jefferson and Adams, and Cath-

Footnotes at end of speech.

olic and Fascist theories of the corporate state, to which, from the time he had settled in Italy, he had become increasingly drawn." [10]

In 1948 some 60 citizens of Rapallo, headed by the mayor, wrote:

"The undersigned, who knew the American writer Ezra Pound in Rapallo, where he had lived since 1923, declare it is not true that he took part in Fascist activities in this city. There is no record of his presence at local meetings, nor was he a member of Fascist organizations.

"He was always considered an American citizen, a friend of Italy, openly sympathetic with certain Fascist principles of a social-economic nature, and with the struggle against communism, which he believed was a danger to the United States themselves. During the war Mr. Pound continued to reside in Rapallo, and from his mode of life it was evident that he did not enjoy privileges, but that he even suffered hardships and economic privations.

"Since it is an evident fact that he never acted from motives of profit, he was able to keep the respect of even those neighbors of his who disagreed with his political opinions.

"During the long years of residence in Rapallo, Mr. Pound's activity was always artistic and cultural, as illustrated in his writings in literary criticism and political economy.

"He always conducted himself properly and never engaged in anti-Semitic activity." [11]

In 1939, Mr. Pound came to the United States for a visit and especially to accept an honorary degree from his alma mater Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. The citation presented to Mr. Pound read as follows:

"Ezra Pound: native of Idaho, graduate of Hamilton College in the class of 1905, poet, critic, and prose writer of great distinction. Since completing your college career you have had a life full of significance in the arts. You have found that you could work more happily in Europe than in America and so have lived most of the past 30 years an expatriate making your home in England, France, and Italy, but your writings are known wherever English is read. Your feet have trodden paths, however, where the great reading public could give you few followers—into Provencal and Italian poetry, into Anglo-Saxon and Chinese. From all of these excursions you have brought back treasure. Your translations from the Chinese have, for example, led one of the most gifted of contemporary poets to call you the inventor of Chinese poetry of our time. Your Alma Mater, however, is an old lady who has not always understood where you were going, but she has watched you with interest and pride if not always with understanding. The larger public has also been at times amazed at your political and economic as well as your artistic credo, and you have retaliated by making yourself—not unintentionally perhaps—their gadfly. Your range of interests is immense, and whether or not your theories of society survive, your name is permanently linked with the development of English poetry in the 20th century. Your reputation is international, you have guided many poets into new paths, you have pointed new directions, and the historian of the future in tracing the development of your growing mind will inevitably, we are happy to think, be led to Hamilton and to the influence of your college teachers. You have ever been a generous champion of younger writers as well as artists in other fields, and for this fine and rare human quality and for your own achievements in poetry and prose, we honor you." [12]

Footnotes at end of speech.

While in the United States, Mr. Pound "succeeded in arousing bitter controveries by his praise of fascism and his favorable comparison of Mussolini to Jefferson." [13]

Upon returning to Italy, Mr. Pound continued his bitter denunciation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the American educational system, Jewish "usurers," Winston Churchill, Joseph Stalin, and bad poetry.

BETWEEN 1940 AND 1945

Mr. Pound began broadcasting over Radio Rome about literary and economic matters and these broadcasts became a soapbox for the world famous poet and amateur economist. Then came Pearl Harbor.[14]

Mr. Pound chose to continue broadcasting.

The monitored transcripts of his broadcasts may be examined on microfilm at the Library of Congress. Significant although not entirely representative extracts from those broacasts appear as an appendix to this report.

Whether these broadcasts represented acts of treason against the United States [15] is not a matter for decision of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

On July 26, 1943, a District of Columbia grand jury indicted Ezra Pound and seven other Americans, who were broadcasting from Italy and Germany, for treason.[16]

Upon hearing in Italy that he had been indicted Mr. Pound wrote a letter, dated August 25, 1943, to the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, protesting the indictment. The Swiss legation at Rome forwarded the letter through the American Secretary of State. Mr. Pound, in his letter, wrote:

"I have not spoken with regard to this war, but in protest against a system which creates one war after another, in series and on system. I have not spoken to the troops, and have not suggested that the troops should mutiny or revolt.

* * * * *

"At any rate, a man's duties increase with his knowledge. A war between the United States and Italy is monstrous and should not have occurred. And a peace without justice is not peace but merely a prelude to future wars. Someone must take count of these things. And having taken count must act on his knowledge, admitting that his knowledge is partial and his judgment subject to error.

"Very truly yours,

"EZRA POUND." [16a]

1945

On May 5, 1945, Mr. Pound surrendered near Genoa. He was sent to the METOUSA Disciplinary Training Center at Pisa where he was incarcerated for over half a year. When Pound was first brought to Pisa, he was put in a specially-constructed, grilled security cage. He was kept in this cage for several weeks after which he was transferred to a pyramidal tent. Maj. Julian Le Page, training officer at the training center, now stationed at the Pentagon, said: "I never heard anything other than the fact that Pound was cooperative and that is why I think he was moved out of the cage."

The following sketch of the cage was made from a United States Army photograph:

On November 26, 1945, Mr. Pound was reindicted on 19 "overt acts of treason." Seven Italians who said they had seen Mr. Pound make "anti-Allied" broadcasts from Rome and Milan had flown to the United States voluntarily in early November to testify before the District of Columbia Federal grand jury which returned the indictment.

The grand jurors presented:

"That Ezra Pound * * * at all times * * * and now * * * a citizen of the United States of America and a person owing allegiance to the United States of America * * * at Rome, Italy and other places within the Kingdom of Italy * * * in violation of [his] duty of allegiance, knowingly, intentionally, willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, traitorously and treasonably did adhere to the enemies of the United States, to wit; the Kingdom of Italy and the military allies of the said Kingdom of Italy, with which the United States at all times since December 11, 1941 * * * have been at war, giving to the said enemies of the United States aid and comfort within the United States and elsewhere." [17]

Footnotes at end of speech.

On November 27, 1945, Mr. Pound stood mute on arraignment and a plea of not guilty to that indictment was entered by the Court. On December 4, 1945, Mr. Pound was admitted to Gallinger Hospital and 10 days later, in pursuance of an appointment by the Court, Drs. Winfred Overholser, Marion R. King, Joseph L. Gilbert, and Wendell Muncie submitted a joint written report to the Court that they had thoroughly examined Mr. Pound and that it was their unanimous opinion that he was suffering from a paranoid state which rendered him mentally unfit to advise properly with counsel or to participate intelligently and reasonably in his own defense. Mr. Pound, they said, was insane and mentally unfit for trial. The text of the letter from the four psychiatrists, dated December 14, 1945, follows:

"The undersigned hereby respectfully report the results of their mental examination of Ezra Pound, now detained in Gallinger Hospital by transfer for observation from the District jail on a charge of treason. Three of us (Drs. Gilbert King, and Overholser) were appointed by Your Honor to make this examination. At our suggestion, and with your approval, Dr. Wendell Muncie, acting upon the request of counsel for the accused, made an examination with us and associated himself with us in this joint report. Dr. Muncie spent several hours with the defendant, both alone and with us, on December 13, 1945, and the others of us have examined the defendant each on several occasions, separately and together, in the period from his admission to Gallinger Hospital on December 4, 1945, to December 13, 1945. We have had available to us the reports of laboratory, psychological and special physical examinations of the defendant and considerable material in the line of his writings and biographical data.

"The defendant, now 60 years of age and in generally good physical condition, was a precocious student, specializing in literature. He has been a voluntary expatriate for nearly 40 years, living in England and France, and for the past 21 years in Italy, making an uncertain living by writing poetry and criticism. His poetry and literary criticisms have achieved considerable recognition, but of recent years his preoccupation with monetary theories and economics has apparently obstructed his literary productivity. He has long been recognized as eccentric, querulous, and egocentric.

"At the present time he exhibits extremely poor judgment as to his situation, its seriousness and the manner in which the charges are to be met. He insists that his broadcasts were not treasonable, but that all of his radio activities have stemmed from his self-appointed mission to save the Constitution. He is abnormally grandiose, is expansive and exuberant in manner, exhibiting pressure of speech, discursiveness, and distractibility.

"In our opinion, with advancing years his personality, for many years abnormal, has undergone further distortion to the extent that he is now suffering from a paranoid state which renders him mentally unfit to advise properly with counsel or to participate intelligently and reasonably in his own defense. He is, in other words, insane and mentally unfit for trial, and is in need of care in a mental hospital."

Footnotes at end of speech.

1946 TO 1954

On January 18, 1946, the Court heard and granted a motion for a formal statutory inquisition to determine Mr. Pound's sanity.

The four psychiatrists, Drs. King, Muncie, Gilbert, and Overholser, who signed the above letter, testified before the inquisition on February 13, 1946, that Mr. Pound was mentally incompetent to stand trial. Pertinent extract from their testimony appear in an appendix to this report.

The Court instructed the specially-impanelled jury:

"Under the state of the law, you are not bound by what they say * * * in a case of this type where the Government and the defense representatives have united in a clear and unequivocal view with regard to the situation, I presume you will have no difficulty in making up your mind."

The jury retired to consider its verdict, and 3 minutes later returned with the finding that the respondent Ezra Pound was of unsound mind.[18]

Following the verdict, Mr. Pound was committed to the custody of the United States and was confined in St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Pound was placed in a criminal lunatic ward at St. Elizabeths, but in 1947, following an unsuccessful motion for bail for Mr. Pound, he was removed to Center Building where he has been quartered for 11 years now.

During the period Mr. Pound has been incarcerated at St. Elizabeths, he has continued to write poetry and to receive visitors, including his wife, Dorothy Shakespear Pound, who has been living a few blocks from the hospital in southeast Washington.

In 1949, Mr. Pound was awarded the Library of Congress-Bollingen prize of $1,000 for "the highest achievement of American poetry in 1948," his Pisan Cantos. Mr. Pound had been selected for the award by a jury of Fellows of the Library of Congress in American Letters. This award created quite a furor because the recipient poet was an "accused traitor."

Robert Hillyer, in the Saturday Review of Literature, wrote: "It is ironic that among the conditions for the award is the stipulation that the recipient must be an American citizen. By some tenuous legality, he may be a citizen, but he knows nothing and cares less about civil obligations * * *. The 1949 Bollingen award is a permanent disgrace."[19]

Even Radio Moscow got into the act, commenting: "One is prompted to ask, How low and miserable must be the quality of modern bourgeois poetry in America if even the insane and verified ravings of a confessed madman could win a literary prize?"[20]

The Librarian of Congress, Luther H. Evans, in a letter to the Saturday Review, said:

"In my many years of study and teaching in the field of political science, I came to regard a political test for art and poetry as a sign of dictatorial, illiberal, undemocratic approach to matters of the mind. * * * I do not feel that it would be proper for me to override the judgment of persons * * * charged with the responsibility to make the judgment [to select the Bollingen prize-winner]."[21]

The Library discontinued its sponsorship of this poetry prize. Mr. Pound continued to be famous as a poet but more and more frequently he was described in the press as the "mad poet" or the "insane traitor."

THE PAST 4 YEARS

In 1955, Prof. Giovanni Giovannini, of the Catholic University of America, wrote that the American press had "maintained a prolonged silence on opinion and sentiment favoring Pound."[22]

The year before, Ernest Hemingway had declared that Pound "should be freed to go and write poems in Italy where he is loved and understood. * * * I believe this would be a good year to release poets."[23]

In December 1955, Sam Hynes wrote in Commonweal magazine, a liberal Catholic weekly, that "it is only prudent to remind ourselves that one room at St. Elizabeths is a closet which contains a national skeleton."[24]

Life magazine, in an editorial, quoting the Hynes statement, urged that "the arguments for quashing the indictment against Ezra Pound should be publicly considered."[25]

New Republic magazine on April 1, 1957, published an editorial declaring: "And yet we would like to see the Government give this old man and this eminent poet his freedom—if not as an act of justice, then as an act of largesse."[26]

Harold Lord Varney in American Mercury, April 1957, suggested that Mr. Pound had been put away as a matter of political convenience "rather than to air his mishandled case in the public glare of the courts." Varney added: "The American Civil Liberties Union does not appear to be concerned over this particular miscarriage of justice."[27]

In August 1957, the American Civil Liberties Union declared that "for a number of years" it had been concerned over Mr. Pound's continued confinement at St. Elizabeths Hospital. The ACLU offered support for "a possible legal challenge."[28]

On August 21, 1957, Representative USHER BURDICK, of North Dakota, introduced House Resolution 403:

"Whereas Ezra Pound has been incarcerated in Saint Elizabeths Hospital for the past 12 years on the assumption that he is insane; and

"Whereas many people visit him there and are convinced that he is not insane:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee; is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the sanity of Ezra Pound, in order to determine whether there is justification for his continued incarceration in Saint Elizabeths Hospital."[29]

The September 1957 issue of Esquire magazine contained a thorough article on the Pound case by Richard Rovere. For several months thereafter, Esquire published many letters to the editor, many from recognized literary figures, most of which strongly endorsed the immediate release of the aging poet.[30]

On March 16, 1958, the Washington Sunday Star reported that the Attorney General, recently urged by poet Robert Frost to review Mr. Pound's case, was studying the possibility of quashing the indictment against Mr. Pound. According to the Star, a Justice Department spokesman "acknowledged that 'certain preliminary steps had been taken to make it easier to reach a decision.'"[31]

On March 23, 1958, the Washington Post and Times-Herald published an editorial:

"It seems highly improbable that Pound, now 72, would be a menace to anyone. If the psychiatrists so conclude, we can see no reason why he should not be released under conditions that would assure him proper care and supervision. It is not reasonable to suppose that the Department of Justice would have any interest in pressing charges against him again * * * the Department could reasonably clear the way for his release at any time the psychiatrists conclude he would be harmless and that the proposed arrangements for his care are adequate."[32]

On April 1, the Attorney General, William P. Rogers, commented at a press conference:

"The doctors have taken the position he [Pound] is not competent to stand trial and they have some doubt if he will be. * * * Is there point in keeping him if he never can be tried?"[33]

The Washington law firm of Arnold, Fortas, and Porter announced on April 5 that, in "the public interest, without a fee, following a request by Robert Frost," it had agreed to represent Mrs. Pound in Mr. Pound's behalf.[34]

The Louisville Courier-Journal asked: "Is Ezra Pound shut up in a mental institution because he is a traitor or because he is insane?" The Kentucky newspaper asked for "peace, of a sort, for Ezra Pound."[35]

On April 6, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, protested any plan to release the poet from St. Elizabeths. Said Representative CELLER:

"I don't care how long he has been in there, maybe we want to keep him in a little longer. * * * I can't understand how they'd let him out scot free. I can't conceive of that.

"Many of our men lost their lives as a result of his exhortations."[36]

The next day, Mr. Pound's law firm issued a statement as follows:

"We have been retained by Mrs. Ezra Pound to institute legal proceedings to secure Mr. Pound's release from St. Elizabeths and to dismiss the 13-year-old indictment.

"We are informed that Mr. Pound's mental condition is such that he will never be able to stand trial, although he is not a danger to himself or society.

"Mrs. Pound has advised us that if Mr. Pound is released they will proceed to Italy where Mr. Pound has spent many years of his life.

"Dismissal of the indictment will not prevent reindictment and trial of Mr. Pound for treason if warranted and if, at some later time, he should recover his mental competence. There is no statute limiting the time when a person may be indicted for treason. However, Government psychiatrists who have studied Mr. Pound for 13 years have stated that there is no prospect of his recovery.

"It is intended that formal legal papers on behalf of Mrs. Pound will be filed in a few days."[37]

On April 9, the Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc. called Representative CELLER's recent remarks "at once absurd and irresponsible. These statements assume as conclusions of law and fact accusations that even the administration that indicted him did not presume to make. * * * Congressman CELLER's statement show him to be more militant than judicial."[38]

The London Times on the same day editorialized:

"Mr. Pound's countrymen will strengthen us in our knowledge that they are fundamentally and traditionally magnanimous if they follow the lead already given by their Attorney General, and allow this strange man a chance to fulfill himself."[39]

The Washington Star, on April 10, concluded: "Considering all the circumstances, it does not seem to us that the ends of justice will be served by the continued confinement of this man."[40]

On April 14, Thurman Arnold and William D. Rogers of Arnold, Fortas, and Porter, filed a motion to dismiss indictment in the case of United States of America versus Ezra Pound. The motion stated:

"If the indictment against him is not dismissed he will die in St. Elizabeths Hospital * * * There can be no benefit to the United States in maintaining him indefinitely in custody as a public charge because that custody cannot contribute to his recovery and defendant's release would not prejudice the interests of the United States. The inevitable effect of failure to dismiss the indictment will be life imprisonment on account of alleged acts and events which can never be put to proof."[41]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Filed with the motion was an affidavit by Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, declaring that Mr. Pound was "permanently and incurably insane," that "there is a strong probability that the commission of the crimes charged was the result of insanity," and that "further confinement can serve no therapeutic purpose." Dr. Overholser stated that Mr. Pound was "not a dangerous person and his release would not endanger the safety of other persons or the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States."[42]

Robert Frost, as friend of the Court, also filed a statement through Mr. Pound's attorneys, saying:

"None of us can bear the disgrace of our letting Ezra Pound come to his end where he is. It would leave too woeful a story in American literature * * * I can see how the Department of Justice would hesitate from fear of looking more just to a great poet than it would be to a mere nobody."[43]

Hearing on the motion to dismiss indictment has been set for April 18, 1958, before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

NOTE AS OF APRIL 18, 1958

The 15-year old treason charges against Ezra Pound were dismissed on April 18, 1958, by the District Court of the United States of the District of Columbia, Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws presiding.

Attorney Thurman Arnold (of Arnold, Fortas, and Porter) told the court that he was representing Mr. Pound "at almost unanimous request of leading writers of the United States and England." In arguing the motion to dismiss indictment, Mr. Arnold said "I do not think it necessary to raise the question of constitutionality." The United States Attorney Oliver Gasch, stated:

"I have studied the affidavit * * * and am satisfied as to the present competency of the defendant to stand trial. * * * Therefore, I do not oppose; in fact I consent to Mr. Arnold's motion."

Judge Laws asked the Government's attorney whether the Government still desired to study the possibility of Mr. Pound's mental incompetence at the time of the alleged crimes. Mr. Gasch replied that "it would be virtually impossible to get [such] evidence in this case," because of the considerable passage of time.[44]

Twelve years ago, Attorney Julian Cornell (then representing Mr. Pound) had written Mrs. Pound that "sooner or later," in the absence of any medical reason to confine Mr. Pound, and "if the case is decided without intolerance and in accordance with legal principles," Mr. Pound would have to be released. Attorney Cornell, however, suggested the case would "not be an easy one".[45]

On April 18, 1958, the Associated Press reported that Jerome, Idaho, radio station KART had offered Mr. Pound a job as radio news commentator.[46] Attorney Arnold told the court that Mr. Pound "expects to go to Italy after he is released."

On April 17, the Wall Street Journal editorialized that in the Pound case, "a little magnanimity would seem to be in order."[47] A letterwriter to the Washington Post expressed opposition to Mr. Pound's release because "the war with Germany and Japan * * * is not forgotten, by the Gold Star Mothers of which I am one."[48]

---

[1] Pound, Thaddeus Coleman (1833–1914). See Biographical Directory of the American Congress 1774–1949. Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1950, p. 1698. (Representative Pound, arguing for his bill establishing industrial training schools for Indian youth, said to the Congress: "give them spades in place of powder, plows in place of guns, opportunity rather than hymns and prayers. Encourage citizenship." (The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 17, 1882, pp. 6152–6153.))

[2] See materials in Library of Congress, local history and genealogy room. (Wadsworth, Loomis, Weston, Coleman, and Pound families.)

[3] Ezra Pound Must be Off, or Why Did He Leave Wood River Valley. Hailey, Idaho. The Hailey Times, Thursday, November 28, 1957.

[4] Williams, William Carlos. Letter to his mother, March 30, 1904, in The Selected Letters of William Carlos Williams, New York, McDowell, Obolensky, 1957, p. 6.

[5] As quoted by MacLeish, Archibald in Grab, Frederic D. and Reid B. Johnson. A Tribute to Ezra Pound, Yale Broadcasting Co., December 5, 1955. (Script. p. 3)

[6] Untermeyer, Louis. Makers of the Modern World. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1955, p. 643.

[7] Osborne James Insley and Theodore Gregory Gronert. Wabash College: The First Hundred Years. 1832–1932. Crawfordsville, Ind., R. E. Banta, 1932, pp. 291–92.

[8] Sandburg, Carl. The Work of Ezra Pound. Chicago, Poetry: A Magazine of Verse, February 1916. pp. 249–257.

[9] Sandburg, Carl. Meet the Press interview, October 27, 1957. (National Broadcasting Co.—television).

[10] Davies, Richard, et al. Ezra Pound. Cheyne Gardens, England, privately printed, 1956. (Written on behalf of the committee formed to obtain his (Pound's) release.)

[11] Letter dated Rapallo, October 18, 1948. Photostat of letter made available by G. Giovannini, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

[12] As quoted in de Pina Martins, Jose V. (English version by Olivia Rossetti Agresti). A radio broadcast by the Vatican Radio, March 30, 1954.

[13] Untermeyer, op. cit., p. 648.

[14] Several writers have suggested that Mr. Pound attempted to return to the United States in 1941 and that he was denied permission to return to this country. An examination of pertinent State Department Passport Division files does not substantiate this claim. To the contrary, it appears that the State Department was officially eager to have Mr. Pound return to the United States and in 1941 his passport was extended, for six months only, in order to compel his return. However, the documents in the State Department files do not preclude the possibility of the development of a misunderstanding between Mr. Pound and a consular official which might have unintentionally aborted Mr. Pound's "attempt" to leave Italy. (This point is treated more fully below.)

[15] *Cramer* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 1, 65 S. Ct. 918):

"The crime of treason consists of 2 elements, both of which must be present in order to sustain a conviction: (1) adherence to the enemy, and (2) rendering him aid and comfort.

"The term aid and comfort as used in the provision of the Federal Constitution defining treason as giving aid and comfort to the enemy contemplates some kind of affirmative action, deed, or physical activity tending to strengthen the enemy or weaken the power to resist him, and is not satisfied by a mere mental operation.

"* * * the acts done must be intentional.

"The intent sufficient to sustain a conviction of treason must be an intent, not merely to commit the overt acts complained of, but to betray the country by means of such acts."

Quotation of Thomas Jefferson in appendix to Cramer case:

"In a letter of April 24, 1792, Jefferson, then Secretary of State, wrote: 'Treason * * * when real, merits the highest punishment. But most codes extend their definitions of treason to acts not really against one's country. They do not distinguish between acts against the government and acts against the oppressions of the government: the latter are virures; yet they have furnished more victims to the executioner than the former, because real treasons are rare, oppressions frequent'." (See Eight Writings of Thomas Jefferson (Library ed. Wash. 1903), p. 332.)

[16] The 7 others were Jane Anderson, Robert H. Best, Douglas Chandler, Edward Leo Delaney, Constance Drexel, Fred W. Kaltenbach, and Max Koischwitz. The indictments against Anderson, Delaney, and Drexel were dismissed in 1947, 1947, and 1948, respectively, for insufficient evidence in view of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Haupt and Cramer cases. Kaltenbach reportedly died in a Russian prison; Koischwitz died in Germany during the war. Best was convicted, sentenced to life imprisonment in 1948, and died 4 years later. Chandler was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment in 1947. Only the Pound case is now pending.

[16a] Copy of letter in Passport File F-136, Ezra Pound, Passport Office, State Department.

[17] Grand jury indictment, filed in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, October term 1945, November 26, 1945. Legal typescript, 9 pages.

[18] Transcript of hearing (118 pages).

[19] Hillyer, Robert. Treason's Strange Fruit. The Saturday Review of Literature, June 11, 1949.

[20] Radio Moscow, March 21, 1949.

[21] Evans, Luther H. A letter from the Librarian of Congress. Saturday Review of Literature, July 2, 1949.

[22] Giovannini, Giovanni. The Strange Case of Ezra Pound. The New Times, August 26, 1955, p. 2.

[23] Hemingway, Ernest, as quoted by Time magazine, December 13, 1954, p. 72. Mr. Pound had also been considered for the 1954 Nobel Prize for Literature. On winning the prize Hemingway commented that he would have been very happy had Mr. Pound been chosen.

[24] Hynes, Sam. The Case of Ezra Pound. Commonweal, December 9, 1955, pp. 251–254.

[25] An Artist Confined (editorial), Life magazine, February 6, 1956.

[26] Ezra Pound (editorial), New Republic, April 1, 1957, p. 6. See also LaZebrik, Jack. The Case of Ezra Pound, New Republic, April 1, 1957, pp. 17–20.

[27] Varney, Harold Lord. Mental Health: Fact and Fiction. American Mercury, April 1957, pp. 11–12.

[28] The American Civil Liberties Union statement is reproduced in full as an appendix to this report.

[29] House Resolution 403, 85th Congress, 1st session.

[30] Rovere, Richard. The Question of Ezra Pound. Esquire magazine, September 1957, and subsequent issues.

[31] Ottenberg, Miriam. Liberty Being Weighed for Poet Ezra Pound. Washington D. C., Sunday Star, March 16, 1958, pp. 1, 4.

[32] Case of Ezra Pound (editorial). Washington Post and Times Herald, March 21, 1958.

[33] Rogers, William P. News conference, April 1, 1958, as reported in the Washington Star and the New York Times, April 2, 1958.

[34] Landauer, Jerry. Action Set To Release Ezra Pound. Washington Post and Times Herald, April 6, 1958, p. 1.

[35] Peace, of a Sort, for Ezra Pound? (editorial). Louisville, Ky., the Courier-Journal, April 5, 1958, p. 4.

[36] Sampson, Paul. Plan To Free Ezra Pound Is Protested. Washington Post and Times Herald, April 7, 1958, p. 1.

[37] Arnold, Fortas, and Porter. News release, April 7, 1958.

[8] Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc., press release, April 9, 1958. Brig. Gen. Merritt Curtis, general counsel of the organization, described the indictment against Pound as "very weak." Col. Eugene O. Pomeroy, vice president, said that Representative CELLER's remarks "make a mockery of the presumption of innocence."

[9] The Case of Ezra Pound (editorial). London, the Times, April 9, 1958.

[10] The Case of Ezra Pound (editorial). Washington Star, April 10.

[11] Motion to dismiss indictment, criminal No. 76028.

[12] Overholser, Winfred. Affidavit, April 14, 1958.

[13] Mr. Frost's full statement appears in an appendix to this report.

Ezra Pound wrote Alice Henderson in 1913 that Mr. Frost was "very American." In 1915, he wrote the editor of the Boston Transcript that Mr. Frost was a "bloated capitalist." In the same year, he said to H. L. Mencken, about his (Frost's) poems, "he has reality."

It has been said Mr. Pound played a substantial role in securing Mr. Frost's early American publication. Mr. Frost, at a University of North Carolina lecture in 1955, said of Mr. Pound: "Of course, quite a few poets owe a * * * debt to Ezra Pound, but we all know he had no business on the radio. But Ezra Pound always was a stubborn man."

Apparently, Mr. Frost began individual lobbying for Mr. Pound's release during 1957 after earlier joint attempts by Archibald MacLeish and Mr. Frost, and an English committee, had failed.

[14] From notes taken at the hearing. The court reporter's transcript of hearing was not yet available.

[15] Cornell, Julian. Letter to Mrs. Dorothy Shakespear Pound, dated March 11, 1946.

[16] Associated Press, Jerome, Idaho, April 18, 1958.

[17] The Case of Ezra Pound (editorial). The Wall Street Journal, April 17, 1958.

[18] Speir, Mary D. Letters to the editor: Ezra Pound's Fate. Washington Post and Times Herald, April 18, 1958, p. A16.

The Medical, Legal, Literary, and Political Status of Ezra Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part 2 of the Legislative Reference Service report on Ezra Pound by H. A. Sieber:

THE MEDICAL, LEGAL, LITERARY, AND POLITICAL STATUS OF EZRA WESTON (LOOMIS) POUND (1885-)—SELECTED FACTS AND COMMENTS

(Second installment)

(By H. A. Sieber, research assistant, Senior Specialists Division, the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, March 31, 1958, revised April 14, 1958)

MR. POUND'S SANITY

Whether Mr. Pound is sane, or insane, or sufficiently sane to be released from a mental institution, would appear to be, in the final analysis, a question for the psychiatrists.

As Mr. BURDICK's House resolution of August 21, 1957, indicates, "many people visit him [Mr. Pound] there [at the hospital] and are convinced that he is not insane." It should be noted that there is expert opinion to the effect that frequently persons who suffer from paranoic delusions appear to be, for all or most practical purposes, quite sane. However, the delusions may make the person suffering from them incapable of comprehending the realities of certain situations, and as the psychiatrists have repeatedly stated in Mr. Pound's case, may make him incompetent to defend himself and therefore, to stand trial.

On March 16, 1958, Dr. Winfred Overholser was reported by the Washington Star as saying:

"It is perfectly possible to be mentally unfit to stand trial and yet be perfectly safe to be at large." [1]

On April 14, Dr. Overholser said in an affidavit filed by the attorneys for Mr. Pound:

"I have on a large number of occasions, both alone and with other psychiatrists * * * intensively tested, examined, observed and studied Ezra Pound. * * * Pound is, and since December 4, 1945, has been, suffering from a paranoid state which has rendered and now renders him unfit to advise properly with counsel or to participate intelligently and reasonably in his own defense. * * *

"* * * the condition of Ezra Pound * * * is permanent and incurable [and] will not and has not responded to treatment * * * further professional therapeutic attention under hospital conditions would be of no avail and produce no beneficial results.

"* * * Ezra Pound will die insane in St. Elizabeths Hospital without trial of the charges against him if the indictment remains pending.

"* * * there is strong probability that the commission of the crimes charged was the result of insanity, and I would therefore seriously doubt that prosecution could show criminal responsibility even if it were hypothetically assume that Ezra Pound could regain sufficient sanity to be tried.

"In the event that the indictment is dismissed, I will recommend the delivering of Ezra Pound from further confinement * * * under suitable arrangements for his custody, care, and restraint by his committee, Mrs. Dorothy Shakespear Pound. Further confinement can serve no therapeutic purpose * * * would be a needless expense and burden on the public facilities of the hospital. Ezra Pound is not a dangerous person and his release would not endanger the safety of other persons or the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States." [11]

MR. POUND'S PHYSICAL HEALTH

Mr. Pound's general physical condition apparently has been good. Dr. Addison Duval, then Acting Superintendent of St. Elizabeths, said in August 1957:

"Mr. Pound, as you well know, is an old man. I would say that he is in very good physical health for a man of his age. He plays tennis, for example." [4]

MR. POUND'S ANTISEMITISM

Whatever prejudices Mr. Pound may have are, of course, irrelevant to a consideration of his legal case.

For example, Mr. Pound's published prose and poetry have caused many persons to attack him for antisemitism. Mr. Pound himself has said that antisemitism is "unaristotelian" and that everyone should be judged on his merits,[5] and it has been suggested that he has been, at worst, "unaristotelian"; at best, reckless in his generalizations and stereotyping.

MR. POUND'S LITERARY STATUS

The late poet Dylan Thomas has said: "Only posterity can see the picture of the poetry of today as a whole."

However, Mr. Pound's status as a poet is rarely questioned. Individual poems, on the other hand, have found both favorable and adverse critics, which would appear to be the normal situation.[6]

PUBLIC OPINION

It would appear that the larger portion of the population knows very little, if anything about the Pound case. Generally, insofar as the active press mentions the case it appears to be favorable to Mr. Pound's release.

It may be doubted if there is any obvious consensus on the various issues which underlie the case. Mr. John Kasper, the propagandist for white supremacy, now in prison, has been connected with Mr. Pound by several writers, and the Pound-Kasper relationship has, for some persons, prejudiced Mr. Pound's predicament somewhat.[7]

MR. POUND'S LEGAL STATUS

When the district court records of the Pound case were examined in September 1957, the docket was marked with a rubber stamp: "Case closed."

In view of other evidence that the case was and is clearly still open, it is presumed that the clerk's entry on the docket represented clerical error, but the incident does indicate the passage of time which has aged but not obliterated either Mr. Pound or the charges against him.

Whether Mr. Pound is guilty of treason is not now the question. Under the law, he has been and is legally innocent in the absence of a conviction. His legal status at this time is therefore: a mental patient under indictment for treason. Conceivably, if Mr. Pound were to stand trial, he might be able to acquit himself before a court of law. At least there are certain features of his case which to some people have appeared sufficient to raise doubts of Mr. Pound's guilt. The determination of whether Mr. Pound is guilty of treason is a matter for a jury and not within the scope of this report.

Presumably, the Justice Department has sufficient evidence to make out a prima facie case—otherwise the grand jury would have refused to indict. It must be presumed that two witnesses to each overt act charged in the indictment, as required by the United States Constitution, were available in 1945, and are still available, else the indictment would stand to be quashed.[8]

The American Civil Liberties Union and others have questioned whether the statute under which Mr. Pound is kept at St. Elizabeths is constitutional. Again, it is not within the scope of this report to attempt to determine constitutionality of a congressional statute. The following arguments used by Mr. Pound's attorney, Mr. Julian Cornell, in 1947, summarizes the position generally taken by critics of the subject statutes:

"If on medical grounds the defendant should be released from custody, then to continue to hold him would be equivalent to a sentence of life imprisonment upon a man who is and always will be presumed innocent. He would be confined for the rest of his life because of an accusation which can never be proved. It is respectfully submitted that such confinement would be unlawful and unconstitutional." [9]

The present motion to dismiss the indictment declares: "The inevitable effect of failure to dismiss the indictment will be life imprisonment on account of alleged acts and events which can never be put to proof."

In 1947, the Government had argued that, within intent of Congress, the Federal statutes relating to confinement of the insane [10] would permit Mr. Pound to be released "only upon recovery of sanity and then to the custody of the court before which the criminal charge is pending."

As to the constitutionality of the statutes, if construed to deny right to bail, the Gov-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ernment argued that there was no constitutional right to bail and that Congress did not, in such cases as Mr. Pound's, intend to extend the privilege of bail.

During the past 5 years there have been cases in other Federal jurisdictions which have made the distinction between temporary and permanent insanity, and this distinction, it is contended, has weakened the Government's 1947 argument.

The subject statutes or similar statutes have been interpreted in some jurisdictions to provide for detention "for only such a reasonable period of time as will afford a fair opportunity to determine whether the accused is only temporarily incompetent and soon will be able to stand trial * * * [and] if [the accused] is not * * * he must be discharged." [11]

In Wells, by Gillig, v. *Attorney General of the United States,*[12] it was held that the wording of the statute looked to a temporary mental condition, not to a permanent one, and therefore, was not unconstitutional.

The present motion to dismiss the indictment does not concern itself with the question of constitutionality but appeals to the discretion of the Court because the defendant during commitment stands in the position of a ward of the Court.[13]

It is contended that the Court has, according to the Pack and Janitz cases, the inherent power to dismiss an indictment where justice requires and where the United States will never be able to prosecute.[14]

MR. POUND'S ALLEGED ATTEMPT TO RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES 1941–42

At least one writer has offered the opinion that if, indeed, Mr. Pound attempted to return to the United States late in 1941 or early in 1942 and if the State Department (considering him to be a quasi-American)[15] made it difficult or impossible for him to so repatriate, then the United States shares some of the responsibility for Mr. Pound's actions when he was left behind in enemy territory.

Current biography, Who's News and Why, 1942, declared:

"Oddly enough, when Pound attempted to return to the United States in 1941 to lecture on fascism he found himself unable to get transportation in spite of the fact that he said he had several sympathizers among Members of the United States Senate whom he had met in 1939. In May 1942, when he tried to get permission to join a diplomatic train which carried large groups of Americans from Italy to Lisbon, he was again refused.[16]

Francesco Monotti reminisced in 1950:

"Ezra Pound did not return (to the United States) for the simple and at bottom harmless antipathy of a consular officer of his country, who treated him cruelly and arrogantly. We remember him in Rome in company of (his wife), ready to sail. He had set everything in order for a long absence; had taken care of his apartment in Rapallo; * * * distributed works of art and his more prized pieces of furniture among his friends; bought tickets for the plane flight. A little contretemps in the date of departure and the manifest antipathy of the consul made him suddenly change his mind (and so, by accident) Ezra Pound became a fugitive and a traitor." [17]

Later, writing for the Rapallo Il Mare, Monotti elaborates:

"(The Pounds) had disposed of their place in Rapallo, given their more beautiful objects to friends and entrusted other things to Adm. Ubaldo degli Uberti. * * * The American Government had notified American citizens scattered around the world, and the Pounds, like good citizens, were ready to obey and return to the United States. But at the consulate there must have been someone who thought of them as black sheep. In those supreme moments between day and night in their lives, something of grave consequence must have happened at the consulate at Rome. * * * He returned a completely changed man. * * * He decided quickly, the tickets were returned to the airline, Ezra Pound decided to remain in Italy." [18]

Richard Rovere has written:

"It is a matter of record that he tried in 1942 to get aboard the last diplomatic train that took Americans from Rome to Lisbon. He was refused permission to board it. He had no choice but to stay in Rapallo." [19]

Eleanor and Reynolds Packard, who were in Italy on December 7, 1941, and who saw Pound on that day, reported in their book, Balcony Empire, published in 1942:

"The day of Pearl Harbor, Pound unexpectedly came to our house and told us that war between the United States and Italy was inevitable but that he intended to stay on. Reynolds told him that he would be a traitor if he did so." [20]

On this same day, according to the Rome Daily American of June 17, 1954, Mr. Pound is reported to have asserted to a friend who had brought him the news:

"I'm cooked. This is my end. But I want you to bear witness that I am first of all an American. I stand with my country, right or wrong. I will never speak over the air again." [21]

Commented Mr. Giovannini on the reports that Pound was stranded in Italy:

"If these reports are correct the Government bears some responsibility for the action of an American citizen left on enemy soil. And if they are false one wonders what effort the Government made to avoid the risk of leaving in enemy hands a citizen who had been severely critical of Roosevelt and his policies." [22]

MR. POUND'S INTENT TO COMMIT TREASON

Chet Huntley defined expatriate as "a person who is more at home far from home." "Am I an American?" asked expatriate Pound in 1939, and he answered his own question, "Yes." [23]

In 1940, before he actually got himself into his legal predicament, Mr. Pound wrote: "I dunno what my 23 infantile years in America signify. I left as soon as (my) motion was autarchic." [24]

When Reynolds Packard told Mr. Pound in 1941 that staying in Italy would make him a traitor, Mr. Pound apparently was unconcerned. Said Mr. Pound:

"I don't see why fascism is contrary to American philosophy. I have nothing against the United States, quite the contrary. I consider myself a 100-percent American and a patriot. I am only against Roosevelt and the Jews who influence him." [25]

Political Scientist Victor Kerkiss argues in the May 1955 Journal of Politics that Mr. Pound's views are an extension of American populism:

"The * * * facets of Ezra Pound's career— as poet, as critic, and literary midwife, and as political thinker—have a generic relationship to each other. * * * American fascism has its roots in American populism. * * * Ezra Pound's political philosophy is clearly in the mainstream of [the] abortive American fascism of the thirties." [26]

Psychiatrist Frederic Wertham presented a psychiatric study of Ezra Pound in the American Journal of Psychotherapy in 1949. Concluded Dr. Wertham:

"A career such as that of Ezra Pound is a reflection of our own social development in the last decades. * * * His insanity is an example of how we are trying to explain away profound defects in society by placing them outside of society, in the sphere of individual pathology. Ezra Pound has no delusions in any strictly pathological sense." [27]

Whether Mr. Pound had the necessary intent to betray his country is the question which a jury must answer before it can decide whether his overt acts are treasonable or acts, possibly, of patriotism gone astray.

When Mr. Pound was interviewed in 1945 on his arrival in the United States for trial, he said: "Does anyone really know what I said: * * * Get rid of the notion that I betrayed anybody."

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[1] Ottenberg, Miriam. Liberty Being Weighed for Poet Ezra Pound. Washington, D. C., Sunday Star, March 16, 1958, p. 1.

[2] Affidavit, April 14, 1958.

[3] At least one psychiatrist has publicly differed with the expert testimony presented to the court as to Mr. Pound's sanity. In 1949, Dr. Fredric Wertham, of New York, in an article in a professional journal (cited elsewhere in this report), wrote: "What is wrong with him [Pound] * * * is not the disease of an individual but a symptom of social degeneration."

[4] Dr. Duval's comments are presented more fully in an appendix to this report.

[5] Pound, Ezra. Signed statement (unpublished manuscript in possession of Washington, D. C., resident).

[6] The controversy over Mr. Pound's receiving the Bollingen prize in 1949 (discussed briefly elsewhere in this report) would clearly show that there are various shades of opinion as to the degree of Mr. Pound's importance to 20th century poetry.

In 1945, Saxe Commins, editor of Random House, had refused to print some of Mr. Pound's poems in an anthology edited by William Rose Benet and Conrad Aiken. Said Mr. Commins at that time: "Random House is not going to publish any Facist. As a matter of fact, we don't think Ezra Pound is good enough, or important enough, to include. If we thought he was, we might have carried him anyway. We just don't think he is." Anthologist Aiken called this burning of books * * * a kind of intellectual and moral suicide which we might more wisely leave to our enemies. See Norman, Charles. The Case For and Against Ezra Pound. New York, P. M., 1945, pp. m12–m17.

[7] Mr. Pound has never publicly dissociated himself from Mr. Kasper's enterprises. However, it should be noted that Mr. Pound has not made public utterances of any sort, except as a poet and in his poetry, since he has been at St. Elizabeths.

[8] In the motion to dismiss indictment filed on April 14, 1958, Mr. Pound's attorneys stated that since the primary alleged acts and events on which the indictment was based occurred before July 25, 1943, "memories have faded and direct evidence by the constitutionally established minimum of two witnesses to each of the various alleged acts and events have inevitably dissipated." The attorneys argued further that the United States lacked sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution.

[9] Motion for bail, February 1947.

[10] United States Code 24:211 provides: "If any person, charged with crime, be found * * * to be an insane person, [the] court shall certify the same to the Federal Security Administrator, who may order such person to be confined in Elizabeths Hospital. United States Code 24:211b provides that when the person so confined "shall be restored to sanity, the superintendent of the hospital shall give notice thereof to [the court], and deliver him to the court."

[11] *Wright* v. *Steele* (125 F. Supp. 1 (W. D. No., 1954)).

[12] *Wells, by Gillig* v. *Attorney General* of the United States (201 F. 2d 556 (10th Cir. 1953)). For further cases relevant to this

considerations, see *Higgins* v. *United States* (205 F. 2d 650 (9th Cir., 1953)); *Craig* v. *Steele* (123 F. Supp. 153 (W. D. No., 1954)); *Kitchens* v. *Steele* (112 F. Supp. 383 (W. D. No., 1953)); *Wright* v. *Steele* (125 F. Supp. 1 (W. D. No., 1954)); *United States* v. *Morris* (154 F. Supp. 695 (S. D. Cal., 1957)); *Dixon* v. *Steele* (104 F. Supp. 904 (W. D. No., 1952)).

[12] *United States* v. *Morris* (154 F. Supp. 695 (S. D. Cal., 1957)).

[13] *United States* v. *Pack* (20 F. R. D. 209 (D. Del. 1957)); *United States* v. *Janitz* (161 F. 2d 19 (3d Cir. 1947)).

[14] A State Department memo dated 1941 referred to Mr. Pound as a "quasi-American." Passport Division file.

[15] Block, Maxine [ed.] Current Biography. Who's News and Why, 1942. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1942, p. 674.

[16] Monotti, Francesco. Ezra Pound Pazzo Per Amore. Il Momento, January 31, 1950. (Translated by G. G. Giovannini.)

[17] Monotti, Francesco. Venivano a Rapallo Perche Vi Si Trovava Ezra Pound. Rapallo Il Mare, October 31, 1954. (Translated by G. Giovannini.)

[18] Rovere, op. cit.

[19] Packard, Reynolds and Eleanor. Balcony Empire; Fascist Italy at War. New York, Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. 250–1.

[20] Pound, Ezra. Attributed to Mr. Pound in Rome Daily American, June 17, 1954, as quoted by Giovannini, op. cit., p. 3.

[21] Giovannini, op. cit., p. 4.

[22] Letter to Herbert Creekmore, February 1939.

[23] Letter to Katus Kitasona, October 29, 1940.

[24] Packard, Reynolds and Eleanor, op. cit., pp. 250–1.

[25] Perkiss, Victor C. Ezra Pound and American Fascism. The Journal of Politics, May 1955, p. 173.

[26] Wertham, Frederic. (M. D.) The Road to Rapallo: A Psychiatric Study. The American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1949, p. 600.

Forty-second Anniversary of Camp Crane, Allentown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, acting on the request of my good friend Col. Albert E. Herrmann, past national commander, United States Army Ambulance Service Association, and out of my personal appreciation for the valiant service performed in World War I by the USAAC's, I am pleased to include the following statement commemorating at 42d anniversary of the founding of Camp Crane at Allentown, Pa., on June 1, 1917:

ALLENTOWN COMMEMORATING CAMP CRANE 42D ANNIVERSARY

Allentown, Pa., the training city of the United States Army Ambulance Corps, of World War I, will celebrate the opening of Camp Crane, at the Allentown Fair Grounds in 1917, when Pennsylvanians came from colleges and universities to enlist with the integral part of the Medical Department of the United States Army, to serve with the American AEF, the French, and Italian armies. Camp Crane opened June 1, 1917.

Young men from University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, Lafayette College, State College, Bucknell College, and Susquehanna University, and groups from Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Reading, Wilkes-Barre, Johnstown, Allentown, and Harrisburg sent sections for training.

In 1917 the first group of USAAC's left for overseas to serve with French Army, later with the Italian Army, and then with the American AEF, as they entered the front line service.

Lt. Col. A. Piatt Andrew, who served with the French Army, later with the USAAC's and also who served on his return from overseas, as a Member of Congress from Massachusetts met in Paris with representative USAAC's, many from Pennsylvania, to form the now known, the United States Army Ambulance Service Association, which held their first convention at the old fair grounds, at Allentown, Pa., in 1920.

Pennsylvanians who have served at national commanders of the USAAC's have been: I. Edward Cohen; Col. Richard Slee, Maj. George K. Weston, Albert E. Herrmann, Richard H. Short, Benjamin H. Bowen, Walter Davidson, Dr. Furman R. Shute, Arthur R. Markley, William J. Raudenbush, William A. Stoeltzing, and James M. E. Boes, and the present National Commander Warren S. Ward, of Lewistown, Pa., who is serving this year with the following national officers from Pennsylvania: Robert W. Faulkner, Kenneth R. Moore, James M. E. Boes, James J. Cummings, Charles L. Winkler, Albert E. Herrmann, and J. Harry Davie.

As the United States Army ambulance service enlisted in Philadelphia, in May 1917, the anniversary banquet will be held in Philadelphia, Pa., June 7, 1958, at McAllister's, with national officers, and local USAAC clubs attending from Allentown, New York, Johnstown, Boston, Batavia, Atlantic City, and New Jersey USAAC posts joining with the Philadelphia USAAC Post, No. 1. Commander Edward Kasten will preside, with Clarence Keifreider as chairman, and the following members of the distinguished guest committee: F. Warren King, Charles R. Ashford, Gustave Blind, Albert E. Herrmann, J. Harry Davie, Frank C. Olds, Robert W. Faulkner, Kenneth R. Moore, Thomas H. Ellis, and James D. Hill.

Sudden Death for Effective Poultry Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the consumers of this country must be warned that unless a decision announced yesterday by Secretary of Agriculture Benson is reversed immediately, they may be eating diseased and unwholesome poultry—poultry harboring virus agents, toxic substances of the vilest kind, tumors consisting of masses of dead cells—and they will be buying this poultry under the innocent impression it is wholesome, because it bears the stamp of approval of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is a serious charge to make. As one who fought for elimination of diseased poultry in interstate commerce and for the enactment last year of the Poultry Products Inspection Act which is supposed to go into effect the day after tomorrow, I am not at all happy to have to come before the House and say the new law has just been shot full of holes.

Yet that is what appears to have happened. Secretary Benson signed an order overruling his own experts and the public-health authorities of the Nation, and suspending one of the key consumer safeguards in the regulations under which the new Poultry Products Inspection Act is to be administered.

He has suspended the regulation which requires removal of kidneys from inspected ready-to-cook poultry. This regulation is now to apply only to mature poultry, not to the so-called young birds which make up perhaps 75 percent or more of all poultry processed and shipped in interstate commerce.

SECRETARY BENSON'S HANDOUT TO PROCESSING FIRMS

Why did Mr. Benson sign such an order? The press release on it said it was for the purpose of enabling the various poultry processing plants to operate on a comparable basis in 1958. This is pure doubletalk. What it means is that certain segments of the poultry industry, reluctant to install the required equipment and unable to shake the convictions of the career experts in the Department, finally got to the Secretary and prevailed upon him—at the very last moment—to overrule his own experts, and give the processing plants what amounts to a sizable gift of money at the expense of decent standards of purity for poultry.

The firms in the poultry processing industry which pulled off this fantastic robbery of the American consumer have used Mr. Benson as an accessory in a crime against the public health.

This is strong language. But it takes strong language adequately to describe the significance of this development.

Will anyone die from eating poultry which has been inspected and passed as wholesome by the United States Department of Agriculture but which is not in fact wholesome? I do not know. Probably not. But perhaps yes. I just do not know. I am not a scientist or a veterinarian or a public-health expert.

POSITION OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE EXPERTS

But here is what Mr. Benson's own Department of Agriculture experts say about leaving the kidneys in poultry while it is being examined and inspected for wholesomeness:

SOME FACTORS UNDERLINING THE REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF KIDNEYS FROM READY-TO-COOK POULTRY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., November 22, 1957.

In regulations to be issued under the recently enacted Poultry Products Inspection Act, the United States Department of Agriculture contemplates that the kidneys will be removed from inspected ready-to-cook poultry. The purpose of such a requirement is to assure the wholesomeness of poultry products.

The inclusion of this requirement in the regulations is based on the legal mandate to insure wholesomeness and the Department's consideration of views expressed by representatives of the poultry industry; Federal,

State, and local public-health officials; specially qualified poultry pathologists, veterinarians, and other scientific persons; representatives of State departments of agriculture and the agricultural colleges; and members of the Department's staff of veterinarians engaged in Federal poultry inspection.

Some of the underlying factors for requiring the removal of kidneys are as follows:

1. Under modern poultry-processing procedures, it is practically impossible to inspect poultry kidneys by reason of the position of these organs in the carcass because:

(a) Less than half of kidney surfaces, in their natural carcass position, can be seen or felt by the inspector.

(b) Feeling of the kidney without visual examination will not in itself insure adequate wholesomeness inspection.

2. Kidneys left in ready-to-cook poultry may result in unwholesome poultry reaching the consumer because:

(a) The occurrence of tumors in kidneys is quite common, some of which may be small and deep within the kidney body. There may also be small, deep-seated diseased-tissue areas consisting of masses of dead cells and other cells affected by degenerative processes or minute cysts or abscesses which will most likely be overlooked.

(b) The kidney is an excretory organ through which toxic substances, waste materials such as urates, and foreign material are formed or received and eliminated from the system of the bird. Body waste materials in kidneys cannot be washed from kidney tissues during processing.

(c) Kidneys are highly perishable. Their glandular nature and blood supply compared to other body tissues make poultry kidneys susceptible to early objectionable post mortem changes.

(d) Tearing or shredding of kidneys during processing, even when the intention is to leave them in, is conducive to contamination and unwholesomeness.

(e) Viruses and other disease agents, some of which are harmful to man, may be harbored in kidneys of birds which show no clinical or post mortem evidences of the presence of disease or unwholesomeness, but are apparent upon laboratory examination.

ISSUE DEBATED FOR MONTHS

Mr. Speaker, the decision to call for removal of kidneys in inspecting all ready-to-cook poultry was not final as of November 22. The Department scheduled separate hearings on all phases of the proposed regulations in all parts of the country and this particular issue was fought out and debated and discussed in all of them.

But when the regulations were issued in final form—or what we thought was final form—in February of this year, this requirement remained unchanged. Others among the proposed regulations were changed or amended or dropped, but this one was unchanged. It was based on the solid conviction of the Department's experts that the legal mandate of the new law, requiring that poultry in interstate commerce be wholesome, required in turn that kidneys must be removed for inspection as part of the process of approving ready-to-cook poultry.

BENSON'S ORDER COMES AS LAST MINUTE SURPRISE

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that although some segments of the poultry processing industry have supported proposed legislation this year to weaken other provisions of the new law, no bill was introduced, so far as I know, to eliminate the provision of the regulations dealing with removal of kidneys.

So the public had a right to assume this issue had been resolved as of last February.

But yesterday, out of the blue, Mr. Benson announced he had suspended this regulation for the rest of 1958. The stage is meanwhile being set to drop this regulation completely. And in the meantime, unwholesome poultry can slip through with a Federal seal of approval.

The same sort of thing happened under the voluntary paid-for-by-industry inspection program. It used to be mandatory under that program that kidneys be removed for inspection. In 1951 the requirement was eliminated on the claim that an inspector could tell by feeling inside the carcass whether the kidney is diseased.

But the Department is clearly on record as saying such a thing is now virtually impossible under modern poultry processing procedures.

I think the consumer would feel a whole lot more secure about the poultry she buys if the experts in the Department of Agriculture, and the public health people, decide the basic regulations instead of the Secretary of Agriculture deciding on the basis of complaints from firms which want to save themselves the expense of proper processing equipment.

BENEFITS TO PROCESSORS UNDER NEW ACT

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to put the poultry processor out of business or bankrupt him. I have suggested several times that if the new law creates financial crises for small firms, that we use the Small Business Administration's loan program to help them get the equipment or machinery they might need to comply with the new law.

But let us not destroy the law's effectiveness by bringing poultry inspection down to the level of the least common denominator in terms of ease of compliance. It was not intended to be a law easy to comply with—it was meant to be effective in protecting the public.

There is a decided advantage to firms—a decided financial advantage—in coming in under the new Poultry Products Inspection Act now, prior to mandatory operation of the act next January 1. Most firms which have already filed applications to come in under the new act are presently under the voluntary paid-for-by-industry program. They have had to pay for the cost of the inspection system up to now in order to get the United States stamp of wholesomeness on their product. Under the new act, the Federal Government pays all costs of the inspection service except overtime. So a firm which has been paying for the inspection service up to now will benefit tremendously by having Uncle Sam take over that cost.

In return for this, the processor should be expected to comply fully with the spirit and intent of the new law. Instead, apparently, some influential processors have reached Secretary Benson and persuaded him to overrule his experts and seriously weaken the effectiveness of the new program.

So the consumer, through his taxes, will be paying for tight poultry inspection but will be getting instead substantially the same kind of less rigid inspection now being provided in many plants at the expense of the processor. And this means the possibility of diseased poultry slipping through.

WHY DID MR. BENSON SURRENDER WITHOUT A FIGHT?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Secretary Benson's action yesterday in suspending this key regulation dealing with the removal of kidneys from inspected ready-to-cook poultry was based on nothing more than lack of understanding of what he was doing or what it meant.

There are rumors floating around that he was pressured into it by threats of various kinds from firms in the poultry industry. This sounds incredible and unbelievable.

I do know, however, that up to the time this order was issued, only about 15 firms in the entire country had completed their applications for inspection under the new program beginning May 1—only about 15 out of perhaps 500 or more which are in the process of qualifying.

Were the others on a sit-down strike to force the Secretary to surrender on this question of kidney removal? Did they know or anticipate that the regulations would be eased in such a dramatic way just 3 days before the start of the new act's operation? Can we now look for a sudden flurry of action by these other firms whose applications are pending so that they can complete their arrangements and come in under the program almost overnight?

I am only surmising. But if it is true that there was an organized conspiracy here to fail to come into compliance until the rules were rewritten to their liking, then I think we have a basis here for a congressional investigation and perhaps a Justice Department one as well.

But Mr. Speaker, I am not as much concerned over an attempt by the industry to pull that kind of stunt as I would be over the Secretary of Agriculture's willingness to let them get away with it, if that is what did in fact happen.

The Department of Agriculture had nothing to lose from starting this program on May 1 with just 15 firms in voluntary compliance. Those 15 firms were ready and willing and able to comply with all provisions of the regulations, including the one dealing with removal of kidneys. We should have started the new program with those 15. If it did not work out—if shortcomings developed in the program—if the kidney removal provision in actual operation turned out to be an impossible burden, then, and only then, should it have been changed.

NO FIRM HAS TO COMPLY BEFORE JANUARY 1

The period between May 1 and January 1 was intended to be a transition period, a trial-and-error period, to get a new and big program of Government into operation. But no firm has to comply with the new law before January 1. Let us not forget that. I do not care if we have 5 or 10 or 15 or 100 plants in the

program the first day or the first week. The important thing is that the program we do have be effective in protecting the consumer; that it start out a strong program and remain a strong one.

Mr. Speaker, this episode, as I said, demands a full-scale investigation, and I intend to seek one. In the meantime, however, there is serious doubt in my mind whether we should appropriate any funds at all for this new poultry inspection program for the rest of this calendar year, until we have a clearer picture of the role Mr. Benson intends to play in undermining and destroying the effectiveness of the law. No funds are needed for this calendar year if we are not going to have an effective program in operation. The law does not require any firm to comply until next January. Any firm which comes in before then is doing so mainly to save itself money—the cost of the inspection it was previously paying for itself.

If all we are going to succeed in doing under this new law during the rest of this present calendar year is a shift the burden of inspection costs from the shoulders of private industry to the United States Government, and get no better inspection program in return, then we are fooling the public and making a foolish use of Federal funds. I would rather delay the start of the whole program until next January, under those circumstances.

Either that, or start a real and meaningful program this Thursday with only those firms included which are willing and ready to do their share—the 15 firms I understand had fully complied before this new order was issued.

A decision bearing on this issue will have to be made by the Congress in the very near future. The appropriation bill which contains funds for the Poultry Inspection Service is going to have to be resolved in conference. It may very well be that we may want to postpone voting any funds for poultry inspection under the new act until we see what the Secretary has in mind in terms of enforcement. If he intends to kill this act's effectiveness by undermining the regulations, as he has already done for 1958 even before the act goes into effect, then I for one want no part of a compulsory poultry inspection program which shifts inspection costs from industry to Government without protecting the consumer from diseased products.

Federal Excise Tax on Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the contents of a letter from a constituent and friend and a successful businessman, Tony Piet, relative to the need for removal of the Federal excise tax in the automobile industry.

Chicago has been recently engaged in a campaign to stimulate the economy in the automobile industry. I have spoken on the floor about this highly successful campaign called You Auto Buy. The success of the campaign exceeded expectations and has been extended.

My purpose in inserting Mr. Piet's letter is to exhibit some sound thinking regarding the excise tax as it pertains to the automobile industry. I am in agreement with Mr. Piet's thinking. This Federal tax imposed many years ago as a temporary measure has the appearance of becoming a permanent fixture unless something is done at the fountainhead to remove it.

It would appear to me that removing this tax is going to inure immeasurably to the good for the economic structure of the country and the people as a whole. I am a firm believer in the ingenuity and capability of private business to do the needed job. Yet they must be given encouragement and not expected to do the job with hands tied down because of the existence of a tax initiated as a temporary measure. When they criticize Congress and the Government, I believe there is some justification. Measures have been taken, programs begun in the past under the guise of an emergency or temporary imposition. The people have gone ahead and accepted it. Their Government, however, has let the temporary become permanent. Consequently today is it any wonder that our constitutents become strongly vocal in their protests over some of the programs their Federal Government, their lawmakers, are trying to sell them.

The letter follows:

TONY PIET MOTOR SALES, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., April 24, 1958.

Hon. EMMET F. BYRNE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EMMET: It is my firm and sincere belief that it is grossly unfair to allow the Federal excise tax to continue—as it pertains to the automobile industry. This tax should have been curtailed as soon as the wartime emergency was over.

The Federal excise tax was originally imposed as a temporary measure, not one for 20 years. I shall sincerely appreciate your wholehearted support in Congress to help throw off this yoke we've been wearing for too long a time.

Now that the wartime emergency is over, we have as great an emergency at our front door and only public spending will ward off the otherwise inevitable calamity we are facing in this wonderful country of ours.

We must encourage spending. By knocking out the automotive excise tax we make our products accessible to a greater portion of the public, thus stimulating a chain reaction of sales, production, and employment.

Our economy is at the crossroads of time. This is a grave issue and your utmost consideration and action is very, very urgent.

Please handle it with courage and expediency now.

Sincerely yours,

TONY PIET.

Mr. Speaker, Tony Piet was formerly a big league ballplayer with the Chicago White Sox, Detroit Tigers, and Pittsburgh Pirates. He is still getting base hits as a businessman. He has also contributed much to build in the community, assisting youth, sponsoring and encouraging the Little League and Pony League baseball clubs. He does not stop in endeavoring to make America better and in selling the idea that there is no place like home, the United States of America.

Eric Sevareid Again Hits the Nail on the Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the keenest analysts now surveying our national scene is Eric Sevareid, chief Washington correspondent for Columbia Broadcasting System. His nightly commentaries on people and events are uniformly penetrating and provocative. He is the type of person who has made the current observance of National Radio Month a meaningful thing.

In is broadcast of April 17, Mr. Sevareid talked good sense on the President's proposed reorganization of our national defense system. I agree heartily with Mr. Sevareid's overall grasp of the problem and the need for changes. I hope Members of both bodies will consider this matter in the calm light of reasoning such as Mr. Sevareid's before letting loose with their brickbats.

Under leave previously granted, I insert the broadcast at this point in the RECORD:

Good evening. The President spoke to assembled editors today on his plans for reorganizing our military system—the most expensive, the most complicated, the biggest, the most vital collective human enterprise ever known in the United States. The real question is whether it would work, to save the country, to defeat an enemy, in time of a great modern war; the real fear is that as presently constituted, it might not.

Rarely has the President delivered a sharper, franker speech. The vigor of his proposals was matched by the bleakness of the picture he painted of present Pentagon conditions.

The implications of his description would seem to include these, among others: We have interservice quarreling over basic concepts of strategy for any given future war, over individual service roles and missions, over specific theater commands, over the new weapons, over research for still newer weapons, over the moneys that the Congress appropriates. Much of this always existed; we have managed to win our wars, anyway; but each time we had to reorganize after war began; the existence of allies and oceans gave us the time to do so; another war would probably have to be finished by the same system existing at its start.

The President said that unified strategic plans presuppose that the Defense Secretary and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have enough control over support activities to assure that these plans could be executed. Then he said, "In critical respects, it is lacking in our defenses today." This is a far-reaching statement; it can only come as a shock to those who have assumed that the immense expenditures and efforts over the last 10 years had at least insured a system

for carrying out a war plan, whether the plan prove good or bad.

The speech today bears heavily on the emotion-charged issues of rivalries and prerogatives between the uniformed services; one of the chief forces compelling a new showdown on this matter is, of course, the emergence of the new and totally untraditional weapons; the struggle for these weapons is also the struggle for funds, for prestige, for size, for wartime roles; this is so because so many of these weapons are militarily universal, falling naturally into no one service. "The fact is," said the President, "modern weapons have scrambled traditional service functions."

One of the most daring and touchy proposals Mr. Eisenhower makes is to try an overhaul of the way leading admirals and generals are selected for promotion and assignment. He is implying that men rise to the top simply by dogged, narrow serving of their own service's special needs; but, at the top these days, officers must consider national defense as a whole first and service needs second. The President is also clearly fed up with the publicity stunts and campaigns staged by the separate services for their own purposes.

Right now the President has a good momentum with him; if he keeps driving this way, he should be able to get most of what he wants; whether these changes are enough, in view of the decision to postpone the money-handling authority asked for the Defense Secretary, will be the next big question.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Summit Madness, Nuclear Nonsense, and John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is undoubtedly true that good Americans from George Washington to Dwight Eisenhower, and including Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, suffered from calumnies heaped upon them by their traducers. I doubt, however, that any of those mentioned were ever the target of attacks so violent as those directed at our present Secretary of State and I doubt if any of them bore up under the barrage with greater dignity and aplomb than has John Foster Dulles.

Any American worth his salt and with a modicum of perception must have long since realized that Khrushchev's insistence on a summit conference has only one purpose; namely, the creation of a sounding board for the issuing of propaganda blasts and the strengthening of his own precarious situation. In all of our dealings with the Russian leaders—as distinguished from the people of the U. S. S. R.—we should never lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with men whose solemn word is of no value whatsoever, and in addition that we are in fact being called upon by means of a summit meeting to lend respectability to a lot of international gangsters and murderers. In this instance Secretary Dulles has counselled against such a get-together and apparently has reminded our President that as a leader elected directly by the people his role is entirely different from that of the leaders of the other nations even though in their initial role they may have been elected to a parliament or general assembly. As an additional word of caution Mr. Dulles might also have reminded our President that when you lie down with dogs you get up with fleas.

The subject of the suspension of nuclear tests is so elemental as to invite contempt rather than discussion. What advantage could accrue to this Nation—or to humanity as a whole—through the suspension of our tests is beyond me. Russia completes her tests—and in addition apparently suffers an accidental explosion in the process—and then because she has nothing to lose for another year and because her people are apparently raising hob over local fallout—she comes piously to the front and says let's agree that you will not run your series. How naive, how silly, how asinine can we get? To me there can be only one conclusion; namely, that wittingly or unwittingly those who urge a suspension of nuclear tests until we have completed our present series and those who are calling for a summit meeting are playing the Communist's tune. The time is now here, my friends, when every patriotic American must stand firm.

And as for John Foster Dulles—the greatest Secretary of State in our time—may God give him increased courage and strength.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to extend a few remarks about the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day which will be observed or remembered by the Polish people and their friends on May 3.

Our Declaration of Independence inspired the Polish people to adopt a constitution inculcating the ideas promulgated by our Declaration of Independence. This was accomplished by the Polish Diet in 1791 in Warsaw. An affinity has existed between Poland and America since the days when one of their great countrymen, Thaddeus Kosciusko, volunteered his services to our young country at a time when we were struggling for our independent way of life.

Our nations have experienced many milestones since we both achieved an independence safeguarded by a constitution.. For us, the past was prologue to a future more glorious but for the Polish people, the years did not yield the things they desired, and still desire. The people in Poland have been subjugated to the Moscow doctrine outwardly but they have continued to show their fighting spirit by maintaining their inherent belief in the right of the individual to the pursuit of happiness. They have not acquiesced in their spirits and hearts but have resisted at every opportunity.

There is no doubt in my mind that though the Polish Government is Communist, the people are not and will never be.

The Polish people are an inspiration to other subjugated countries and even to Americans. We should never forget to be thankful to our Creator for bringing America this far. We must guard our individual liberties unceasingly.

It is my fervent hope that one day not too far distant we shall observe another day dedicated to the liberation of Poland so that in reality she may join the family of the free nations, as an official full-fledged member.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received from Mr. James K. Selden, president of the Methuen International Mills, Methuen, Mass., and a copy of his letter to the Small Business Administration, concerning a ruling by the Quartermaster Corps which seemingly is making a mockery of the intent of Congress to help small business:

METHUEN INTERNATIONAL MILLS,
Methuen, Mass., April 28, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We feel that if it was the intent of Congress to help small business on the Government contracts that a ruling by the Quartermaster Depot, which enables any large concern to bid through a dummy, is making a mockery of that intent.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have written the United States Small Business Administration.

Very truly yours,
JAMES K. SELDEN,
President.

METHUEN INTERNATIONAL MILLS,
April 25, 1958.

UNITED STATES SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing this letter as a representative of one of the many manufacturing enterprises which come, by definition, under the heading of "Small Business." Under recent rulings issued by Quartermaster Corps it appears possible that awards on invitations for competitive bidding on "100 percent small business joint determination" may go to bidders who, small as they themselves may be, have actual manufacturing and processing performed by others who do not qualify as "small business." Not only possible but actually as recently exemplified in connection with invitation QM (CTM) 36-243-600 gabardine 14½-ounce wool, and this incident I have discussed with your Mr. W. S. Walle.

Now, I and my associates believe, that under such an interpretation as disclosed

therein, that the real intent of congressional legislation on this subject is thwarted, inasmuch as the national full productive capacity or its military prowess is not served on a small business set-aside by permitting dealers or traders, who do not subcontract to small business, to bid in competition successfully.

It is requested, therefore, that your Administration review this whole matter in the light of these circumstances and other pertinent factors and take steps to modify the rulings referred to above, so that small business concerns may be given encouragement in continuing their activities not only for their own sakes but also in behalf of the national interest.

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. SELDEN,
President.

Change and Challenge in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a splendid address made on Saturday, April 26, at South Carolina's distinguished military college, The Citadel, at Charleston, by the president of the Chrysler Corp., the Honorable L. L. Colbert. Mr. Colbert is a distinguished industrialist in his own right. As a graduate of the University of Texas and of Harvard Law School, he identified himself with the late Walter Chrysler at an early age. Recognizing the budding genius of this young man, Chrysler marked him for the position he now occupies by making it possible for Mr. Colbert to serve in every segment of Chrysler's now giant industry.

Mr. Colbert spoke, for the most part, on the automobile industry, realizing that the state of health of the automobile manufacturing business represents the index of the state of health of our national economy. The automobile produced in America uses almost every commodity that is manufactured in this country—consequently, when the automobile business is slack the state of the health of our economy is not good.

Mr. Colbert's address makes suggestions on some of the things which would help our economy. His advice is wise and sound.

I recommend his address to my colleagues:

CHANGE AND CHALLENGE IN 1958

(Speech by L. L. Colbert, president, Chrysler Corp., at The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, Charleston, April 26, 1958)

Thank you, General Clark, and good morning ladies and gentlemen.

When General Clark honored me with an invitation to give one of your greater issues lectures, he made quite a point of asking me to speak from the heart about any issues or problems that seemed important from my point of view as one associated with the automobile industry. On the face of it, this would seem to be an easy assignment for an automobile man. But the trouble is that our industry stands right at the center of the American economy, and we seem to be subject to every change, force, pressure and stimulus that happens to be operating at any given moment. So it's a little difficult to know which of the many problems now facing us, the economy and the country I should talk about.

Right now, with the general level of business down considerably from the heights reached in 1957, everybody seems to have his eyes turned toward Detroit. People are looking to the automobile industry to provide a big push toward recovery. This includes policymakers in Washington, steel executives in Pittsburgh, and economists everywhere.

They look hopefully in our direction for a very good reason. When you consider it as a whole, including factories, dealers, suppliers, service stations, and all related activities, the automobile business is one of the key sectors in the economy—and what happens to our sales and production thus has an important bearing on the prosperity of the entire country. One out of every six businesses and 1 out of every 7 workers in the United States are directly dependent upon the manufacture, distribution, servicing and use of motor vehicles. Automobile manufacturing absorbs about 70 percent of the finished rubber products, 20 percent of the finished steel, and 40 percent of all the radios produced in this country. And of course the impact of the automobile industry on the aluminum, glass, electronic and machine-tool industries is also very heavy.

To hear some of the comments being made these days about the key importance of our activities, you might think we could easily provide the much-needed upward push on the economy with a few fast decisions. We have been getting a great deal of free advice on the decisions we should make—decisions on prices, on automotive styling, and on horsepower, to mention just a few—and along with the advice usually comes the word that if we only followed it we could easily sell an extra million or two cars a year.

It would be wonderful if life were that simple for us in Detroit. The fact is that our decisions are affected by many complex considerations—by taxes and Government regulations, by labor and material costs, by the prevailing economic conditions of the country, and above all by the attitudes and the decisons of our customers. I think you will agree that this is a pretty imposing array. There is one important thing to remember about all these considerations. Like everything else in modern life, they change.

The virtue of a free and open society is that we have ways of making adjustments from year to year to fit changing needs. And in the kind of century we are living in, this may be the greatest virtue a country can have.

Change is the controlling condition of our lives, and the speed of change is being stepped up with every passing month. When I was a college student people were fond of saying that ours was the age of the automobile. But very soon it became fashionable to say we were living in the air age. Then it was the age of jet propulsion, and before long the age of the atom. Only a few months ago we were hearing about the age of the missile. And now, they say, we are entering the space age. So it goes.

The present speed of change, with new developments crowding upon us so fast, reminds me of a story that went the rounds in World War II. A carrier pigeon was flying from divisional headquarters to a command post somewhere in the field with a highly important order that was to change the whole disposition of men and materiel. On the way, he became aware that another pigeon was coming up behind him pretty fast. And then he heard this second pigeon say, "You'd better fly a lot faster than that—I'm carrying the countermand."

I guess all of us are going to have to fly just a little faster to keep up with our responsibilities and opportunities and meet the many challenges of this fast-changing mid-century world.

Arnold Toynbee once said: "In a growing civilization a challenge meets with a successful response which proceeds to generate another and a different challenge which meets with another successful response. There is no term to this process of growth unless and until a challenge arises which the civilization in question fails to meet."

What Mr. Toynbee said is profound. Even since he wrote those words, not so very many years ago, the world has changed. And today our civiliaztion is meeting not just one challenge after another, but many challenges simultaneously. Among other things, we are being challenged to match the growing economic and military power of Soviet Russia—to develop the means of exploring space—to meet the ever-growing needs of our people for education—and to find ways to stimulate the continued expansion of our economy as the necessary foundation of our national strength.

But, in my opinion, there is one challenge to our free democratic American civilization that is probably more important than any other. In a word, it is the challenge of finding ways to pay for all the things we are going to need as a nation.

It has become pretty clear with every passing month that the cost of our national defense, including research and development, together with the cost of the educational and other public services in our States and local communities, is not going to get any smaller. If anything, it is going to increase.

These next few years are going to make exceptional demands upon people in all walks of life. But they will make perhaps their heaviest demands upon the business community of America, because it will be the special responsibility of business to stimulate the expansion of the economy.

In recent months we have heard some important people say, in effect, that if we are going to build an adequate defense we will have to give up some of the customary features of the American standard of living.

Now as I see it, that kind of talk is based on a serious misunderstanding of the kind of economy we have. We grow strong as a nation not by giving up goods and services but by finding ways to raise our levels of production and consumption and by broadening our economic base. A diversified and growing economy provides the flexibility and mobility to meet fast-changing situations. It does this by making available a continually widening range of goods and services and skills. It also builds a broadening base of income that can, if necessary, supply increased tax revenue without higher tax rates.

The events of the past few months have reminded us powerfully that a prime source of economic progress is science and technology. To the industrial manager this means that research must be put first in all his plans for remaining successful and useful in a competitive economy.

All of us are familiar with the wonders of research and what it has meant and will mean in our lives. I am not going to labor the point. I do think it might be of some interest, however, to say a few words about the research that goes on year after year in the automobile industry.

At Chrysler we are very proud of the engineering in our cars. It was our engineering that enabled us to make a sales breakthrough a third of a century ago when people thought the business was all sewed up. And year after year we have brought important engineering firsts to market. They

include four-wheel brakes, high-compression engines, floating power, the fluid coupling, and power steering. On our current models we are especially proud of our suspension systems which we are certain give our cars the most comfortable and most stable ride to be found in any production cars built in this country or anywhere else in the world. I might say in passing that there are a good many independent automotive specialists who agree with us on this matter.

Thank you very much for your kind attention to this 1-minute commercial.

One possible result of the very intensive research conducted by the automobile industry is that not too many years away there may be entirely new kind of engine in your car. For some years all the major companies have been researching and experimenting and testing to find out how to build a production model of a gas-turbine engine. This is an engine that has no pistons—that needs a sparkplug only to get started—an engine that needs on octane rating for its fuel.

Chrysler Corp. was the first company in the United States to design a working gas-turbine engine that could be installed in a passenger car of normal size. Two years ago, about this time of year, our engineers drove a Plymouth powered by a gas-turbine engine from New York to Los Angeles.

There are a great many problems ahead of us before we are ready to put an engine of this kind on the market, but someday this or some other new kind of engine will make obsolete every car on the road. What if the gas-turbine should come in 10 years and an even more revolutionary engine in 20? What would this do to the idea that seems to appeal to some people of a nice standardized car that never changes?

In the automobile business you have to be ready for new and radical developments in product and in methods—and you have to be ready to beat the other companies to those new developments if you can. Competition in this industry is in constant, accelerating motion at every level. That's the nature of the business and we wouldn't want it any other way.

Every day of our lives in Detroit we are reminded of the important fact that new ideas are the source of all economic growth. And it is equally important that new ideas are generated by individual men who somehow get fired up to put their abilities to work. I am sure you will agree with me as you go out into military service or into civilian life that the most important and perhaps the most difficult challenge you will have to face as leaders of men is the challenge of finding ways to stimulate that incentive in others.

Sometimes businessmen talk as if incentive is entirely a matter of money. This is not true. Men are stimulated by a wide variety of motivations. Among other powerful drives there is a man's pride in workmanship, his love of his family and of his country, and his desire to prove that he is somewhere near as good as he pictures himself in his own private thoughts. But it is also true that when you can tie those basic drives to financial incentives and make them work together, you get the kind of spectacular results that make this country the kind of country it is.

We are hearing a lot of talk these days about needed reforms in taxation, and I think a great many people agree that through tax reform it might be possible to add measurably to the creativeness and the forward drive of our economy. A number of highly competent groups are studying the tax problem, and the country is looking forward with great interest to their recommendations.

From my point of view as an automobile man there are two tax matters I would like to comment upon briefly. They are closely connected with the ability of the country to recover quickly from the present recession and to expand steadily in the years ahead.

First there is the matter of the automotive excise taxes. As you know, everyone who buys a car or a truck pays a Federal tax amounting to 10 percent of the manufacturer's wholesale price to the dealer. We consider this tax discriminatory. In effect, it puts automobiles and trucks in the same category with luxuries, like perfume and earrings. We feel that the motor vehicle is almost as necessary to modern living as food, clothing, and shelter. It makes no more sense for the Federal Government to tax a man for buying a new car than it would to tax him for buying a new house.

Over and beyond our feeling that this tax is discriminatory, however, there is a more important consideration. By removing this tax or drastically reducing it, the Federal Government could inject a stimulus into the economy that would be felt from coast to coast. It would benefit everyone affected by the manufacture, distribution, servicing, and use of motor vehicles. And as I explained earlier, that includes just about the entire population in one way or another.

It is of the greatest importance, in our opinion, that the reduction of this tax be made on all new cars now in dealers' stocks and that protection be given new-car purchasers between now and the enactment date of a new excise-tax law.

The other tax matter that affects us, as well as every other manufacturer, has to do with the corporate income tax allowances permitted by the Federal Government to enable a company to replace worn-out or obsolete equipment. As you know, if a company buys a new piece of machinery, such as a turret lathe, it must set aside enough money each year to buy another lathe when the present one wears out or is made obsolete by technical progress. These set-asides are known as depreciation expenses and the Federal Government considers them—quite logically—as part of the operating costs of a company rather than as income to be taxed.

As I have stated it, this arrangement sounds perfectly satisfactory for all concerned. In practice, however, we run into serious problems. And most of those problems go right back to the fast rate of change in modern life, which I mentioned earlier. There was a time not so long ago when a piece of machinery was generally used until it wore out. Under those conditions it was perfectly logical for the Internal Revenue people in Washington to let you set aside, 7 percent of the original cost of the equipment each year and charge that amount to operating expense. This was done on the theory that it would last 15 years or so.

Under present conditions, however, few machines are ever in use long enough to wear out. Long before that time they get out of date and have to be scrapped. The length of life of machinery today is determined by the pace of technological progress—not by the length of time it takes to tire out a piece of iron. You may have to scrap your machines because new ones are more efficient or because your product has changed so much the old machine won't do the job. So, under present conditions, you have to write off the cost of most equipment at far faster rates than you did 20 years ago.

At Chrysler, for instance, we just recently scrapped nearly all the machine tools in an entire engine plant because they had become obsolete. Only 6 years earlier that installation was the most advanced and the most highly automatic of its kind in the automobile industry.

Government officials are beginning to recognize this new situation, but they are a long way as yet from giving it realistic consideration in their tax decisions. Neither are they recognizing that it takes far more money to buy the new machines than it did to buy the ones they replace. Inflation, which has added to the cost of living in so many other ways, has increased the cost of machinery enormously. What this means is that you can't even come close to replacing an old machine with a new one just by recovering the cost of the old one.

Other countries have discovered that they can speed up their industrial growth by gearing their tax policies on depreciation to the realities of 20th-century technology. In the United States we have been making only very modest progress in the use of realistic depreciation policies to provide incentive for industrial expansion and modernization. We still have a long way to go.

For far too long a time people have talked about taxation in negatives. It has been mentioned in the same breath with poverty, death, and tyrannical government. It is true, of course, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. But in a broad sense it is also the power to give men the incentive to explore, discover, create, and advance. Used in such a way as to keep in proper balance the incentives of individuals and the sound progress of the country as a whole, tax laws and tax administration can tap the greatest of all resources—the will of men—and put it to work in the Nation's interest.

Our country is going through a difficult period. We are very far from knowing the answers to all our problems. But there is one thing we can be sure of. That is the basic truth that the main source of our strength lies in the will and the imagination of free individuals working creatively and cooperatively with other free individuals. And it is by remembering that truth and using it as the guide to our thinking and planning that we will realize our great promise as a people.

Daylight Time Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy Herald-Whig of April 25, 1958:

DAYLIGHT TIME AGAIN

Summer daylight time goes into effect in Quincy Sunday morning at 2, with clocks being moved up 1 hour for the 6-month period ending Sunday morning, October 26. It means an added hour of daylight for most Quincyans, as for millions of other Americans. But it also means a renewal of confusion for much of the Nation, including some Quincyans and quite a few of Quincy's neighbors.

Daylight time is an old story in Quincy, for with the exception of 1 year it has been in effect—at least for summer months—every year since 1940. The result is that most Quincyans suffer only a little confusion, unless their work takes them to neighboring communities that remain on standard time. At repeated elections Quincy voters have approved the fast-time program, even if by small margins at times.

Just as a majority of Quincyans have shown their preference for daylight time, so have the citizens of increasing numbers of Illinois communities. More and more cities of the State have adopted it. Since it has

long applied to Chicago and—in fact—the whole populous northeastern part of the State, it is obvious that a considerable majority of all Illinois citizens will be under daylight time this year.

For this reason it seems silly that the State should not adopt daylight time on a statewide basis, as have many other States. Two of Illinois' neighboring States, Indiana and Wisconsin, now have adopted daylight time on such a statewide basis. Ironically, both at one time expressly forbade any community within their State boundaries to adopt daylight time. But Illinois, with a long record of many communities obviously preferring daylight time, has continued to leave it on a local option basis.

It would be still better to have daylight time effective on a nationwide basis. That would eliminate all of the minor and major confusions that now exist. This was true, of course, during the war. It was effective then on a 12-month basis. It still seems that if it were good for the Nation during wartime, that it should be good for it now.

Space Age Problems Face Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in my newsletter last week I took the opportunity to apprise the people whom I have the honor to represent of some aspects of the problems facing the Congress in this space age of which they may not be aware. Under unanimous consent I include this newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

SPACE AGE PROBLEMS FACE CONGRESS

The present session of Congress has not been by any means a lighthearted one. What with the crisis brought on by the sputniks, the muttniks, the missiles, and the rockets, the problems of the recession, not to mention foreign aid, reciprocal trade, reorganization of the Defense Department, and scores of other critical and controversial problems, the Congress has not had much to be lighthearted about. But there have been moments when the smile has managed to triumph over the scowl. It is our thought that our friends this week might enjoy a report on the lighter side of events at the Capitol.

Because the Congress has been largely preoccupied with problems of the space age, the Capitol Hill newspaper, Roll Call, early this session published a glossary or dictionary of space-age terminology to assist Members and their assistants in dealing with space-age problems. Reprinted below are some of these helpful definitions:

Buck Rogers: Democratic candidate for President in 1960.

Flash Gordon: Republican candidate for President in 1960.

Vanguard: Reluctant rocket developed by the Navy to launch satellite.

Jupiter: Army version of Vanguard—what the first American satellite was put up with.

Thor: What the Navy was when Jupiter did the job.

Meteor: A space-age greeting, as for instance: "Pleased to meet you and also to meteor friend."

Etiletas: Satellite that goes backward. It is accidental—they don't planet that way.

Interstellar constellation: Any political convention.

Rockette: Female space scientist.

Ionosphere: Fear of having too many ions in the fire.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SPACE EXPLORATION AND ASTRONAUTICS HAS SPACE PROBLEMS

The House Special Committee on Outer Space, recently established under the chairmanship of Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, started right in having problems in space exploration—in finding suitable office space for the committee to meet. The new office building is under construction, but meanwhile every nook and cranny of the Capitol itself and the present office buildings, including windowless cubbyholes originally designed to be storage rooms and closets, have long ago been pressed into use as office space. Hence the new committee has run into serious difficulties finding a suitable headquarters. One of the members of the committee, when asked by a colleague how they were coming along in this exploration for office space, replied ruefully: "It looks like the members of the select committee are going to have to be the first passengers on the first trip to the moon. I don't know where else we are going to find any space." Eventually, however, the new committee was able to establish offices in the basement of one of the office buildings in space previously occupied by telephone equipment. This led another member to quip: "The Select Committee on Space Exploration and Astronautics is operating from a telephone booth."

The newly appointed members of this committee are being referred to as "the higher-ups" by their colleagues. In one heated exchange in the cloakroom, involving a member of the select committee and one of his less privileged colleagues, the latter was heard to retort: "That may be all right for you fellows on the space committee, but it's too high up in the air for us ordinary workmen."

Just prior to the launching of our first American satellite your Representative received a letter from one of our good leather-goods manufacturers in our district generously offering to make available to our defense authorities a suitable dog collar for use on the first dog sent up into outer space by our missile and rocket experts. The offer has not yet been accepted.

Truly we are living in the Buck Rogers-Flash Gordon age and not only our youth wants to know but all America wants to know the answers.

The President's Veto of Pork Barrel Projects Is Approved by the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the recent veto by President Eisenhower of S. 497, the rivers and harbors omnibus bill, and it was an action that took courage of conviction and an attitude of great selflessness, has not met with the disapproval of the public as some would have us believe. Indeed, I think that those who saw to it that this bill was loaded with political pork-barrel projects are mightily disappointed now that through purposeful political action they have set back, as President Eisenhower pointed out, the worthy, tested, and qualified projects contained in that bill.

From the outset I had watched that situation arise and had opposed such flagrant violation of the principals previously set out by this Congress. In committee and on the floor of the House I had called for elimination of projects that had not previously been studied by the United States Army engineers and which had not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and other executive agencies because they did not conform to established standards.

In view of the veto and the importance of getting a sound program underway as soon as possible I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 12235) that I feel certain includes worthy projects that meet these proven standards and additional programs that will qualify by bringing them into conformity with already accepted standards. I remarked upon this during yesterday's session of the House.

In support of the President and of my action, many papers across the Nation have editorialized upholding this veto. I ask permission at this time to include under unanimous consent three of these editorials in the RECORD that the Members may benefit from their considered comment:

[From the St. Petersburg Times of April 19, 1958]

NO TIME FOR PORK BARREL

The cries of political anguish which greeted President Eisenhower's veto of the rivers and harbors bill were not, we fear, prompted by deep concern over the loss of the bill's public-works projects in a time of unemployment.

Many of the projects to which the President objected were pulled out of the weathered pork barrel. They were election-year sugarplums, designed to please the home folks.

It took political courage for the President to veto the bill. Many of his supporters in the hustings will be angry.

It took similar fortitude for Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER to vote against the bill. The measure contains a number of projects in Mr. CRAMER'S district—surveys for dredging along the Sunshine Skyway, at Gulfport, and Frenchmen's Creek, among them. But as a member of the minority in the House Public Works Committee, Mr. CRAMER opposed the bill on the floor because of some of the items in it which the administration had not approved.

Administration perusal of a bill of this kind calls into action a subtle legislative-executive struggle. Congressmen want projects in this own districts for obvious political advantage. The administration, which must carry out the projects, frequently feels they are against public policy. The executive branch wants available money used for other things. It cannot veto out unapproved projects, and so must kill the entire bill—as President Eisenhower did in 1956 and 1958.

There should be another rivers and harbors bill. Most of the Florida projects which have been lost not only are important, but have received the O. K. of the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. Certainly some compromise can be worked out between the President and the Democratic Congress.

But the needs of the unemployed shouldn't mask dredging and flood-control

programs which are not necessary or improperly financed.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Tampa, Fla., of April 17, 1958]

TRY AGAIN, MINUS THE PORK

To hardly anyone's surprise, President Eisenhower has vetoed a $1,500,000,000 water projects bill.

But to hear some of his critics tell it, the President has cut off the right hand of every Member of Congress and the left leg of everyone on the unemployment rolls.

All of which is bunk filled to the pork-barrel level.

The President acted as he did not because he objected to every item in the measure or because he is unwilling to take forthright steps to fight the recession. On the contrary, and quite frankly, Mr. Eisenhower said that many of the projects proposed in the bill were worthwhile.

But he also pointed out others were wasteful and that the bill included some 28 new projects costing $350 million "under the terms which I cannot approve without destroying some of the most important governmental policies" on water resources.

It should be noted that the President of the United States does not have the authority granted many of our governors to veto individual items in appropriation and authorization measures. He must accept such a bill in its entirety, exactly as Congress passed it, or else veto it.

Mr. Eisenhower, of course, could have taken the easy road in this instance. He could have signed the bill in its pork-barrel form. Then some of the present critics, grudgingly perhaps, might have given him credit for helping to clear the way for more jobs.

But the President is not one to spend just for the sake of spending. He could not in good conscience sign a water projects authorization bill he knew was loaded with far more than the usual number of pork-barrel projects.

To those who say the President is unsympathetic with the plight of the unemployed, the answer is that the water measure would not have gone into effect immediately even if he had signed it. It would merely authorize the various rivers, harbors, and flood control projects, with the actual appropriations to come later.

The course now open to Congress should be crystal clear. It is to come up with a new bill free of the pork-barrel and other defective items to which the President and many other individuals object. It should be done in the realization that it is just as sinful to waste taxpayers' money on make-work boondoggles during a time of recession as it is in a period of boom.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 17, 1958]

TOO MUCH PORK

President Eisenhower's veto of the $1.7 billion rivers and harbors bill could hardly have come as a surprise to Congress. The reasons he cited for returning the legislation without his approval were largely the same as those he gave for vetoing a similar authorization nearly 2 years ago. They may be summed up this way: Too much pork.

The measure had some good provisions in it, of course. The President cited favorably $800 million worth of projects previously authorized in connection with river basin development. But Congress, as it has been accustomed to do in the past, loaded the bill with pet projects desired by special interests back home but not recommended by the Army engineers for various reasons. Mr. Eisenhower indicated that he might have accepted some of these projects if their sponsors had provided for the assumption by local government of its proper share of the cost. As the President pointed out in this message and in his veto message of 1956, "the best test yet devised for insuring that a project is sound is the willingness of local people to invest their own money in a joint enterprise with the Federal Government." Indeed, several of the items thrown into the omnibus bill have been denounced by the Corps of Engineers as having no economic justification.

Promoters of the pork barrel projects had attempted to justify them as antirecession measures. But the President pointed out that, with a few exceptions, many months or even several years might be required to reach the construction stage on them. Meanwhile there are plenty of other Federal public works of importance that could be started now to stimulate the economy. Many of these already are being rescheduled for immediate construction.

The President made a sensible suggestion as to how Congress can avoid the prospect of a Presidential veto on rivers and harbors legislation in the future. He proposed that projects approved by the Corps of Engineers be included in one bill and all the other projects be the subject of separate measures. In that way desirable legislation would not be imperiled by pork barrel proposals. Any project sound enough to stand on its own feet would be assured of special attention in this way. And a veto of any or all of the additional projects would not affect those which are really essential to the public welfare.

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to advise my colleagues that the American Institute of Architects at its centennial convention by resolution gave its one hundred percent support to the completion of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the City of St. Louis, in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission on May 25, 1948.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is a national undertaking authorized by the Historic Sites Act, approved August 21, 1935, and is under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States. The Memorial consists of about 40 city blocks (about 82 acres). It is designed to be a national memorial to Thomas Jefferson, his aids, and the explorers and frontiersmen who made possible the westward expansion of the United States. The beautiful arch designed by Eero Saarinen portrays the meaning of the gateway to the West and its significance to the growth of our country.

At this time I would like to place in the RECORD for the reading of my colleagues a letter directed to my attention written by Mr. Edmund R. Purves, executive director of the American Institute of Architects.

The letter follows:

APRIL 24, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The American Institute of Architects, the organization representing the profession of architecture in the United States, has historically been zealous and active in its efforts to establish and preserve beauty in this country. The professional obligation of our members is the provision of shelter and comfort for human activities in the most practical and efficient manner, at the same time expressing the spirit, the sense of beauty and the aspirations of the people who live, work, and worship in it. For architecture reveals the real nature of people. Today, as in the days of the Egyptian pyramids and the Gothic cathedrals, architecture is the visible, enduring expression of civilization. Architecture not only reflects—it determines civilization.

From the earliest days in our history some of the greatest and certainly the best known of our architecture has been the monuments commemorating great events, great men, and great ideals. These are among our most precious heritages.

The Jefferson Memorial, like the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial, was conceived in the grand tradition. Standing where it is planned at the confluence of the two great rivers that opened the west, and commemorating the Louisiana Purchase which truly started America on the path to greatness, it will turn the historic St. Louis waterfront into a point of beauty and inspiration to the thousands who will see it from air, land, and water.

The concept and design of the Jefferson Memorial were achieved through methods which traditionally have produced the great monuments. America's outstanding architects submitted designs in competition and from among these the present design by Eero Saarinen, a fellow of the American Institute of Architects, was chosen. This simple shape of heroic dimensions should take its place among the great monuments and add to the historical and aesthetic glory of our Nation.

The American Institute of Architects meeting in its Centennial Convention in 1957, noted that this project is at a standstill and passed the following resolution:

"Resolved by this centennial convention of the American Institute of Architects, That the Congress of the United States be urged to take action necessary to complete the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission on May 25, 1948."

The American Institute of Architects appreciates any action you may be able to take to see that this great work is carried forward.

Respectfully yours,

EDMUND R. PURVES,
FAIA, Executive Director.

Resolutions of County Convention Hit Administration's Farm Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Clearwater County DFL convention in my district on April 19 passed four thoughtful resolutions on the agricul-

ture situation generally, family farmers, problems, dairy supports, and Hells Canyon. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD these timely resolutions:

RESOLUTION ON AGRICULTURE

Whereas the Republican administration in Washington, particularly through the Department of Agriculture, has carried on a premeditated, planned program of elimination of the family farm, of continued reduction of parity on agricultural products, of hostility toward the entire stabilization of farm income, of sharp increase in interest rates on FHA and other loans causing an unbearable burden on farm borrowers; and

Whereas this has reduced farm income by $2½ billion causing distress and disaster on many farms as well as to small-business men, unemployment, factory shutdowns, and general economic stagnation: Be it

Resolved, That we condemn this program as economically unsound, inhuman, undemocratic, and not in the best interest of the Nation as a whole; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon all people to support candidates of the Democratic Party in the coming election in order to restore confidence again in government and salvage our economy from chaos and bankruptcy.

RESOLUTION ON PARITY

Whereas there is a widespread lack of understanding and appreciation of the economic problems of family farmers among other segments of society today; and

Whereas this is partly because the farmer's share of consumer's dollars continues to decline and opponents of farm programs have exaggerated the cost of the farm program to the taxpayer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there should be education done in this field as to the need for the farmers to receive their equal share of the national income. We further believe that to stabilize the economy of this United States there must be a program whereby the average farmer will receive 100 percent of parity up to a marketing quota, this quota not to exceed $15,000 for each farmer, and that any farmer who produces in excess of the above will be entitled to only 60 percent of parity on any farm product above the $15,000.

RESOLUTION ON DAIRY PAYMENTS

Whereas we believe that the dairy industry is basic in the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas we further believe that more farm families are directly affected by the value of dairy products marketed; and

Whereas the reduction of payments on dairy products to 75 percent of parity has seriously jeopardized the entire dairy industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, This DFL County Convention assembled at Bagley, Minn., April 26, 1958, go on record urging restoration of dairy supports to at least 90 percent of parity through production payments to farmers.

RESOLUTION ON HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas the construction of a Federal high dam in Hells Canyon, Idaho, would more fully utilize the tremendous potential of this natural resource and make available electrical energy at the lowest possible cost, permitting the processing of the great phosphate deposits in this area at a saving of $12 to $16 per ton compared to the low dams proposed to be built by private interests, in this way providing savings of millions of dollars to the farmers of America for generations to come as well as providing adequate flood control and an abundance of water for irrigation: Be it

Resolved, That this Clearwater County DFL Convention reiterate our stand in favor of Federal development of this natural resource and the distribution of this energy through REA lines and the retention of this heritage of the people for the benefit of all the people of our country, and again urge our Members in Congress to continue their vigorous support of this principle.

Fair-Trade Law Will Help Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony on my bill, H. R. 10847, which I presented to the subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This measure is designed to protect independent smaller businesses from unfair competition and to strengthen the Nation's economy, and in this connection Members of the Congress are urged to give this legislation their sympathetic consideration.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS M. PELLY, REPUBLICAN, WASHINGTON STATE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 10847

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and members of the committee for giving me the privilege to appear and speak for my bill, H. R. 10847, a bill proposed to bring back into our domestic economy some semblance of law and order in the retail field as it relates to trademarked brand merchandise.

The Chicago Daily News of March 11, 1958, carried an article by Sylvia Porter from which I quote:

"Price wars which have followed the abandonment of fair trade on small appliances may be building plenty of business for the big stores, and they're certainly giving consumers a chance to grab some bargains, but the wars also are dooming small appliance retailers the Nation over."

The newspaper article referred to the House Small Business Committee's prediction in January 1957 that if small-business failures and big-business expansions continue at the rate of the previous 5 years, most of the distribution and service business of the Nation and all manufacturing business within 18 years would be controlled by giant corporations.

For myself, Mr. Chairman, let me say bigness is not anything to apologize for, except when failures of small independent businesses are a contributing cause to size. I believe the backbone of our competitive economy and of free enterprise is the neighborhood or family type of business, the independent operator with a few employees, and the smaller concern. This is the kind of store whose policies conform to the grassroots ideas of service and profit incentive and offer customers year in and year out responsibility. This is the kind of business that gives America its high living standard.

I am aware, of course, of the theory whereby certain economists believe that the cure to the present recession lies in attracting consumers and the public by price adjustments; in other words, to draw people into the market places to unload inventories and by stimulating purchases to overcome a psychological public attitude of restraint.

However, Mr. Chairman, if such action was instituted, it would in no way disturb the planning outlined in my bill or similar bills before the Congress. In other words, what my bill proposes is to protect trademarked brand merchandise and nothing beyond that. Even if this is accomplished through an act of Congress, it does not create any monopoly where there is competitive merchandise minus trademarked brands in the open market. In many instances, these large corporate chains merchandise their own brands so this means this is a free and open market for John Q. Public to be served through.

A wretched price situation existed in the early thirties in the depression days where advertised trademarked brands were used as loss leaders and, in most instances, these trademarked brands were sold at less than cost with the hope of attracting buyers into the establishment; where they sold unbranded merchandise, and the public did not gain and independent retail establishments were severly injured.

The Congress, realizing this situation, in or around 1937 enacted the Tydings-Miller law. This law held good for some few years, until action of the Supreme Court nullified certain sections of the law and then left the field wide open again for certain classes of retailers to use trademarked brands as loss leaders, all at the expense of the trademarked brand manufacturer himself, and secondly, injuring competent efficient independent trade.

Then, again, the Congress, realizing the injury sustained in the nullification of the Tydings-Miller law on certain sections of the law, by legislation instituted the McGuire Act, the national law.

There's no need, Mr. Chairman, for me to go into what took place from that moment on. The record speaks for itself but independent retailers find themselves in the same position now, in fact, now even worse than under what existed prior to 1937.

During the hearings on the McGuire Act, there was a statement made by I believe a competent witness who appeared before the committee. I believe his background was in industry for over a quarter of a century as an independent retailer, and it will be found in his remarks before this committee that he mentioned that all fair-trade legislation did was to place competition where it rightfully belongs, with the producer of trademarked brands. I am referring to the testimony of Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. Many of my colleagues are well acquainted with the gentleman and know of his experience in small business.

You and I know that the Nations buyers are being fooled intrading areas with these so-called discount houses. Of course they feature trademarked brand merchandise in most instances. The responsibility for their existence is largely due to weak sales policies of the trademarked brand merchandise manufacturer. In other words, the producer in his greed for volume has no real interest as to where his merchandise is sold so long as he, the producer, gets the volume. That might be a fine situation with those producers of trademarked brands if they carried on their overall policy exclusively with discount houses, but it would appear to me that where they seek other retailers to handle their merchandise and expect those retailers the create public acceptance, then there is some reason for the Congress to write into law as it applies to interstate commerce some justifiable protection for many hundreds of thousands of independent retailers handling trademarked brand merchandise throughout the Nation.

Before coming to Congress, I operated a retail stationery business and in my time I have signed a good many fair trade agreements with manufacturers. To stay in business and pay half-decent wages and not go bankrupt it is essential to average certain gross profits. To give a 20-percent discount requires doing almost twice the volume one would otherwise do.

The other day I came across some of my old figures. The store gross profit percentage which is before expenses were deducted was 36.88 percent. The percentage of expense was 34.32. So, in this case the profit before tax and nonoperating costs was 2.56 percent of sales.

Thus it is with a smaller business, there is hardly enough profit and frequently losses, so there is little incentive to encourage a businessman to continue. Always there is the temptation to sell out and go to work for a big fellow or chain and thereby avoid the long hours, worry and risk, and probably make more money at the end of the year.

But it will be a sad day for this Nation and its basic economy without the individual smaller firms. That, however, is the trend and what will happen without fair trade laws, in my opinion, to allow for protection of quality of merchandise and trade brands and against ruthless price cutting by powerful monopolistic concerns with practices designed deliberately to eliminate competition—often by selling below cost.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be on record so there can be no misunderstanding, that I will not be interested in sponsoring any legislation that would create a monopoly, whether the monopoly applied to a large segment or small segment in our economy. My legislation would not create that situation.

Further, Mr. Chairman, if I thought that my legislation would open up the door for collusion between producer and retailer or through groups of retailers, then I say to you and members of the committee, I would ask you to vote down the legislation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope and trust for the good of efficient independent business, not alone in my State and District but throughout the Nation, that this committee report out sound and workable legislation as we cannot permit independent business in the various communities throughout the Nation to be destroyed through the ruinous vicious unfair competition, all tending to create a monopoly.

I might add one other thought. I do believe that if consistent vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws had been carried out by the Government consistently during the past 50 years, there never would have been any need for my legislation or similar legislation now before your committee.

Thank you.

If Everybody Would Buy Something

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the very fine article by Mr. M. L. Gunzburg, who to my knowledge on April 8, 1958, was the first to advocate the now famous buy campaign. Mr. Gunzburg is to be complimented for his foresight and contribution:

[From the Los Angeles Times of April 8, 1958]

IF EVERYBODY WOULD BUY SOMETHING

(By M. L. Gunzburg)

The President of the United States has said, in effect, that there is nothing wrong with the American economy that cannot be cured once the people start to buy.

The problem seems to be—when will that time come? How soon will the vast purchasing power of the masses (and of industry) be unleashed and American prosperity once more be in orbit? Where, oh where is the mechanism that can send it aloft?

And from where will it rise? Where is the launching site? In the White House? In Congress? Will it shoot upward from the canyons of Wall Street? From out of the indexes of industry and finance? Or does it lie slumbering deep and hidden in the psychology of the common consumer?

One eminent Senate leader proposes a tax cut for the lower and middle-income groups; an opponent insists high-income groups and corporations be included.

A third Senator protests that all such tax cuts would be so inflationary and so politically explosive as to end in blowing up the Senate itself.

A fourth leader is convinced that public works will prove disappointingly slow and ineffective and that tax cuts also are a mistake and that the true answer lies in correcting the policies of the Federal Reserve.

Other suggestions advocate lifting withholding taxes temporarily, but opponents question how much of such sums would be merely put aside into additional savings of employees and employers and how much would be released into circulation.

Yet all of the theories propounded have the same aim: via one or the other involved Rube Goldberg-like successions of economic cause and effect create purchasing power in the hands of the consumer and the incentive to buy in his "noggin"—and lo, the recession will be reversed.

Meanwhile the administration is advocating and determining its own remedies and has assured us that when and if and as necessary, it will take action.

But what action? What measures? At what costs, not only when enacted but in the future?

How long must we wait for them to be enacted? How much longer, 6 months, 6 years for them to become effective?

And it seems that the longer we wait the more confused and frightened and uncertain the consumer becomes—and the less inclined to spend his money.

Meantime, while the statesmen argue and the sages tremble, here is the writer's suggestion. Its enactment could be immediate.

Here is how it might work:

The administration, preferably the President himself, would appear on the Nation's combined networks and present to it a slogan and a campaign—Buy It Now.

And what would that simple slogan, Buy It Now, mean in actuality? A down-to-earth, rank-and-file, man-in-the-street voluntary program, free of Government controls, coercion or penalty—dependent on individual initiative and individual responsibility.

The President would make it clear in the beginning that he was not addressing his remarks to the 5 million unemployed or to those suffering seriously from the recession. The President's remarks would be directed solely to that vast remaining percentage of the population, citizens whose personal and family prosperity has exceeded anything they have known before.

To these, our more fortunate citizens, he would say in so many words:

"I am not asking you to take off on a buying spree, to be imprudent, to spend your savings in vain. I am asking only that you analyze your budget and your needs and then focus your attention on one item or service that you truly need or desire and one which, without doubt, you will purchase sometime within the year, and instead of waiting—buy it now.

"In fact, you might well have purchased it by now but for one reason or another have postponed doing so. You may have succumbed to the psychology of the times shared by many persons and business organizations—notions that this is not the time to buy, that it may be cheaper later or that you had best wait for prices to hit the bottom. You may even feel uneasy and embarrassed buying.

"But is this holding back of real assistance to your neighbors, or to your own well-being? Quite the contrary. Perhaps the time has come when the neighborly thing to do is to buy the very thing which you feel your neighbor might envy your having.

"Perhaps the shame some citizens feel in buying when their neighbors are unemployed might turn instead into a shame for not buying when their expenditures could bring employment to others. There are over 5 million unemployed and an estimated 2 million partially unemployed, yet seldom before have consumers held so much money in banks.

"Perhaps this is the time to share the economy, in the way it can best be shared, by its use. Select one item you need or wish and buy it now. Is it a new car, a new suit, a refrigerator, a washing machine, a necktie, a stock or bond in which you have faith, a new home, a new room, new carpets, color TV or a transistor radio, piano lessons, a much needed pair of glasses, a visit to the dentist or to your personal physician for a checkup, a bicycle or pair of skates or college education for your grandchildren, or a long-desired vacation?

"Select an item or service you have been wanting to purchase, something you know for sure you eventually will buy—and buy it now."

What are the potentials of such a buy it now campaign?

An obvious advantage is that such a campaign could be understood readily by the average citizen. No mystic shibboleths of classic economics will frighten off the man in the street.

As a practical national effort it could be enacted immediately and its results evaluated swiftly. There would follow no long, uncertain period during which we would await results.

We would have little to lose and at the very least much wisdom to gain.

For such a campaign might shed light on one of the unknown factors of economic law—the mystery of what part psychology plays in supply and demand.

Up to this point we have dealt with the idea of a buy it now campaign as a national effort that would be voluntary without Government intervention.

In fact, it could be so voluntary that the business and advertising fraternity could by itself alone initiate and carry through such a campaign, narrowing it to the limitations of a commercial buy-it-now month.

However, other than the voluntary, there is yet another approach to the buy-it-now campaign, an approach appealing less to the patriotic motives of the consumer and seller and more to their pocketbooks.

This pocketbook approach is also a simple approach, but it necessarily would involve Government action, for it would couple the buy-it-now campaign with an accompanying Federal moratorium or partial moratorium on excise taxes, thus creating substantial inducement indeed to the consumer to buy during the period of the campaign.

It then might be inexcusably bad business for the consumer not to buy it now.

Such a moratorium on excise taxes, as a Government weapon against unemployment, could possess remarkable pinpointing accuracy in coming to the aid of distressed areas and industries.

But regardless of the extent to which Government might participate in any such campaign, one point remains clear: Government is America's biggest buyer and its cooperation as a buying force alone in such a campaign could assume the success of buy it now.

Proposed Amendment to H. R. 12065, the Unemployment Compensation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, it will be the purpose of the minority membership of the House Committee on Ways and Means to urge that during the floor consideration of H. R. 12065, relating to the payment of temporary supplemental unemployment compensation, to offer an amendment to the bill. The amendment to be offered would make Federal funds available on a repayable basis to those States which at their option elect such funds for the purpose of extending unemployment compensation benefit durations under State law to those individuals who have exhausted their benefit entitlement after June 30, 1957. This proposed amendment embodies in its essential elements the administration's proposal for providing supplemental benefits modified by the proposal sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] to assure that the respective States will have the individual authority to determine whether or not a State participates in the program. The amendment contains a further modification so as to make benefit eligibility at the discretion of the State available with respect to individuals who have exhausted their benefit entitlement since July 30, 1957.

It will not be my purpose to debate the merits of this amendment at this time. Such debate will occur during the floor consideration of the legislation. However, I would point out to my colleagues that this amendment that I have described represents a marked improvement over the bill, H. R. 12065, in the form that it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It is an improvement in that it does not establish a public dole. It is an improvement in that it does not threaten the destruction of the existing unemployment compensation program. It is an improvement in that it preserves the integrity of the Federal-State relationship in the area of unemployment compensation. It is an improvement in that it grants to the States the discretion to determine whether or not the individual States will participate in the program. It is an improvement in that it is not administratively unworkable as is true of the bill, H. R. 12065, in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, so that the membership of the House and other interested persons may have an opportunity to study this proposed amendment to H. R. 12065 I will insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD at this point. In the event that this amendment is approved, it would, of course, be necessary to also offer an amendment to the title of the bill which I will do at the proper time:

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 12065

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the 'Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.'

"TITLE I. INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE EXHAUSTED THEIR RIGHTS

"Payment of compensation

"Eligibility

"SEC. 101. (a) (1) Payment of temporary unemployment compensation under this act shall be made, for any week of unemployment which begins on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this act and before April 1, 1959, to individuals who have, after June 30, 1957 (or after such later date as may be specified pursuant to section 102 (b)), exhausted (within the meaning prescribed by the Secretary by regulations) all rights under the unemployment compensation laws referred to in paragraph (3) and who have no rights to unemployment compensation with respect to such week under any such law or under any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law.

"(2) Except as provided in section 103, payment of temporary unemployment compensation under this act shall be made only pursuant to an agreement entered into under section 102 and only for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which the agreement is entered into.

"(3) The unemployment compensation laws referred to in this paragraph are:

"(A) Any unemployment compensation law of a State.

"(B) Title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1361 et seq.).

"(C) Title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as amended (38 U. S. C. 991 et seq.).

"Maximum Aggregate Amount Payable

"(b) The maximum aggregate amount of temporary unemployment compensation payable to any individual under this act shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount (including allowances for dependents) which was payable to him, under the unemployment compensation law or laws referred to in subsection (a) (3) under which he last exhausted his rights before making his first claim under this act, for the benefit year with respect to which this last exhaustion occurred. The term 'benefit year' means the benefit year as defined in the applicable State unemployment compensation law; except that, if such law does not define a benefit year, then such term means the period prescribed by the Secretary.

"Weekly Benefit Amount

"(c) The temporary unemployment compensation payable to an individual under this act for a week of total unemployment shall be the weekly benefit amount (including allowances for dependents) for total unemployment which was payable to him pursuant to the unemployment compensation law or laws referred to in subsection (a) (3) under which he most recently exhausted his rights. The temporary unemployment compensation payable to an individual under this act for a week of less than total unemployment shall be computed on the basis of such weekly benefit amount.

"Application of State Laws

"(d) Except where inconsistent with the provisions of this title, the terms and conditions of the unemployment compensation law or laws referred to in subsection (a) (3) under which an individual most recently exhausted his rights shall be applicable to his claims for temporary unemployment compensation under this act and to the payment thereof.

"Agreements with States

"In General

"SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with a State, or with the agency administering the unemployment compensation law of such State, under which such State agency—

"(1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of temporary unemployment compensation to the individuals referred to in section 101 on the basis provided in this act; and

"(2) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of temporary unemployment compensation under this act.

"State May Select Later Date for Exhaustions Under State Law Which Qualify Under This Act

"(b) If the State so requests, the agreement entered into under this section shall specify, in lieu of June 30, 1957, such later date as the State may request. In any such case, an exhaustion under the unemployment compensation law of such State shall not be taken into account for the purposes of this act unless it occurred after such later date.

"Amendment, Suspension, or Termination of Agreement

"(c) Each agreement under this act shall provide the terms and conditions upon which the agreement may be amended, suspended, or terminated.

"No Denial or Reduction of State Benefits

"(d) Any agreement under this act shall provide that unemployment compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any right to temporary unemployment compensation under this act. This subsection shall not apply to a State law which temporarily extended the duration of unemployment compensation benefits, if such State law provides for its expiration by reason of the enactment of this act.

"Veterans and Federal Employees

"In States Which Do Not Have Agreements, Etc.

"SEC. 103. (a) For the purpose of paying the temporary unemployment compensation provided in this act to individuals—

"(1) who have, after June 30, 1957, exhausted their rights to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; and

"(2) in a State, if there is no agreement entered into under section 102 which applies with respect to the weeks of unemployment concerned,

the Secretary is authorized to extend any existing agreement with such State. Any such extension shall apply only to weeks of unemployment beginning after such extension is made. For the purposes of this act, any such extension shall be treated as an agreement entered into under this act.

"In Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

"(b) For the purpose of paying the temporary unemployment compensation provided in this act to individuals—

"(1) who have, after June 30, 1957, exhausted their rights to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; and

"(2) in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the

personnel and facilities of the agencies in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands cooperating with the United States Employment Service under the Act of June 6, 1933 (29 U. S. C. 49 et seq.), and may delegate to officials of such agencies any authority granted to him by this act whenever the Secretary determines such delegation to be necessary in carrying out the purposes of this act; and may allocate or transfer funds or otherwise pay or reimburse such agencies for the total cost of the temporary unemployment compensation paid under this act and for expenses incurred in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"Review

"(c) Any individual referred to in subsection (b) whose claim for temporary unemployment compensation under this act has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing and review as provided in section 1503 (c) of the Social-Security Act (42 U. S. C. 1363 (c)).

"Repayment

"In General

"SEC. 104. (a) The total credits allowed under section 3302 (c) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 3302 (c)) to taxpayers with respect to wages attributable to a State for the taxable year beginning on January 1, 1963, and for each taxable year thereafter, shall be reduced in the same manner as that provided by section 3302 (c) (2) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for the repayment of advances made under title XII of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1321 et seq.), unless or until the Secretary of the Treasury finds that by December 1 of the taxable year there have been restored to the Treasury the amounts of temporary unemployment compensation paid in the State under this act (except amounts paid to individuals who exhausted their unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act and title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 prior to their making their first claims under this act), the amount of costs incurred in the administration of this act with respect to the State, and the amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor as the State's proportionate share of other costs incurred in the administration of this act.

"Repayment in Excess of Amount Owed

"(b) Whenever the amount of additional tax paid, received, and covered into the Treasury under subsection (a) with respect to wages which are attributable to a State exceeds the sum of the amounts described in subsection (a), there is hereby appropriated to the Unemployment Trust Fund for crediting to the account of such State an amount equal to such excess. The amount so credited shall be used only in the payment of cash benefits to individuals with respect to their unemployment, exclusive of expenses of administration.

"TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"SEC. 201. For the purposes of this act—

"(1) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(2) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii.

"(3) The term 'first claim' means the first request for determination of benefit status under this act on the basis of which a weekly benefit amount under this act is established, without regard to whether or not any benefits are paid.

"Review

"SEC. 202. Any determination by a State agency with respect to entitlement to temporary unemployment compensation pursuant to an agreement under this act shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"Penalties

"False Statements, Etc.

"SEC. 203. (a) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment under this act shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"Recovery of Overpayments

"(b) (1) If a State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, or a court of competent jurisdiction, finds that any person—

"(A) has made, or has caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or has knowingly failed, or caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and

"(B) as a result of such action has received any payment under this act to which he was not entitled

such person shall be liable to repay such amount to the State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be. In lieu of requiring the repayment of any amount under this paragraph, the State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, may recover such amount by deductions from any compensation payable to such person under this act. Any such finding by a State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, may be made only after an opportunity for a fair hearing, subject to such further review as may be appropriate under sections 103 (c) and 202 of this act.

"(2) Any amount repaid to a State agency under paragraph (1) shall be deposited into the fund from which payment was made. Any amount repaid to the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current applicable appropriation, fund, or account from which payment was made.

"Information

"SEC. 204. The agency administering the unemployment-compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary (on a reimbursable basis) such information as he may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"Payments to States

"Payment on Calendar-Month Basis

"SEC. 205. (a) There shall be paid to each State which has an agreement under this act, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"Certification

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment—

"(1) to each State which has an agreement under this act sums payable to such State under subsection (a), and

"(2) to each State such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this act in such State.

The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this act.

"Money To Be Used Only for Purposes for Which Paid

"(c) All money paid a State under this act shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this act, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this act may be made.

"Surety Bonds

"(d) An agreement under this act may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this act.

"Liability of Certifying Officers

"(e) No person designated pursuant to an agreement under this act, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this act.

"Liability of Disbursing Officers

"(f) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this act if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (e) of this section.

"Denial of benefits to aliens employed by Communist governments or organizations

"SEC. 206. No person who is an alien shall be entitled to any benefit under this act for any week of unemployment if, at any time on or after the first day of his applicable base period and before the beginning of such week, he was at any time employed by—

"(1) a foreign government which, at the time of such employment, was Communist or under Communist control, or any agency or instrumentality of any such foreign government, or

"(2) any organization if, at the time of such employment (A) such organization was registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (50 U. S. C. 786), or (B) there was in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 of such act or determining that it is a Communist-infiltrated organization.

"Regulations

"SEC. 207. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 208. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Frank J. Becker Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congressman FRANK J. BECKER Scholar-

ship Award which has been established by the Republican Club of Lynbrook, N. Y., is a wonderful example of true American spirit and it is with great pleasure that I place this informative article concerning it in the RECORD. This article appeared in the April 3, 1958, issue of the Tri-Town Leader, of Nassau County:

BECKER SCHOLARSHIP AWARD ESTABLISHED BY REPUBLICAN CLUB

The Republican Club of Lynbrook has established the Congressman FRANK J. BECKER Scholarship Award, according to an announcement made by Eugene O. Krause, chairman of the award committee.

The award is a cash scholarship grant of $500 and the award is raised through the auspices and under the sponsorship of the Lynbrook Republican Club.

The Congressman BECKER Scholarship Award is nonpolitical, stated Mr. Krause, and it is offered to a senior at any duly accredited high school who has been a resident within the 14 election districts of Lynbrook for 12 months preceding date of application.

Mr. Krause said, "In keeping with President Eisenhower's recent pleas for more private clubs to offer scholarships, the Lynbrook Republican Club has established the Congressman BECKER Cash Scholarship Award of $500."

Mr. Krause added, "The political nature of the sponsor and the political affiliations of the applicant will neither hinder nor aid the applicant in pursuance of the scholarship. The scholarship is awarded on the basis of scholastic record, character, personality ratings, good citizenship, and financial need."

Prospective applicants may obtain a complete copy of the rules by writing to Congressman FRANK J. BECHER Scholarship Award Committee, Eugene O. Krause, chairman, 12 Taft Avenue, Lynbrook, N. Y.

Postal Rate Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with admiration and respect the courageous statement by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield in connection with the action of the House-Senate conferees on H. R. 5836, the postage rate legislation.

Mr. Summerfield issued the following statement when queried by the press on this matter:

The action taken today by the Senate conferees in the Senate-House Conference in rejecting the 5-cent rate on letter mail would scuttle President Eisenhower's proposed $2 billion postal modernization program that would provide 12,000 badly needed post offices to assure better mail service and also provide employment for thousands of workers.

It represents a callous disregard of the Senate's previous approval of this 5-cent letter rate and is a temporary victory for the large business users of the mails who for years have benefited from below-cost postage rate subsidies which are being paid for by American taxpayers to the tune of over $2 million every working day. The fight to stop this unconscionable raid on the Treasury will continue until fair and equitable increases in postage rates are achieved.

I heartily concur with the public spirited statement of the Postmaster General, and I want to urge every Member of the Congress to give it the serious consideration that it so well merits. I, for long, have been amazed at the selfishness of many large users of the mails. They are perfectly content to have the taxpayers pay a large share of their postage for them. I think these freeloaders should be made to pay their own way, and the large majority of Americans with who I have discussed this matter feel the same way. I wish the Postmaster General well in this fight of his to protect the public interest in this matter.

Give Communists the Silent Treatment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Give Communists the Silent Treatment?" This appeared in Nassau County's largest weekly newspaper, the Leader, one of the finest grassroots newspapers in the country. I am sure that everyone having an opportunity to read this will agree there is a great deal of merit in the type of campaign promoted in this editorial, and I trust that every Member of the House will have an opportunity to read it.

The editorial follows:

GIVE COMMUNISTS THE SILENT TREATMENT?

Entirely too much has been written and said about the advantage the Red Russians gained in the propaganda war by announcing they had suspended A-bomb tests. Propaganda is effective only when gullible people of a nation fall for it. We think the people of the United States have reached the stage where they take any propaganda eminating from communistic sources at its face value and let it pass unnoticed.

Anyone who thinks the United States should really end its experiments before it is prepared to do so is too naive to be worthy of consideration, or just plain nuts to put it bluntly. Wouldn't the Communists like us to fall for a gag like that? Pacifists who have been wearing out their feet parading from upstate Connecticut and Pennsylvania on to U. N. headquarters in Manhattan demanding that we follow the Communists' example are poor, simple-minded individuals who do not understand they are, without realizing it, aiding and abetting the Russian cause.

The unfortunate thing is that news commentators broadcast the news the Reds send out and newspaper editors, who ought to know better, give it valuable space in their publications. Following this policy is never going to bring the Reds to their knees. Negotiations have failed. The campaign of Prayers for Peace has been ineffective against a Godless people.

But there is one type of campaign that has not been tried. Why not give the Communists the silent treatment, undemocratic though such a plan might be? If news broadcasters and newspapers would agree among themselves to ignore everything of a propaganda nature favorable to the Reds and not publish a line or speak a word about it, the Communists would be stunned.

Soviet scientists got into the air first with their sputniks, but both have dived to earth in flames, while the three United States produced satellites are still whirling through space apparently destined to continue to do so long after the Russian moons have been forgotten. If the Reds should put up another sputnik, the fact should be dismissed with brief mention. The same policy should be followed with all news coming from behind the Iron Curtain. There should be no comparisons.

When the Communists come to realize that their lies are not going to get into print or onto the air, they will have to pause to ponder. They will realize they are not being taken seriously by an enlightened America. And then perhaps they can be brought to the understanding that until they establish themselves as truth-tellers to say the least they will receive no recognition.

It's worth a trial. Let's apply the silent treatment to the Reds.

The Constitution: A Bulwark of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following composition written by Tommy Mansker:

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS BILL OF RIGHTS: A BULWARK OF LIBERTY

Our country won its independence from Great Britain in the year 1781. For 8 years its foundation, the Articles of Confederation, was weak and faulty. The United States of America, in spite of its name, was far from being a perfect Union. It was, indeed, as the articles said, "a league of friendship" among the States.

In time, some of the States became less friendly toward one another. Soon they began to quarrel seriously. Instead of pulling together as a team, the States were pulling in different directions. There was danger that the States might break away and become small, separate countries. In order to prevent this, the able leaders of the country, fearing our new Nation might fail, called a Constitutional Convention in May 1787 at Independence Hall in Philadelphia to patch the cracked foundation. After seeing that it was impossible, they wrote a new formula, the Constitution of the United States of America.

The Republic of the United States of America was established as a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Though the United States is a republican form of government, it is also a democratic form of government. Even though it is not a true democracy, in which all residents of the country gather at one location to make their laws and choose their leaders, it is a representative democracy in which the different sections of the country vote in their regions and elect representatives to send to their National Capital to make the laws. The Constitution also guarantees each and every State a republican form of government and is bound to protect each of them

against invasion and on application of the legislature or of the executive when the legislature cannot be convened, against domestic violence.

In forming a government that would not be overbalanced, each branch of the Government had to be given enough powers to equal those of the other branches. At times there have been attempts to overbalance the situation by 1 of the 3 branches, but so far, none have been successful. One example of this was during the radical Republican period just after the Civil War when the Republican Party had a majority of over 70 percent in the Congress. With such a majority, they could pass any bill they wished to propose, and the President's veto would be completely worthless.

The Constitution, which set up the 3 divisions of the Government, was itself divided into 3 parts, the preamble, the articles, and the amendments. The first part, the preamble, is the reason for the writing on the Constitution. It is: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The second part of the Constitution, the articles, defines the powers given to the different parts of the Government. In article 1, the powers of the Congress are defined. This article gives the Congress, and only Congress, the power to make laws. The most important of these powers are listed in section 8 of article 1. They are: clause 1, collecting taxes, duties, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; clause 2, to borrow money on the credit of the United States; clause 5, to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin; clause 9, to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; clause 11, to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; clause 12, to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; and clause 13, to provide and maintain a navy. All these are most important due to the ever present threat of communism. In order to cope with communism, these duties of the Congress are the most important for they concern the defense and trade of the United States.

In order to be a member of the Congress, there are certain requirements that must be met. To be a member of the House of Representatives, a person must be 25 years old, a resident of the United States for 7 years, and a resident of the State from which he was elected. Before taking office, a Senator must be 30 years old, a resident of the United States for 9 years, and a resident of the State in which he was chosen. All Members of Congress must take an oath. It is: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

In article II, the duties, qualifications, and powers of the executive branch are mentioned. The executive branch is headed by the President and both of them together enforce the laws made by Congress and signed by the President. In order to be President, a natural born citizen must be, at least for 14 years, a citizen of the United States, and 35 years old. The President takes the following oath before taking office. It is: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Duties of the President include being Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This keeps anyone from becoming a dictator because the President is elected every 4 years. Also, in doing this, the makers of the Constitution placed in the hands of one man the great governmental and military powers that must be used together in time of war.

Other important powers of the President are: He shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not provided for, and which shall be established by law.

A President may be removed from office, as can any other member of the United States Government, by the Congress. The House of Representatives impeaches the person and the Senate judges whether he is guilty or not. Only one President has ever been impeached and he was Andrew Johnson. This one case ended in an acquittal of the charges by the Senate. The only Member of the Senate ever to be impeached was William Blount, of Tennessee, on December 17, 1798, to January 14, 1799, but was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Only one member of the Supreme Court was ever impeached. He was Samuel Chase whose trial, November 30, 1804, to March 1, 1805, ended in an acquittal.

The third article provides for a Supreme Court and defines its powers. The Supreme Court has the power to decide whether or not a law passed by the Congress and the President, is constitutional. There are 9 members of the Supreme Court, 1 being a Chief Justice. Before taking the post of Justice in the Supreme Court, a man must take the following oath: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as ——— according to my abilities and understanding agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God." To be a Justice of the Supreme Court, a person must have the experience of an attorney.

The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their office during good behavior, and shall not be diminished in pay during their continuance in office.

Although the Constitution does not definitely give them the power, the Supreme Court can overrule a State or local law. The only way a decision may be overruled is by a constitutional amendment.

Though the first 3 of the articles are the most important, there are also 4 others. Article 4 has to do with the States and their laws and how they must be observed by other States. Article 5 tells how two-thirds of the Congress and three-fourths of the States must approve in order for an amendment to be added to the Constitution. Article 6 has to do with the debts of the United States and article 7 tells about ratification of the Constitution. All of the States finally ratified it.

After the articles came the third part of the Constitution, the amendments. The first amendment has these four important safeguards for the American people: (1) Congress must not set up any religion for the Nation, and cant' keep anyone from practicing whatever religion he prefers, (2) Congress cannot stop anyone from saying, writing, or printing almost anything he likes, (3) Congress cannot keep anyone from meeting with others to talk on anything they like, (4) Congress cannot keep anyone from asking his Government to correct something that he thinks is wrong. This is probably the most important of the amendments that James Madison had in mind when he organized the first 10 amendments.

The second amendment provides for the State militia and their right to use arms. Amendment three forbids soldiers to invade the privacy of a home, as the British did in the colonies before the Revolution. The fourth amendment gives the people the right to forbid a search of their house without a legal right. The people added this amendment to prevent such arrests and searches without a warrant. In the first half of amendment five, the Federal Government is prevented from bringing anyone to trial for a serious crime without a grand jury first deciding he is guilty. The second half of amendment five tells certain things that the Government is not allowed to do. They are: a citizen cannot be tried for a crime the second time, a citizen cannot be forced to testify against himself, the Government cannot take away anyone's home, unless by the due process of law, and the Government can't take anyone's property legally without giving them a fair price for it.

The sixth amendment describes certain rights which the Federal Government must give anyone arrested on a criminal charge. He must have (1) a public trial as soon as possible after being arrested, (2) a jury trial, composed of usually 12 men, (3) information telling him just what he is supposed to have done, in order for him to prepare his defense, (4) a chance to see, hear, and answer the witnesses who speak against him, (5) the help of the Government, if necessary, in bringing to court witnesses who can help him, and (6) a lawyer to defend him, paid for by the Government if he is unable to pay.

Amendment seven refers to cases of the kind usually called "civil suits." Such cases deal with disagreements about persons' rights and duties toward one another. Amendment eight states that an arrested person is not to be tortured and must not be fined or imprisoned beyond reason. It also gives him the right to post bail and leave jail until he comes to trial.

The first eight amendments listed certain rights belonging to the people. Those rights were so clearly defined that the Federal Government could make no mistake about them. It was not possible, however, to list all the rights which the people wanted to keep for themselves. Amendment nine was added so that the Federal Government would not try to take away people's rights simply because those rights were not named in the Constitution. If a right is not granted to the Federal Government, that right rests with the people. One example of this is education. Education is a matter that, by the Constitution, is to be left up to the local community, but lately has become a tool of the Federal Government.

Amendment 10 deals with the undelegated powers of the people. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, not prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This amendment, in short, gives the States rights and powers that the Federal Government cannot take away.

There are 12 more amendments to the Constitution, which were added to make the Constitution itself clearer. They range all the way from the outlawing of slavery to the outlawing of intoxicating liquors, and to the direct election of Senators to the limitation of the President's term to a maximum of 10 years.

Without all of the above mentioned parts of the Constitution, despotism, insurrection, invasion, and domestic violence would be likely to occur. Invasion comes when a country's defenses are not kept up to par of self-protection. Domestic violence, unrest within the country itself, occurs when there is no foundation to hold it together. This might even

lead to insurrection which is an organized effort to overthrow an established government. A country without a strong foundation is always in danger of a one man rule or dictatorship. Adolf Hitler overthrew the President of Germany and became dictator because Germany had no established constitution. With a proper foundation, a country will never be in danger of despotism, unless the people become totally indifferent.

For more than 160 years the United States of America has been a strong Nation of free people. It is like a fine house, carefully planned, well built, and kept modern and in good repair. This house is so large and so carefully laid out that there is room in it for all who live here to work and enjoy life.

Before the Constitution was written, the American people tried for nearly 6 years to build a house of freedom, using the Articles of Confederation as their plan. But the building showed many signs of weakness, and soon seemed likely to fall apart. Instead of having their house on one main foundation with cornerstones of leadership, courage, foresight, and individualism, it was as if each room in the house stood on its own foundation. Not until the Constitutional Convention did its work in 1787 did the American people understand how to build a house of freedom that would be strong and lasting—the same one that we live in today. The United States is truly a house of freedom.

Salute to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last week, from all over our country came happy birthday greetings to the brave state of Israel on the occasion of its 10th anniversary of freedom. The sentiments of these messages mirrors the deep hope and faith the American people have in this newest bastion of freedom and democracy. They illustrate the enduring ties between these two great nations.

Under leave previously granted, I insert at this point in the RECORD, editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, and a fine article by Eleanor Templeton, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 20, 1958:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 24, 1958]

ISRAEL AFTER 10 YEARS

This week Israel begins a celebration of its 10th anniversary as a modern nation. There have been moments in its brief history—and agonizing moments they were—when the celebration of future anniversaries appeared remote indeed. Yet many a great nation, including our own, has been called upon to resist enmities and pressures that seemed almost certain to overcome it in its early years. The great nations are those which have suffered but endured, faced disaster but triumphed. Israel is such a nation.

As it completes its first decade it can look back upon achievements which few nations of modern times can match. Its population has nearly trebled—some 2 million inhabitants as compared to the 650,000 who were living there when the British mandate ended. Numerically this is an imposing increase, but in human terms it is even more impressive, for it represents a biblical ingathering of the exiles. To Israel have come survivors of the Nazi holocaust in Europe, refugees from Iron Curtain lands, immigrants from north Africa, and thousands of other homeless and hopeless Jews. In Israel they have found both home and hope.

Through the love and labor of the Israelis of today and the Zionists of yesterday, the land that used to be called Palestine has been transformed from a virtual desert into a thriving national community—a democratic country devoted to art as well as agriculture, education as well as industry, science as well as commerce.

All this has been done in the face of an Arab hostility that has more than once swollen into violence and bloodshed. Israel, again like great nations of the past, was born in strife. A United Nations resolution proclaimed her existence, but her own people died to make the proclamation live. Today, too, there is strife and tension and turmoil, and it is safe to say that these will continue until Israel's neighbors have accepted her as a fact of life in the Middle East.

In an article written for this newspaper recently, Foreign Minister Golda Meir said that the Israelis of today, far from being interlopers, represented an ancient people with no other ambition but to build its national life in freedom and security.

These words are true and today, as 10 years ago, Israel offers its neighbors not a sword, but peace. True, a military parade in Jerusalem will be part of the official celebration, for Israel is a land beleaguered and it, too, has reason to know that only its own strength and striking power is a deterrent to attack. It also knows that the offer of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion to talk peace with Nasser or any other responsible Arab leader, any time, any place, has never been accepted.

This year Israel will celebrate its anniversary with pride in its past and confidence in its future. When the exiled Jews of old were asked by their captors to sing the songs of Israel in Babylonia they refused, saying: "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" Today they are singing it in their own land, and the free men of the world, the men who admire courage and respect faith, will extend to them the ancient Hebrew greeting "Shalom aleichem"—Peace be with you.

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1958]

ISRAEL'S TENTH

From the hills of Galilee to the sands of Aqaba, from the waters of the Dead Sea to the shores of the Mediterranean, a myriad of blue-and-white flags will be flying proudly today in celebration of the 10th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel.

Conceived in idealism and born in fire, Israel has already accomplished the impossible. It has established itself as a free democracy on an ancient, rocky soil that had not known freedom for centuries. It has grown in strength and security though surrounded by hostile neighbors. It has created a new kind of civilization at this traditional crossroads of old civilizations. It has done so through the unconquerable strength of a pioneer spirit welling up from 2,000 years of tragic history.

The force of character, the courage in arms, the determination to survive, the will to create, that have marked the first decade of this extraordinary state combine to give assurance of its future. Militarily undefensible, economically unviable, politically impossible, it has yet managed to defend itself, to develop its economy, to establish its institutions. It has thrown open its doors to Jewish victims of oppression throughout the world, giving a new sense of dignity to those denied this basic human right in the countries from which they came. The men and women who have built the State of Israel in these first 10 crucial years have plowed the soil, have planted forests, have created industries, have brought water to the desert, have constructed homes and towns and cities, have deepened ports, have opened mines; and in doing all this and more they have not failed to give attention to the most important factor of all in their national development: the education of their youth and the fusion of many kinds of people with diverse backgrounds into a vigorous and, eventually, a common culture.

They could not perform the miracles they have performed without help, nor without paying a fearful price. The help has come mainly from the United States, and it will be needed for a long time to come. The price has been the unwavering enmity of the Arab world, which failed in its attempt to throttle Israel at the start and which has not yet become openly reconciled to the fact that Israel is here to stay. The Arabs' reiterated hostility and refusal for 10 years to make peace gives Israel good reason for her constant posture of military readiness; but Israel herself has sometimes in the past seemed too quick on the trigger in an explosive situation that could engulf the globe.

The continuing state of tension between Israel and the Arab countries is obviously one of the most dangerous elements in the world today; and, by any objective appraisal of this situation, it makes no sense. If the Arab States would recognize the realities and negotiate a peace, and if in turn Israel would be willing to make concessions toward that end, the moral, political, and economic benefits to all the peoples of the area would be beyond calculation. David Ben-Gurion, Israel's messianic Prime Minister, has told Parliament in his latest message that "we must make untiring and incessant efforts to find a way to the hearts of the peoples who are still hostile to us and bring about peace between the Jewish people and their Arab neighbors." The achievement of this goal must be the deepest hope of all of Israel's friends throughout the free world who are congratulating her on this, her 10th anniversary.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 20, 1958]

ISRAEL CELEBRATING A 10-YEAR MIRACLE

(By Eleanor Templeton)

TEL AVIV.—About dusk Wednesday, a concentrated burst of joy will explode all over Israel. That is the eve of Israel's 10th independence day, and celebrations which will continue for several months will be inaugurated in a night-long rejoicing.

Only a few of the celebrants will stop to consider, on this night, all the achievements of their country in its first 10 years of existence. Most of the singing and dancing in the streets, the laughter and gladness, will be an expression of deep gratitude for the miracle of existence itself, for the great fact that Israel's 10th anniversary has come to pass.

Even many of the country's leaders (including Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion) will tell you that this is the crowning achievement, and they also find it somehow miraculous. But at the same time they recall the acts of will and work, the amount of caring and trying that brought this thing about, and they concede that it is not all miracle.

A 70-YEAR FOUNDATION

To begin with, there were the 70 years of Jewish colonization in Palestine, first under Turkish rule and then under British mandatory administration, preceding the establish-

ment of the State of Israel. These were the real foundation years for the advances made in this first decade of statehood. Yet even considering this, the record of this decade is impressive.

The initial big step forward was made on the land, vast areas of which have been restored to fruitfulness. In some instances this was a matter of digging stones out of the hills by hand. But in most cases modern agricultural methods, equipment, and education were employed to increase cultivated areas by nearly 300 percent and irrigated land by more than 400 percent.

Overall agricultural production has trebled and now covers about 70 percent of the Nation's food requirements; in some branches such as vegetables, eggs, and poultry, local demand is fully met. Moreover, substantial amounts of foodstuffs are exported; with citrus fruit heading the list, they comprise 42 percent of total exports.

A DESERT BLOSSOMS

One of the most heartening features of this revitalization of the earth is the change it has made in the landscape. People who knew the old Palestine as brown and barren, with hillsides and even many valleys fit only to pasture sheep and goats, are invariably struck by the transformation they see today.

Almost the entire northern half of the country is verdantly pastoral, lying under the Mediterranean sun like a great garden, green for nearly three-quarters of the year. An intensive afforestation program has covered hills and mountains, once mostly rock, with pine and cypress. Dunelands are dotted with tamarisk trees to control the drifting sand. Eucalyptus, olive, and date palms flourish; citrus groves are, of course, abundant.

And everywhere you see the red roofs of rural settlements of various types, none of them very far apart and all of them established according to a plan (of which national defense is an important element). About 450 of these have been founded since 1948. Along with expanded villages, they have absorbed a fair share of the 915,000 immigrants who have come into Israel since the establishment of the state.

NOT EVEN THE LANGUAGE

This flood of immigrants itself demanded of the struggling young nation one of its most impressive performances. The newcomers originated in 60 different countries. The great majority of them arrived without funds or property. Only one in five knew anything about farming and very few had any vocational training. No more than a handful had any knowledge of Hebrew, the language of the country.

To receive, settle and integrate this multitude into the life of the nation within 10 years was no small feat. Adjustments in this process are still going on and will continue for some time. Nevertheless, what has been done is admirable not only in terms of skill in handling an enormously complex situation but also in terms of humanitarian endeavor.

It was this untrained reservoir of labor which had to supply most of the working force used to build up Israel's industry. Fortunately, response to training was for the most part effective. Industrial production has risen three-fold in volume and value since 1949, and Israel today is the most highly industrialized country of the Middle East.

New industries established include steel, fertilizers, tires and other rubber goods, paper products, piping, diesel engines, electrical appliances and the assembly of motor cars and refrigerators. Textiles, plastics, all essential household items and many nonessential ones are produced locally.

This greater industrial production gave a boost to Israel's exports, which quintupled during the decade. Her balance of trade, however, is still in the red, chiefly because of the import of capital equipment for industry and necessary foreign currency expenditures to met heavy defense costs. But exports now go out to more than 80 countries, and commercial trade agreements are in effect with 20 countries.

To help transport her goods and to serve the tourist trade, Israel has built practically from scratch a modern merchant fleet of 34 cargo and passenger vessels. Other transport facilities have kept pace. Harbors have been improved and are still in the process of development. The railway system has been modernized and expanded to serve the four principal cities and way points. The national airline, El Al, links Israel with Europe and the Americas and recently set an international record for the speediest commercial flight from New York to London (8 hours 3 minutes).

Main roads, extending from one end of the country to the other, are generally good and include one piece of roadbuilding as dramatic as it is economically important. This is the 150-mile Beersheba-Eilat Highway, opened in January, which cuts through the fantastic rock mountains of the Negev desert to connect Israel's Red Sea port (Eilat) with the rest of the country.

These, then, are some of the highlights of Israel's economic progress during her first 10 years. But no account of this progress would be complete without linking it to science, for in Israel science is above all a matter of applied research. Although a great deal of pure and basic research is done, especially by the Hebrew University and the renowned Weizmann Institute of Science, most of the funds and brainpower available are devoted to solving practical problems of industrial, agricultural, and mineral production.

An excellent example of this was the opening last year of the Arid Zone Research Institute at Beersheba, capital of the Negev. This institute will concentrate all the scientific activities concerned with the conquest of the desert—for the Negev is not only the storehouse of most of Israel's minerals but is also the principal future area of agricultural expansion and the consequent absorption of the country's increasing population. Atomic research also will figure in this effort, as will the outstanding work Israeli scientists are doing in the field of solar energy.

Yet no matter how intense the drive toward building and strengthening the economy of the state has been, it has not been pursued at the expense of social gains or of educational and cultural advances.

Health services, operating under a system of socialized medicine which also permits private practice, are very good. There is an adequate supply of doctors and their professional standard is high. The infant mortality rate has been halved, and many diseases indigenous to the area have been virtually wiped out. Salk vaccine is produced locally and all children up to 4 years of age have received it. National insurance covers industrial accidents, maternity care, and old-age and survivor benefits.

Education is free and compulsory between the ages of 5 and 14. The school system provides facilities from kindergarten through university and technical institutes. Two schools of higher learning, the Hebrew University at Jerusalem and the Israel Institute of Technology (Technion) at Haifa, have won recognition abroad and both are building new campuses. Since 1948, university attendance has increased fivefold, as has school attendance in general.

Culture blossoms everywhere in Israel, from the most sophisticated city circles to the simplest farm settlement. Interest and participation in all the arts—notably music, the theater, painting, and sculpture—is lively, and the quality of the creative work done is frequently exceptional. Many Americans have had a chance to see this for themselves in performances of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra and the Inbal Dance Troupe, both of which have toured the United States and Europe.

As for literature, a new Hebrew-language school of writing is emerging from the pens of Israeli writers. Also, Israel holds second place in the world for the number of book titles published in proportion to the population, as well as in the import of foreign-language books.

Finally, Israel is a genuine democracy and there is no doubt that she has made democracy work to serve the people above all else. This is not to say, naturally, that life in Israel is a ll bliss, or that the nation has found an answer to all its problems, or that it has not made mistakes.

Israel still does not enjoy permanent peace along her borders. She still faces economic problems and internal maladjustments which only additional decades of hard work, devotion, and intelligent guidance can overcome.

But Israel has learned from her mistakes and tries not to repeat them. Moreover, if she suffers from Arab hostility, she also benefits from the friendship of many nations, great and small, East and West, and freely acknowledges that she could not have survived without this friendship. And if one can judge by the record of this first decade, Israel, given the boon of peace, will be a land not only of promise but also of fulfillment.

Guide Given To Curb Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by J. A. Livingston which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 25, 1958.

I believe it is high time that the Congress looked into this matter with a view to ending such conduct by corporation officers.

GUIDE GIVEN TO CURB EXECUTIVES' CUPIDITY

(By J. A. Livingston)

The accident of divide and rule serves corporation executives well when they want stockholder approval of self-enriching compensation plans. This is not because stockholders are helpless or impotent. It is because stockholders are divided.

Investment trusts, such as Massachusetts Investors, Investors Mutual, Wellington Fund, and others, hold sufficiently large blocks of stock to influence managements. But the funds are too preoccupied pushing the sale of their own shares and managing investment portfolios to watch scrutinously over executive morality.

They'd rather pay the management of a successful company what it says it's worth—in bonuses, stock-option plans, pensions—than get involved in a proxy argument. Banks, trust companies, insurance companies, endowment funds do likewise. It's the easy way.

Recently, executives of the Aluminum Co. of America, Fairchild Engine & Aviation, and American Optical Co., for example, reduced stock-option prices because of the stock-market drop. They weren't willing to wait, as stockholders must, for their stock

to recover. They were impatient for gain. Now, executives in other companies are establishing fairy-godmother committees to do the same for them. These include National Lead, Consolidated Coal, Standard Oil (Ind.), Chas. Pfizer, Olin Mathieson Chemical, James Lees & Sons, Lehigh Valley R. R.

These heads-I-win-tails-I-can't-lose option plans for executives have bruised the ethical sensibilities of many financial analysts who have studied the proposals. Yet, proxies were sent in—as usual—despite the dilution of stockholder equity and grab-bag morality. No institutional investor wants to stick a lone neck out.

Here, it seems to me, such organizations as the National Association of Investment Companies, the trust division of the American Bankers Association, and the National Federation of Financial Analysts Societies could perform a service for themselves and executives by providing forums for open discussion of executive compensation. Out of such discussions would come standards of self-value.

If a responsible investor group ever set down standards of reasonableness for judging stock-option, bonus, and other plans of compensation, then all institutional investors would have some basis for refusing to send in proxies endorsing overreaching proposals. They'd not be ruled by division, but by fear of reprisal. If, for example, a corporation were confronted by a consistent reaction from banks to a stock-option plan, it would not retaliate by withdrawing the deposits. It has to have banks.

And so, as a basis for discussion, as a starter toward standards, I am setting forth five limitations which seem to me worthy of consideration in stock-option plans.

Not more than 1 percent of the total stock of a company should be allotted under option in any 1 year, with an overall limit of 5 percent in any 10 years. (If additional shares are issued—as in a merger—the percentage would include them; the option quota would rise.)

A 5-year limit on options. An executive ought to be able to make the option pay off in that time. If not, let him ask stockholders for a new option.

The option price (apart from complying with tax laws) should not be below the stock's book value or less than 10 times average earnings on the stock for the last 10 years. (This guards against issuance of options when a stock is unduly depressed—for fortuitous reasons.)

At least 50 percent of stock purchased under option should be held for 2 years after acquisition, the other 50 percent at least 3 years. (Stock option plans are justified as an inducement to hold a good executive. There ought to be ties to the inducement.)

No change in the price of the option in less than 5 years and only if the price of the stock has dropped for reasons utterly beyond anticipation. (A recession, for example, could hardly be considered outside normal expectation. It is a hazard of business which stockholders and optionees ought to be prepared to live through.)

All social orders and all institutions succeed best with guideposts to restraint.

Automation and Technological Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, here, in the United States, organized labor is much concerned with the uses of the new technology of our day, especially with automation. This new technology has already caused many new problems in collective bargaining. It has held forth to us a great promise but that promise is yet to be fulfilled in any real degree.

We learn from a release emanating from the United Nations in New York of Soviet boasts regarding the new technology. Although we of this Nation have long prided ourselves upon our pioneering in technological development, it appears now that the Soviet is also forging ahead in breaking new ground.

The Soviets already boast that some 2 million workers will be released from dull and dangerous employment by 1960 because of the new technology. It boasts that none of these workers will be jobless and that the Soviet Union is able, as benefits a workers state, to shorten the working day without reducing wages.

Now, all of us know the nature of the Soviet boast. But its challenge to us cannot be lightly dismissed. The fact is that the Soviet is forging ahead in the production race. The whole world is watching this race as the result will contribute much in influencing their thinking. Here at home jobless workers are already questioning whether they have not been sold short, since they know that higher production, higher wages, and better living standards can result from the new machines if we use them intelligently.

In this connection I wish to include an address by Albert Whitehouse, director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, IUD Conference on Automation and Major Technological Changes, Tuesday, April 22, 1958, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRAM

This is a collective bargaining conference dealing with automation and major technological change. It takes place just as major collective bargaining gets underway in key industry. It takes place also at a time when our economy is undergoing a highly significant shift. The views expressed at this conference will, without doubt, reflect these developments and will almost certainly give emphasis to problems resulting from the new technology and to the kinds of solutions to these problems that we must seek.

The National Industrial Conference Board recently reported that industry's investment in each worker on the job has been rising rapidly since 1939. This means only that more and increasingly complex machines are being used on the job.

The NICB states that United States industry had $16,000 invested in each production worker in mid-1957. This figure was a full $1,200 above the figure for mid-1956. It gives evidence of the vast plant boom that has taken place over the past few years. It also shows the direction of that boom—investment has been increasingly in more complex and more automatic machinery, including highly automated equipment.

All of us are familiar with the advertisements of the notoriously antiunion Warner-Swazey Co. This firm just loves to advertise that big investment makes possible our jobs and that all of us should die of gratitude because investment per worker is increasing.

Warner-Swasey's ads are, of course, blatant half-truth. Sure, the amount of money invested in machinery has increased, but this has also made it possible for fewer workers to turn out an increasing amount of end products. And the fewer the number of workers in a plant, the higher the investment per job will be.

The recent NICB study makes this fact abundantly clear. It also points out one of the reasons for present day economic problems. The study found that in the boom period from mid-1956 through mid-1957, there was an increase of 7 percent in plant investment. Part of this, of course, represented higher prices. Somewhat more than half, however, represented real investment.

This was a time in which output of goods was rising rapidly and one in which business was accumulating inventory at a rapid rate in anticipation of higher prices and steadily rising profits.

The boom in factory building was still very vigorous and more new equipment than ever was being installed. This, then, should have been a period in which the number of production workers should have increased.

The contrary, however, was true. There was a drop of 2 percent in the number of production workers. Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that the investment per production worker has been increasing so rapidly.

Possibly we ought to fear most the day when it will take a hundred thousand dollars of invested capital to provide a production job. If that day ever arrives, we may need very few production workers indeed.

Surely this could be a blessing and could mean the liberation of man from the tyranny of routine work. But, unless we look the facts in the face and recognize the true trends, we may well find that we have bought ourselves a mess of pottage.

* * * * *

Today's factory is far different from that of only yesterday and tomorrow's automated plant will be even more radically altered. Such plants will turn out more and more of our total output and they will be capable of fantastic feats of production. What is true of the productive process is becoming equally true of the information and distributive functions of our economy—the sales, clerical, and bookkeeping jobs.

An eloquent description of what automation involves was contained in a series appearing in one of the world's great newspapers just as the recent feverish period of plant expansion got underway. This description has been reinforced by time and, if anything, may have understated the case.

"So fantastic are the potentialities of new control devices," the account declared, "that it is possible to visualize acres of factory or office space in which no worker is needed. Automated equipment can process raw materials, assemble them into finished goods, package them, and load them into freight cars without direct human help.

"That is not all. The automated machines can adjust to variable productive conditions, correct their own mistakes, inspect the finished product, and even change their own parts when parts break down or wear out.

"Automated machines do not stop with telling other machines what to do; they even breed new automated equipment. With magical new calculators, design data for huge mechanical installations can be completed in one-fortieth of the time formerly required."

That description was written 3 years ago. It was not fantastic then and it is far less so today.

Some 2 months ago, the American Management Association held its fourth annual electronics conference. This conference, among other things, heard a representative of Southern Railway describe how the use of an IBM 705 machine saved his firm $805,000 in clerical costs during its first year of operation. This 1 machine, this representative added, could bring white-collar wage costs down as much as $1,500,000 in 1 more year in his firm alone.

A recent account in the New York Times described an automatic factory for pro-

ducing airplane parts. This factory is operated from punched tapes and controlled by digital computers. Electronic controls have been linked with a milling machine, a drilling device, and a boring machine to make available for the first time the economies of Detroit-type mass production in the area of small-lot production. This kind of production, it seems, makes up most of the machining done by American industry. Interestingly, the plant was described by an official of the Hughes Aircraft Co. as "the nucleus of the first electronically automated factory."

• • • • •

Just 12 machines of the Corning Glass Co. located in 4 different plants can produce 1.88 billion bulbs for electric lamps and other glass pieces in a single year. Each machine is geared to an automated process.

Each machine is capable of turning 2,000 blank bulbs per minute. Not so many years ago a 3-man shop required 14 hours to turn out 1,200 such bulbs. This production is 15 times as great as could be obtained with semiautomatic equipment at the end of World War I. In just 40 seconds, a Corning machine can turn out as many bulbs as an experienced glassblower can make by hand in 8 hours.

Yet each machine requires but one worker per shift for its operation. In plain language, just 24 workers now can turn out a major part of the glass bulb production of the United States.

The wonders of automation have so often been proclaimed that we now tend to take new industrial revolution for granted. At first, we tended to gasp when we learned, for example, that at the Prudential Life Insurance Co., a single combination of IBM 702 and 705 machines handles 8 million premium notices annually to company policyholders in New York, New Jersey, and other Eastern States.

Each month, these new-style business machines select from their "memory" the policies coming up for current premium notices. They then calculate the amount due, determine any dividends forthcoming, and apply them according to the desires of the policyholders. They also handle the figuring necessary for any loans outstanding on policies.

Each time a great scientific advance is made, man seems unable to cope adequately with it. We now have the H-bomb and this great achievement does little more for us than cause shivers to travel up and down our spines. In the world's frantic search for military security, we may find that we have poisoned ourselves and our atmosphere, if we don't first blow ourselves to Kingdom Come.

When the atom first was split, we were greeted with the promise of a great hereafter on earth. And without doubt, the atom even now still offers us great hope as well as terrible fear.

When automation and the new technology were introduced, we were greeted with the same promises. Just remember back a few years when automation first became a national byword. Remember how we were promised that automation—if left to the corporations—would bring about a wonderful brave new world in which our economic and social problems would be resolved with all the precision of an electronic computer.

Only yesterday the experts predicted that automation would create more jobs than it eliminated. Not too long ago we were told that automation was the answer to higher production and that higher production would automatically create higher living standards.

These were the predictions of experts who told us that any dislocations would be very temporary and unimportant. They told us, if you will recall, that automation would create skilled jobs by the tens of thousands and that the new technology would bring higher wages for those it displaced. They told us that the future called for brains in the factory and they freely predicted an end to routine drudgery in the office.

These were the rosy promises and they were not all that was promised. We were promised that automation was the way to higher employment, to stable prices, and to better living standards for all. Anybody who dared offer a word of caution was hit as a saboteur who would destroy the machines and as a flyspeck on the wheels of progress.

Promise is easy enough, but performance requires more than mere complacency. And those who offered major technological change as America's chief diet have indeed been complacent.

Let me hasten to add lest I be brickbatted as a prophet of woe and as antimachine, that I fully recognize the need for more and better machines. And let me stress once more that American labor does not fight technological progress. But we have a right and a duty to question the uses of the machine and to examine the social and economic implications of its use. And we have also the right and the obligation to point out that social progress is not automatic and that the machine by itself guarantees nothing but a method of production.

It is time then to review the performance. And it is time to point out that automation and other major technological change have failed to bring automatically those things promised so blithely. Where are the great numbers of more highly skilled jobs? Where are the lower prices? Where are the jobs for everybody that were virtually guaranteed to us?

Recently, the National Industrial Conference Board made a study of employment developments within 130 companies. The NICB found that automation is changing the structure of the work force. It found that between 1954 and 1957, the proportion of workers engaged in direct production declined, although this was during a period of rising output. In 1955, in fact, the auto industry turned out a record number of cars and the steel industry poured more steel than ever before. In both cases, the number of workers involved failed to keep pace with the tremendous output.

We were told that while there might be a decline in the number of production workers, this would be more than offset by an absolute rise in the number of higher paid workers required for more skilled nonproduction jobs.

This simply didn't happen. Maintenance requirements in automated plants appear to be no greater than those in nonautomated plants. In fact, the evidence seems to point in just the opposite direction. The NICB study found that there was a drop in the proportion of maintenance workers in automated plants, as well as a decline in the number of production control and security personnel involved.

It appears to be true that there now are more white collar clerical and other office workers in the factory work force. But the work of these groups is also being automated. And the increase in white collar workers has not kept up in absolute numbers with the number of displaced production workers.

You will hear figures of all kinds today and I don't want to bore you with them. But in 1953, total employment in all manufacturing numbered 17,238,000. In 1955, a much higher production year, total employment in all manufacturing was 16,557,000.

I think that some of us have been kidding ourselves regarding the purpose of technology under our enterprise system—and probably under any other system. The purpose of better machinery is to cut labor costs by eliminating jobs. Now, it's that simple and if you can find any company that installs better and higher speed equipment for any other purpose, I'd suggest that you capture its president and present him to a museum.

The point is, obviously, that if as a result of lower unit labor costs product costs decline and wages rise, disemployment resulting from the introduction of the new technology will be temporary and localized. I think the economists have a word for it—frictional unemployment. But if prices rise and real wages fail to keep pace with rising output, then watch out.

I know that I have oversimplified all this, but I am not an economist. I do know from brute experience during the great depression that I was unemployed for a long time, although the steel mill that disemployed me had just as much capacity to produce in 1932 as it had in 1929.

They said then and they said only recently that there really isn't any such thing as technological unemployment. Perhaps not for any long pull and I won't argue that question. But tell it to a worker who loses his job and his skill when a new machine is introduced and who can't find a job paying the same level of wages or any new job at all.

The new technology may indeed create new skills. But it also destroys skills of equal degree and, possibly, as many skills as it creates. They call this progress and perhaps it is. But the big question is progress for what. If we can translate the change into human betterment, we are making the only kind of progress that really counts.

Performance even during our most prosperous years has not been of the best, despite the predictions of the experts. And in the past many months, performance has been miserable.

In 1956 and 1957, more was spent on new factories than ever before. Our capacity to produce became greater than ever. But the more we could produce, the higher prices went. And wages did not keep pace. Today, dollar wages of factory workers are almost $2 a week below last year. Real wages have declined by about $2.50 more.

A year ago, the average wage in manufacturing was $82 a week and now it's about $80. Last year, the experts accused us of causing inflation with our big $80 gross pay. This year, the same experts are accusing us of causing the slump. Possibly, the best way to answer the experts is to have them figure out how they can get by on a weekly wage of $80 in this day and age.

Since last year, unemployment has continued to rise. In March of this year, some 200,000 more manufacturing workers became disemployed. Largely because of seasonal rises in construction and agricultural employment, this key fact has been relatively ignored.

There are now 1.5 million fewer manufacturing workers employed than a year ago. Tens of thousands more of these workers are working less than a full workweek.

The same President who only last fall told us not to buy, has now called upon us to extend our purchases. If President Eisenhower will tell the Nation's 15 million employed factory workers how to do this on what they are now earning, I am sure they will be eternally grateful. I, for one, can't figure it out unless the manufacturers lower their prices significantly, or agree to raise wages. Or unless Government will act to cut individual income taxes at the lower and middle levels, raise unemployment compensation, hike minimum wages and take the other commonsense steps that our modern technology makes so obviously necessary at this time.

America's real problem today is certainly not one of production. Our manufacturing workers are ready, willing, and able to man the new technology. They ask but little—jobs at adequate wages. This, it might be pointed out, is entirely consistent with national policy as spelled out in the Employment Act of 1946.

It appears quite certain that our members cannot depend upon industry and Govern-

ment to do the necessary job. Fortunately, our unions are strong enough to make their traditional contribution in the situation. We need wage increases and we intend to get them in this year's negotiations. When we get them, we will be better able to carry out President Eisenhower's mandate to buy more.

The big problem of America is not production. Our problem is to keep our pipelines from choking up with too much goods. Anyone who thinks higher wages are bad in this situation is suffering an acute case of economic myopia. Today's technology calls for higher wages and higher living standards with fewer hours of work and, unless they are forthcoming, all of us may find ourselves threatened by the plenty we are now able to produce. Anyone who cares to dispute this is advised to talk to America's family farmers who are accused of being too productive and are being forced to move off or give up their farms.

I would like to mention one other aspect of modern technology which so often appears to get lost in the shifting social scene. Modern machines and computers are expensive. With the recession, the big firms are resorting more and more to computers in their offices as well as in the factories. Small firms that cannot afford this equipment will find it ever harder to survive, except possibly in the increasingly constricting service areas still defying the inroads of the new machines.

The road ahead is bigness in industry. And bigness in industry leaves the American people but one major economic defense. That economic defense will, more and more, prove to be the unions. Those who would seek to destroy collective bargaining had better have a hard look at where the new technology is leading in the world of industry.

Automation has created many new bargaining problems for unions. The incentive systems of yesterday often make no sense at all in the face of the new machines, not even for management. Job grading systems also tend to lose meaning as the content of jobs is destroyed. Automation creates its own kind of job boredom and this is also a problem for organized labor, as well as for management. These problems and the many others that have already manifested themselves on the job, I leave to your discussions of today.

Neither today's economic situation nor the coming of automation should be cause for lament. If automation and the new technology have not yet brought us the kinds of results we should reasonably expect, we must not forget the great promise that these new instruments contain. We know more than ever that we cannot obtain from these instruments the fulfillment of their promise unless we make them the servant of all the people. We have a tremendous job ahead before we can say that we have achieved this objective. Now is no time to slow down.

* * * * *

Congratulations, Joe Glasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that one of the Nation's leading weekly newspapers, the West Side News, has been accorded the highest honor by the National Safety Council. This newspaper, which serves the western suburbs of Cleveland and has a weekly circulation of over 100,000, was 1 of 18 suburban newspapers throughout the country accorded the signal honor. This acclaim was awarded for their excellent contribution and service to safety through public-information mediums.

My heartiest congratulations to Joe Glasser for bringing to the city of Lakewood and the other western suburbs of Cleveland this outstanding tribute.

The West Side News article concerning this award follows:

WEST SIDE NEWS SAFETY EFFORTS WIN NATIONAL ACCLAIM—1957 NATIONAL SAFETY AWARD WON BY WEST SIDE NEWS—ONLY LOCAL NEWSPAPER HONORED—FOUR CLEVELAND RADIO STATIONS AND WJW-TV ALSO WINNERS

We hope you will pardon us if we appear to be a little boastful! We are very excited and humbly proud of the distinction that came to the West Side News this week—the announcement from the National Safety Council in Chicago that this newspaper has been named the winner of the council's public interest award for 1957.

The West Side News is the only newspaper, daily or weekly, in northern Ohio to receive the award. The only other recipients in Greater Cleveland were radio stations KYW, WBOE, WGAR, WHK, and television station WJW-TV.

The noncompetitive award is made annually by the National Safety Council to United States and Canadian public information media for exceptional service to safety.

The 1957 award went to 40 daily and 18 weekly newspapers, 147 radio and 36 television stations, 1 television and 2 radio networks, 4 radio-TV syndicates, 10 general circulation, and 29 specialized magazines, 29 advertisers, and 57 outdoor advertising companies.

"A review of these 1957 public interest award entries," said Ned H. Dearborn, president of the National Safety Council, "shows beyond question the tremendous contribution of mass communication media to the sharp reduction in the number of traffic deaths last year.

"We are proud to honor the outstanding leadership represented by these awards."

Judges of the award, all specialists in the public information or safety field, were: Hugh Curtis, editor, Better Homes and Gardens, Norman Damon, vice president, Automotive Safety Foundation; Maxwell Fox, of the Advertising Council; Frederick H. Garrigus, manager of organized services, National Association of Broadcasters; Wesley I. Nunn, advertising manager, Standard Oil Company of Indiana; Dr. Kenneth E. Olson, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University; and John Osbon, Midwest news editor, Broadcasting magazine.

A letter from President Dearborn of the council to the editor of West Side News said, in part:

"We here at the council have been well aware of all you have been doing for safety, and we are delighted that the judges agreed.

"I am sure you feel, as we do, that there is another, less tangible result of your safety efforts * * * the knowledge that you have helped prevent many accidents."

Yes, Mr. President; we do share your feelings about the real reward for effort in behalf of safety—the warm, comforting thought that perhaps because of what we did a life or limb was saved.

We are truly grateful for the honor which has come to this newspaper. It will be an inspiration to us as we continue to use the influence of the West Side News in the cause of safety.

Remarks by Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson on Law Day, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., Friday, April 25, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 26, 1958, the School of Law of the University of Texas in Austin, Tex., observed Law Day.

The principal speaker on this occasion was a distinguished alumnus of the University of Texas, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury.

Secretary Anderson made a very significant and timely address on the new challenges and the opportunities facing the American people to preserve a free society and achieve lasting peace.

The address is as follows:

A free people protects both its political freedom at the ballot box and its economic freedom at the market place. A free society requires not only the right but the duty of individual participation. Our political participation is through political parties; our economic participation is through the opportunity to work at jobs of our own choosing; through the widespread distribution of the fruits of the economy; through a high standard of living; and through ownership of the means of production.

As individuals we participate in ownership in a variety of ways. Approximately 9 million of our people own shares in the country's corporations. There are 3 million farmers who own their own farms. There are more than 4 million business enterprises owned by individuals or small groups. There are more than 30 million families who have bank checking accounts, and almost that many families have savings accounts.

There are over 100 million people who own life insurance. There are 30 million families who own their own homes, almost 40 million families owning automobiles, and innumerable other millions of owners of washers, refrigerators, radios, TV sets and other equipment quite apart from capital goods which in themselves generate further production.

While each segment of the economy seeks to benefit through profit and wages, there must be a general acceptance of the belief that despite self-interest the operations of all groups in our economy must be conducted in the interest of the public good.

Our social institutions we insure through a government by the rule of law. We recognize that behind that law are certain immutable truths. Our laws are framed with a goal of translating these truths into rules that are applicable to everyday living.

It has always been necessary to seek to find a balance between absolute freedom and absolute control. This balance cannot be a static one; it must constantly be adjusted as times change and as society becomes more complex. Also, our changing relationship with other nations must frequently be modified and expressed in terms of new formal international cooperation.

In the economic world we have something of the same problem. There was a time when men of necessity tried very hard to be self-sufficient. As society grew, it was felt that certain economic laws had validity, and that one of the most important of these was

a reliance on self-interest as the best guarantee of the general welfare. It was generally thought that if each man pursued his own interest this natural law would work automatically to accomplish equity between the workers and their employers and to bring the greatest good to society as a whole. Relations between nations likewise proceeded pretty much on the same principle—that self-interest generally provided the best guide to policy and action.

As the industrialy revolution spread through more and more areas of economic activity, it came to be recognized that complete laissez faire was an unrealistic concept—that in few instances was economic power expressed in terms of individuals acting in isolation from others. The very fact that people are coming to express themselves through groups, however, emphasizes rather than minimizes the importance and the responsibility of the individual. Because group action is essential, the role the individual must play in the group, if he is to avoid surrendering his rights as a member of a free society, becomes increasingly vital.

In the international field it took much longer for a policy of national isolation to be seen for what it was—both unrealistic and outmoded. But the coming of the air age finally drove this fact home; in both our internal and external relations it is now pretty generally recognized that we have moved well into a period in which both people and nations must try to meet their responsibilities working with other people and other nations.

The aim of the economic machinery, the ownership of which is so diversely spread, is to supply the goods and services that our people require, at prices that not only make possible effective demand but leave room for experimentation and innovation, for the process of change, for the creation of those new wants and new decisions to buy which are essential to progress. Despite the widespread ownership in this country, we have an increased characteristic of grouping.

Most American production, for example, is achieved through corporations where individuals contribute their funds but entrust the production and distribution processes to managerial efforts. Labor expresses its desires and exercises its powers through unions. Farmers organize into associations or join cooperative marketing organizations. Businessmen, both as individuals and as companies, work together through associations to promote their particular interests. Geographical communities express themselves through chambers of commerce or boards of trade.

All through the spectrum of business, this grouping continues; and in recent years it has pushed increasingly across national borders. Certain of the European countries are trying to join their efforts in the European common market and others are seeking to develop a free-trade area. The nations of the free world are entering into trade agreements and working out international understandings with respect to the distribution of goods among themselves and in and out of the Iron Curtain bloc.

This coming together of group activity develops certain tendencies. In the first place, the wide diffusion of ownership puts increasing emphasis on managerial control. And entrusting decisions to management has a tendency to lessen a consciousness of individual participation and to promote the feeling that the Government in trying to maintain a balance between economic groups can cure all economic ills.

Yet, if we are to have an economic system that is to succeed, the American people must accept economic as well as political duties, economic as well as political responsibilities. And this sense of responsibility must be keen enough and well enough understood so that it becomes an effective influence in determining the use of power by larger groups. Since we act as groups, we must have, in addition to laws and regulations which govern their action, a basic adherence to a principle of economic ethics that transcends the advantages to the group membership. We must recognize correlated duties to other groups and the public as a whole. The economic control relinquished by the individual in our complex American economy has not passed automatically to the Government. It is finally in the hands of people.

While as a matter of public policy we try to maintain a balance between the desires and powers of different elements of the economic system, we must be sure that we give maximum play to freedom of choice, liberty of action, the initiative of the individual, and the dynamic compulsion that stems from incentives. In a free, competitive society we should recognize that Government has an important role but that it has, also, its limitations. Government, for example, may open up and make available certain economic potentialities. This we do through the building of roads, the development of waterways, the stimulation of means of transportation, and the performance of like functions. At the same time, we have taken steps to protect employment, to insure the bargaining rights of individuals, to avoid monopolies, to require certain minimum standards of safety, to mitigate the hardships of unemployment and old age in an industrial society, and generally to insure the equality of opportunity. Here again, we are walking the narrow road between the proper functions of government which means some surrender of individualism to the economic good and the maintenance of individual freedom and incentives.

Whatever the changed distribution may be in the achievement of the balance, I think we might all agree that it should be accomplished through the Government operating by rule of law rather than by fiat or decree.

In the words of John Locke, our goal should be "not to abolish or restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom." How much have we abolished, and how much have we preserved? Even more fundamental is the question of how much must be abolished in order to "preserve and enlarge" the scope of freedom in an ever-changing society? Strictly speaking, we do not operate under a free enterprise system—freedom for every man "to do what he lists," to quote Locke once more. Certain individual rights had to be curtailed in the interests of the larger group. We have a competitive price system; but in order to preserve its competitive aspects we found that we had to take away some part of the freedom of individuals to practice unrestrained competition.

Since the first experiments in democracy, in fact, we have been made to realize in many different ways that our liberties carry with them certain ethical responsibilities for not abusing these liberties in order to promote selfish interests.

For example, it is taken for granted that we may invest our savings in any way we choose. The corporation whose shares we may have bought, on the other hand, is not at liberty to conduct its business in any way it wants. We have set up many kinds of rules to assure fair competition, to protect the small investor and stockholder.

All these things are serious limitations on individual liberty and on economic power. Because this is true, each one has had to battle for acceptance. But, however fumbling we may have been in going about it, our goal has always been the one expressed by John Locke of submitting to certain restrictions in order to preserve and enlarge the environment in which society as a whole could function effectively. The difficulties in every age of deciding which limitations will promote freedom and which will limit it unduly are enormous. But these are just the decisions which we must make as responsible members of a democratic society.

We must recognize too that the issues involved never remain quite the same. Technology and innovation may move with lightning speed to change the terms of our problem, almost overnight. In the words of Mr. Justice Cardozo, "Hardly is the ink dry upon our formula before the call of an unsuspected equity—the urge of a new group of facts, a new combination of events—bids us blur and blot and qualify and even, it may be, erase."

We have some particular situations with which we must concern ourselves:

The first is that we live in a world of tensions. There is a disturbing and very real competition between nations on a physical basis. The drive for world domination on the part of an aggressor nation is not a new development in history, but it comes armed in our own time with a new potential for destruction. There is another new development—or rather a development which is taking new forms: the competition among nations now extends into the economic structure. And at the root of both our physical and economic tensions is a wide divergence in ideology—political, social, and economic. We must be relentless in seeking the ways of peace. The world must be spared, if possible, the holocaust of atomic war.

Secondly, our national life is not likely to become more simple, either politically or economically. It is very much more likely to become increasingly complicated. We must learn to live and to work within these complications in order to satisfy both our national needs and the reciprocal requirements of membership in the community of free nations.

Finally, we must accomplish both of these responsibilities within the framework of a free competitive system through voluntary cooperative efforts, or we will gradually be brought to submit more and more to regimentation imposed by a central authority.

In our day the problem is made more difficult because for a long time we may well be engaged in a cold war. If we were engaged in an active war, all of the normal rules both of economics and of society would be ignored and we would temporarily submit to the kind of regimentation that would bring all of our forces into play in order to win. If we were wholly at peace there would be a change of emphasis and in our efforts to help promote sustainable growth, we would be directing more of our economic activity to the making of things to be used and enjoyed by man in increasingly better living.

In a cold war we are somewhat in between. We want to produce the goods and services for maintaining a higher standard of living. We want to win both the ideological and the economic battle for uncommitted countries. We want to avoid dislocations and maladjustments in our economic system without surrendering more than the necessary minimum of freedoms. At the same time, we willingly submit to the fact that a large part of our national effort goes into the making of things which are essential for governments for waging war, but which are of no use whatever in providing for the things that man wears and eats and requires for shelter. And so, imposed upon the complications of an already complicated world, we have the necessity for contributing a larger share of our total national production to something that is inherent waste and whose best use would be to never use it at all.

As a part of the cold war we will be concerned not only with our defense in a physical sense but with the competition which will exist between the Western World and the Soviet bloc countries in an economic sense.

This subject is much too broad to yield to a full discussion here. I should like to point out 2 areas—1 to their advantage and 1 to our advantage—that should weigh in our thinking.

The Soviet Union as a monolithic state with the ownership of all of the means of production concentrated in the central government, may be able to deal with other countries advantageously both on a system of barter and in making ruble loans. For example, it can afford to take foodstuffs of other countries in barter arrangements because of its need to supplement its own production of food, while in the United States we are confronted with problems of agricultural surplus. In making ruble loans to other countries, the Soviets can appear to be generous because they realize that when the ruble is spent for capital goods, it must in the first transaction be spent either in Russia or one of the Soviet-bloc countries. There is the barest kind of international trade in the ruble as such.

On the other hand, if the United States should make a dollar loan to other countries, unless it is accompanied by conditions requiring its expenditures in the United States, the dollars loaned will be competed for by all of the other countries of the free world which produce capital goods.

As a general proposition, therefore, in transactions as between governments and other countries the Soviets would have an advantage. On the other hand, with no means of production owned by the citizens of Russia, they would be hardpressed to go into other countries and purchase capital equity even in participation with the citizens of other countries. It is hardly conceivable that either the neutral or free countries would tolerate substantial investments of capital and equity ownership by the Soviet Government itself.

On the other hand, the private citizens of this and other free countries wishing to invest their own capital find a warm welcome in other countries as equity investors if they follow the rules of good citizenship of the other nations. In this way, great opportunities are opened to the individual citizens of the less developed countries to play an important role in the betterment of their country's economy and its people. On the basis, therefore, of dealing between private individuals, the United States and other free countries may have a net advantage over the Soviet.

If one believes, as I do, that real and lasting peace in our world must have an economic as well as political foundation and that this foundation must be planted most firmly in the consciousness of men concerned with their own betterment and with rising standards of living, we may very well have at our disposal—in these dealings between private individuals—the best means of securing both economic betterment and a just and lasting peace.

As the economic machinery of other countries around the world is developed or goes through processes of evolution and change, we must make it possible for them to adopt those portions of the American and free world system of capital as are consistent with their own traditions and their own capabilities. We are leaders in a tremendous cause—the struggle of men everywhere to live without crushing want and to live in freedom. No tyranny in history has been able to crush this hope in the hearts of men. But it is unrealistic as well as dangerously shortsighted to assume that others will want to take over our entire way of life just at it has developed in this country, regardless of how well it may fit their particular needs at this particular period of their development. We must try to be advocates of our system, with emphasis on the benefits which flow to people—recognizing that the particular techniques which helped us achieve those benefits may have to be modified for use elsewhere.

When we look at our country in perspective, we are impressed with the fact that during the last 75 years we have built the most productive system in the world. When one analyzes why this is so, a great deal of attention must be paid to the process of growth and change resulting from the dynamic demand of people for more goods and for better ways to produce them. These demands are expressed in terms of research, technology, and incentives on the one hand, and in higher standards of living on the other. In the whole process of change and development, the constant conflict between liberty and controls continues.

The forces which have been responsible for the evolution and development of our economic system and its tremendous productive power are as vital today as ever before and beckon us to new horizons of accomplishment. There will always be problems with which we have to cope. A competitive economy with dependence upon myriad decisions and judgments will always incur the hazards of recession and inflation. We have learned a great deal about how to cope with them. We must always be endeavoring to learn more. This requires flexibility and a willingness to utilize our maximum competence and instrumentalities both as a people and as a Government to see that neither inflation or deflation should run a ruinous course.

We will always have the problem of providing the incentives for the formation of adequate capital and the education which will secure an adequate supply of skilled people. We will always be concerned with the complexities of cost and price and the consequent responsibilities that are attendant upon labor and management in order that we maintain a sound relationship in the public interest. We will eternally have with us the problem of maintaining our freedoms and avoiding regimentation.

Our faith in this country and our economic system is strong. We have become the greatest productive Nation in the world. Our distributive capacity has run somewhat behind and we must be sure that our ability to distribute both nationally and internationally matches stride with our productive ability.

We doubled our national output once every 24 years before World War II and once in 18 years since that time. The benefits of our growth are being shared on a widening basis. Individual and family income is on the rise. More than one-third of the American families earn in excess of $5,000 per year. And, the Committee for Economic Development, in a recent report estimated that by 1975 the average family income after payment of taxes will amount to $7,100 a year (in terms of dollars of 1956 purchasing power) and that by 1975 our gross national product may well exceed $725 billion.

Today there is a new challenge and a new opportunity.

Our national population has doubled in 50 years. It is expanding at a rate of 3 million persons per year. The number of American workers is increasing at a rate of nearly 1 million per year. Millions of new workers will be needed to make, sell, and distribute our goods.

Looking at even broader figures, it took the world something like 5,000 years of recorded history to have the first billion people alive on this earth at one time. This occurred in 1830. It took us only a little over 100 years to have the second billion people alive at one time on this globe. By 1970 the world will have 3 billion inhabitants—and those 3 billion are the people whose wants and demands will make the economy of our country and the economy of the world.

These factors of growth bring us to the realization of the new demands that will be impressed upon our technology and our science; new obligations for educational opportunities and a higher quality of education. They emphasize the necessity for improving the national health; for utilizing all our ingenuity as individuals, business and Government to minimize fluctuations in our economy; to provide, in addition to material things, new cultural opportunities for people who have time to enjoy them.

The vistas of the future are as limitless as the capacity of our people. It belongs to the dynamic, to the imaginative, to those who are willing to work and compete.

France—From Reconstruction to Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

FRANCE—FROM RECONSTRUCTION TO EXPANSION

The booklet France, From Reconstruction to Expansion, published by the press and information service of the French Embassy in New York, is an excellently documented economic survey of postwar France. Attractively illustrated and well edited, it provides interesting and informative reading matter.

Starting with a short description of France's economic plight at the end of World War II, the booklet describes what was known as the first modernization and equipment plan, a long-range program of reequipment and modernization which gave France's economy a new forward look.

As a result of this plan, involving an investment of nearly $12 billion, the French railroads today handle 20 percent more passenger traffic and 65 percent more freight than they did before World War II. In the coal mines, output per manshift has increased 30 percent over 1938. Renault automobile works turn out 4 times as many cars as before the war, with only 50 percent more workers.

Most of the credit for this progress is attributed to United States aid under the Marshall plan which gave the initial impetus to reconstruction and contributed largely to the realization of the French goal.

The years 1952–53 marked the turning point in France's postwar economic development. With reconstruction well underway, and her industrial production having increased by 50 percent above the prewar level, orderly expansion together with currency stabilization and a balanced foreign trade became the primary objectives.

A second modernization and equipment plan was devised to develop new areas for capital investment and to create new incentives in agriculture, building, manufacturing industries, and equipment of overseas territories. Private capital was to supply a steadily increasing share of the investment, and it was possible to reduce the percentage of public funds in the total investment from 30 percent in 1952 to 26.8 percent in 1956.

Realizing the importance of merging the various national markets of Western Europe, France was a prime factor in setting up the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Payments Union, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Common Market.

The French population, now totaling 44 million, has increased by over 4 million in a little more than 10 years. The country's birthrate is now higher than at any time since the turn of the century, and life expectancy is longer. The birthrate is one of the highest in Western Europe. This has created a new problem—a shortage of adults between the ages of 20 and 64, and therefore a manpower shortage.

There has been practically full employment since the liberation. This, together with the rise in productivity through better equipment, and an increase in the number of working hours to 46 as against 39 per week before the war, has enabled France to attain her high level of production. To remedy the manpower shortage, the French Government took measures that allowed for an increase in immigration of laborers. During 1957, 140,000 foreign workers migrated to France, chiefly from Italy.

The chapter on agricultural progress contradicts the traditional picture of the French farmer as an ultraconservative individualist clinging to obsolete methods, resisting technical advances and practicing diversified farming on a midget-sized plot. In fact, the picture today is very different.

Reparceling of more than 5 million acres between 1945 and 1958 has made it possible for farmers who joined the program to cultivate as a single unit the same acreage that was divided before into a number of nonadjacent parcels. As a result of increased use of fertilizer and lime, and a better selection of seeds, the average output per acre has begun to increase rapidly. New crops are being introduced. A striking example is that of rice which, in a few short years, has progressed enough to render France not only self-sufficient, but even an exporter of this commodity. Education in agriculture is also becoming more popular at all school levels.

France is taking steps to meet her ever-growing needs of sources of energy in coal, hydropower, petroleum and natural gas through increased production at home and from imports. Today, one-third of the energy consumed in France is imported, mainly in the form of petroleum and, to a lesser extent, coal. She is now counting greatly on a vastly larger production of petroleum at home and in her oversea territories, particularly the Sahara and French Equatorial Africa.

Nuclear energy will also play a significant role in the near future. France is not only the most advanced country in Western Europe in the industrial use of nuclear power, but she is also a pioneer in the harnessing of power from the sea and the sun. Conclusive tests have been made in the use of thermal energy from the sea to produce electricity, and a choice of a site for the first plant is under study. A solar furnace which produces heat of 6,300° Fahrenheit was built in 1952 and another one is being erected. This source of energy is used to produce heat-resistant materials and high-temperature alloys.

France is the fifth largest steel-producing country in the world, and fourth in the production of aluminum, and output in both is constantly increasing.

The fame of the small French car has made French automobiles an important export, and the largest truck in the world is manufactured in France. French ingenuity has also produced such revolutionary aircraft as the wingless Atar, the rocket-powered Trident, the Leduc flying stovepipe, and the only supersonic fighter that needs no prepared airstrip for landings or takeoffs. The Caravelle, a commercial medium-range twin jet, now in production, is considered the world's fastest, safest, and most comfortable in its category.

The electrical, chemical, and textile industries have likewise made rapid strides since the setback of World War II.

The drastic destruction of dwellings during that period, plus the sharp rise in population has focused special attention on building construction. The goal of 300,000 new units yearly is expected to be reached in 1958, and this effort will have to be sustained and even amplified in the coming years. In addition, the industrial boom has caused internal migrations which have aggravated the situation in certain cities. Regional planning and legislation designed to encourage a decentralization of industries are, however, beginning to transform the economic map of France.

These far-reaching plans are well served by the existence of an excellent network of communications and efficient transportation. Forty-two percent of the total rail traffic is already being moved economically by electric engines, and this percentage is expected to increase to 70 percent by 1961. The French highway system is the densest in the world. The merchant fleet is one of the most modern, with only 9 percent of its ships more than 20 years old.

Total imports into France constitute over 11 percent of her gross national product, as against a total of 3 percent for imports into the United States. Foreign trade is thus vital to the French economy, and in periods of industrial expansion when imports of raw materials increase sharply, and the pressure of demand on the domestic market hinders a parallel development of exports of manufactured goods and foodstuffs already made difficult by the protectionist policies of other countries, a foreign exchange crisis develops. This happened in 1956–57. Yet, thanks to prompt Government action to maintain a high level of exports, and the possibility now offered to France to draw upon various sources of financial aid (a total of $655 million in credits from the European Payments Union, the International Monetary Fund, and the United States Government and agencies) the international position of the franc is greatly strengthened.

Today the French live better, but they also work harder and save more than they did before the war. The rise in the individual standard of living between 1938 and 1955 is estimated at 29 percent. Consumption patterns reflect this rise. The French now spend twice as much as they did in 1938 for appliances and cars, and less for food, with the exception of meat, fruit and vegetables.

From 1949 to 1957 the gross national product increased 50 percent. Private consumption increased at almost the same rate, but Government purchases have risen at a much faster pace.

The important proportion of defense expenditures is explained by French commitments to NATO, and the need to maintain order and security in the Department of Algeria. Yet, in proportion to gross national income, the military budget of France is comparable to that of her NATO allies, the United States and Great Britain. A special effort has been made in the past year to develop additional fiscal revenues. New taxes were voted in 1957, and it is estimated that in 1958 fiscal revenues will amount to about 540 billion francs ($1,300,000,000) more than in 1957. Actually, according to the figures for 1956, the proportion of the tax burden to gross national product was higher in France than in the United States (31.2 percent in France as against 25.5 percent in the United States).

Thus, the economy of France continues to grow and become more stable, and that country is confident that, through proper measures, she will continue on the road of progress and prosperity.

America's Future Is Up to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, each year a national essay contest is sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The topic this year was America's Future Is Up to Youth. In the local contest sponsored among the students of Smithville High School, Smithville, Tex., which is in the 10th Congressional District, which I represent, by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Dr. George M. Jones Post, No. 1309, the first-place winner was Mr. George C.—Mickey—Mick. Mickey is the first boy ever to win first place in the Veterans of Foreign Wars essay contest in Smithville High School. His essay has now been entered in the State contest, from which the winners will go to the national competition.

Because of the nature of the subject, I feel that the Members of Congress will be interested in reading Mickey's excellent essay.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following essay in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S FUTURE IS UP TO YOUTH
(By Mickey Mick)

With the coming of the space age, the possibilities for the future of our country have stretched into infinity. Never before have the youth of America, who hold the guiding reins of our Nation's future, been faced with such responsibilities and such challenges.

What will the future bring? Will we continue as a democracy, or will we be influenced and changed by fascism, socialism, communism, and some of the other isms? Will we preserve our precious heritage of freedom and security, or will we succumb to the evils of lust and greed and manmade discord?

A great deal of emphasis is being placed on scientific study these days. Too much cannot be said about the importance of education, but there is much more to our future than staying one jump ahead of our neighboring nations in scientific discoveries. There is no magic formula for human behavior to be found in test tubes.

In preparing for the future of America, we must have vision, faith, and courage—vision to see what needs to be done, faith that it can be done, and courage to do it.

When the Declaration of Independence was signed in Philadelphia over 181 years ago, there was very little evidence to support the hope of the colonists that a great nation had been born. Here were a mere 4 million souls struggling for existence on the fringe of a wilderness, beset by hostile Indians on the north and west, and challenging the power of the British Empire to the east. How could they succeed? And if they did win their independence, how could a little nation so remote from the center of civilization amount to anything? The answers spell the full measure of the Spirit of '76, the spirit of independence.

The Declaration of Independence did more than declare the independence of the American colonies from the British Crown.

It proclaimed the great general principles of free government and the inspired ideals which were to guide the new Nation. The American way of life was born.

The men present at the birth of our Nation were men who had pledged their fortunes, their honor, and even their lives that American democracy might come into being. The heritage they have given us is priceless; yet we seldom realize its value and sometimes our lack of knowledge is deplorable.

During the last war the average American prisoner was under a serious handicap. He had to tell what he knew about American politics and American history, and many times the Chinese or Korean instructors knew more about these things than the prisoner did. He could not answer the arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism because he knew very little about his America.

In a recent survey of popular understanding of the Bill of Rights, it was reported that one-third of the Americans interviewed did not know what the Bill of Rights was.

Any student in the United States, long before he reaches college age, has been exposed to the teachings of American history, heritage and traditions. He learns at an early age that he has a charge and responsibility to keep when he becomes an adult. Yet often, he disregards the lessons of the past as meaningless; that they applied to a different set of circumstances than today. But history has a tendency to repeat itself, and to be prepared for the future, we must study the past.

The Pilgrims, the Puritans, and the Quakers came to this country seeking religious freedom. Our Republic was founded under God's guiding power and belief in a higher authority, the authority of God.

In George Washington's first inaugural address he said, "No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

No truer words have been spoken. Security and strength came from God back through the years our country was engaged in conflict and wars. Providence seemed to intervene, leading us to victory. Loyalty to God, country, and to self is the true basis of Americanism.

Every day we revel in our new inventions that make life more miraculous. We even gloat over discoveries our neighboring nations have not made. We are perfecting now the most effective means of organized war that the world has ever known. But the weapons of organized peace are still in the laboratory stage. Our youth are confronted with a great challenge in seeking world peace.

In facing this challenge we are armed with the knowledge that God's infinite power is ever present. It governs the behavior of men even when they seem to submit to the leaders who oppress and enslave. Evil survives in the world primarily because good men fear to make the sacrifices that must be made to win and retain freedom.

The real question in approaching the future is whether we are willing to meet its tests; whether we will let greed and selfishness reign where we know there must be generosity and unselfishness, whether we will be cowardly or brave, and whether we will extend the hand of friendship and with love open our hearts to other human beings, or whether we will shirk the obligations which inner conscience and the pages of history tell us to fulfill.

Human knowledge does not perish. It lives on under the inspiration of Divine Providence, whose remainders of what truth really is come to us every moment of our lives.

With faith in His wisdom we can face the challengers of the future, courageous and unafraid.

The future is ours, if we make it ours.

Passbook Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under a recently enacted New York State law it is now possible to borrow money at a cost of 3 percent or less, providing you have an amount equivalent to the amount of the loan deposited in your savings account.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Donald I. Rogers, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 24, 1958, and which recounts the details of passbook loans:

YOUR FAMILY'S FINANCES—PASSBOOK LOANS
(By Donald I. Rogers)

One of the prerequisites to being a legislator, we have often thought, is the ability to entomb a really valuable concept in the kind of dank prose that disguises its value beyond all recognition.

At least, that's what seems to have happened to a bill that came out of the last session of the legislature. It was signed by Governor Harriman last week. Called chapter 695 of the Laws of 1958, it performs the very valuable function of offering those who want to borrow money a very low cost way of doing so.

The catch is, you have to have money in the bank. The law lifted the period on which savings banks can make loans secured by an equivalent passbook balance from 90 days to a year.

Thus, if you've got $1,000 tucked away in your account and want to use the cash to buy a new car or make a down payment on a summer cottage, you can do worse—in terms of net interest cost, at least—than taking out a passbook loan.

The loan is secured by your account and the dividends you draw on it—generally 3 percent, sometimes as high as 3¼ percent—cuts your borrowing costs to about as low as you can manage anywhere.

A quick look at the figures will show you this is the case. Assuming your interest cost on the loan will run as high as 6 percent—the fixed rate varies from bank to bank—deduct from it your dividend rate, and you come up with a net borrowing cost of 3 percent, or less.

This is considerably less than the effective rate on conventional installment credit, which runs anywhere from 8 to 12 percent. You can work out a similar arrangement if it's coming on close to a dividend date and you want to make a sizeable withdrawal—and save your dividends, too.

This is a bit like having your cake and eating it, too, but it can be done. Savings banks pay interest on either a quarterly or semiannual basis. Most of them will grant a short grace period, but apart from it, you have to have your money on deposit at the end of the period in order to draw dividend credit. Let's say, though, that you're 6 days away from the end of the dividend period and want to withdraw $3,000. If you've had that much on deposit for a quarter at 3 percent, you rate $22.50 in dividends.

By pulling your money out of the bank, you stand to lose that $22.50. You can manage to keep most of it by taking out a passbook loan for the 6 days remaning in the dividend period.

Let's assume borrowing that much money for 6 days will cost you 4¾ percent in interest, or $2.38. At the same time, however, you will be eligible for your dividends. Deducting from them the $2.38 you come up with a net saving of a little over $20. The original $3,000, of course, goes to pay off the loan.

The size of the saving you can make on this type passbook loan will vary with the size of your account. But like the secured passbook, installment type loan, it can save you money. All it takes is money in the bank.

Nationality Groups Can Render Unique Service to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, April 27, 1958, it was my distinct privilege and honor to receive the liberty award from the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. The award was given to me by Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, on behalf of the committee, and it was presented to me for championing liberal legislation.

In accepting this award, I stressed the fact that the United States is not utilizing sufficiently the talents and the ideas of the immigrant and nationality groups in helping our country to combat communism and Communist propaganda. It is my belief that these groups can render a great and unique service at the present time in promoting the interests of America and of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my address in accepting the ward from Governor Harriman.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, SUNDAY, APRIL 27, 1958, NATIONALITIES DIVISION, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed very grateful for the signal honor which you have bestowed upon me tonight in the presentation of this award. May I express to all of you my sincere thanks.

In accepting this award, permit me to express a few brief thoughts which I should like to share with you today.

The Nationalities Division, as we all know, is comprised of various groups of immigrant origin or having immigrant antecedents. All of us are very proud of the fact that these immigrants have brought with them to this country the rich heritage of their national culture, along with their passionate love for freedom. They have made wonderful contributions to America in every sphere of activity, and have helped build America to its present greatness.

These people, their children and their grandchildren, are among the most loyal, industrious, and hard-working citizens in our country. American ideals and democratic traditions are precious to them. They have defended American democracy and our way of life when called upon in the past, and are ready to do so again whenever it becomes necessary. Our country is richer and stronger because of the contributions made by immigrants, the infusion of their ideals and traditions, the moral uplift of their spiritual strength—all of which have been blended with American democratic life, to give it greater harmony and greater unity.

Why am I telling all this to you? I have a specific reason in mind.

During the past dozen years or so, since the end of World War II, the free world has been on the defensive against the inroads of Communist subversion and propaganda. How many of us realize that no less than 700 million people in Europe and Asia have come under Communist domination in the short space of those 12 years? But that is a fact, and in many instances it was achieved by the Communists without firing a single shot—merely by means of propaganda and subversion.

Today, the battle of ideas is more important and more productive than the battle of weapons. In fact, I believe that the world may never see another worldwide battle with weapons of total destruction, because both we and the Russians are well aware that they mean suicide for the human race. Consequently, the Kremlin is relying on propaganda and deception to conquer the free world, rather than on atomic weapons or missiles.

In the field of propaganda we do not seem to be much of a match for them. Although we have truth on our side, and morality, and religion, and charitable deeds, and righteousness—somehow we have failed to reach the masses of Asia and Africa and other areas of the world.

Take our foreign aid program as an example. In the 11 years between 1945 and 1956, the United States had given to nations all over the world $57 billion in military, economic and technical assistance, most of it in the form of outright grants. Russian aid in the same period totaled only $1.5 billion—and nearly all of it in the form of loans to be repaid. Yet the humanitarian and charitable deeds of the United States are overlooked by the very nations whom we seek to help, while they listen to Russia and prefer to sing its praises for promises which are never fulfilled.

In extending this aid to our allies, as well as to the neutral nations, we have never given ourselves a pat on the back, nor did we convey to them that Americans were paying for this aid through the nose in backbreaking taxes and assessments, nor that we were indeed sacrificing ourselves for their welfare. Yet it is ironical how our motives have been misconstrued by some of these underdeveloped nations who suspect us of seeking, through our aid, to impose upon them some form of control or domination. At the same time, they prefer to disregard Russia's threats to their very existence. Some of them are truly convinced that the Kremlin's only concern is with the welfare of all humanity.

Thus, my friends, in the greatest public relations test in the world, the test which will ultimately determine our security and the survival of the free world, we act like amateurs. I regret to admit that we are failing that test.

There is no doubt about the fact that we lack boldness and imagination in our propaganda tactics, in our efforts to refute these false impressions, and in our methods of bringing the truth to the peoples of the world. We are the best salesmen in the world for automobiles, TV's, washing machines and the like, but when it comes to selling the best way of life yet devised by man—we have failed miserably. Surely, we have not run out of ideas or imagination.

This is neither the time nor the occasion to analyze why we have failed or where we have failed. Nor am I the one to make such a thorough analysis. But I would like to point out one area which we have not utilized to the extent that we should, and it is an area which could have brought us very telling results.

I refer to the immigrant and nationality groups in this country. Why have we not better utilized this rich resource of people and ideas to help bring the message of America to the people behind the iron curtain and to the uncommitted nations sitting on the fence? Why have we not utilized to greater advantage the people of immigrant origin who still retain certain cultural and spiritual roots in their ancestral homes, but who are of unquestionable loyalty to the land of their adoption?

Surely, such people who have profound understanding and sympathy for their former homelands could render excellent services in promoting the interests of America in these countries. Men in this room make excellent ambassadors, ministers, business representatives, and even undercover agents. Yet we prefer to send others who cannot even speak the language of the country.

Could it be that we still regard people of immigrant origin with suspicion? Can this be true, even after they have shed their blood in lands of their ancestral origin for America? Is the fact that we still have discriminatory immigration laws a basis for this suspicion?

Let me say to my friends who trace their origin to the Mayflower that if this suspicion does still exist—if we cannot attain complete recognition, freedom and equality in our own country, if we are still accorded the status of second-class citizenship—then it is a sad day for America, and I see no hope for it or for the rest of the world which looks to us for guidance and leadership.

Within the iron curtain countries and in the undecided nations today the spark of freedom and independence still burns—and we must keep it burning, if Communist dictatorship is to be eventually subdued. This must come about and will come about, not through war, but from within these countries. We must rally them to action in the interests of all mankind. We must get the truth across to them, and we must keep them alert.

This is a task in which the nationality groups can do yeoman service. They know and understand the languages of these people, their mentality, and their suffering. I know they would gladly assume this task, if given a chance. America has much to learn from its adopted sons and daughters, and much to gain. I know they are most anxious to show their loyalty. In times such as these, it would be criminal negligence not to utilize their energy, their talents, and their ideas.

Frank Polk Wins Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Frank Polk, one of Cleveland's leading high-school seniors, has again added laurels to his short but scintillating career. For the fourth straight year, he has won the 1958 Students Press Crusade for the Universe Bulletin by obtaining 255 subscriptions, far ahead of his nearest competitor.

Also, in addition to winning many essay contests, Frank has won a 4-year scholarship to Xavier University. My congratulations to Frank and to his proud parents.

An appropriate article which appeared in the Catholic Universe Bulletin follows:

BEHIND HIM: TWO NEW CONTENDERS—POLK SCORES 255, WINS FOURTH UNIVERSE BULLETIN CRUSADE TITLE

Frank Polk won his fourth straight—and last—championship in the 1958 Students Press Crusade for the Universe Bulletin.

Frank, now a senior at St. Ignatius High School, came up with 255 subscriptions—his highest total—to outrun the field by 155.

Behind him is a newcomer to the winners' circle, little Janet Waterwash, fifth grader at St. Christine School, Euclid, who finished with an even 100 subscriptions.

In third place is Gerald Patronite, St. Henry fourth grader who came through with 94 in his first year as a crusader.

The three winners will receive prizes of $50, $25, and $15, respectively, in addition to commissions, division prizes, and bonuses. Polk, for instance, will reap a total of $144.25.

In winning his fourth straight crusade crown Frank added 5 subscriptions to last year's 250. He also kept intact another Polk record. He has improved his subscription total every year since his first crusade as a fourth grader at St. Timothy School.

The St. Ignatius youth began about as far back as you can get. As a fourth grader he sold one subscription, and that to his family.

He then boosted his total to 9, 16, and as a seventh grader, to 31. In the eighth grade he broke into the big three of the diocese, taking second place with 88 subscriptions.

He went to the top as a St. Ignatius freshman with 122 and stayed there with totals of 166, 250, and this year's 255.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin A. Polk, 4243 East 128th Street, Frank thinks he would have hit an even higher total this year except for the recession.

This has been a big year for Frank. Besides walking away with the crusade prizes, he also won a 4-year tuition scholarship to Xavier University, and won $60 in a VFW essay contest. His essay was best in the county and in the State finals.

Though Frank graduates in June, he still has hopes of continuing the Polk crusade dynasty. He said:

"My sister, Loretta, is in the third grade at St. Timothy now * * * she'll be in her first crusade next year."

One of World's Greatest Good-Will Ambassadors, Namely, "Diamond Jim" Moran, Has Passed On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, there was only one "Diamond Jim" Moran, and I doubt if there ever will be another just like him. He was a most unusual character, so unusual that his memory and spirit will become a legend in

Louisiana, where he was born and reared and rose from a poor shoeshine boy to a fabulous character known all over the United States, and, as a matter of fact, all over the world, as "Diamond Jim" Moran, who owned and operated the world-famous restaurant known as Diamond Jim's La Louisiane. To this colorful restaurant came celebrities from all parts of the world.

While shining shoes in New Orleans in front of some of the world-famous French restaurants as a youngster, he had occasion to see wealthy people going into these establishments, bedecked in furs and jewels. Diamonds caught his fancy and his first purchase as a shoeshine boy was a diamond chip which cost $5, of which he paid $1 a week for 5 weeks out of his shoeshine earnings. This diamond he treasured most of all during his lifetime.

It was not long before he became an outstanding boxer and after that, he rose to fame as a boxing referee. As a matter of fact, many outstanding boxers refused to have him as a referee for their bout because he put on such a dazzling show as referee that he took away much of the showmanship of the boxing match. As a boxer and flamboyant referee, he caught the fancy of the late and sports-minded Senator Huey Long and became one of his closest friends. Huey always called him his good-will man and took him with him on many of his trips as a United States Senator from Louisiana.

After the Senator's death, he decided to open a restaurant, known as Diamond Jim's, where perhaps the toughest competition in all the world existed, in New Orleans, La., where the old French restaurants, many of which have been in operation for over a hundred years, and have been famous for all these years, were known the length and breadth of the world.

From the opening day, success was his and no man ever sported as many diamonds as did "Diamond Jim," and his restaurant and diamonds brought him fame and fortune. Each year, in a private car, he would go to the Kentucky Derby, with diamonds on his shoe laces, diamonds on his glasses, on every finger, on his watch chain, and everywhere a diamond could be located, dressed in a fur derby, ermine tie, and all accessories that went with same. Governors gave him State police for protection of his diamonds whether it was at the Kentucky Derby or when he was visiting other States. At each derby, he would receive tremendous publicity and attraction, as thousands would jam every nook and corner for just a look or an autograph from "Diamond Jim."

With all of this, he never forgot his friends, rich or poor, and whether in his early life as a poor youth struggling for success, or when he was swept away by crowds at the Kentucky Derby, he was always the one and only "Diamond Jim" Moran, a friend of the little man as well as celebrities from all parts of the world.

Known as a one-man Broadway show with a different act for each and every occasion, Joe E. Lewis, the famed comedian, once said "'Diamond Jim' comes by his naturally—I have to work for mine."

The Kentucky Derby, which will be run this coming Saturday, May 3d, will miss "Diamond Jim" Moran; the thousands who had hoped to see this colorful figure will also miss him. Because on Sunday, April 13, he passed away in the place he loved, Diamond Jim's La Louisiane restaurant in New Orleans.

Many things have been said about this colorful and amazing character. Here are some of the things Thomas Griffin, top columnist for the New Orleans Item, in his famous Lagniappe column, wrote about Diamond Jim:

He was true-blue in his friendships and considerably more charitable than most people realized because that was one side of him that never boasted.

Despite his diamonds, his mink neckties and flamboyant suits, there was no pretense about Diamond Jim. He never tired telling of how he started in business for himself at the age of 9, shining shoes. How he later became a barber and owned his own shop at 16. How his eye caught his first diamond in a jewelry store window opposite the French Market.

I've written a lot about Jimmy Moran in the 9 years I've known him but he seemed to cherish one line more than any other that ever rolled off this typewriter. It was: "For what he is, he's as genuine as his diamonds." I'd like to bid him farewell with the same thought in mind.

In another New Orelans newspaper, one of the country's best sports writers, Bill Keefe, had this to say in his celebrated column, Viewing the News, in the Times-Picayune:

MANY BID ADIEU TO JIMMY

Practically every prominent man (and many women) in New Orleans and south Louisiana was at the wake Monday night or the funeral Tuesday of Jimmy Moran, whose hearty greeting and sincere smile long will be remembered by the thousands of friends he made as he went through a lively life. From distant Las Vegas, Nev., came Joe W. Brown, millionaire oilman, thoroughbred breeder and owner of the fabulous Horseshoe Club in the Monte Carlo of America.

From every walk of life the friends of Diamond Jimmy crowded into the funeral parlors of Lamana-Panno-Fallo to bid a last adieu to a man whose chin always was up and who always was able to smile no matter how trying the adversities.

What was of great solace to his family and closest friends, not one person was there on duty attendance; wealth and influence prompted none to go, because Jimmy lacked those possessions. His personality was the only magnet; and that was the sole reason so many gathered at his bier and the sole reason for hundreds of telegrams coming from all parts of the country expressing regrets.

Members of every political faction and every denomination claimed Jimmy as a friend. Happily, nearly all of them had professed their esteem while he was able to appreciate it. His conviction for violating the prohibition law carried no stigma with it; the hypocrisy of that law brought about its death.

Again in his column the following day, Bill Keefe had this to say:

FEW LIKE JIMMY MORAN

Hundreds of men in New Orleahs—in high stations or low stations—will mourn the passing of Jimmy Moran. There was a man who went through life practicing the beautiful doctrine of brotherly love. Through fair weather and foul, good luck and bad, lush times and close-to-the-cushion times Jimmy always had a thought for the fellow who needed a meal or a dollar; and no questions asked.

When a man is blessed with worldly goods, generosity, and benevolence are accepted as matters of course; but when a man is down to "case" money, yet hands it all out to fellow men whose need is great, it's something to be noted. Jimmy Moran had not prospered lately; in fact, he had seen some lean months.

Just 2 weeks ago he phoned and told a couple of us he was preparing a new dish—spaghettini bordelaise with chopped-up oysters and, he said, "come on down." I told him we couldn't because we had made arrangements to eat tripe stew at a little restaurant by the French Market and he said: "Pick me up; I'll put off this dish."

Down we go and in a few minutes word got around that Jimmy was in there. The crowd began to gather. There were prosperous businessmen who just wanted to say hello, as well as a steady flow of boys and men who had seen better days; many of them hungry. Jimmy got a 10 spot and a 20 changed into dollar bills and started handing them out to the ones who looked like they'd welcome a meal. In a corner sat an old man—a cripple; leaning on a cane. Jimmy waded through the crowd: "Pal," he said, "don't you want to eat." The old man said he was sick and couldn't eat; so Jimmy handed him $2 and told him to go buy some medicine—or anything he wanted. It was Jimmy's last two bucks.

One night at the Coliseum, Jimmy, who was about as good a referee as ever performed here, gave a close decision against Johnny Cook. Joe, Johnny's brother, went haywire and slammed a heavy pop bottle down on Moran's head. Never, as far as I know, did Jimmy feel any bitterness over that. He dismissed it by saying: "The boy lost his temper; anyhow, I'm glad he hit me in the head. It didn't hurt too much."

Jimmy had a wide circle of friends among prominent doctors, businessmen, and State and city officials; and a host of appreciative friends from every strata of life. If he ever cheated anyone or did a fellow man a scurvy trick I never heard of it; and he probably didn't know about it either.

Those who walked last with "Diamond Jim" were some of his closest friends, who were his active pallbearers; they were Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison, United States Representative James H. Morrison, State Senator Robert A. Ainsworth, Jr., Pascal Radosta, Dr. James Tamburello, Ernest Italiano, Claude W. Duke, and Ben Weiner.

His survivors include his widow, the former Mary Latino; 4 sons, Nunzio, Anthony, James, Jr., and Robert Brocato; his mother, Mrs. Sam Brocato D'Antoni; 5 sisters, Mrs. Chetta Dellipanni and Mrs. Frank Carrero of Inverness, Miss., and Mrs. Frank Cabibi, Mrs. Josie DiMaggio and Mrs. Mamie Carrero of New Orleans; 2 brothers, Lawrence Brocato and Joseph D'Antoni; and 8 grandchildren.

With the passing of "Diamond Jim" Moran, New Orleans, the State and the Nation lose a colorful character, a wonderful character, and a man who perhaps did more as a goodwill ambassador to bring celebrities from all over the world into his fabulous restaurant, which he loved so much, located in the famed and fabulous city known the length and breadth of the world, New Orleans. He proved what makes people from all over the world have an eternal burning desire to come to the United

States, because his life showed, that from a humble beginning, the sky is the limit as far as your opportunity to achieve success and fame. He is a perfect example of one who, as a shoeshine boy with an humble beginning, can rise to fame, fortune, and success, and perhaps it can only happen in one country, that country being our beloved United States.

May "Diamond Jim," with all his good deeds, rest, and have peace in the hereafter.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Hobart and William Smith Colleges, two institutions of learning in Geneva, N. Y., have contributed to a great extent in helping, promoting, and preparing our future leaders of the country.

For the past 17 years these 2 colleges have been instrumental in sponsoring an annual schola cantorum concert, in New York City, which concert has inspired many thousands of appreciative listeners with its splendid concert and religious music.

Saturday, April 19, 1958 was designated by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Jr., mayor of the city of New York, as Hobart and William Smith Colleges Day for the city of New York, in honor of these two outstanding colleges.

I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the proclamation presented by Mayor Wagner to the Reverend Dr. Louis M. Hirshson, president of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, at City Hall, New York City, on Friday, April 18, 1958. The proclamation follows:

Whereas the Right Reverend John Henry Hobart, third Episcopal Bishop of New York, established Hobart College in Geneva, N. Y., in 1822, as a seat of learning and a stronghold of the faith; the college being sustained in troublous times through the generosity of New York's historic Trinity Church; and

Whereas Hobart's sister college for women, William Smith College, is this year celebrating its 50th anniversary and representatives of these colleges and their schola cantorum are returning to the see city of their founder and the home of their renowned benefactor to participate in the celebration of National Christian College Day; and

Whereas the city of New York extends a hearty welcome to the Right Reverend Dr. Louis M. Hirshson, president of these colleges, and to all students, alumni, parents and friends of the colleges on this auspicious occasion:

Now, therefore, I, Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim Saturday, April 19, 1958, as Hobart and William Smith Colleges Day in New York City, and do call upon the citizens of our city to celebrate with the Nation the return of the faculty, students and friends to the home of the magnanimous benefactor and the esteemed founder of a splendid institution whose contribution to society has been so rewarding in human, spiritual and physical values.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 18th day of April, 1958.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

.4942

Appendix

Communications: 20th Century Ideas in Motion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of addressing the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction—DAVI—of the National Education Association, at its 1958 convention in Minneapolis.

In this address I discussed certain ideas which have a direct reference to legislation now pending before the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS: 20TH-CENTURY IDEAS IN MOTION

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Before the 1958 Convention, Department of Audio-Visual Instruction (DAVI), Minneapolis, April 23, 1958)

It is always stimulating to meet with men and women for whom ideas are fresh, vivid, and living things. It is my good fortune to have the opportunity to discuss with such a group as this the problems and the importance of getting good ideas into effective motion.

This is the reason for existence and the motivation after all, of all teachers. Getting ideas translated into action is also the goal of us who are in public life. And each of us takes tremendous pride in achieving that goal, in our own way.

For anyone who works with ideas, these have been particularly challenging times. Somehow, our great Nation has been given the impression of a giant in chains, our tremendous strength somehow impotent. Yet seldom has there been more of a ferment of ideas, nor a more restless, seeking spirit among our people. But our ideas seem to sputter, flare up, and fade away before they can be translated into affirmative action. As a Nation, we just don't seem to be able to get off the ground, like the early Vanguard.

Remember a few short weeks ago—that graphic symbol of frustration and enchained intelligence—the Vanguard rocket. There it sat, a magnificent idea made concrete, choking on its launching pad with some minor fuel malfunction or other, while overhead whirled two Soviet sputniks—very much in motion—unchallenged by the most sophisticated scientific community on the face of the earth.

This international humiliation was ended, as we all know, when another idea or complex of ideas known as the Explorer satellite system, vaulted into space.

A rocket on a launching pad has a lot of potential. An idea on the launching pad of an intellectual's mind has a lot of potential. But it is the push, the thrust, that we can get behind the rocket, and the idea, that is so very critically important.

Putting ideas—good ideas—into motion takes a great deal of energy, decision, and skill.

We are not short on ideas in this country. Far from it. This is one of the blessings of this democracy, that everyone feels free to think up new ideas, and we have a bubbling of opinion and thought that is very healthy and useful.

But to translate the best of these ideas into motion and action, there must be a matching decision and a full use of the wealth of techniques of communication.

Believe me, the Soviet Union under the leadership of the extremely shrewd and capable Khrushchev understands the power of the idea in motion.

Perhaps no one has better stated the contrast betwen the vigorous use of ideas (including false ideas) by the Soviet leaders, and our own unaccountable failure to rise to the occasion recently, than the cartoonist Herb Block of the Washington Post.

I think you would agree, incidentally, that this cartoon is a superb demonstration of the picture that speaks a thousand words. It needs no explanation. It is humorous, bitterly humorous. In a few lines Block has expressed the frustration and exasperation of millions of thoughtful Americans.

I can assure you that I understand how the President or Mr. Dulles must feel when they open their morning paper and get a bang in the eye like the one Herb Block delivers every few days or so.

My office wall is festooned with cartoons like this one by another fine artist, Scott Long of the Minneapolis Tribune. Mr. Long can make quite a point with a few brush strokes, too. You might say that he can trim a subject better than the Senator HUMPHREY in his cartoon. Ray Justus, Scott's able colleague on the Minneapolis Star, also has a real impact. I cannot let this opportunity go by to mention that Scott Long received well-deserved recognition recently, for this superb demonstration of visual shorthand.

This is the newspaper clipping about Scott's award by the journalism fraternity Sigma Delta Chi for the outstanding cartoon of the year. The cartoon originally appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune the day after Little Rock, and was widely reprinted around the country.

There is an example of how to crystalize, or distill an idea, get a solid push behind it, and create a major impact on public opinion.

One of the major underlying causes of the tragedy of Little Rock was, I fear, that the ugly situation developing was not met with sufficient determination at an early enough time. Timing, in political affairs, as well as in audiovisual productions, is extremely critical. Timely decisions, and the determination to put them into effect, are among the first repsonsibilities of leadership in a democracy like our own.

Many felt long before Little Rock that there were ways and means of meeting and preventing the saddening spectacle that developed. Many feel today, that with timely decisions and determination to press forward, there are ways to cope, and cope effectively, with the powerful propaganda drive of the Soviet Union, with this very serious recession, and with the onrushing problems of our expanding population.

We are looking, then, for that thrust that gets us off the ground. All the rich and diverse talents and resources of this democracy await the vital forward impulse that can be released only by the topmost political leadership of the Nation, and particularly by the man who holds the vast powers of the American presidency.

Someone must turn on the switch to set the American dynamo humming. Khrushchev challenges us to compete. Our first decision must be to accept the challenge in the realm of ideas, as we accepted the military challenge of the Soviet Union first made over 10 years ago.

You can't run a footrace, you know, if you are forever bending down to tie your shoelaces.

To paraphrase Lord Palmerston, the great British foreign minister of the early 19th century, ideas are stronger than armies. If they are founded on truth and justice, they will in the end prevail, as he said, "against the bayonet of infantry, the fire of artillery, and the charge of cavalry."

The Soviets have adopted Palmerston's point of view with a vengeance, except that they have conveniently neglected that fine print about truth and justice. We, I fear, are still hypnotized by hardware. Vitally important as it is to maintain parity in weapons with the Soviet Union, what great folly it will be if we do not recognize that military force is but one area of competition.

Now let us assume—and let us devoutly hope—that someone will at least turn on the switch. Let us assume that we are determined to do something.

Now comes the second great task of political leadership: Putting the massive power of the United States behind the right ideas.

A democratic leader has sometimes been compared with an orchestra leader, to get some idea of the diversity which he must weld into unity. Surrounded as I am with men and women steeped in the audiovisual production tradition, I am tempted to compare the democratic leader with a producer. In a sense, the leader in a democracy is like the producer of a motion picture, a television program, a radio broadcast, a sound-slide series. He is trying to persuade people to do something. And to help him in his task, he is truly fortunate in our country to be able to call upon the skills of many people, many specialists, many talents. Like the producer, his job is too big to do by himself. He must, however, select the basic idea, furnish the motive power, and then prepare to follow through, to supervise, encourage, and stimulate his team of specialists.

The producer must find the right idea—the right story, or concept. He knows that the finest of technicians and the most superb talent will give him nothing more than a mediocre production, unless he has an important idea to work from.

Similarly, the democratic leader must spend much time and energy in selection of his program and policy. That is basic. From all the deluge of advice and entreaty, he must select the most promising, judge it against his own intelligence and experience and training, and make that primary decision: This is the program behind which I will throw all my resources and energy.

Just as in a film, a telecast, or radio broadcast—just as in a lecture in a schoolroom—it is absolutely vital that what is chosen to be

said be important. So much, so very much, of what goes on film, over television and radio, in the newspapers is simply frivolous, petty, and unimportant. There is a tragic waste of fine talent and creative energy in the field of communications in America, due to poor ideas and concepts.

Most of the bad pictures, the bad television shows, and the public policies of the Nation which fail, have had lavish productions—crews of writers, squadrons of technical personnel, shoals of money. They are bad, most of them, because the basic idea chosen was a bad one—mistaken, shallow, unimportant. There is too much fanfare and not enough substance.

How difficult it is to pick that right idea, amidst the bombardment from all sides. But how important. For the producer, it is the opportunity for a smash production, fame, possibly fortune.

For the democratic leader it can be the opportunity for greatness.

George Allen, the new Director of the United States Information Agency, recently said something like this: All the radio transmitters, motion picture productions, and television shows in the world cannot substitute for or replace intelligent basic policy.

In other words, you can't get by very long on words and pictures alone. You can't make a bad policy good without changing the policy itself.

But again—let's assume that we decide not only that we are going to get an action program under way, but we have even selected a good, sound program. Now comes the how part—technique, the choice of the medium of communication.

The democratic leader must think about his audience, his target. He is now full-tilt in the field of communication. What is the best way to get his program going? Is his target the chairman of a Senate committee? Is it the Washington press corps? Is it the home constituency?

His audience may be the people of the country directly, as was so often the case with President Franklin Roosevelt, in his radio fireside chats. It may be the people of southeast Asia. It might be American farm families, or small businessmen, or big businessmen; it might be the impoverished young intellectual of India.

In the field of public policy, it is my opinion that audio-visual techniques do not yet play the role they someday will. In his choice of medium, the Democratic leader still relies for the most part on the news release, the speech, the press conference.

I might point out that I am trying something entirely new for me tonight, in using audio-visual materials in an address of this kind, and I am grateful for the kind assistance so freely offered to this rank amateur in the audio-visual field.

While we in Government are still slow in taking advantage of all the possibilities of the audio-visual field, some of the new habit patterns of Americans are being recognized—particularly the incredible amount of time devoted to watching television. The live news interview on television has become a fixed institution for the "trial balloon" on public policy. Even the wire services are now beginning to watch these shows for their morning stories.

TV is having a yet unmeasured impact. We are all familiar with the exciting experimental work being done in the Nation's now 31 educational television stations, often in conjunction with the audio-visual departments of school systems, colleges and universities. Not only are these cooperative undertakings performing a magnificent job of putting ideas in motion, but they are fruitful training grounds for the young men and women whose future tasks will include the interpretation of American life and policy abroad.

Television, film and audio-visual materials in general are becoming vitally important in the communication of ideas in all of the advanced nations of the world, while radio for years has been the possession of the most peasant economy. The United States has not, however, begun to exploit audio-visual techniques as instruments of foreign policy to anywhere near the extent that is possible. As television set ownership rises, as motion picture and slide projectors spread into the have-not areas of the world, a growing opportunity is given us to get our ideas across.

Some steps have been taken in this direction. When Marion Anderson completed her triumphant tour of Asia, the film produced by Ed Murrow for CBS, See It Now, was reproduced in more than 100 copies for distribution overseas. But in general, the fact continues to be overlooked that with the simple, honest portrayal of American life that can be found in the best of our documentary films—many of the ideas of America can break through the hundred language and distance barriers that effectively block the real America from the world's view.

How much can be said about the mind and the heart of America in the kind of artistry represented by such works as The Strange One, with its portrayal of the patient work of a social worker in a home for delinquent boys, or the beautiful conception of the impact of technological America on the boy from the bayou country in Flaherty's Louisiana Story, the stark beauty of this scene of levee building in Pare Lorentz's The River.

And how much of the American conscience and drive toward the reform of evil is reflected in this brief sequence on slumdwellers, from The City.

We must do much more of this kind of work in our overseas information program.

It is true that we have built up rather a substantial number of film libraries overseas—1 in each of more than 200 information centers in 78 countries. And the USIA motion picture or information officer attached to the center offers a rather varied usage of our films. Audiences will range from those in regular commercial theaters all the way to groups who have trudged in from a radius of 10 miles in the jungle or desert. Some 7,000 projectors of its own are used by the Agency in the less developed areas, as well as over 300 mobile motion-picture vans equipped with their own electric generators.

The schools in many countries are using our motion pictures, and apparently in some places have even made them an integral part of the school curriculum. Government agencies, especially in agriculture and health, frequently borrow the USIA films. Civic clubs, religious groups, labor and professional groups, youth organizations—the kinds of groups that use films in our own country—are given access to the USIA films. Practically all of the more than 1,000 titles are also available for use on any TV stations overseas.

Many times, in the best audio-visual tradition, the USIA people make an effort to combine, or as they say "interlock" media—to broaden or to sharpen the impact. A USIA exhibit can be, and often is, later given a form of permanence with the use of the motion-picture camera—just as Marion Anderson's visit to southeast Asia was recorded for later film showings.

About 40 percent of the films in the overseas program are acquired through a regular and systematic screening of the output of educational, documentary, cultural, and industrial films. For other films USIA contracts with private companies for documentary and newsreel type films. Still another group is produced by USIA overseas in 44 countries, in an effort to clothe the message in the local language and settings.

Some intensely interesting work has been done in the less developed areas, where films were tailored specifically for local needs and problems. Incidentally, the first overseas production done for USIA was performed by a group of American university film production units, under USIA contract, including the University of Minnesota's in Iran.

The USIA use of audio-visual materials, along with their use by the International Cooperation Administration, has clearly stimulated a desire in the less developed countries to make use of such materials in their own self-improvement programs. My friends in USIA assure me that many people from the audio-visual ranks which you represent have served with great distinction abroad in the many governmental programs of planning and producing audio-visual materials for rapid mass learning.

But are we doing enough? One way to measure this is to look at what the Soviet competition is doing in the field.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union contains a propaganda and agitation section (Agitprop) which receives its orders directly from the Presidium of the Central Committee, the highest body in the Soviet world. The closely interwoven structure of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government insures that for propaganda purposes there is no distinction between the two.

The cost of current Soviet bloc propaganda activity is incalculable, but a few indexes are available. For example, it is estimated that each year the Soviet program spends considerably more on jamming the Voice of America alone than the United States does on its total overseas information program. Incidentally, it has also been estimated that the Sixth World Youth Festival last year in Moscow—the purpose of which was almost exclusively propagandistic—cost more than $150 million. Again more than the entire United States information effort.

It is known that in 1957 an average of 2,254 program hours per week went out over the Communist international broadcasting network. (This can be compared with 750 hours a week on the Voice of America.) The Soviets published approximately 25 million books in free world languages during the first three quarters of 1957 and also published more than 110 foreign language periodicals circulating in free world areas. The cost of activities such as these and of other activities of the thousands of local chapters of the Communist Party and front groups must be staggering. No, I do not think we are doing enough in the use of audiovisual materials in our overseas information program. Congress has a serious responsibility to make more funds available for this purpose. And the administration can surely show more imagination and initiative in encouraging the fuller participation of the thousands of talented figures and craftsmen throughout America who could contribute so much to a broadly expanded program.

Not only could we have a Voice of America. We could, with sufficient planning, produce an enormousful effective visual program. We could say: Here is America. Here we are, with our faults as well as our virtues. Here is the real America of striking vigor, flashing imagination, bursting creativity. Here, we could say, is an America struggling to find the answers, an America earnestly seeking to do what is right, an America not at all reflected in the gangster movies, the technicolor musicals, and all the westerns that have ever galloped across the screens of Europe and Asia and Africa.

Let me emphasize once again, that without something to say, that is, without a policy to implement, doubling and even tri-

pling the USIA budget would largely be a waste of time. Furthermore, it is safe to say that dollars alone will not provide an effective program of audiovisual production for our information porgram overseas.

The scientists assure me that dollars alone will not produce creative thought and important discoveries. They stress, again and again, that the truly creative person is a relative rarity, and that very careful programs must be designed which are entirely without reference to the massive expenditures of funds.

A million dollars could be plunged into the production of one motion picture, and frequently is, in the entertainment industry. That same million could be dedicated to a program of encouragement and incentive to the struggling audiovisual producers around the country, and might produce startling results.

There are gifted individuals, in college and out, throughout the country—experimenting on shoestrings, struggling to advance the art of visual communication, working on budgets of $500 or perhaps $5,000—producing stimulating, honest, sometimes beautiful, films and filmstrips for perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the cost of a Hollywood entertainment film. Just think what they could do with just a few thousand dollars to work with.

Financial worries that affect the typical educational TV station, for example, cannot help but diminish the creativity and effectiveness of their work. I see no reason why governmental units at the local, State, and national level should not participate in the financing of these operations, in the public interest.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, I believe, is to begin hearings tomorrow on a bill to provide financial assistance to States which have been unable to move as yet into the field of educational television.

Other proposals are already being given serious attention. In title 10 of S. 3187, which I am proud to sponsor with Senator LISTER HILL, we have proposed a program which I believe would go a long way toward advancing the art and technique—and the habits of use—of audio-visual materials for serious (as opposed to more entertainment) purposes.

Essentially, under title X we would provide $5 million for the first year, and $10 million for each of the next 4 years to promote research and experimentation in the audio-visual field.

There would be grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit agencies and individuals, to be approved by a national advisory council on new educational media. Contracts would be authorized for projects of research and experimentation in audio-visual instruction. A central exchange and library of audio-visual materials would be maintained, including materials produced abroad.

Program units would be organized and made available to State and local educational agencies.

All of these activities would be coordinated under an institute for research and experimentation in new educational media within the United States Office of Education.

Such a broad program of encouragement would strongly supplement the pioneering work which has already been done by the Ford Foundation and other nonprofit foundations and organizations, which has been so important in the steady progress of the past decade in audio-visual production and use.

The Senate has held extensive hearings on this bill, and I am very hopeful indeed that our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will favorably reput the bill to the Senate floor some time in May. On the House side, similar progress is being made on a matching bill.

With such a two-pronged effort—that is, encouraging creative experimentation on the one hand, and providing in effect a market for audio-visual productions through such agencies as USIA—the whole field of audio-visual work can be enormously stimulated.

This would be good for our Nation. It would make us more articulate in our dealings with the rest of the world. It would also intensify the broad educational effort we are now making, by multiplying the number of students which can be reached by superior teachers. This, in turn, would give impetus to our effort to regain the initiative in our struggle with the Soviet system—a struggle which demands, and will continue to demand, the most intensive planning, coordination, and perseverance.

Only through the vigorous and imaginative use of all the media of communication can an administration expect to convince the country that it must make the sacrifices necessary to meet the multiple Soviet challenges and to avoid the catastrophe of either war or Soviet domination. And only through an equally vigorous use of communications media—founded soundly on intelligent policy, of course—can our leaders expect to rebuild the confidence and unity of the West and shatter the glib confidence of the Soviet leadership.

But even should we succeed in ending the arms race, in reducing the crushing burden of armaments and the overhanging threat of catastrophe from nuclear weapons, we must still be prepared to face a generation of struggle to win the minds and hearts of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Let us hope that we will have the determination to enter the contest seriously, the intelligence to formulate wise policies, and the trained men and women to put them into effective action.

Of all the powerful ideas at work in the world, none has more strength than the world's yearning for peace—and not simply the absence of war, but peace with progress.

We must identify ourselves vigorously, simply and directly, with this great idea, in terms of positive progress toward better housing, more jobs, more food, and for dignity and freedom for the men and women who have had nothing for so long.

Ideas, you see, are in motion—powerful ideas that are sweeping away old political institutions, breaking through the encrusted traditions of five centuries. Nationalism, and fierce nationalism at that, is an idea and a movement among the Asian and African peoples that must be recognized and taken into the most serious consideration by American policy planners. The idea of equal opportunity and nondiscrimination on the grounds of religion or color is another powerful idea that is upsetting the old order. The peoples of colored skin in this world are in the majority, and it has long since become evident that they will no longer tolerate the inferior status we of the West have assigned them for these five centuries of Caucasian domination.

The magnificent conception of international organization for peaceful purposes is still another tenacious and vigorous idea important in our world—and very much in motion. Steadily, in the face of the huge buildup of weapons of mass destruction, men and women of vision and purpose are working to strengthen the economic, social, and cultural organizations that are some of the brightest hopes in an often bleak international picture. The idea that all peoples should be free of the age-old scourge of disease is being magnificently carried forward—in malaria control programs, in the attack of trachoma, tuberculosis, and scores of other plagues.

Still another idea powerfully at work in the world, but one which our Government regretfully has not yet adopted, is that food and fiber are great national treasures, and can be vital instruments of foreign policy. Mr. Khrushchev is the first of the Soviet leaders to recognize this fact, and in the face of our own leadership's indifference to the opportunity to use food intelligently and wisely, the Soviet leaders are surging forward in an effort to overtake us in food and fiber production. American food and fiber abundance is not something we should be ashamed of, but an asset of incalculable value.

Finally, the idea of providing the kind of education that will permit individuals to realize their full intellectual potential, the idea of ensuring that gifted young people will not be denied higher education opportunities simply because of a lack of family finances, is gathering real momentum. In our history we have steadily widened the opportunity for education for everyone. But it is only recently that we have come to realize the great gaps in our educational structure. It is nothing short of tragic—for the individuals and for our Nation—that we have not devised a system that would provide the 150,000 or so young high school graduates with very superior ability who do not now go on to college each year for lack of funds, the opportunity to develop their potential through higher education.

I think we are going to take steps to meet this challenge. As long ago as January of 1957 I proposed legislation to provide direct scholarships and loans for 40,000 such young people. This year, I was privileged to join with Senator LISTER HILL in introducing the national defense education bill about whose title X we have had some discussion earlier. We have even succeeded in encouraging the administration to make a similar, though far smaller, request of Congress. Clearly we are going to have concrete, positive legislation in this field this year, and the impact on the intellectual level of our Nation may be astonishing over the coming decades.

Finally, it is important to point out that were there no Soviet Union, were there no Nikita Khrushchev, were there no overhanging threat of nuclear warfare, we would still live in a world of incredible problems and dangers, and opportunities. Surely it is short-sighted to be forever reacting instead of acting, to be forever holding back instead of forging boldly ahead with our own ideas. This is a world in constant flux, ever changing, constant only in its inevitable change.

The task of encouraging and training the young people of our Nation to assume political, economic, and technical leadership is of nobility and intense importance. You teachers, and you specialists in the visualization of the idea, deserve the warmest support and encouragement of the Nation. I can only assure you that there are many in the Congress of the United States who share my conviction that the profession of teaching must somehow receive the social and financial rewards that have for so long been denied to educators.

This is just another idea that I hope to get into motion.

Meanwhile, while our society, not yet in its full maturity, does not yet recognize in more concrete terms the critical importance of the teaching profession to the strength and economic health of our Nation, let me assure you that never has the prestige of the teacher been higher. Never, it seems to me, have the prospects been brighter for the participation by educators in major policy decisions of our Government. This is a long and important stride forward, I believe, and bodes well for the future welfare of our own, and of the world's people.

Repeal of Federal Transportation Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for several years I have urged that the first of all Federal taxes to be eliminated should be the wartime Federal excise taxes on travel and transportation, which are so harmful to the Western States. Unlike other excises, the transportation tax not only adds a single percentage increase to the cost of the particular item on which it is levied; rather, it enters several times into the cost of producing, distributing, and selling all manufactured items in this country, and it does so proportionally to the distance that these items must be transported. Thus, again, unlike other excises, it is not only regressive but also specifically discriminatory against areas, such as Oregon, which are located so far from the major industrial and population centers of our Nation that transportation costs constitute a disproportionately heavy element in the cost of everything we buy and sell.

Because the unfairness of this particular tax against my State has long occupied my attention and efforts in the Senate, I have been delighted with the push now being given to the repeal of the Federal transportation excise by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the able leadership of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other members of that committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and me and an illuminating editorial from the Portland Oregonian of Thursday, April 24, 1958, endorsing the repeal of the Federal transportation excise tax.

There being no objection, the correspondence and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
April 24, 1958.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: On February 24 Senator MAGNUSON, myself, and other members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee introduced an amendment intended to be proposed to H. R. 7125, excise tax legislation presently pending before the Senate Finance Committee, the purpose of which is to repeal the 3-percent excise tax on freight and the 10-percent excise tax on transportation.

These excise taxes were imposed during the war period, as you know, to conserve the transportation facilities for the war effort. Since the purpose of these taxes has long since been served, I am convinced their prompt repeal would provide the necessary stimulus to business activity which is so badly needed today. The excise tax on freight, with its multiple aspects, is a drag on healthy economic growth. These taxes differ from the ordinary excise tax in that they apply to almost every conceivable type of consumer goods from baby foods on up to automobiles, and they impose an undue restriction on almost every segment of our economy as well as the transportation industry.

Hearings which I have held as chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the purpose of determining the cause of the deterioration of our railroad industry have just been concluded. One recommendation which was made consistently, intended to be helpful not only to the transportation industry but to other segments of our economy as well, was the repeal of these excise taxes. I believe that by taking prompt action to bring about their repeal, business activity can be promoted and hope that you share my views.

I invite you to join with Senator MAGNUSON, myself, and other members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in urging that prompt and favorable action be taken on the amendment which we have introduced to bring about the repeal of these taxes. I sincerely trust that you will be able to do so.

An expression of your views with respect to this matter will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 28, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you for your letter of April 24, concerning the proposal for the repeal of the Federal transportation excises being urged by you, Senator MAGNUSON and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am more than happy to assure you that you can count on me to give you all possible assistance toward accomplishing the repeal of these taxes at the present session of Congress.

Since 1956, as you may remember, I have repeatedly urged the abandonment of these transportation taxes, because they are highly regressive in general, and because they are particularly discriminatory against areas such as Oregon, which must bear the burdens of heavy transportation costs in everything we buy and sell in the more populous markets of the eastern industrial States. On several occasions I have introduced amendments to repeal the transportation taxes in connection with other tax bills, but the Finance Committee has not so far thought the situation appropriate for consideration and adoption of such amendments in the Senate. You may recall that earlier this year we had a very constructive colloquy on the floor of the Senate on this subject.

That is why I am very glad that you, as a member of the Committee on Finance, and also as chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, are taking the lead to push for the abandonment of these excises now. I was disappointed that President Eisenhower, in his recent statement of proposals for Federal railroad policies, did not recommend the repeal of the transportation excises. However, I certainly hope that a total repeal and not only a partial reduction can nevertheless be enacted at the present session of the Congress.

Be sure to let me know whenever I may be of any assistance in the efforts of you and your colleagues of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, when this issue comes before the Senate.

With best personal regards,
Sincerely,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

[From the Portland Oregonian of April 24, 1950]

FIRST AID TO RAILROADS

The case for repeal of the transportation excise tax is so strong that Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks' recommendation that it be considered only as part of a general tax revision is surprising.

What greater, immediate stimulus could common carriers receive than relief from a restrictive tax which gives private truck fleets and leased or chartered trucks and barges a 3-percent advantage over them? Repeal of the freight tax appears from this viewpoint a better aid to the harassed railroads than Mr. Weeks' proposal that the Government guarantee $700 million in loans to the roads.

Perhaps all Federal excise taxes should be reviewed to determine what effect they are having on the business recession. A reduction in the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles, for instance, might be just the incentive needed to revive the lagging automobile market and give the whole industrial complex a boost.

Some excise taxes undoubtedly are necessary as revenue producers. The transportation taxes, however, were never designed to raise revenues. They were adopted in wartime to discourage use of railroads and other transportation facilities when these were needed for full prosecution of the war. The purpose now should be not to discourage but to encourage use of common carriers by both passengers, who must pay a 10-percent tax, and shippers, who pay 3 percent of their freight costs.

Most excise taxes are paid equally by all Americans, but not the transportation tax, which hits disproportionately those living in the West and other districts distant from the large population centers, who already are burdened by higher freight rates. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER has determined that Oregonians who ship a carload of canned fruit to Pittsburgh pay nearly four times as much Federal transportation tax as do middle westerners who make similar shipments to the Pittsburgh market. The same inequity applies to manufactured articles sent to Oregon from the East.

Not only does the transportation tax divert common-carrier business to shipper-owned or leased trucks and barges, but it causes shippers able to do so to send freight over Canadian transcontinental railroads, which have no excise tax to worry about. Thus the country as a whole, not only the West and South, is hurt.

A majority of the Senate Commerce Committee, as well as of a subcommittee which has made a study of railroad problems, has gone on record in favor of repealing the 3-percent freight tax and 10-percent passenger tax. The administration could help bring about this vital improvement in the tax structure by recommending immediate action instead of further delay.

A Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in

the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial, A Look at the Record, which appeared in the Indianapolis News on Wednesday, April 23, 1958:

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

Secretary of Commerce Weeks tried this week to help restore that national self-confidence which is essential to recovery from the recession.

Mr. Weeks pointed to several hopeful signs. He predicted a real upturn by late summer.

He may be right, too.

However, implacable partisan opponents of the administration will give him nothing but a pie in the face for his efforts.

The only contributions these extremists have made toward halting the business slump has been to yell for bigger Government expenditures and cuts in low-income taxes.

This combination adds up to a recover-by-deficit approach to economic problems. Its end result could be national bankruptcy.

Responsible Democratic leaders have let Harry Truman become their bellwether on the recession issue. They have not repudiated his shocking performance at a congressional hearing. Instead, they have echoed him—although in meeker tones.

These Democratic leaders—including such men of reputed stature as Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON—have hypocritically avoided references to the 1948–49 recession.

In that period of business decline, which paralleled the present one, the official Truman administration policy was the same wait and see policy of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Truman enunciated that policy in his 1949 economic and state of the union messages. His leading economic adviser, Leon Keyserling, restated it a few weeks later.

Democratic leaders also are stuck with other Trumanesque efforts to rewrite history.

They are stuck with Give-'Em-Fiction Harry's imaginative unemployment claims. The truth: Unemployment between 1933 and 1953 averaged 9½ percent. Since 1953 it has averaged 3.8 percent, with a 5 percent high in 1954. And this without any wars.

They are stuck with Trumanisms about personal income. The truth: Personal income in 1957 was $343,500,000,000. This was far higher than in any war-boom year under the Democrats. And the 1957 gross national product was $89,100,000,000 more than the Korean war peak under Mr. Truman.

They are stuck—these Democratic leaders—with Truman demagogy about high bondholders profits and money-lender interest rates under the Republicans. The truth: In 1939 interest payments were 6.3 percent of national income. In 1957 they were only 3.6 percent. In 1939 wages and salaries represented 66.1 percent of national income and in 1952 67.2 percent. In 1957 they represented 71.1 percent.

They are stuck with a bald-faced misstatement that Republican administrations have shot the cost of living into outer space. The truth: Between 1939 and 1953 the purchasing power of the dollar dropped from 100 cents to 52 cents for an average annual loss of 4 cents. In the last 5 years the annual drop has averaged one-half cent.

We could cite many other distortions of fact which are being given either vocal or silent support by Democratic dignitaries. In following Mr. Truman's lead, they are stuck with them.

But, worst of all, they are stuck with an arrogant philosophy of government which holds that the average American voters is too dumb to distinguish fact from fiction.

The optimistic wait-and-see prophecy of Secretary Weeks probably will not restore any unemployed citizen to his job this week or next week. But we'll take his honest generalities over Harry Truman's alterations of history.

As for the huzzas in high Democratic ranks for the former President's antic behavior, many Democrats at the precinct level must feel there is a poverty of national leadership in their great political party.

Free Enterprise Still Alive in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FACTS ABOUT WILLIAM BOX, WILLIAM KENNEDY, AND THE PROVOCATIVE, IMPUDENT BOX CARDS

THE CREATOR

Thirty-year-old Bill Box wanted to be a fine arts or top commercial artist, but his ribald, quixotic sense of humor got the better of him.

Four years ago he was parking cars in a lot adjacent to a Los Angeles restaurant so that he could eat and continue his studies at an art school. Between accordion-pleating car fenders and learning how to paint and draw, Bill sold the first of his provocative ideas and their terse, one-line captions for $25 each.

Almost like a contrived movie scenario, Bill Box became friends with another Bill by the name of Kennedy, and his entire life was set for a change of pace.

THE BUSINESSMAN

Bill Kennedy, 1 year Box's junior, had come to California as a TV salesman, but his ultimate ambition was to crash the video studio gates as a singer. However, his problem was threefold more complex than Box's. Bill had a wife and two children to support, which brought him to the parking lot to supplement his income.

His sense of humor and love of brash, sophisticated realism proved an appreciative audience for the drawings of his new friend, Bill Box, but he didn't quite approve of selling these contemporary art gems for $25. If others could make money from Box's creations, why couldn't he and Bill do it, cutting out the middleman?

THE FIRST TRY

Thus in April 1954, the two Bills pooled their resources and fine-combed Box's art portfolio. With a total capital of $26, they entered the greeting card business, producing the first batch of insolent, eye-popping cards that were later destined to shock, sometimes anger, and always hurl Americans into gales of hysterical laughter.

Converting Kennedy's battered 1948 Ford into a combination office and storehouse, the pair of Bills set out for San Diego to lay siege upon the stationers and greeting card dealers of that city. The junket netted a $238 profit.

OPERATIONS SAN FRANCISCO AND BEYOND

Next came an invasion of San Francisco with a new stock of cards, which were equally as successful as the San Diego trip, but if this business was to provide a decent living for two people and their dependents, it had to expand at once.

In line with this idea, Kennedy borrowed $150 from an aunt to underwrite his partner's journey to Wenatchee, Wash., where the artist talked his father into putting up $1,500.

This capital provided a new stock of merchandise and took the two Bills to New York for the annual stationer's convention. Until their invasion of Gotham, greeting cards had changed very little in design or context in more than a century.

Get-well cards, mothers' day mementos, birthday greetings, showers, wedding and engagement congratulations and an assortment of friendship cards literally dripped with saccharine sentimentality, and their florid designs looked more like seed catalogs than greetings.

"Everybody has a mother, but everybody doesn't think she looks like Whistler's painting," Kennedy recently reflected. "It is more entertaining, honest, and functional to send a contemporary parent one of Box's birthday greeting cards than the kind with a satin pincushion heart and some schmaltzie poem, such as 'M is for the million things she gave me.'"

Those who attended the stationers' convention must have agreed with Kennedy and Box, for they cautiously and conservatively bought assortments of the new-type greeting cards. This encouraged the partners to open an office and to send samples of their line to some 1,500 dealers across the country.

Experts in the direct mail business consider a 1-percent return on a national mailing profitable. The provocative Box card samples brought 400 orders, equal to almost a 27-percent response.

Everybody who ordered Box cards didn't necessarily like them. The boys still keep as a precious memento of those early days, an uncashed check, dated October 22, 1954 (6 months after they started in business), for 90 cents. It is from a Philadelphia stationer in payment for a box of their cards and it bears the warning in the sender's indignant handwriting: "Do not send any more."

NOW WE ARE 20

Since the firm's inception 4 years ago, the 2 Bills have had to move their business 4 times to account for necessary expansion and increased business. Twenty people are employed and there are sales representatives scattered from Maine to Hawaii to Brazil.

Currently the 2 Bills are considering requests from abroad to translate their entire line of cards into 18 foreign languages to meet the demand. Last year they sold 3 million cards and by the end of this year they will have done in excess of $500,000 gross business for the preceding 12 months.

A New York office now takes care of orders from States east of the Mississippi, the Caribbean, and Canada.

THE FUTURE

"No business can base a continued success on the creativity of one man," Bill Box maintains. He and his partner are therefore continually on the lookout for bright, original, and impudent new talent with ideas that can be incorporated into the Box card line.

To better facilitate such a search they are currently sponsoring the second annual national Campus Cartoonist of the Year contest among college artists of both sexes. They offer the winner a free, all-expense-paid, round-trip to Paris and a generous royalty deal on any cards created by the contestants which they decide to publish under the Box card label.

Steve Allen, Groucho Marx, and Al Capp are the judges and thousands of entries have already been received from would-be future Box card artists.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

The first thing a Box card fan usually asks either of the two Bills upon meeting them, is how the saucy little cards came to be

born, smashing all American greeting-card traditions.

Actually, the boys will tell you, offbeat and zany messages and cartoons are not new. Americans, between 1860 and 1918 bought and mailed millions of comic, impudent Valentines annually, but these were sent anonymously and designed to deeply wound the recipient.

Box cards are proudly signed by their senders and they are in protest, mainly, over saccharine sentimentality and pure corn. While the granddaddy comic Valentines were the forerunners of this type of greeting, they were sent only on St. Valentine's Day. Box cards are a daily, year-round excuse to make someone happy and to shock them out of their self-pity through astonished laughter.

Activities of the International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all too often we fail to understand and appreciate the importance of work being carried on by the International Labor Organization.

In Labor's Daily of Thursday, November 28, 1957, an excellent article appeared describing some of the activities of the ILO.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor's Daily of November 28, 1957]

ILO EXPERTS HELP HAVE-NOTS FIND PLACE IN MODERN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY

(By J. Avery Joyce)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—"If you want peace, prepare for social justice."

This simple, yet stirring, sentence is engraved on the foundation stone of the International Labor Office in Geneva.

Simple? Yes. But in it lies a great challenge, not only to the consciences of men but to their knowledges, abilities and skills. It is a challenge which has been taken up by more than 700 picked representatives of the 74 nations which now belong to the ILO.

Under this brave banner, grounded in the democratic principles of the ILO constitution, devoted men and women of scientific and technical training and experience, have gone forth as missionaries of good will to the peoples who have needed their learning and their leadership across the wide earth. Starved of adequate funds, opposed by blind and selfish interests, ignored by the daily press—which thrives on wars and murders and scandals—the ILO has nevertheless proved to the very hilt that its foundation motto is the only practical way forward to world peace in the space age.

"Partners is progress" is the title of the latest summary report of what the ILO has accomplished during 1957. "Partners in Peace" would have equally described the fine role played by these technical assistance experts, working under the ILO program in country after country, on a microscopic budget—which, even so, certain United States interests tried to cut last summer, but failed in face of overwhelming opposition from other countries and from the United States labor movement itself.

COMMUNITIES PROGRESSING

In many parts of the world, communities long steeped in poverty are now adding to their incomes by producing pottery, textiles, and other handicrafts with the guidance of ILO experts. Skills are being taught to thousands of boys in ILO-aided centers and schools. Training centers for adult workers and instructors are being improved and overhauled. Cooperatives, set up with the assistance of ILO experts, are helping to ease the transition from primitive to modern industrial economy.

Output in factories and workshops has everywhere risen, following assistance from ILO productivity teams. Social security, minimum wages, factory inspection, and better working conditions have come for the first time to workers in some of these regions. Campaigns for greater industrial safety are being waged and government departments handling these problems have been overhauled and reorganized. And all this is being done with the active support of the peoples and governments concerned.

More than half of the ILO's activities are devoted to helping countries to develop the skills they need. Take the example of Haiti. This mountainous republic is swept by high winds which devastate the countryside but which, if harnessed, could yield power which Haiti needs.

ILO experts taught Haitian mechanics how to construct windmills for irrigation and other purposes. One of Haiti's principal crops is sugarcane, but the machetes with which the cane is cut had to be imported. ILO experts taught Haitian artisans how to make knives themselves.

Again, the correct construction of the wheel was unknown in Haiti's backcountry. Most people carried loads on their heads. So the wheelwright's trade was introduced. Finally, to meet long-term needs, training specialists are helping Haiti to reorganize technical education and streamlining its vocational schools.

More complicated have been ILO training projects in India, Italy, Yugoslavia, and other countries where the needs of heavy industry have to be met. India's enormous needs for skilled labor—one of her new giant steel plants will need 10,000 workers—have led her to seek ILO assistance in overhauling the vocational and instructor training programs. Italy has a highly skilled labor force, but needs training programs for new or unemployed workers, and ILO specialists are helping to develop two pilot training centers in Genoa and Naples.

The most important assistance rendered by the ILO to Yugoslavia has been placing of hundreds of her workers in western European countries under the ILO's worker-trainee program. ILO instructors are also assisting Yugoslav industry to train workers on the job and to improve other vocational training facilities.

Now, take a more difficult case. Honduras has a tropical climate, luxuriant vegetation, a relatively scanty population and a single crop economy. Out of its active population of 647,393 persons, 538,014 are engaged in agriculture and forestry, 37,556 in industry, 6,512 in construction, and 3,104 in quarries and mines.

Up to 1954, Honduras did not have a code of labor laws like other Latin American countries. This abnormal situation threatened to lead to social strife and, in 1954, the country was swept by strikes. Relations between employers and workers were disrupted by the disputes.

The first step was the drafting of a labor charter by the ILO. The charter took into account the level of social and economic development in the country, but it assured freedom of association and collective bargaining, provided a legal basis for collective agreements, and guaranteed payment of wages. It also laid down principles for the regulation of working hours, the conclusion of labor contracts, and the protection of women and children.

NEW LAWS ENACTED

By 1955, new laws were on the statute book and, in anticipation of the passing of others, ILO experts have already begun training ministry officials and labor inspectors. Steps are now being taken to see that both trade union and employers' representatives understand the techniques of collective bargaining and arbitration.

What has been done about the world's vast army of the disabled? Turning, for a moment to two countries, Guatemala and Indonesia, which we are constantly being told are under the shadow of advancing of communism, let us look at just one as part of the peaceful remedy. ILO projects covered handicapped persons in addition to the blind during 1957.

Guatemala has set up small workshops where workers partially paralyzed or disabled through occupational accidents are now learning a variety of trades from radio repairs to shoemaking. Similarly, Indonesia's rehabilitation center at Solo, designed as a model for the whole of Asia, is making considerable headway with the help of experts drawn from a number of U. N. agencies, including the ILO. There, more than 200 physically handicapped persons are undergoing training in different skills under the ILO. In the medical section, blind Indonesians are learning a new profession, that of masseurs.

What of the future? The projects sketched above are only a few pioneer examples of the genuine peacemaking activities of the ILO. They are not in themselves the complete answer to the major problems of war and peace. But they fit into the vaster pattern of international efforts to promote happiness and to raise living standards on all continents.

In a world which is still trying to live down one hatred and misery are fears of centuries, the technical and scientific activities of the various U. N. agencies, representing the pooled brains of numerous countries, stand out as a bright ray of hope for the earth's forgotten men.

Missouri the Heart of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, when the DAR held its recent annual convention in Washington, one of Missouri's delegates was Mrs. Davis Franklin Eads, the Missouri State regent of the organization. She gave a very short, but, I think cogent, timely, and very excellent speech entitled "Missouri the Heart of the Nation." It describes my State's virtues so well that I ask unanimous consent to have the short address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI THE HEART OF THE NATION

Missouri finds itself in the spotlight of your attention at this time, an experience

not new in her history. For over 200 years she has periodically attracted attention from the outside world because of significant people and events. This land where the rivers meet is an enigma to many; a land of cities and quiet rural communities. Attempts to sum Missouri up in one pat phrase have always failed. It has been called the show me State and the Mother of the West. But none has defined it. Its character does not seem to fit into any particular region, not even the Middle West of which it is geographically a part, but where its color and constant variety make it seem almost alien. The New Englander speaks vaguely as out West or down South. The southerner, remembering Missouri's Grant and Sheridan calls it up North or hastily balancing those memories with happier thoughts of Joe Shelby, Sterling Price, or Gov. Claiborne Jackson, moves it closer to Dixie. To the far westerner, Missouri is back East, or more often a wistful back home.

The Missourian is even harder to define than Missouri. Depending on the section and town from which he comes, he may greet you with "Howdy," "Good morning," or "Bon jour." He may serve you with beef and kidney pie, rare roast beef and trifle; or with corn dodgers, greens, and pot likker, and fried apple pies; or with spoon bread, fried chicken, black-eyed peas, and strawberry shortcake. His home may be a brick bungalow, a functional modern, the trim white frame cottage of the 1880's; it may be a stately Greek revival mansion with temple portico, or half timbered in the medieval manner, or French chateau style, or brick corniced and flush with the sidewalk in the German manner. He may go to church in a simple white frame edifice with a tiny bell tower, or in a brush arbor for a protracted meeting, or in a century-old cathedral. He may sing you folk songs older than our country, in English or French or German, or the rollicking ballads of the frontier; he may take you to a sharp note singing festival or to hear symphonic music in Kansas City or St. Louis where the orchestra is the second oldest in our country. He will tell you legends and tall tales with a broad sense of humor. He may seem reserved, but once acquainted, you will find him open, friendly, and hospitable.

Most Missourians are predominantly conservative. They live well but abhor ostentation. Society editors are wont to complain that the really socially prominent avoid publicity like a plague. By and large they are gregarious, and have few racial prejudices. They believe in working hard, owning their own homes, and tolerating their neighbors. They seldom lose their sense of humor or their sense of proportion, and are consequently slow to take up fads or to join radical movements. They call St. Louis, St. Louis—not St. Louey, but Kansas City is sometimes called K. C. Their State is most often called Missoura rather than Missouri. It is called the Show Me State because they are hard believers. Since splendid highways cross the State, it is easy for the State to be shown, and we would like to do just that. We invite each of you to visit the home State of our president general.

Appropriations in Terms of Estimated Annual Accrued Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, at my request the citizens committee for the Hoover report has sent me an analysis of the differences between S. 434, the Kennedy-Payne-Byrd bill which passed the Senate without a dissenting vote last year, and H. R. 8002, the annual accrued expenditure bill passed by the House on February 4. As you know, H. R. 8002 has been pending on the Senate Calendar for nearly 3 months without being brought to the floor for consideration.

I do not know the reason for the delay in considering this measure. However, I do think it would help restore a greater measure of congressional control over Government expenditures and urge that it be brought to the floor without further delay.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the citizens committee to me be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR
THE HOOVER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1958.

The Honorable CLIFFORD CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: The citizens committee is glad to answer your inquiry regarding the annual accrued expenditure bill, H. R. 8002, as compared with S. 434, the Kennedy-Payne-Byrd bill, which passed the Senate during the first session. We will not give here a technical explanation, since that is better left to the experts in the appropriate Government agencies.

The pertinent Hoover Commission recommendation upon which these bills are based is recommendation No. 7 of the report on budgeting and accounting: "That the executive budget and congressional appropriations be in terms of estimated annual accrued expenditures, namely, charges for goods and services to be received."

Both bills would put that recommendation into effect, although the two bills differ as to the means by which it would be done.

Under S. 434, the present method of making appropriation in a budget year for not only the goods and services to be received in that year but for long-lead procurement for goods and services to be delivered in subsequent years, would be replaced by:

(a) An appropriation for the budget year representing the goods and services to be delivered in that year, and

(b) Contractual authority for goods and services to be ordered in that year but not delivered or rendered until subsequent years.

Under H. R. 8002, the present method of making appropriations would, in effect, remain the same. However, there would be a limitation in each appropriation which would control the amount of goods and services to be received in the budget year.

In other words, appropriations would be controlled on an annual basis under the limitation procedure, and in addition orders for long-lead-time procurement could be placed under the appropriation similar to the method of placing orders under contractual authority as contemplated by S. 434.

An additional feature of the measure which passed the House, is that it would make it possible for the Congress to include, in appropriation bills, amendments, rescisions, or transfers of appropriations previously made without such provisions being subject to a point of order.

The procedures under both bills would be similar. They would bring about what the Hoover Commission had in mind, namely, annual control of Government programs and a systematic annual review with positive action to be taken by the Congress each year in the review of orders placed for long-lead-time procurement. In the opinion of this committee the two bills would have practically the same result and are virtually equal as to substantive effect.

With respect to the measure, H. R. 8002, J. Harold Stewart, former president of the American Institute of Public Accountants, and chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Budget and Accounting, states:

"In view of the debate in the House today on House bill 8002, I have reviewed the proposed amendment of the bill by Congressman WIGGLESWORTH and believe the bill if so amended would be in substance and principle equivalent to House bill 8002 as originally drawn. The amended bill should provide an adequate framework for carrying out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission that the Federal budget be administered in terms of annual accrued expenditures."

And Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, states:

"The Treasury Department is in favor of the enclosed draft amendment to H. R. 8002 as described in the Bureau of the Budget letter of March 4, 1958.

"This amendment would substantially carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It would also carry out the intent of the President's 1959 budget message in this regard."

And the then Director of the Budget Percival F. Brundage states:

"As requested, I am setting forth herein the views of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the enclosed draft of an amendment to H. R. 8002.

"The amendment would require that the budget include a proposed limitation on annual accrued expenditures for each appropriation account whenever a satisfactory system of accrual accounting is established for such account.

"The amendment sets forth the items which would be chargeable against any such limitation on annual accrued expenditures. This constitutes, in effect, a definition of accrued expenditures which is substantially in accord with that term as defined in the reported version of H. R. 8002.

"Any unused balance of the limitation on annual accrued expenditures would lapse at the end of the fiscal year concerned. Goods received during that year but not paid for could be paid for in the next fiscal year without further congressional action—provided the limitation was not thereby exceeded. Goods and services ordered during that year but received during a subsequent year could be paid for under the appropriation against which the obligation was incurred, but only within a new limitation on annual accrued expenditures established by the Congress for the subsequent year.

"The effect of the amendment would be to give the Congress increased control over the value of goods and services to be received in each fiscal year. Appropriations would continue to be made in the same manner as at present and would continue to be available for incurring obligations and for making payment therefor; however, their use for the latter purpose would be subject to the limitations on accrued expenditures which would be established by the Congress each year.

"The existing method of making appropriations and incurring obligations would be preserved. The use of contract authority would not be involved. Although the amendment would not eliminate the carryover of appropriation balances, it would permit Congress to control their use by determining, through the limitation on annual accrued expenditures, the value of goods and services which could be received each year. (While H. R. 8002, as reported, would eliminate the carryover of appropriation balances,

it would involve a carryover of balances of contract authority.)

"We believe that the draft amendment would accomplish substantially the same result contemplated by the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to accrued expenditures, and the Bureau of the Budget would favor its enactment."

We trust this supplies the information you requested and we are grateful for your interest in this important question.

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE FRANCIS.

Wisconsin Projects Eligible for Community Facilities Act Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mayor Ivan A. Nestingen of Madison, the capital city of Wisconsin, in response to my inquiry about Wisconsin projects which might take advantage of the loan money made available under the Community Facilities Act. I think Mayor Nestingen's letter underscores the need for a lower interest rate. When the Senate changed the rate from the original 3 percent we moved in the wrong direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mayor Nestingen be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MADISON, WIS.,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
April 28, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: On April 1, 1958, you addressed a letter to this office inquiring as to the needs of this city in regard to aid in obtaining, at a reasonable interest rate, money necessarily borrowed to finance municipal improvements.

In reply to your letter, I wish to state that, in another several months, we will have a capital budget presented to the city council which, in my opinion, will reflect the need for borrowing in this city in the approximate amount of $25 million over the next 7 to 10 years. This includes borrowing for schools, streets, land acquisition for parks and other uses, urban renewal, storm-sewer construction, and other projects. More specific information can be furnished if you desire, but I do wish to wait until after the capital budget has been compiled.

Your letter indicates that the bill, which you mention, would provide for an interest rate of about 3 percent. My subsequent conversation with you indicated that it might be 3¼ percent. I do wish to let you know that, if this is the interest rate that would be established under the bill, it would not be of benefit to this community, barring a change in fiscal circumstances, since the highest interest rate we have paid in the last 10 years has been 2.75 percent about a year ago. Currently, it appears that the market has reduced somewhat and that the interest rate may have tapered off from this peak of 2.75 percent.

On May 20, 1958, we will be issuing $2,300,000 in general obligation bonds for needed school construction. At that time, we can better judge how much the market has eased off from this peak interest rate which we are now paying on bonds issued a year ago.

Please let me know if we can furnish further information to you which will be of benefit to your office on this question.

In the meantime, I wish to extend my best wishes for your continued success.

Respectfully yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Mayor.

Economic Conditions in Washington County, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting and thought-provoking article in the April 2 issue of the Calais, Maine, Advertiser, in regard to economic conditions in Washington County, Maine, which was brought to by attention by the Honorable Elbridge B. Davis of Calais, Maine, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Calais (Maine) Advertiser of April 2, 1958]

COUNTY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE CLIMBS TO ALARMING PEAK OF 40 PERCENT

With an almost total lack of demand for pulpwood and with sardine plants still inoperative, the unemployment rate in Washington county has climbed to a peak unsurpassed since the depression in the 1930's.

The population of Washington county is approximately 32,000 and the labor force has been set at 9,000 men and women. More than 3,000 residents of the county contacted the Maine Employment Security Commission office last month in regard to filing for compensation or jobs. But there apparently are no jobs.

Since the MESC estimates that only three-quarters of the unemployed are registered, this means that another 1,000 persons have no regular source of income at present. The conclusion is, therefore, that more than 40 percent of the county's labor force is unemployed.

CRITICAL SITUATION

This, obviously, is contrary to recently published reports that things were never better downeast—the fact is, without intending to push the panic button, that the situation is indeed critical. The area can use any assistance it can get, either from State or Federal agencies.

The condition as compared to last year at this same time is much worse, according to an informed source. In April 1958 there was a total of 2,100 persons on the county MESC active file—900 less than this year.

The new year for filing for unemployment compensation began Tuesday and MESC representatives began the mammoth task of acting on the 3,000 claims for compensation.

Included in these 3,000 people will be an estimated 300 men and women who, however, failed in 1958 to make even the $900 necessary to qualify them for the minimum compensation of about $6 a week.

Those who do qualify will be paid an average of $16 a week for 26 weeks or until work is found for them. The State average is about $19 per week.

MIGRATION STOPS

What happens to these people who are making such a pittance? Before the business downturn or modified recession took hold, many of them were migrating from the county. Now that there is little work to be found even in the heart of the industrial areas to the south, all the unemployed are sitting tight here in the county.

The tremendous rate of unemployment comes about as a result of an almost total lack of demand for pulpwood and the fact that sardine plants by law must remain closed until April 15. Actually the factories will most likely be inactive until at least mid-June since the herring don't usually make their appearance until then—if then. Of the 3,000 persons applying for compensation for unemployment, 1,800 are associated with the sardine industry.

The United States Navy's $40 million radio station at North Cutler, described by certain county leaders as being a boon, is proving a bust instead so far as employment of local help is concerned. Only about 15 men are on the job of clearing brush and even at the peak the greatest number to be on the payroll will be right around 100 when all is said and done. Politicians may claim a bigger figure but the facts don't back them up.

The Beals Island-Jonesport Bridge is another project that is not directly benefiting the area as far as work is concerned. The majority of the men employed have been and are specialists in steel and cement work.

On the brighter side of the picture, indications are that pulpwood operations will start in about 10 days: Chemical debarking will begin about April 15 employing about 100 men and regular pulp peeling will get underway around May 15 involving 300 or so men. By mid-August there will be jobs for everyone who wants to work in the sardine factories, in the bean fields and on the blueberry barrens.

ROAD WORK

Recognizing the critical condition is the board of county commissioners which has authorized the immediate start on several road construction projects in the county to help eliminate unemployment in this area.

But should the residents of this county be content with seasonal employment? Many think not. Just what the answer will be remains to be seen but one county official said this week that "It would help if the folks here in Washington County would stop bragging about what their grandfathers did and start wondering about what their grandchildren are going to do."

United States Exhibit at the Brussels World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have received a most heartening letter from a constituent attending the World's Fair in Brussels, with respect to the United States exhibit at the fair. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARNHEM, HOLLAND, *April 25, 1958.*

DEAR SENATOR IVES: I want to be, perhaps, your first constituent to report on the United States pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair from which I have just come. It was terrific. I spent 3 full days at the fair and each day I returned to the United States pavilion—it was so fascinating. We are competing vigorously with the Russians and thus far I would say we are nearly even in crowd drawing.

I would say that the most appealing features of many are:

1. Cinerama: Crowds are so pleased they clap after each 19-minute showing.
2. IBM No. 305: Crowds are always around this machine, which answers questions in 1 of 10 languages covering 2,000 years.
3. Fashion show.
4. Voting machines: This was President Eisenhower's brainchild and they are going over big.

The Russians spent far more money on their exhibit. In fact, it is quite overwhelming and convincing. Should more funds be requested to pep up our exhibit or add to it, I believe the added expense would be well worthwhile.

With all best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

MAURICE N. BRIDGES.

MORRIS, N. Y.

The Beautiful and Historic Lake Country of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a very fine article by Mr. John C. McDonald of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune appeared in the April 25 Christian Science Monitor. The article is entitled "Canoe Country Anchors to Canada," and in the article Mr. McDonald discusses at some length the very beautiful and historic lakes and streams of Minnesota.

It is most fitting that in the 100th anniversary of the State of Minnesota, the Christian Science Monitor has taken this opportunity to bring Minnesota's magnificent water resources to the attention of a broad readership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by John C. McDonald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANOE COUNTRY ANCHORS TO CANADA

(By John C. McDonald)

DULUTH, MINN.—The most northerly part of the Nation is 130 square miles of virgin wilderness which is of the United States but not actually in it.

Populated by moose, mink, muskrat, and some 100 year-round human residents, this northwest angle of Minnesota is touched by water on 3 sides, and its roadless beauty is moored in Canada. It is directly accessible to the rest of Minnesota only by airplane or boat.

Farther east, and still clutched tightly against Canada, is a vaster trackless area—canoe country, truly—which is the Superior National Forest. Intended to be preserved as the land that was once America, every foot of its nearly 1 million acres, larger than all of Rhode Island, is covered with forest and water. Airplanes are forbidden by Presidential edict from flying into it.

HOST OF CHOICES

This, then, is one side—the hardier, roughing-it side—of Minnesota as a vacationland. But the summer traveler has a host of other choices. He can tour the north shore of Lake Superior, Indian mounds and reservations, ghost lumber camps, the metropolitan Twin Cities and the second largest university in America, the lake regions, the western prairies.

Minnesota has 45 State parks, comprising 80,000 acres, and 4,000 lake-resorts which range from thrifty, close-to-nature types to luxurious lodges which provide supervised play for the children while mom and dad play golf or bridge.

Nine out of ten Minnesotans live within 5 miles of water suitable for swimming, boating, or fishing. Inland waters cover more than 4,000 square miles.

Largest and grandest of the State parks is Itasca wherein are vast stands of Norway (the Minnesota tree) and white pine, many lakes, and herds of deer. Here it was that Henry R. Schoolcraft came upon the source of the Mississippi River, across which one can skip today without getting his feet wet.

At Alexandria may be seen the controversial Kensington Runestone, believes to have been left in mid-America by the Vikings in 1362, more than a century before Columbus ventured westward from Spain.

If the traveler's taste leans to vast expanses of blue water, he will find that the 150-mile North Shore Drive from Duluth to the Canadian border at Grand Portage rivals the Côte d'Azur for sheer beauty of inland sea and gracious trees.

There's grandeur for the ear as well as the eye in vivid but not effete place names which contrast delightfully with the myriad Round Lakes and Long Lakes and Mud Lakes encountered so repetitiously elsewhere: Temperance, Flute Reed, Devil's Track, Knife, Portage, Arrowhead, White Face and Baptism Rivers, Sawbill and Meander Lakes, Castle Danger, Gooseberry Falls, Palisade Head, and Grand Marais.

RESTORED STOCKADE

Standing vigil high over Lake Superior on this drive is Split Rock Lighthouse, said to be the most-photographed lighthouse in the United States.

Grand Portage, to which redcapped voyageurs once brought pelts of mink and beaver for the eastern market and Europe, is the site of a restored stockade.

A huge statue built to the memory of the voyageur will be dedicated June 15 at Crane Lake, near Hibbing. The legendary lumberman, Paul Bunyan, whom the North Star State has claimed as its own for more than 100 years, is inshrined in enormous likenesses in Bemidji and Brainerd. On Gull Lake near Brainerd is Lumbertown, U. S. A., a recreation from the past.

The nearby Mille Lacs area is the home of many Indians and their ceremonies.

Our National Arboretum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial and an article on the National Arboretum which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 23. I was glad to see that the Senate Committee on Appropriations had called attention to the future of the Arboretum in their report on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1959 and that some positive action should be taken on it.

I do not know how many Members of this body have ever visited the Arboretum, but would suggest that a visit at this time would be very worthwhile. At the same time, while viewing the horticulture beauty which exists there, one could see the deplorable conditions under which the persons employed are required to work as well as the utter inaccessibility to the public for the purpose of viewing the wonders of nature.

The editorial and article follow:

TREES TO LOOK AT

So few persons have visited the National Arboretum that the sorry plight of this desirable project in northeast Washington is not widely known. Aubrey Graves, this newspaper's outdoors editor, tells the story elsewhere in today's issue. It is a tale of neglect, indifference, waste, and missed opportunity to give the Nation's Capital an outstanding botanical and horticultural display.

There is much in the Arboretum to be seen—lovely trees and woodlands, magnificent azaleas and other flowering shrubs in an impressive habitat. But facilities for the care and propagation of the many varieties of trees and shrubs are far from adequate. Worse than that, the Arboretum is almost a closed corporation, and the public only occasionally gets a peek. During the mere four weekends a year when it is open to the public, the heavily burdened staff must work overtime to accommodate visitors. Much of the area is inaccessible, and the remainder must be viewed on the move because no parking is provided and roads are not designed for two-way traffic.

Congressional appropriations are not to blame for this pathetic situation; for the past 2 years Congress has voted more money than the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget recommended. Congress also approved a 5-year development plan in 1946, but the Agriculture Department has not carried through the program and now it must be brought up to date.

Congress and the Department together can initiate a remedy by seeing to it that the new appropriation includes funds for a decent administration building, laboratories, roads, and staff; and if the Department does not come through with a satisfactory proposal, Congress ought to ask why. If the Department of Agriculture is not basically in sympathy with the concept of an Arboretum that will be genuinely a national showpiece, then the program ought to be transferred to some more interested agency—perhaps to the Smithsonian Institution, which operates the national zoo. There's not much point in an Arboretum that no one can see.

ARBORETUM LONGS FOR LOVE

(By Aubrey Graves)

Like an unwanted stepchild, the National Arboretum prays every night for a real father.

As long as it remains a legal function of the United States Department of Agriculture, sponsors of this outdoor tree museum are convinced, it never will enjoy healthy development.

Thirty-one years ago, Congress directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a national arboretum. For the

next 2 decades, little was done beyond acquiring a 410-acre site at 28th and M Streets NE., on Mount Hamilton and Hickey Hill, along the west bank of the Anacostia River.

"The big difficulty," Frederic P. Lee said in an interview last week, "is that nobody in the Agriculture Department at a policy-making level gives much of a damn about the arboretum."

Lee believes it should be rescued from the United States Department of Agriculture. He thinks it would get far more considerate treatment for instance, under the Smithsonian Institution.

Lee is chairman of the 15-man National Arboretum Advisory Council, created by law in 1927 to advise the Secretary on its planning and development.

Its founders intended the arboretum to become a botanical and horticultural institution serving Americans much as London's famous Kew Gardens serve the British people.

For the public, it was to provide a spot of striking beauty at any time of year. For the school child, it was to be a zoological garden of plants and a museum of woodsy-growing things. For the scientist, a laboratory for study and experimentation.

More than $2 million has been invested in the arboretum. Yet, except, for 4 weekends a year, it has never been opened to the public. And even then, because of the lack of roads and trails, only 60 acres are accessible.

The arboretum has indeed become a spectacular woodland. Each spring, nature puts on a magnificent azalea display there, said to be unrivaled anywhere in the world. Its flowering dogwood and crab apple, hollyhock, mountain laurel, magnolia, and quince are described as fully as impressive as the Tidal Basin's famed cherry blossoms.

"I went out there to look at the azaleas once," remarked Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, during a 1956 appropriations hearing, "but I had a time getting around to really see them."

"Senator," said Lee from the witness stand, "if you had gotten there when the crowd was there, chances are you would have been told you could not get out of your car—you get in here, you make this circle, in one door and out the other—because we cannot handle two-way traffic, and we cannot let you go over on this side because there aren't any roads."

Skimpy appropriations, just about enough to do a grass-cutting job, have provided no money for guides, guards, or adequate roads.

When the azalea display is on, scientists and other arboretum staff members work overtime to direct traffic. "We have no guards. Wet get horticulturalists and doctors and others performing such functions, voluntarily, over weekends, just to make it available to the public at that time."

One year the budget-pruners hit the arboretum so hard it was forced to appeal to boy scouts to clear a fire break. During the drought of 1954, 18 maintenance men had little time for ordinary housekeeping duties. They were kept busy carrying water to plantings, because there was no money for an adequate irrigation system. Many plantings died that summer.

That year $156,000 was provided to operate the preserve. "I would not be surprised," said Francis De Vos, assistant director, "if it takes that much to maintain the White House grounds."

Declared Director H. T. Skinner: "During the last depression, the CCC initiated many major improvements. Unhappily, it looks as though we'll have to wait for another depression before we get any real help."

Relatively few Washington area residents have visited the arboretum. Many do not even know it exists. A visitor who asked to be driven to the arboretum completely confounded one taxi driver.

"Lady," he snorted, "I've been hacking for 20 years and there's just no such thing as a National Arboretum here."

Congress is not responsible for the Arboretum's difficulties, declares Lee. "The United States Department of Agriculture at the higher echelons, and the Budget Bureau are."

Twice recently, Congress appropriated more money for the Arboretum than the United States Department of Agriculture wanted. For 1956, the Department asked $161,000; Congress raised the figure to $372,570. For 1957, the Department requested $372,570, was told to take and spend $500,000.

The budget for the fiscal 1959 is being weighed now, and history is repeating itself. The Department proposed to give the Arboretum $185,000 less next year than it got this year. A closed hearing was held several weeks ago, and the matter now is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The financial straitjacket forced on the Arboretum year after year recently moved HAYDEN to write a scolding letter to Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson.

"The Aboretum was set up by Congress as a legal function of your Department," the Senator wrote. "It ought to be given the consideration given to other parts of your Department."

Repeatedly, members of the advisory council have protested the bare subsistence diet. Their letters have drawn such replies as: "Your work has been of great value to the administration. * * * We have to view the budget picture as a whole. * * * The proposed reduction does not reflect any lack of interest on our part. * * * We hope you will continue to serve."

Some council members express extreme boredom over serving as advisers whose advice is habitually disregarded.

The United States Department of Agriculture wishes to take $185,000 away from the Arboretum next year, sponsors were told, "to provide additional funds for national defense."

That was disputed by Mrs. Hermann A. Place in recent letters to HAYDEN and to Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri. Mrs. Place is vice chairman of the council.

"The budget (pp. 307–308) shows that * * * the Agricultural Research Service (under which the Arboretum falls) was not cut for national defense or any other reason. It was increased over the appropriation for last year."

What did happen, she declared, is that the USDA decided to increase utilization research at the expense of farm research. Utilization research has to do with finding new uses for surplus agricultural products.

If the $185,000 cut is made, declared Mrs. Place, "the roads, parking spaces, grading and seeding cannot be finished and the Arboretum again cannot be opened to the public."

The Arboretum now boasts only two permanent structures—a small gatehouse and a portion of a service building. The only other buildings are ramshackle frame affairs put up by the CCC boys in 1934.

"One of them," Lee told the Senate group, "was broken down by a hurricane and one fell down later without the necessity of an act of God. All the others leak—and I am overdescribing their splendors."

Lee insists that about $1.5 million is needed for an administration building and laboratories.

"We cannot do a research job out there until we get them," he says. "We also need another $40,000 just to bring that $151,000 batch of unused plans up to date."

"Congress," Lee told the Senators, "should do 1 of 2 things: Equip the Arboretum to serve in the fields of research and education, in ornamental and economic horticulture—or abolish it."

Faster Depreciation of Business Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "CAPEHART Offers Bill To Allow Faster Depreciation of Business Assets," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, April 29, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPEHART OFFERS BILL TO ALLOW FASTER DEPRECIATION OF BUSINESS ASSETS—IT WOULD AT LEAST DOUBLE AMOUNT FIRMS COULD DEDUCT FOR TAX PURPOSES

WASHINGTON.—Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, introduced legislation designed to spur a big capital investment boom by greatly increasing depreciation deductions businesses may take in computing income taxes.

His bill would double or more than double—depending on the type of asset involved—the amount of deduction that could be taken from tax returns of businesses for capital assets built or acquired during 1958 and 1959.

The measure would step up the depreciation deductions by cutting substantially the useful life at present legally set for capital assets ranging from air conditioners to steel mills and from farm tractors to new locomotives. The useful life of the property determines the amount of deduction that can be taken for depreciation each year and the longer the useful life, the smaller the annual deduction.

Mr. CAPEHART expects wide business support for his proposal and is hopeful the Treasury will endorse it also. He discussed the bill at length with Treasury Secretary Anderson yesterday, but Mr. Anderson declined to back it at this time—even though the Treasury is understood to have been thinking along the lines of more liberalized depreciation deductions in the event some tax relief is recommended.

Chances for approval of the measure are slim unless a general tax cut is voted. But if Congress gets into a sweeping reduction program, approval would be possible.

TREASURY HASN'T REVIEWED BILL

Treasury officials said the bill is Mr. CAPEHART's own proposal, and has not been reviewed in detail by the Treasury. They reported Mr. Anderson would take no stand on any tax legislation until he had consulted with the leadership of both parties in Congress. The Treasury and Democratic congressional leaders have been operating under an informal truce agreement to consult with each other before acting in the tax field.

Nevertheless, some Democratic lawmakers would like to overturn their leaders' agreement with the administration's go-slow policy. Senator DOUGLAS (Democrat of Illinois), for instance, yesterday started 3 days of hearing by his House-Senate Economic Subcommittee aimed at gathering evidence that a tax cut is needed. A panel of eight private economists agreed in the opening session that further Federal activity is needed to spur economic activity. More support for tax reduction is expected at today's hearing.

The opposite view was voiced, however, at the United States Chamber of Commerce an-

nual meeting. Senator BENNETT (Republican of Utah), declared in a speech there that the Government is "being urged to go a little wild" on heavy spending programs and tax cuts to combat the recession. He forecast a Federal deficit of $20 billion to $24 billion for this fiscal year and next combined, if all the schemes are adopted, and argued against such action. Lower prices and a stable dollar are the best recession remedies, the Senator argued.

Chamber President Philip M. Talbott also opposed heavy expenditure of Federal funds and "make-work" projects, which he asserted did not materially change the direction of the economy in the 1930's.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman BYRD, Democrat of Virginia), declined comment on the Capehart bill except to say it was a very far-reaching proposal and probably should originate in the House, which constitutionally must start tax bills. Representative SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, third ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, is scheduled to introduce the bill in the House today. Its backers hope to attach it as an amendment to legislation to continue present corporate tax rates and certain excise rates past June 30, when they are scheduled to decline under present law.

Under the traditional "straight line" method of depreciation, business taxpayers can deduct from their taxable income the cost of capital assets evenly over the useful life of the asset. Thus, for a capital asset with a useful life of 10 years, 10 percent may be deducted each year for 1 with a useful life of 25 years, 4 percent a year may be depreciated for tax purposes. The useful life of the various types of capital assets is set forth by the Internal Revenue Service in a rule widely known as Bulletin F.

The Capehart bill would simply cut in half the Bulletin F estimates of the useful life of property where the useful life does not exceed 15 years. If the useful life were greater than 15 years under the present schedules, the measure would cut in half the first 15 years and cut by two-thirds the remaining life expectancy. It would apply to cases where the present useful life is at least 6 years.

RETROACTIVITY TO JANUARY 1, 1958, PROVIDED

The new rates would be retroactive to January 1, 1958, and would cover any property constructed, acquired, or contracted for before the end of 1959. The Indiana Republican estimated it would cost the Treasury about $600 million a year immediately in revenue loss, but he said this would be made up later when the depreciation allowances ran out earlier than they would under present law.

He gave these examples of how depreciation would be figured under his bill: A new plant could be depreciated in 16 years instead of 40, and the same change would apply to most homes, apartment buildings, and office buildings; heavier machine tools could be depreciated in 7½ to 9 years, instead of 15 to 20; a new tractor could be depreciated in 5 years, instead of 10 years, and a corn crib could be depreciated in 12.5 years, instead of 30.

The larger annual depreciation allowances, Mr. CAPEHART said, would create jobs more quickly and more soundly than any other proposal now before Congress. He said his bill would provide major tax relief for the 10 million business units in the United States.

At the Douglas subcommittee hearing, the panel of business, labor, and university economists presented a generally gloomy view of the economic outlook. Their predictions ranged all the way from recovery delayed until the third or fourth quarter of this year to a recession going on well into 1959.

The most optimistic view came from William F. Butler, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, who thought the most likely situation to be that "the business curve is now bottoming out and we shall see a renewed advance before the year's end."

When Mr. DOUGLAS asked whether the Government should try to cut spending and balance its budget now, as some groups advocate, or whether it should further stimulate the economy by public-works spending or tax cuts, the panel agreed that budget balancing was out of the question under present economic conditions and that additional Federal stimulants were needed. The individual prescriptions of what should be done varied, however.

Mr. Butler said he expected early signs of a leveling and then an upturn, and added he thought a tax cut now would be unwise. But if signs appear that the downturn is snowballing, he said, a tax cut would be in order.

At the other extreme, University of Illinois Economics Professor V. Lewis Bassie argued that in the absence of more vigorous Federal action, the decline would continue and that even with Federal action, there was only a slight chance now of averting the most extreme phase of the downturn late this year.

Agreeing with this view, Nathaniel Goldfinger, AFL–CIO economist, characterized the present recession as the most severe economic decline in 20 years. Even the most optimistic view of recovery in the next few months, he said, would probably mean a continuation of over 4 million unemployed unless the Government undertakes a comprehensive program of tax cuts to stimulate consumer spending and a public-works program to provide jobs.

National Teachers Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Eau Claire Auxiliary to Post 305, Veterans of Foreign Wars, takes a praiseworthy interest in getting recognition for the public and parochial schoolteachers of the Nation who carry the enormously important responsibility of educating our children. I have a letter from Mrs. Frances Hyde, legislative chairman of the auxiliary, urging that Congress adopt May 4, the birth date of Horace Mann, as National Teachers Day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Hyde's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Eau Claire Auxiliary to Post 305 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is requesting your support of the bill our national organization has before the House naming May 4 as National Teachers Day. This date, the birthdate of Horace Mann, father of the American public school, will be recognized locally by presenting each public and parochial teacher with a flower as a token of appreciation.

It is hoped that we may have publicity on radio, television, and in the newspapers as well as recognition from the pulpits on May 4.

The problem seems to be getting the bill to a vote as we are sure at this time, with the urgency for teachers and education, public recognition and appreciation are imperative.

Gratefully yours,

FRANCES HYDE,
Legislative Chairman, Eau Claire Auxiliary to Post 305, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Air-Pollution Problem Facing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on the danger of pollution in our country. There are various kinds of pollution. This morning some of us were privileged to hear about pollution by the Communist philosophy. There is no question that it is insidious, essentially evil, and that it penetrates the minds of persons who should not be susceptible to that line of thinking. But now I want to speak not of that kind of pollution, but of another kind. I mean not only water pollution, either. I mean air pollution as well.

It does not make much difference whether we determine the greatest menace is dirty water, dirty ideas, or dirty air. The fact is that all three are very dangerous to health and the security and continuity of the Republic.

My own State has a long tradition, perhaps one of the earliest traditions in this country, of fighting to clean things up, to clean up wrong ideas. As someone has said, the time for right thinkers has come. It is time to clean up our water as well. But now I want to speak about cleaning up smoky, dirty air. I know of no one in the State of Wisconsin who would be so smug as to say we have arrived at perfection.

My particular reference today is to the air-pollution problem. Much has been done about it nationally, and in certain selected cities.

The other day I was looking out the window of my apartment and I saw in this, the great capital city of the Nation, a great belching forth of smoke from a chimney about 300 feet away. The wind was blowing my way and, of course, the smoke affected the screen of the window, and even affected the curtains. But even that kind of air pollution is not the worst kind. In many places air pollution has interfered with the health of the community. The fact is that in industrial towns, especially, the air is still far too dirty. Of course, the heavier the industry, and the more auto traffic in the town, the tougher the problem, ordinarily.

I send to the desk now an article from the April 26 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, which devotes itself to the problem of reducing still further air pollution in Wisconsin's largest city, Milwaukee.

Fortunately, Milwaukee, thanks to fine civic leadership and local industry cooperation, does not have a fraction of the problem faced by some of our other metropolises. But, as the article shows, it does have a problem; and it is trying to meet it. Readers will, I feel, understand that if a great city like Milwaukee, with its superb traditions of clean government and clean living, still faces this problem, just how severe the problem is in areas which do not have one-tenth the model record that Milwaukee enjoys.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CITY AIR IS CLEAN, THAT IS, COMPARATIVELY—IN OTHER METROPOLITAN AREAS THE PROBLEM IS WORSE—OUR LUNGS ARE DIRTY PINK

(By James C. Spaulding)

The pedestrian who breathes a sigh of disgust at the polluted river flowing through downtown Milwaukee must first inhale air containing dirt, rubber, asphalt, unburned gasoline, acids, and a variety of other chemicals harmful to man.

The Milwaukee adult consumes daily, if his appetite is average, about 2¾ pounds of food, 4½ pounds of water and assorted other liquids. His air consumption is closer to 30 pounds.

Into a theoretical mixture of 20.93-percent oxygen, 79.04-percent nitrogen, and .03-percent carbon dioxide are spewed the noxious gases and unburned hydrocarbons from 660,000 gallons of gasoline consumed daily by close to 450,000 cars and trucks in Milwaukee County.

CAN WHIFF REFINERIES

The sulfur from gasoline, diesel fuel, coal, oil, and various industrial processes produces irritant sulfur dioxide and sulfurous acid. Poisonous oxides of nitrogen and irritant ozone, an unstable form of oxygen that is toxic in low concentrations, also are a result of automobile engine exhaust fumes and the action of sunlight on them.

If the wind is right and there is not too much of it, the city dweller in Milwaukee also may get a whiff of the refineries at Whiting and Gary, Ind., blended with the rich essence of Menomonee Valley rendering plants.

The lungs of the adult Milwaukeean are, as a result, a dirty pink, a condition recognized by pathologists as anthracosis. The cause is simply breathing dirty air.

AIR IS PRETTY CLEAN

Yet for all the seeming menace it appears that Milwaukee's air pollution problem is minimal compared with most other metropolitan areas in the United States.

The blustery winds and flat terrain of Milwaukee protect its residents from what has become a growing hazard of metropolitan living.

A doctor who specializes in lung function studies said that Milwaukee probably had the cleanest air of all cities he had visited. Another physician, who has studied air pollution elsewhere, said that Milwaukee appeared to be particularly fortunate.

An engineer expert in air pollution said that while it was theoretically possible for a killing smog to develop in Milwaukee, it was practically impossible.

CONTROL REDUCES PROBLEM

An active smoke control program in Milwaukee County appears to have reduced air pollution here in the last 10 years, despite population and industrial growth.

Complaints about coal fumes date back to 1661 in England, but it was not until well after the industrial revolution that London fogs began to kill.

In Donora, Pa., 5 days of fog in late October 1948 killed 22 persons and prostrated nearly half the 12,500 inhabitants of the Monongahela River Valley city.

The worst fog of all occurred in London in 1952. From December 5 to 8, an estimated 4,000 persons died in the metropolis as a result of the fog.

The word "smog" was coined in Los Angeles, the acknowledged champion in air pollution in the United States. There is controversy over whether Los Angeles smog is deadly.

The California city is almost ideally situated for smog to develop. It is ringed by steep hills on three sides and the gentle breeze from the west only serves to keep fumes from escaping.

Cool air from the Humboldt current wafts in from the Pacific. Warm air coming down is heated and clamps a lid over the city. This condition, known as temperature inversion, is a requirement for smog.

Los Angeles has 240 days of temperature inversion a year. It is one of the conditions that make the climate so pleasant. But into this balmy, unmoving air is poured daily 1,000 tons of unburned hydrocarbons from the burning of 5 million gallons of gasoline. There are 3 million cars in the county.

The chief effects of the smog are eye irritation, reduced visibility, and crop damage.

PROBE RESULTS CITED

Both the Milwaukee Health Department and the county smoke-control office have been watching the air-pollution prospects here.

A few years ago the health department investigated diesel exhaust fumes because of frequent complaints about their smell.

It was discovered that the exhaust of gasoline-burning engines contains 30,000 to 70,000 parts per million of carbon monoxide, an odorless, colorless, tasteless, and deadly gas. Diesel exhaust contains only 50 parts per million.

However, the diesels produced much more of chemicals called aldehydes; these can be smelled at concentrations too low to be measured.

PARTICLES ARE MEASURED

The department also measured the concentration of carbon monoxide in the evening rush hour along West Capitol Drive and found five parts per million in the middle of the road, but none at the sidewalk.

At the southeast corner of North Plankinton Avenue and West Wisconsin Avenue, the concentration was 10 parts per million in the late morning and 20 parts per million in the late afternoon.

A concentration of not more than 100 parts per million is considered safe exposure for 8 hours.

The smoke control office measures both the particles falling out of the air and those so fine that they remain suspended. Fallout in the county ranges from about 17 tons per square mile per month in agricultural areas to 55 tons in heavy industrial sections, where the amount has been declining steadily.

Chicago's average air debris fallout is 66.1 tons per square mile per month, and in the Loop it is nearly 250 tons.

FILTER IS WEIGHED

Earlier this week, the smoke control office took one of its periodic samples of the air Milwaukeeans breathe to see what was floating in it.

To do this, 59,750 cubic feet of air was sucked through a 7 by 9 inch pure white filter in 24 hours in a machine about 80 feet above West Wells Street in the new library addition.

When the filter was removed it was black with dust, carbon, soot, rubber, and asphalt particles. It weighed 123 micrograms more than when it was inserted in the machine.

It is only fair to say, however, that the amount of debris collected was less than nearly any American city of comparable size and less than many much smaller cities.

Need for Increased Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from one of my constituents which very ably and very dramatically underscores the need for immediate action by Congress to provide increased social-security benefits for our older and retired citizens.

The writer, Mr. Clarence Russell, of Superior, Wis., points out that these senior citizens have been giving their lives and families to further the best interests of our Nation and the welfare of their communities. They have been paying taxes and contributing to the social-security fund. Now, as they choose or are forced into retirement, they are not just human junk, Mr. Russell points out; they have a valid claim for more realistic return from their social-security contributions.

Mr. Russell is a power use advisor for the head of the Lakes Electric Co-op, and has wide contacts with rural people of northern Wisconsin to back up his views. I believe we in Congress must act now to insure our elder citizens a sense of continuing usefulness to their families and communities and economic security against the hazards and infirmities of old age.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Russell's letter be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Their being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HEAD OF THE LAKES CO-OPERATIVE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
Superior, Wis., April 16, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We now live in the midst of a mighty revolution. The complacency of the 19th century has been succeeded by the turmoil of the 20th. Long established values in morals and ethics have been discarded; widely accepted beliefs have been abandoned. Government and business particularly responsible for the affairs of the Nation are dragging their anchors.

These great changes are felt all over the world; they affect the life of every individual. There are none so lowly as to escape, none so remote as not to feel the turbulance of these times.

It is particularly important at this time that our Government seriously consider our old people who have been forced into re-

tirement for these reasons: (1) old age; (2) health; and (3) most important, they could not cope with the challenge of change.

Some have admitted complete defeat and are endeavoring to exist on the minimum subsistence. Others have gone down fighting to the last of their resources, still trying to pay taxes, maintain their homes and pridefully hold a place in their society. Being of keen mind, though physically handicapped they could capably take over the administration of the schools and communities if it were not for the bureaucratic limitations of Social Security and Welfare. They have no place in industry. They are taking abuse and criticism for working after retirement age.

As power use adviser for the Head of the Lakes Cooperative Electric Association, I work among its 2,000 members. I am also closely associated with other men and women doing the same work for other electric co-ops. The questions and remarks are the same:

1. After giving our lives and families to the best interests of this Nation, are we just human junk? We have paid taxes, paid social security since it began, supported our schools and churches and contributed to the civic welfare of our community and neighbors, gave our sons to two world wars and Korea and now in the service of our country when called.

2. Our Senators and Congressmen have taken good care of their security?

3. I have shown your recent brochure in which you state the amount of money in the social security fund. Some are simply stunned into sad silence, others just say, what good is idle money? And more, not in print.

4. Whose money is that?

As time goes on there will be more old folks to use social security for their remaining years. There will also be thousands more to contribute to this fund.

Since we have made and are enforcing a retirement law, a reasonable standard of living must be provided. Our old people are not just human junk. They are trained and educated. Their influence at the polls is already being felt locally. It will be felt in Washington.

One more punch below the belt would be to sell out their electric cooperatives serving them electric power. They pioneered that movement after years of wasted effort to get power otherwise.

In this instance, I speak for our rural people. No doubt, the same conditions exist in all States and all walks of life.

No doubt, you are aware of all this and have your finger on the pulse of the Nation, so to speak; I do the same with a smaller group. One would go far to find a finer, more stable people than those of rural America. Don't sell them short.

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE RUSSELL.

The Teacher's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the entire Nation is concerned as never before by the problem of education.

A significant contribution to public understanding of the basic factor in effective education was supplied by Prof. H. G. Thuesen in the March 1958 issue of the Oklahoma Teacher.

Professor Thuesen's timely article follows:

THE TEACHER'S CONTRIBUTION
(By H. G. Thuesen, Oklahoma State University)

The cost of education has received a great deal of attention. Much less has been said of education's contribution to the benefit of our people. Formal education in our grade schools, high schools and universities is carried on through the activities of teachers. Since teachers are the basic instruments in education, education's contribution is essentially the contribution of teachers.

Now it appears that many, if not most teachers, are insufficiently aware of what their services are worth in terms of the economic and cultural benefits enjoyed by our people and our ability to defend ourselves. This is unfortunate, for if teachers are not aware of their contributions in the scheme of things, who can be? Not only would it be desirable for teachers to be well versed in the value of their accomplishments, but it would be of great value if teachers would accept the responsibilitiy of informing the community of the benefits conferred by their work.

WORK HAS TWO FACETS

A teacher's work has two facets. One of these is the benefit derived by students as individuals. Such benefits are great. They often have been spelled out in terms of increased earnings of the individual. A commonly quoted figure for the increase in total lifetime earnings is $100,000 for the average person who completes 16 years of instruction, carrying him through a 4-year course in college. This averages about $6,000 per year of schooling. There is no telling which of the 16 years of schooling is the most important, so let us assume that it is the same for all years. Thus, the teacher who teaches the equivalent of 20 students for a year brings a contribution of $120,000 to the 20.

The benefits that education confers upon a student have little meaning to a first grader, and many times not much more even to college students. Many students at all levels fail to realize that it is what they learn that counts, and not grades or diplomas.

TEACHERS UNAWARE OF VALUE

Could this be because teachers do not sufficiently apprise the student of the worth of learning? And is this, in turn, because they themselves are insufficiently aware of the value their teaching holds for the student?

Parents as well as students often do not have a clear idea of what it is that gives value to education. Most parents make some sacrifice to send their children to school, but many seem unaware that the worth of education lies in the extent that learning increases their child's capacity. Consequently, too many parents who will go to great length to obtain the best for their children in other things, complacently tolerate inadequate instruction for them. The Nation, education, children, and teachers suffer from such lack of knowledge. Teachers need to take measures to insure that parents shall realize the need for quality in education and demand the best obtainable for their children.

A second facet of the teacher's work is its contribution to the citizenry of the community, State and Nation. Teaching helps not only those who directly benefit from it, but also helps all persons in the community. Recently we have come to realize that all of us are dependent for survival upon our learned scientists. Wonder drugs, the product of educated minds, are a boon to the illiterate as well as to the learned.

BENEFITS FROM TEACHING

The general public, which must support education, does not appear to understand the general benefits that flow from teaching. Consequently, education is not supported at the level that would be of greatest advantage to the public. Teachers might well make it a point to learn the importance of their contributions to national, cultural, and economic welfare and survival, and then become articulate in disseminating this information.

What has education contributed to the general welfare? Let us consider a few examples. Consider the matter of health. Everybody now can have effective protection against diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid, and polio due to marvelous vaccines. The wonder drugs have tamed pneumonia, tuberculosis, and other infectious diseases. Mortality from appendicitis has dropped nearly to zero. Repairs are made to hearts, bones, and eyes. None of these boons to man was produced by the uneducated. When a successful treatment for cancer is discovered, and it will be, it will be discovered by persons who have been subject to a long formal course of education beginning with the first grade, gained at the hands of the teachers.

PRODUCTS OF EDUCATION

People at large set a more bountiful table as a result of the teachers' contribution. Geneticists have produced hybrid grains which have greatly increased grain yields. Better animal and poultry strains and the use of antibiotics and growth hormones have resulted in meat production per pound of feed much greater than was possible just a few years back. Tires produced 40 years ago had a life of about 3,000 miles, but cost as much as present-day tires that are good for 30,000 miles. An early-day maker of automobiles advised the user of his products to "clean spark plugs every 10 miles." Automobiles of 30 years ago had a life expectancy of 26,000 miles. Twenty-five years later the life expectancy had increased to well over 100,000 miles. Automobiles have increased in comfort, reliability, and ornateness but have decreased in real value cost per mile of operation.

The modern city or rural home has electric lights, power washing machine, gas or electric stove, freezer, telephone, radio, and television. These are not the products of the self-taught. These appliances are indirectly the product of teaching, for they are developed and made possible only by formally taught people who once were in grade school, high school, and college. Our entire agricultural and industrial complex would collapse if formal education was interrupted for a period of but a few years.

Similarly, our democratic way of life, religious life, literature, art, and music which give life meaning would suffer severely if we neglected to teach our youth for but a single generation.

TRAINED MINDS NEEDED

Our leaders feel that we are now in a race for national survival. The race will be run and won by trained minds. Minds trained to deal with concepts and ideas will be needed. Airplanes faster than sound, missiles, rockets, space satellites, radar, atomic fission, and fusion on which our survival in the future depends are the products of trained minds. Schools are but orderly means for progressive training of our mental resources. In this process it is the teacher who is the central figure. It is the teacher who imparts to students individually and in groups, knowledge, wisdom, insight and appropriate attitudes at all levels of our educational effort. The teacher is the crux of our culture, our welfare, our health, and our survival.

This is the contribution of the teacher. This is the contribution that the public must come to understand.

When the public does understand, we may expect them to select the most capable persons in the community to instruct their youths, following the practice of the good husbandman who selects the best of this year's crop for next year's seed. Then the teacher will be the community's leading citizen, first in prestige, remuneration, respect, and esteem.

H. R. 8609

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced H. R. 8609, a bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind, 54 Members of Congress have introduced similar bills. More than 200 Members of Congress have directly or indirectly indicated their support of this bill. I believe that this is a wonderful tribute to the blind population of our country and to the progress that they have made in the past several years.

In its broadest sense, it is recognition on the part of the Congress of the United States of all of our blind population, that they are first-class citizens, and that they should enjoy all of the rights and privileges that are the heritage of every American citizen.

It is further recognition that as first-class citizens there should be no discrimination against the blind simply because they are blind, either social, legal or economic.

When the time comes, I am confident that the entire bodies of both the Senate and the House will give unanimous support to H. R. 8609 and its Senate companion bill, S. 2411, because I am convinced that there is not a Member of this august body who would deny our blind citizens the freedoms that we who have sight enjoy.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to insert a letter addressed to Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Education, which was written by Jack Murphy, a brilliant Missourian who is both deaf and blind:

It gave me great pleasure to read in the Braille Monitor that you are in sympathy with Senator KENNEDY'S bill, S. 2411, and that you have promised to grant it a fair and thorough public hearing. I believe that such assistance from you will guarantee the eventual enactment of this just and necessary legislation.

S. 2411 and its companion bill, H. R. 8609, certainly will encounter formidable opposition from influential spokesmen of agencies for the blind, but their arguments must not prevail. The point at issue is so fundamental, so essential to the economic and social integration of the blind with society, that reason and common sense simply have got to outweigh professional posturings and rationalizations. This controversy between the agencies for and the organizations of the blind is one of those historically common clashes between tradition and change—between what was right and what is right—that have so often revealed how enlightened leaders in one era become misguided obstructionists in the next. The Maginot Line was a great feat of military engineering but the wrong answer to mobile warfare. Bigger battleships (though impressive achievements) were impotent to deal with air power. Multi-million-dollar schools and learning-can-be-fun programs haven't prepared us to meet the Russian challenge. Nor does mere growth in the size and complexity of our agencies assure maximum benefit to the blind people of America.

Schools and teachers, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, supervisors of job-training programs, vocational counselors, placement agents, training centers for guide dogs, office staff, consultative agencies—all these and many more figure in the costly business of work for the blind. But is this vast and rapidly growing social mechanism adequately helping blind people to grasp the manifold opportunities open to the visually handicapped in our industrial society? Or is it, in part at least, stubbornly clinging to obsolete concepts of public assistance and overemphasizing the desirability of segregating the blind in sheltered shops, where officials receive good salaries while the blind employees are paid substandard wages? Are too many incompetents swelling the ranks of workers for the blind? Which deserve greater benefit from a given service, the professional personnel or the clients?

Who should be the judge of all such questions? Not the paid worker for the blind. Professional solidarity, self-interest and the tendency to follow the line of least resistance inevitably condition their judgments. Nor the general public. Blindness and the problems and potentialities of the blind are only vaguely understood by the average sighted person. Only the blind—who are actually living with the problems which the agencies are unable to solve—can evaluate, on a realistic basis, the role played by the workers for the blind. We need a voice in the councils of our agencies, and we must be empowered to speak with some degree of authority.

Wilkes-Barre Church Marks Golden Jubilee Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of April 27, 1958, calling attention to the 50th anniversary of the founding of St. Stanislaus Kostka Parish, of Wilke-Barre, Pa., which will be observed with services on Sunday, May 4:

NORTH END CHURCH TO MARK GOLDEN JUBILEE—ST. STANISLAUS KOSTKA PARISH WILL OBSERVE FIRST CENTURY WITH SERVICES ON SUNDAY, MAY 4

St. Stanislaus Kostka Parish, North Main Street, will observe the 50th year of its founding on Sunday, May 4, with a solemn pontifical high mass of thanksgiving offered by Most Rev. Jerome D. Hannan, D. D., bishop of Scranton.

Assisting Bishop Hannan at the pontifical mass will be Rev. Francis J. Zolcinski, pastor of St. Stanislaus, assistant priest; Rev. Joseph Pliny and Rev. Simon Struckus, deacons of honor; Rev. John Piontek, deacon of mass, and Rev. Henry Zapotocki, subdeacon; Rt. Rev. Joseph Madden and Rev. Thomas Gola, master of ceremonies and assistant master of ceremonies.

St. Stanislaus was organized in 1908 through the efforts of Rev. Leon Broda, who at the time was assistant pastor at St. Peter and Paul Church in Plains. A list of eligible parishioners was drawn up and organizational work went on despite various hardships and difficulties. The records of the parish show the following to be among the first organizers and founders: Vincent Tluczek, Stanislaus Fabian, Joseph Gwara, Blase Burry, Joseph Wojtanowski, Blase Kopec, Walter Makarewicz, Anthony Lafaj, Vincent Lesewicz, Anthony Dziewit, Joseph Cichocki, Anthony Wilk, Stanley Sawicki.

PURCHASED OLD CHURCH

With the appointment of Rev. J. Sargalski as the first resident pastor the opportunity arose to purchase the old church from the Greek Catholic Parish of St. Mary's for they were in the process of building a new and larger church for their congregation.

The first baptism in the parish church was that of John Ziemba, son of Mr. and Mrs. Adam Ziemba; the first marriage recorded was that of Valentine Litwinski and Helen Chmielewski; and the first funeral that of Martin Brzystonia.

Priests who served the parish as pastors after Father Sargalski were: Rev. A. Pawelski, Rev. S. Sobieniowski, and Rev. I. Ritter. In 1928 Reverend Ritter was transferred to Throop, Pa., and Rev. John J. Podkul was appointed pastor of St. Stanislaus. From the beginning he showed signs of great interest in the parish by the number of improvements and repairs to the parish property. The old church was moved to the Franklin Street side with the intention of building a new church on the site of the old church, but due to the depression, these plans were abandoned for the time. It was through Father Podkul's efforts that a parish school was opened for the children by purchasing the old public school that is directly across the street from the church. A home was also purchased and renovated for the future home of the Bernardine Sisters.

In April 1940 the present pastor, Rev. Francis J. Zolcinski, was appointed pastor of St. Stanislaus. During the last 17 years many things have been accomplished through the cooperation and good will of the parishioners, but the highlight of those years was the fulfillment of the hopes and sincere desires of the parishioners in seeing a new church replace the small and inadequate one that served them for so many years. This was finally realized when the late Bishop Hafey dedicated the new St. Stanislaus Church on Main Street on Sunday, October 25, 1953.

The parishioners of St. Stanislaus know that they have much to be thankful for; they realize that they have been recipients of countless graces and blessings over this span of 50 years and realizing this they will give thanks to God in a special way when they, with their bishop, observe the golden jubilee on Sunday, May 4, 1958.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to

the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, which for 167 years is being celebrated on May 3.

Free Poland's Constitution Day was May 3, and it is still observed in the hearts of the people within the country, and throughout Polish communities the world over.

It has become a tradition for Members of the United States Congress to commemorate on the floor of their respective Houses Poland's National Day on May 3, to evoke links of friendship between both Nations, and to stress United States interest in the fate of Poland. Members of the United States Congress, who visited Poland lately, unanimously agree that although the Polish Government is Communist—the Polish people are not. American visitors are impressed by the friendly feelings of the population toward the United States of America. This attitude is not surprising to me, I have known many people of Polish ancestry for many years in my own State of Rhode Island and I have always found them to be of honest integrity, peace loving, and possessing great Christian virtues. Many of my closest friends, whom I respect very much, are made of the same fiber as the people encountered by my colleagues in Poland.

The people of Poland, in spite of ruthless Communist subjugation on the Stalin pattern, have maintained their patriotism and moral resistance. Their feelings and beliefs did not flinch under Communist indoctrination and terror. This also applies to the much exposed young generation today.

The Poznan revolt and the events of October 1956, which took place under popular pressure, have shown the resistance of the Poles against Soviet rule and their aversion to every form of communism. Ideological slogans, like "Polish road to socialism" proclaimed as a new program by the Gomulka regime are regarded by the average Pole merely as tactical moves, Communist style.

I can fully realize that the country finds itself in a compulsory situation toward Soviet Russia. The suppression of the Hungarian freedom uprising by Soviet troops, practically without any reaction of the Western powers, remains as a threatening memento.

It is useful to remember that any country subjected to communism is considered by Soviet Russia as virtually conquered for the Soviet bloc with all consequences deriving therefrom. This means, in practical terms, that any effort on behalf of the people of that country to replace the Communist system of government by a democratic one, through free voting expressing the popular will, is regarding as a hostile interference in the omnipotent right of the Communist Party to rule the country. And, therefore, as an act of aggression against Soviet Russia and other member states of the bloc. The use of Soviet troops to extinguish the Hungarian freedom uprising constitutes an evident proof of Soviet policy methods.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that somehow, what we are saying today will reach the ears of our friends in Poland, and will help to sustain their hope of freedom. We wish them well in their continued fight to throw off the yoke of communism.

The Town That Killed Hay Fever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. DENNISON, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent, Floyd Bixler, of Hiram, Ohio, has called my attention to the following article entitled "The Town That Killed Hay Fever," by Dwight E. Stevenson. This modern parable, which appeared in the Christian Evangelist for April 21, 1958, should be read by everyone. I commend it to the Members of the House.

THE TOWN THAT KILLED HAY FEVER

(By Dwight E. Stevenson, the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.)

Once upon a time there was a town in which every inhabitant was afflicted annually with hay fever.

Year after year, generation after generation, during the months of July and August the people went about with watery eyes and running noses and without being able to say their N's, their M's, and their NG's properly.

Then one year a bright high-school senior who had been studying botany after school hours discovered that the hay fever was caused by ragweed growing in Farmer Brown's cow pasture. So the senior told his parents and friends what he had discovered.

"An interesting theory," they said, but they did nothing. After he had told everybody he met and had talked at length with people of watery eyes and running noses—and without being able to articulate his N's, M's, and his NG's properly—the senior became disgusted because nobody would believe him or do anything.

So early one morning while the dew was still heavy, he borrowed his father's scythe and stole quietly out to Farmer Brown's cow pasture. There, with violent sneezes punctuating his labors, he mowed steadly until he had destroyed every ragweed. And then in the late afternoon he made a fire and burned the withering plants which he had slain. Then at sundown, with a throbbing head the size of a rainbarrel, he struggled back to his home and dropped wearily into bed.

The next day all over town eyes stopped watering, noses ceased dripping, and all the people suddenly found that they could say their N's, their M's and their NG's properly. The senior tried to tell his friends that this was because he had destroyed the ragweed.

Most of them laughed in his face and some of them even coined for him the nickname of "Ragweed Willie." But a few believed him and with the help of these few he kept the ragweed down all that summer, and the next, and the next. In fact, the town fathers joined him before many summers passed and the annual slaying of the ragweed was turned into a community festival.

In time Ragweed Willie died, and a grateful community laid him to rest with a huge funeral and even dedicated a school building to his memory. Every year on R-Day the town sallied forth to the old cow pasture which had since become a town park, and slew ragweed to the accompaniment of band music, picnic lunches, and games.

Since by now, three generations had passed and no one living had ever actually seen a ragweed, the ritual of R-Day had become a quaint folk custom, and a sharp division arose concerning it. Some defended it stoutly as the most important single day in the whole year, and emphatically affirmed that the rituals of that day had deep cultural—not to say mystical and even religious—significance.

Others disagreed, but in order not to be disagreeable they simply stayed away from the festival; on R-Day they climbed into their automobiles and went to the mountains and the lakes while an ever-diminishing number of their fellow citizens carried on the empty rituals.

Thus it came about that the park grew neglected and R-day was forgotten. Ragweeds, unknown for a generation, began to reappear; and during the months of July and August the people who had known of hay fever only from what they read in their history books began to go around with watery eyes, running noses, and without being able to say their N's, their M's, and their NG's properly.

Finally, the malady became so bad that the mayor called a public meeting in the assembly hall of the Ragweed Willie High School. The mayor made a speech—without his N's, his M's, and his NG's, and many others—amid the encouraging response of coughs and sniffles—added their contribution to the patriotic occasion. Some said one thing, some another.

"The icecap at the North Pole is melting. That's the cause of it," said one. "Think back and you'll see that the winters are milder than they used to be and the summers are hotter."

But the speech that all of them liked best and the one they applauded the longest went something like this: "Fellow-citizens and proud sons of the Ragweed Willie tradition. This is no ordinary crisis. We have elected representatives in Congress. They are supposed to look out for our interests. But what are they doing for us? I demand that our Government use some of our tax money to look after our interests. I pay my taxes every year, and what do I get for them? Hay fever. Why doesn't somebody in Washington do something?"

After that, somebody made a motion and a petition was drawn up. Everybody signed it. Then they all went home thinking what great things had been accomplished. It was now up to Washington to do something.

On the way home, one sufferer who seemed to be a little worse off than the others, was heard to complain. "Hay fever. What did I ever do to bring this upon me? You know that I never bothered anybody or stuck my nose—achew—into other people's business. What did I ever do to deserve this?" And there were many that spoke the same sentiments.

Meanwhile, outside the town, in the abandoned park that long, long ago had been Farmer Brown's cow pasture, tall ragweed groves flourished and waved gently in the evening breeze.

The Medical, Legal, Literary, and Political Status of Ezra Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third installment of

the Legislative Reference Service report on Ezra Pound, by H. A. Sieber:

THE MEDICAL, LEGAL, LITERARY, AND POLITICAL STATUS OF EZRA WESTON (LOOMIS) POUND (1885–)—SELECTED FACTS AND COMMENTS

(Third installment)

(By H. A. Sieber, Research Assistant, Senior Specialists Division, the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service, March 31, 1958, revised April 14, 1958)

APPENDIX A

(Extracts pertinent to Mr. Pond's competence to stand trial)

TESTIMONY OF PSYCHIATRISTS BEFORE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CRIMINAL No. 76,028, FEBRUARY 13, 1946

Dr. Marion King: [1]

"Question. Is he able to advise his attorney relative to the facts, the cause, and what he did?

"Answer. No, not in a reasonable manner.

"Question. Do you think he is feigning insanity in any way?

"Answer. No."

Dr. Wendell Muncie: [2]

"Question. Now, will you explain to the jury why you do not think he is able to consult with counsel?

"Answer. Because I do not have any doubt but that his counsel * * * when he would try to pin him down to anything would be left out on a limb * * * through his distractibility and vagueness."

Dr. Joseph L. Gilbert: [3]

"Answer. * * * he would be unable to cooperate in a defense, to cooperate and understand."

Dr. Winfred Overholser: [4]

"Answer. It was the fact that he felt he was so important and of such value to the United States under those theories, that I put him down as suffering a mental disorder."

APPENDIX B

IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOTHERAPY, 1949

Dr. Frederic Wertham: [5]

"The counsel for the defense used the expression 'insanity common to genius.' Ezra Pound himself answered long ago:

" 'It has been your habit for long to do away with good writers,
You either drive them mad, or else you blink at their suicides,
Or else you condone their drugs, and talk of insanity and genius,
But I will not go mad to please you.'

"Surely the psychiatrists know the difference between a political conviction and a delusion. * * * Ezra Pound has no delusions in any strictly pathological sense."

APPENDIX C

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW WITH DR. ADDISON DUVAL, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL, AUGUST 21, 1957 [6]

Question: "Dr. Duval, how would you describe Mr. Pound's present physical health?"

Dr. Duval: "Mr. Pound, as you well know, is an old man. I would say that he is in very good physical health for a man of his age. He plays tennis, for example."

Question: "How would you describe Mr. Pound's present mental health?"

Dr. Duval: "The hospital, of course, has the legal duty of advising the court that committed Mr. Pound at such time when Mr. Pound has recovered so that he might be said to be competent to defend himself, that is, to stand trial. I can say this much: He has not improved or recovered to such an extent that we can say that he is competent to stand trial. There might be some justification to think that he is in sufficient mental health to live in a community. Mr. Pound is not dangerous."

Question: "Then, would you say that he could be released, conceivably?"

Dr. Duval: "Dr. Overholser has, I am sure, given some thought to this, and I suppose that if charges were disposed of, ameliorated or dropped."

Question: "I do not want to ask you to tell me anything which is confidential, naturally. Of course, I will treat whatever you tell me discretely. Would you think, Dr. Duval, that Mr. Pound, if he were released, would have to be an outpatient to a doctor or to the hospital?"

Dr. Duval: "No—well, let me put it this way, chances are that Mr. Pound would not ask or feel that he needed any treatment. The question might arise, however, if his neighbors—unaccustomed to any erratic behavior on his part—might think that he needed treatment."

Question: "Does Mr. Pound still appear to hold the extreme views which——"

Dr. Duval: "I definitely feel that Mr. Pound's basic philosophy has not changed. I do not suppose you can expect a man who has lived with certain views all his life to change, especially at his age. How long has he been here? Nine, 10 years?" [7]

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS MADE BY WRITERS ON OCCASION OF MR. POUND'S SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1955

W. H. Auden: "There are very few living poets, even if they are not conscious of having been influenced by Pound, who could say, 'My work would be exactly the same if Mr. Pound had never lived.' " (From A Tribute to Ezra Pound, broadcast over WYBC, the Yale Broadcasting Co.)

E. E. Cummings:

"Re Ezra Pound: Poetry happens to be an art; and artists happen to be human beings.

"An artist doesn't live in some geographical abstraction, superimposed on a part of this beautiful earth by the nonimigination of unanimals and dedicated to the proposition that massacre is a social virtue because murder is an individual vice. Nor does an artist live in some soi-distant world, nor does he live in some socalled universe, nor does he live in any number of 'worlds' or in any number of 'universes.' As for a few trifling delusions like the 'past' and 'present' and 'future' of quote mankind unquote, they may be big enough for a couple of billion supermechanized submorons but they're much too small for one human being.

"Every artist's strictly illimitable country is himself.

"An artist who plays that country false has committed suicide; and even a good lawyer cannot kill the dead. But a human being who's true to himself—whoever himself may be—is immortal; and all the atomic bombs of all the anti-artists in spacetime will never civilize immortality." (From Six Nonlectures.)

T. S. Eliot: "I believe that I have in the past made clear enough my personal debt to Ezra Pound during the years 1915–22. I have also expressed in several ways my opinion of his rank as a poet, as a critic, as impresario of other writers, and as pioneer of metric and poetic language. His 70th birthday is not a moment for qualifying one's praise, but merely for recognition of those services to literature, for which he will deserve the gratitude of posterity, and for appreciation of those achievements which even his severest critics must acknowledge."

Ernest Hemingway: "Will gladly pay tribute to Ezra, but what I would like to do is get him the hell out of St. Elizabeths, have him given a passport, and allow him to return to Italy, where he is justly valued as a poet. I believe he made bad mistakes in the war in continuing to broadcast for that sad Mussolini after we were fighting him. But I also believe he had paid for them in full and his continued confinement is a cruel and unusual punishment."

Archibald MacLeish: "Every year since I began teaching at Harvard and for long years before that I have been more and more impressed by the extraordinary vitality of Pound's work. Most work ages with time. His doesn't. It keeps the hard sharp glitter—the cutting edge."

APPENDIX E

SOME ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

John Ciardi: "* * * he is the one master above all others who has taught contemporary poets their trade and that—agree or disagree with him * * * he is a man with a vision, and that vision has been suffered for and won." (New York Times, book-review section, June 24, 1956, pp. 4–5.)

Robert Fitzgerald: "Ezra Pound's place in the story of poetry is not in question, and with every year, it becomes more discriminated and understood. * * * It goes without saying that all of us who practice the art of poetry are indebted to him." (The Kenyon Review, autum, 1956, p. 518.)

Allen Tate: "Pound is a great poet in petto, and an even greater instigator of literary enthusiasms and schools." (Sixty American Poets, 1896–1944 (revised by Kenton Kilmer, Library of Congress, 1954), p. 93.)

Dag Hammarskjold: "Modern are * * * makes us seers—seers like Ezra Pound when, in the first of his Pisan Cantos, he senses 'the enormous tragedy of the dream in the peasants' bent shoulders.' Seers—and explorers—these we must be if we are to prevail." (Address, October 19, 1954.)

Carl Sandburg: "Brother Ezra, quite a poet. He never cared too much for humanity, but he won't be forgotten for his beautiful words. I think, after a year at that hospital, Ezra had discovered humanity right there among the crazy people, the most interesting, most human people in the world. I wonder does Ezra know that the United States Government made it possible for him to find out about people? But they ought to let him out now; he's had enough." (Interview at Flat Rock, N. C., December 18, 1957.)

Robert Frost:

"I am here to register my admiration for a Government that can rouse in conscience to a case like this. Relief seems in sight for many of us besides the Ezra Pound in question and his faithful wife. He has countless admirers the world over who will rejoice in the news that he has hopes of freedom. I append a page or so of what they have been saying lately about him and his predicament. I myself speak as much in the general interest as in his. And I feel authorized to speak very specially for my friends, Archibald MacLeish, Ernest Hemingway, and T. S. Eliot. None of us can bear the disgrace of outletting Ezra Pound, come to this end where he is. It would leave too woeful a story in American literature. He went very wrongheaded in his egotism, but he insists it was from patriotism—love of America. He has never admitted that he went over to the enemy any more than the writers at home who have despaired of the Republic. I hate such nonesense and can only listen to it as an evidence of mental disorder. But mental disorder is what we are considering. I rest the case on Dr. Overholser's pronouncement that Ezra Pound is not too dangerous to go free in his wife's care, and too insane ever to be tried—a very nice discrimination.

"Mr. Thurman Arnold admirably put this problem of a sick man being held too long in prison to see if he won't get well enough to be tried for a prison offense. There is probably legal precedent to help toward a solution of the problem. But I should think it would have to be reached more by magna-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

nimity than by logic and it is chiefly on magnanimity I am counting. I can see how the Department of Justice would hesitate in the matter from fear of looking more just to a great poet than it would be to a mere nobody. The bigger the Department the longer it might have to take thinking things through." (Statement to the court, April 14, 1958.)

Hayden Carruth:

"The means exist by which the United States Government could quash Pound's indictment and set him free. * * * In fact, it is hard to think of a good reason why Pound should not have his freedom immediately. * * *

"Pound restored integrity to the language. That is the gift for which all writers must offer him their thanks. (Perspectives No. 16, summer 1956.)

Louis Untermeyer: "It is easy to belittle the eccentric theorist, but the poet's importance must not be deprecated." (Makers of the Modern World, 1955.)

Paul Green: "I do not know all the factors involved in the Ezra Pound case but so far as I can see there is no good reason to keep him any longer at St. Elizabeths. I have never had any sympathy with his attitude toward this country. He has always been abusive of it and never really tried to help it like other honest and hard-working Americans. For that I condemn him and tell him to stay out of my hair. Still I don't have any interest in seeing him punished if punishment it is. He is sick and sorry no matter how good a poet. So kick him out, get him out, I say—and let him root hog or die. * * * There are worse traitors in the American scene than Pound and they're neither shut up nor punished." (Letter, September 17, 1957, Hanover, N. H.)

Richard Rovere:

"The main thing about Ezra Pound is that he is a poet of towering gifts and attainments. Poetry is not a horserace or any other sort of competition, and it is silly to argue over which poet runs the fastest, jumps the highest, or dives the deepest. Still, a respectable case could be made out to the effect that the century has produced no talent larger or more fecund than Pound's. * * *

"Pound's position is secure, not only because of the power of his own work but because of his service as a midwife to genius and as an influence on other poets." (Esquire magazine, September 1955.)

(The following comments are extracts from letters to the editor of Esquire magazine following the Rovere essay in the September 1957 issue:)

Marianne Moore: "Yes, indeed, I feel strongly that it is stagnant and unrealistic of us not to secure the release of Ezra Pound from St. Elizabeths."

Van Wyck Brooks: "I would gladly sign any petition for the release of Ezra Pound."

William Carlos Williams: "Ezra Pound is a superb poet whatever else he may be and well worth the country's preserving."

Selden Rodman: "I do emphatically agree that Pound has suffered more than enough for his foolishness * * * and should be released."

John Dos Passos: "I certainly think he (Pound) should be released in the custody of his wife."

APPENDIX F

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N. Y., August 28, 1957.

Mr. ARNOLD GINGRICH,
Esquire Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GINGRICH: I have read with interest Richard Rovere's article on Ezra Pound in the September Esquire, which you kindly sent to me. The American Civil Liberties Union has for a number of years been concerned over Mr. Pound's continued confinement at St. Elizabeths Hospital. We have repeatedly offered our support for a possible legal challenge not only because of assertions by Mr. Pound's friends that there is no necessity for keeping him in the hospital, but also because of the larger legal problem his confinement represents.

We, of course, have no judgment as to whether Mr. Pound's mental condition would normally justify his release. Even though his condition may justify the conclusion that, at liberty, he would be no menace to society or to himself, he may nevertheless need special care. Unless his wife or some other responsible person such as a court appointed guardian or committee, is prepared to assume responsibility for such care, it would be a cruel thing to turn him out of "the sanctuary of St. Elizabeths" if he still believes that he would be "shot by agents of the international crew." But we are willing to cooperate in a court test of his continued confinement with anyone who is in a legal position to assure this responsibility.

His position is by no means unique. Not only in the District of Columbia, but in New York and many other jurisdictions, a person charged with crime but held mentally incompetent to stand trial receives what amounts to a life sentence without conviction of crime. (Other persons whose mental condition requires their confinement can eventually be released for private hospital care, out-patient treatment or home care if they are considered to be harmless, even though they have not regained their sanity.)

The Federal law requires that any person charged with crime and found to be insane, shall be certified as such to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who may order him to be confined in St. Elizabeths Hospital. When a person is so confined the superintendent of the hospital must deliver him to the court "when he is restored to sanity." If he is not so restored to sanity, he is continued in confinement. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare apparently has some discretion in this matter, and probably could release a person charged with crime, even though he is not "restored to sanity," but, under the law of New York and some other States, the responsible official has no such discretion and a person cannot possibly be released until he has stood trial for the crime with which he has been charged.

I hope that Esquire will continue to give attention to the broader ranges of the problem which you have so effectively presented in the case of Ezra Pound.

Yours sincerely,

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Executive Director.

APPENDIX G

THE DISCIPLINARY TRAINING CENTER NEAR PISA, ITALY

(Some excerpts from correspondence in Army files, and some excerpts from statements by military personnel stationed at the Pisa DTC:)

The commandant of the disciplinary training center near Pisa, at which Mr. Pound was detained from May to November 1945, was Lt. Col. John L. Steele, Corps of Engineers.

The center was not the usual Army prison—it was, according to an article in Yank, the Army weekly "a wonderful place—to stay out of. Life for the 3,600 prisoners at the center is planned to be tougher than combat and when the Army tries to make things rugged it does a good job." [9]

Mr. Pound was the only civilian at the center during the period of his incarceration, according to the training officer of the center at that time.[9]

The commanding officer of the 61st Station Hospital wrote in March 1946 (about 3 months after Mr. Pound had been returned to the United States) that complaints of mistreatment at the center were "a daily occurrence" and "it is inconceivable that such a constantly repeated complaint have no basis in truth." The trainees had to "sleep in 50 degree temperatures in pup tents" and endured "daily rations * * * which are insufficient." [10]

It had been reported in February 1946 that there was evidence of physical trauma in the disciplinary training center.[11]

Upon Mr. Pound's admission to the prison camp, he was placed in a "security cage," such as described in the disciplinary training center standard operating procedures.[12]

Signal Corps photograph No. SC 250735 shows such security cages and reveals the difference between Mr. Pound's special cage and the others.

Mr. David Park Williams, a former guard at the center, has testified:

"The first of these cages was torn down when Pound was brought to the disciplinary training center and a new enclosure of heavy grillwork was built in its place * * * because of an alleged fear the Italian Fascists would attempt to rescue the accused traitor. * * *

"Pound did not remain longer than a few weeks in his gorilla cage probably because of his increasingly poor health. He was moved from the cage to the medical area * * * relatively comfortable." [13]

Another disciplinary training center jailer, Robert L. Allen, has written:

"The trainees marching by or working in the area (of the cage) considered Pound with awe, taking the reinforced cage as evidence that he was a particular tough customer.

"The weeks in the cage were hard on Pound. As shelter, a piece of tar paper was thrown over the top. * * * Because the dust and harsh sun in the cage inflamed his eyes he was transferred to a tent within the Medical Compound." [14]

It has been suggested by Professor Giovannini and others that the nature of Mr. Pound's imprisonment in the open cage and the detention of over 6 months at the disciplinary training center represented less than due process for a man charged with treason, punishable by death. It has been also suggested by Mr. Giovannini and others that the "cruel and unusual" imprisonment of Mr. Pound might have brought about the mental collapse which later made him incompetent to stand trial, although it has never been determined whether Mr. Pound's legal insanity might not extend back to the period of his broadcasts. On April 14, 1958, the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital indicated "a strong probability that the commission of the crimes charged was the result of insanity."

APPENDIX H

EXTRACTS FROM BROADCASTS, 1942–43

January 29, 1942: "The United States has been for months, and illegally, at war through what I consider to be the criminal acts of a President whose mental condition was not, so far as I could see, all that could or should be desired of a man in so responsible a position or office."

February 3, 1942: "You are at war for the duration of Germans' pleasure. You are at war for the duration of Japan's pleasure. Nothing in the Western World, nothing in the whole of our Occident can help you dodge that. Nothing can help you dodge it."

April 16, 1942: "For the United States to be making war on Italy and on Europe is just plain damn nonsense, and every native-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

born American of American stock knows that it is plain downright damn nonsense. And for this state of things Franklin Roosevelt is more than any other one man responsible."

April 23, 1942: "I ask whether the 'spirit of '76' is helped by a-floodin' the ranks of the Navy with bridge sweepin's; whether war is won by mercantilist ethics; and, in any case, whether men like Knox, and Stimson, and Morgenthau can be expected to fill the heart of youth with martial ardor and the spirit of sacrifice."

May 10, 1942: "The next peace will not be based on international lending. Get that, for one. The next peace will not be based on international lending, and England certainly will have nothing whatever to say about what its terms are. Neither, I think, will simple-hearted Joe Stalin, not wholly trusted by the kikery which is his master."

May 26, 1942: "Every hour that you go on with this war is an hour lost to you and your children. And every sane act you commit is committed in homage to Mussolini and Hitler. Every reform, every lurch toward the just price, toward the control of a mark is an act of homage to Mussolini and Hitler. They are your leaders however much you think you are conducted by Roosevelt or told by Churchill. You follow Mussolini and Hitler in every constructive act of your government."

May 31, 1942: "The melting pot in America may have been a noble experiment, though I very much doubt it. At any rate it is lost."

June 28, 1942: "You are not going to win this war. None of our best minds ever thought you could win it. You have never had a chance in this war."

July 20, 1942: "You ought not to be at war against Italy. You ought not to be giving or ever have given the slightest or most picayune aid to any man or nation engaged in waging war against Italy. You are doing it for the sake of a false accountancy system."

July 22, 1942: Europe calling * * * Ezra Pound speaking! I hear that my views are shared, most of them, by a large number of my compatriots, so it would seem, or maybe an increasing number of my compatriots. And there is a comforting thought on a warm day in a fine climate. I should hate to think that all America had gone haywire. I should like to feel that the American race in North America, in the North American continent, had some wish toward survival. That they wanted there to be a United States of tomorrow. * * *

"Well, you have been fed on lies, for 20 years you have been fed on lies, and I don't say maybe. And Mr. Squirmy and Mr. Slime are still feeding it to you right over the BBC radio, and every one of the Jew radios of Schenectady, New York and Boston—and Boston was once an American city; that was when it was about the size of Rapallo.

"And how much liberty have you got anyhow? And as to the arsenal—are you the arsenal of democracy or of judeocracy? And who rules your rulers? Where does public responsibility end and what races can mix in America without ruin of the American stock, the American brain? Who is organized? What say have you in the choice of your rulers? What control of their policy? And who does own most of your press and your radio? E. P. asking you."

April 27, 1943: "I don't think there is any American law that permits you to shoot Nicholas Butler. It's a pity, but so it is no ex post facto laws are to be dreamed of. Not that Frankfurter or any other damn Jew cares a hoot for law, or for the American Constitution."

May 4, 1943: "What are you doing in the war at all? What are you doing in Africa? Who amongst you has the nerve or the sense to do something that would conduce to getting you out of it before you are mortgaged up to the neck and over it? Every day of war is a dead day as well as a death day. More death, more future servitude, less and less of American liberty of any variety."

On January 29, 1942, when Mr. Pound returned to the Rome microphone for the first time since Pearl Harbor Day, the announcer who introduced him said:

"We now present a talk by Ezra Pound. * * * The Italian radio, acting in accordance with the Fascist policy of intellectual freedom and free expression of opinion by those who are qualified to hold it, following the tradition of Italian hospitality, has offered Dr. Ezra Pound the use of the microphone twice a week. It is understood that he will not be asked to say anything whatsoever that goes against his conscience as anything incompatible with his duties as a citizen of the United States of America." [15]

Mr. Pound began: "Ezra Pound speaking, speaking from Europe. Pearl Arbor Day, or Pearl Harbor Day, at 12 noon, I retired from the capital of the old Roman empire, that is, Rome to Rapallo, to seek wisdom from the ancients. I wanted to figure things out. * * * I spent a month trying to figure things out * * * so I began figuring out that a complete [break ?] in self communication between the calm and men of the Jewish hemisphere is not to be desired. * * * The United States has been misinformed. The United States has been led down the garden-path and maybe down under the daisies. All through shutting out the news." [16]

On the reliability of the transcripts of the monitored broadcasts, Hugh Kenner has commented:

"This indictment relates to his having made broadcasts over a shortwave radio maintained by the Italian Government during a period when a state of war existed between the United States and his country of domicile. It does not appear that he said anything that would have constituted treason had he said it in the United States Senate; what he did say it is difficult to discover, the indictment being publicly supported only by transcripts of grotesque unreliability. On February 12, 1942, for instance, he is alleged to have alluded to 'Max Bearbon,' 'Helen of Troy,' and the classical authors 'Askulus' and 'Propursious,' and to have read, with a commentary, Canto 46, which according to the transcription of the broadcast in the Library of Congress, opens as follows:

" 'And if you'll say that this day teaches a less, all that the Reverent Eliot (Haston) more natural language, you who think you'll get through hell in a hurry, huh, ah, that day how those cloud over his (horizon) and for 3 days snow clouds over the sea, banked like a line of mountains.' [17]

"There is even, in an earlier broadcast, a reference to the 'confusion system,' the transcriber having evidently not been able to bring Confucius immediately to mind. Posterity will smile to notice the wealth of attention that in those years was focused on every word of a great poet (the psychiatrists examined even his published work): the expenses devoted to monitoring the broadcasts, recording them, making shorthand transcriptions, typing from the notes, cutting stencils, mimeographing, filing, and disseminating through channels: the resources of a great commonwealth backing all this activity not in pursuit of crumbs of wisdom, but in the hope that he would say something for which he could be hanged." [18]

APPENDIX I

PASSPORT FILE F130—EZRA POUND, PASSPORT OFFICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

1. Memo, October 11, 1941, referred to Pound as a "pseudo American."

2. From the Division of Foreign Activities, a memorandum, June 18, 1941:

"On July 12, 1941, this Department instructed the American embassy at Rome to limit Pound's passport for immediate return to United States. However, he refused to return home and to best of our knowledge is still residing in Italy.

"* * * Mr. Pound should never again be granted passport facilities by this Government." [19]

3. Passport No. 3154, Ezra Loomis Pound, date April 4, 1941, was returned to the State Department on August 25, 1943, with a memorandum advising the Secretary of State that it was "left behind and * * * has expired."

4. The Swiss delegation at Rome forwarded to the Secretary of State a copy of a letter from Ezra Pound addressed to Attorney General Francis Biddle, under date of August 25, 1943. Mr. Pound, in his letter, wrote:

"I have not spoken with regard to this war, but in protest against a system which creates one war after another, in series and on system. I have not spoken to the troops, and have not suggested that the troops should mutiny or revolt.

* * * * *

"At any rate a man's duties increase with his knowledge. A war between the United States and Italy is monstrous and should not have occurred. And a peace without justice is not peace but merely a prelude to future wars. Someone must take count of these things. And having taken count must act on his knowledge, admitting that his knowledge is partial and his judgment subject to error.

"Very truly yours,

"EZRA POUND."

---

[1] Medical director of the U. S. Public Health Service and the Bureau of Prisons (p. 55, transcript of hearings).

[2] Associate professor, Johns Hopkins University (p. 30, transcript of hearings).

[3] Chief psychiatrist, Gallinger Hospital, Washington, D. C. (p. 100, transcript of hearings).

[4] Superintendent, St. Elizabeths Hospital (p. 79, transcript of hearings).

[5] Psychiatrist and author, New York City (The Road to Rapallo, op. cit., pp. 594, 597).

[6] Dr. Overholser, the superintendent, was in Europe.

[7] Actually, Mr. Pound has been at St. Elizabeths since 1946.

[8] Hofman, Norbert (Sgt.), GI Reform School, Yank, the Army weekly, November 9, 1945, pp. 16–17.

[9] LePage, Julian (Maj.) telephone conservation, date not recorded, October (?) 1957.

[10] Piszkiewicz, F. J. (Maj., Medical Corps, commanding, 61st Station Hospital, APO 782, U. S. Army), letter dated March 6, 1946, to Commanding General, Peninsular Base Section, APO 782.

[11] Burns, E. L. (CWO, assistant adjutant general, Headquarters Peninsular Base Section), letter dated February 28, 1946, to commanding officer, 61st Station Hospital.

[12] Standard Operating Procedures, Headquarters, MTOUSA Disciplinary Training Center, 6677th Disciplinary Training Company (overhead), June 28, 1945, p. 58.

[13] Williams, David Park, Ezra Pound in the Pisa Stockade, Chicago, Poetry: A Magazine of Verse, January 1949, pp. 216–17.

[14] Allen, Robert L., Aftermath: The Question of Ezra Pound, Esquire magazine, February 1958.

[15] This preamble, with slight variations, was a regular feature of Mr. Pound's subsequent broadcasts.

[16] Transcript of short-wave broadcast, January 29, 1942. Reception very poor (FCC record No. 9461–9462).

[17] And if you will say that this tale teaches * * * a lesson, or that the Reverend Eliot

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

has found a more natural language * * * you who think you will get through hell in a hurry. * * * That day there was cloud over Zoagli. And for 3 days snow cloud over the sea banked like a line of moutnains."

[1] Kenner, Hugh. Comment: on Ezra Pound. Chicago, Poetry magazine, July 1957. Pp. 238–39.

[2] Apparently for further residence and travel outside the United States.

Department of Defense Award Given to King's College, Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of April 25, 1958, calling attention to the Department of Defense Reserve award presented to King's College, of Wilkes-Barre:

KING'S GETS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AWARD FOR RESERVES' COOPERATION

King's College yesterday received Department of Defense Reserve award from Rear Adm. E. R. McLean, Jr., commandant of Fourth Naval District.

The award, which had been announced in Washington by Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, was presented to Rev. George P. Benaglia, C. S. C., president of the college. Impressive presentation ceremonies took place on the second floor Regina Lounge of the main building. Uniformed representatives of all the armed services were on hand, and later attended a buffet luncheon on the sixth-floor lyceum.

It was the first visit to Wyoming Valley by Admiral McLean since assuming command of the district. The admiral was greeted at the entrance to the turnpike, after coming to this city yesterday morning from Philadelphia by automobile. A motorcade formed at King's Hafey-Marian Hall and went to meet the dignitary.

Acting Mayor J. Harry May presented the key to the city to Admiral McLean, and the party then proceeded to the main building in Wilkes-Barre. Following the presentation of the Reserve award to King's, Admiral McLean and his party visited Naval Reserve Training Center, Kingston, and inspected the base. A farewell party was held at Charles Weissman Recreation Center, Terrace Street.

Many King's students, members of the Armed Forces Reserves, were in the guard of honor at the presentation ceremonies.

King's gained the award in recognition of the college's outstanding cooperation with reservists and Reserve activities achieved through its personnel policies.

Rev. Edward Nolan, pastor of St. Jude's Church, Mountaintop, gave the invocation. Lt. Comdr. Jay A. Young, a faculty member at King's, introduced the admiral at the award ceremony. Closing remarks were by Comdr. William Boyd, head of Naval Reserve training in Wilkes-Barre and Scranton areas.

Admiral McLean spoke of the importance of a strong Reserve program as being of vital necessity to the security of the Nation. He also said, in his opinion, the Russian launching of the satellites might prove to be a blessing in disguise.

He said:

"It has given our educators the means with which they can go to the parent and plead for the extra hours of work. It has made possible the increased benefits for deserving students who have not the necessary money for higher education. And, in addition, it awakened us from the complacent attitude which I believe prevailed—that solely by virtue of our being Americans, we were the ones who had a corner on the market in scoring 'firsts.'

"It is obvious that we cannot enter into a numerical steeplechase with the Soviet. To do so would be to court economic disaster. And in spite of the present size of our active-duty forces, I have already indicated that they would be insufficient to wage any sizable war. They would have to be the 'shock troops,' augmented by vast numbers of our 'civilian armed forces,' the Reserves.

"And it is not enough to have mere numbers on our Reserve rolls. These reservists must be of the highest caliber and trained to the greatest degree possible. This training cannot be accomplished after the bell has rung. It must be now that we make every effort to give the up-to-the-minute facilities and training so necessary in this era of technological advance."

King's president, Rev. George P. Benaglia, C. S. C., said the college always has been happy to participate and cooperate with the Reserve program. Members of the student body and faculty have been encouraged to take part in the training, he added.

"Our system of education may be falling behind the Russians in certain phases," Reverend Father Benaglia added, "but the Russians may be sowing the seeds of their own destruction by making education available to the masses of that nation.

"We must be prepared," he continued. "Our leaders recognized the need of propagating moral ideas in the world and of remaining prepared and ready for any emergency. At King's College, we recognise the need of disciplining the mind and will of our young men," added the college president.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May marks the 167th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, which every Pole, throughout the world, cherishes as the symbol of the Polish fight for freedom and nationalism. All freedom-loving peoples of the earth join with the Polish people in hallowing the document as a famous moment in the history of man's striving for liberty and equality.

The American people sympathized with the Polish people in the late 18th century and indirectly shared in the establishment of the Polish constitutional monarchy. Many of the immortal patriots of the Polish struggle had fought alongside the American revolutionists. The flame of liberty kindled in the American colonies spread with them to Poland. The American Constitution provided a model, in many respects, for the Polish Constitution. When the news reached America of the action of the Polish patriots, George Washington, our own great leader in revolution, war, and peace, said to a friend:

Poland * * * appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty, which * * * reflects great honor on the (Polish) * * * king.

As our forefathers two centuries ago, we extend our sympathy to the Polish people, who are today held in bondage by the Red army. May the Polish people once again celebrate this memorable day in peace and freedom.

Social Security for Adopted Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 12194, to amend the Social Security Act to authorize insurance benefits for a dependent adopted child effective upon the entry of the final order of adoption.

Under current law, such benefits do not accrue until 3 years after the date of adoption. I am told that the 3-year period was incorporated in the law as a precaution against abuse by those who might adopt children for the sole purpose of increasing the family's social-security benefits. In my judgment, this is an unrealistic danger and an unnecessary precaution.

Under the adoption laws of most States, the child is admitted to the home of its adoptive parents under an interlocutory court decree which grants conditional custody for 1 years. During that year, frequent supervisory visits by constituted State authorities are required. If the adoptive parents fail to exercise proper parental influence, fail to demonstrate appropriate parental devotion, fail to make adequate provision for the child's physical, mental, and social welfare, or fail in any other particular to meet the requirements of the State adoption laws, the interlocutory decree is vacated and the child is remanded to the custody of its natural parents or the child-placement agency as the case may be. On the other hand, if all statutory requirements are met, the interlocutory decree is merged by the court with a final order of adoption. Effective with the date of entry of the final order, the adoptive parents stand in loco parentis to the child and assume all legal rights and obligations incidental to and incumbent upon natural parenthood; and the child assumes all the legal rights and obligations of a natural child. The child becomes an heir-at-law, and in most States, the child is required by statute, as soon as he reaches the legal work age, to support a disabled parent, whether natural or adoptive.

Mr. Speaker, the rigid elegibility criteria and the exacting regulatory provisions of State adoption statutes preclude the possibility of abuse of the social security program by greed adoptive parents, and surely the 1 year period is sufficient to resolve the question of good faith.

I submit that it is and should continue to be the policy of Government to encourage rather than discourage the humane act of adoption of dependent children. The Federal Government recognizes the social validity of that policy and gives it positive effect in the Internal Revenue laws under which an adopted child is eligible for a dependent's income tax exemption of $600 in the taxable year in which the final order of adoption is entered.

I am advised by the Director of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance that the passage of this legislation "would add no appreciable cost—less than 0.01 percent of payroll—to the program." Indeed, very few workers approaching the retirement age of 65 and even fewer workers already retired will adopt young dependent children who would be covered by this amendment. As a practical matter, the amendment would affect primarily orphans or semi-orphans adopted by grandparents or older collateral kindred.

I hope it will be possible for the Committee on Ways and Means to give this legislation its early consideration.

We Can Do the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely article by Mr. Alexander Barkan, deputy director, Committee on Political Education, which appeared in the AFL–CIO American Federationist, issue for May 1958. The article attempts to answer the question: "Does the American labor movement have any influence in politics?"

WE CAN DO THE JOB

(By Alexander Barkan, deputy director, Committee on Political Education)

As we approach the eve of another biennial election we might as well face up to the fact that we will have to answer the biennial question, "Does the American labor movement have any influence in politics?"

The quick answer, for those who would like to read and run, is "Yes." And I think I can prove it.

Between now and election day—and for weeks and months after election day—the question will be posed in many forms and in many places.

If the form sheet has any validity, there will be at least six columns by Raymond Moley saying that labor cannot deliver the vote but issuing a call to arms against labor in politics.

Six or seven (the form sheet is a little hazy on this) Senators will insert articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD denying labor can be effective in politics.

Representative RALPH GWINN, of New York, will again claim COPE is spending over half a million dollars in his district to defeat him.

Westbrook Pegler will rewrite his piece on labor in politics for the 25th time; Fulton Lewis will continue ihs breathless revelations; a television panel show will badger a guest—just to get the story, of course.

And with all of this knowledge pounded into them, somewhere between 50 and 60 million people will vote on election day for and against candidates recommended by the labor movement. Some will win and some will lose, and the debate will taper off until this time in 1960.

It's all good clean fun and a valuable part of the political process. The fact that it sheds very little light on the subject is beside the point. What is important is that it is a legitimate subject for debate in the great market place of ideas that constitutes our democratic system.

In approaching the subject dispassionately it is lucky that the American electorate is probably the most thoroughly surveyed and polled electorate in the world. Particulrly in recent years, thoughtful public opinion scientists—found mostly in universities as opposed to those of a different breed found mostly on New York's Madison Avenue—have devoted a good deal of time and attention to what makes the American voter tick.

The best work, perhaps, has been done by the survey-research center at the University of Michigan. It has also done the most work.

In Febeuray 1957, the SRC published a study showing the composition of the American electorate in the 1956 election. It estimated that 15 percent of the population was strongly Republican, 14 percent weakly Republican, 23 percent independent, 23 percent weakly Democratic, 21 percent strongly Democratic and 4 percent nonpolitical.

Lumping those without strong views together, it comes out 15 percent Republican, 21 percent Democratic, 60 percent without fixed views and 4 percent with no views at all.

In the 1956 election President Eisenhower got a substantial majority of the 60 percent who occupy the middle ground between strongly Republican and strongly Democratic.

Against that background it is useful to look at the way people classified as workers voted. Union members voted 52 percent for the Democratic candidate for President who was recommended by the AFL–CIO General Board and 48 percent for the Republican candidate. The contrast with the voting behavior of the general public, of which union members are a part, is marked. The contrast with the voting behavior of nonunion workers is even greater.

While 52 percent of the union workers voted for the candidate recommended by the AFL–CIO, only 35 percent of the nonunion workers voted for the same candidate. Sixty-five percent of the nonunion workers voted for the opposing candidate, while 48 percent of the union workers voted for the same candidate.

It seems to me that the difference between the 52 percent and the 35 percent is the area of labor's influence. The only distinction between the two groups, according to the survey research center material, was that one was composed of union members, the other was not. They were equally distributed, presumably, over the same areas of the country, came from the same racial and religious backgrounds and were in the same general social and economic brackets.

I leave it to the statisticians to figure out to the decimal point how much of the difference is attributable to our efforts. I would only stress that these figures relate to the way people voted in the 1956 presidential election. They have no bearing on party membership.

This February 1957 study was followed up in September 1957 with another study, by Philip Converse, also of the University of Michigan survey research center. He sought to isolate the voting behavior of union members, as one group, for a further look.

His conclusion was that "workers who have a strong, personal feeling of belonging to a union and who understand clearly where their union stands politically are the ones most likely to cast a labor vote in national presidential elections."

Converse added: "The longer a person has been a union member, the more likely he is to identify with the union and to behave politically as the union would desire. Further checks show this relationship is not the result of an older depression generation of members who joined under rather unusual circumstances. New union members in their fifties and sixties have about the same low identification with unions as do new memgers in their twenties—and the reverse holds true for long-term union members, regardless of their age."

More detailed study confirmed the findings. In those unions which expressed a clear political preference in their publications, whose leaders took strong stands and gave direction to their members, the vote for backed candidates was higher than in unions in which this was not the case.

Put in a simpler way, workers most familiar with their unions understand best the necessity for political education and agree most with the political recommendations of their organizations.

A January 1958 study by 2 members of the Institute of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University of 2 local unions in New Jersey came up with the same conclusions.

There are many things not touched upon by either of the studies. Obviously it is vital that recommendations, to have weight with the membership, must be arrived at on a sound basis of logic and arrived at through a democratic process. Recommendations based on the predilections of a small group carry no weight nor do they deserve to.

Obviously, also, mere recommendation is not sufficient. The reasons must be spelled out and they must be sound reasons. It is the responsibility of the leadership to see to it that members are made aware of the union's position and that they have the facts.

These studies, of course, do not fit the pattern cut by the foes of the labor movement whose minds are filled with labor bosses pushing buttons which marshal millions of nameless slaves to the polls. But, somehow, serious studies never do fit the images these people have or seek to conjure.

That, however, is their problem. Ours is to do the job we can do with all the vigor and energy at our command. There is nothing so convincing in a debate as demonstration.

Progress on Conservation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, a recent résumé of notable conservation legislation in this Congress, by John B. Oakes, a famous conservationist and New York Times feature writer, appeared in the Times of April 20, 1958.

I am especially glad to note that, as 1 of the 2 major pieces of conservation

legislation, he cites the bill, of which I am the author, to limit military withdrawals on the public domain. Mr. Oakes comments on other conservation legislation and pending measures of interest to conservationists. I believe that the article will be of interest to Members, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point for their information:

CONSERVATION: LEGISLATIVE GAINS—CONGRESS SETS A MARK WITH PASSAGE OF TWO MAJOR MEASURES

(By John B. Oakes)

Enactment of two major pieces of conservation legislation as this session has already given to the 85th Congress a special significance from the point of view of preserving America's scenic and natural resources. It also illustrates once again the growing power of conservation as a major legislative force.

Most notable achievement in this field was passage of the so-called anti-billboard bill, which will encourage the respective States to control billboards along a large part of the new 41,000-mile Federal Interstate Highway System. Although in the course of a long and lively Senate debate this measure was seriously weakened, the fact still remains that it represents the first expression on the part of the United States Government that billboards are undesirable excrescences along our highways and that they ought to be limited and restricted as a matter of public policy.

The principal dilution of the bill came on the motion of Senator NORRIS COTTON of New Hampshire, whose own State provides some choice examples of the ruination of beautiful roadsides by the billboard industry.

In any event, under the act as adopted, the Federal Government offers a small financial bonus to the States if they control billboards according to Federal standards along those portions of the new highway system not built on existing rights-of-way. It is estimated that this may mean that about two-thirds of the total mileage could be covered. Principal credit for the victory goes to that indefatigable conservationist Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER of Oregon; to Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee and to Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California. The next move is up to the States themselves.

THE ENGLE BILL

The other important conservation measure that has become law at this session is the Engle bill. Its passage means that the Armed Forces will no longer be able to grab huge chunks of the national domain without specific congressional approval. This measure, sponsored by Representative ENGLE of California, is designed to put an end to the increasing practice of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of trying to lay hands on large tracts of public land—frequently wildlife reservations—as target areas and maneuver grounds.

The new legislation requires prior congressional approval for any such transaction involving more than 5,000 acres. It also requires observance of State fish and game laws in all military areas. This will be a new experience for many military personnel.

WHICH WAY MISSION 66?

A lively argument among men dedicated to the protection of America's natural resources revolves around the objections of a number of militant conservationists to what they think they see going on under Mission 66, the national parks' 10-year development program.

Their basic criticism is that the Park Service is allowing unnecessary inroads to be made on the parks in the effort to accommodate increasing visitor pressure. They also charge that the Park Service is violating the spirit of the national parks in other ways, such as permitting salvage and sale of hurricane-felled timber in some areas or encouraging certain kinds of recreational activity that could better be carried on outside the parks.

For example, a ski run and tow at Hidden Valley in the Rocky Mountain National Park has aroused objections from persons who believe that winter sports in the parks should not be permitted to disfigure or deface the natural aspect of the parks themselves—as any ski run cut down a forested slope must do to some extent. Furthermore, it is argued that mass recreational activities in summer or winter have no place in the parks, which have been set aside essentially as scenic, wilderness, and wildlife preserves.

FOR FISHERMEN

Recently, the new million-dollar development at Flamingo, near the southern end of Everglades National Park, was described in this newspaper from the point of view of its benefits to salt-water fishermen. A trailer park, motor court, and marina have all been built there. The article stated: "Obviously, the Park Service expects this to be a big fishing deal and it appears that it will become one."

Query: Is it a proper use of a national park to develop a large-scale fishing establishment, or should fishing be kept merely an incidental use as it always has been previously throughout the park system? Will the people flocking to Flamingo be coming there to see and enjoy a national park as such, or will they be coming, irrespective of park values, simply to enjoy fine new fishing grounds?

The critics say there is danger of the parks' being deflected from their statutory purpose of conservation, preservation, and use "in such manner * * * as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." They fear that the construction aspects of Mission 66, principally roadbuilding and new physical facilities, are leading to a destructive overdevelopment.

In a letter to this column, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the Park Service, makes the following comment on this kind of criticism:

"Believe me, we are aware of the pitfalls that are ahead of us in connection with taking care of the large numbers of people that are coming to the parks. We are also aware of the general impression that * * * Mission 66 is nothing but a construction program. But it is really not a construction program; it is a protection program. Be that as it may, I am still thoroughly convinced that if we do this right, the parks are going to be better protected from the mass use of people who are now coming into them than they were before we started."

The men of the Park Service are acutely conscious both of park values and of the tremendous pressure of visitors on the parks—some 60 million annually today and 80 million expected less than a decade hence. The parks suffered severely from neglect at the hands of Congress and the public during and after the war, and only recently has the demand for better facilities for both protection and use of the parks begun to be translated into adequate appropriations. This is the Mission 66 program.

NO OUTSIDE OBJECTIONS

To the extent that the funds are used for more personnel, better training, more adequate interpretative methods or land acquisition, there has been no outside objection. But the bulk of the money is going into roads, buildings and physical improvement. In its construction aspects alone, Mission 66 has in its first 18 months (July 1, 1956–January 1, 1958) completed or started over $15 million in visitor accommodations in the parks, and some $80 million in Government-built facilities including camp grounds, roads and utility systems.

Mr. Wirth states that "the development program under Mission 66 is pointed in this direction: to move developments for mass use away from the heart of the park; to pull mass-use developments away from the climax scenic areas, sometimes even beyond the boundaries of the park * * * Today it is fair to claim that nine-tenths of the area within the national parks is still in as fresh and natural condition as when these areas were established. One of the objectives of our whole park program is to preserve the wilderness character of those scenic, natural areas."

EROSION TAKING PLACE

This is just where some of the critics fear an erosion is taking place.

Behind this lively dispute lies another area of disagreement between some of the Government's natural resource agencies and many conservationists. This is the argument over the wilderness bill, a proposal that would give special statutory protection to all recognized wilderness areas owned by the Federal Government, including those in national parks, national forests, and on other public lands.

Opponents of the bill argue that it is either unnecessary or too restrictive, while the conservationists maintain that the only way to make sure America's remaining wilderness will be protected in the future is to nail it down by law instead of relying on the good will of the Federal agencies involved.

Thirty-ninth Anniversary of Death of Slovak Patriot General, Dr. Milan Rastislav Stefanik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Viktor Nesnadny, vice president, Slovak Liberation Committee in the United States, on the 39th anniversary of the death of the Slovak patriot general, Dr. Milan Rastislav Stefanik, which will be observed on May 4:

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF THE SLOVAK PATRIOT, GEN. DR. MILAN RASTISLAV STEFANIK

Milan Rastislav Stefanik, the son of a Lutheran clergyman, was born on July 21, 1880, at Kosariska in Slovakia. His elementary education was had in the school in his native village. After attending the lyceum in the capital city of Slovakia in Bratislava and in Sopron, he left Slovakia to study at the Institute of Technology at Prague. After obtaining his doctorate at Prague in 1904, he enrolled at Charles University, for advanced study in higher mathematics and philosophy. He chose astronomy for his life's work and pursued his specialty at the University in Paris and later in Zurich and Milan. Upon his return to France, he was appointed professor at the Meudon Observatory on the outskirts of Paris. He soon established a name for himself in the science of astronomy. In short time, he was commissioned to build an observatory on Tahiti Island. This work attracted the attention of the whole scientific world. He was made a member of the French Academy. Soon afterward, England honored him with membership in the British Royal Society. Aside

from the years of his childhood and early youth, he spent nearly all of his adult life in foreign lands—the many influential friends he made outside of Slovakia stood him, and his collaborators, in good stead during the years of World War I, when the New Republic was in the making.

Upon the outbreak of World War I, he enlisted in the French Army as an aviator. Wounded in action over the Balkans, he refused to be hospitalized and continued flying and fighting. He took part in repelling the German attack near Arras. He was decorated for bravery and steadily advanced in rank. By 1916, he rose from the rank of private to the rank of general in the French Army.

In 1915, when the Czecho-Slovak National Council was established in Paris, he, and his collaborators worked for the liberation of the Slovaks and Czechs. The Allies were naturally more than willing to foster a Separatist movement in the heart of the Central Powers. On December 17, 1917, President Poincare of the French Republic commissioned him to organize an independent Czecho-Slovak Legion to serve under his command. Then, as commander-in-chief of the Czecho-Slovak Legion, he went from country to country—due to his fame as a scientist and his many friends in scientific circles throughout the world, he found the doors of all governments open to him and their officials most attentive to his pleas—and shrewdly and patiently, he pulled together the slender threads of Slovak and Czech interest, sympathy and influence in America, in England, and in Russia. He blazed the trail and paved the way for Masaryk, particularly in France and America.

He recruited 3 armies, 1 in France, 1 in Italy, and 1 in Russia, aggregating 175,000 extraterritorial volunteers, of which the Slovaks constituted at least a third. On September 20, 1917, he met with a great body of Catholic priests in New York, rekindled in their hearts the fires of Slovak nationalism, and as a result, the million dollar drive in America for the new republic was a huge success.

The liberation of Slovaks and Czechs came. The Republic was proclaimed on October 28, 1918. He was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence of the Czecho-Slovak Republic signed in the United States. Subsequently, under the Treaty of Versailles, the Republic was officially accepted into the family of nations.

On May 4, 1919, he started for Slovakia—to be appointed Minister of National Defense in the new republic—the land where he was born, the land he loved, the land for which he was ready and willing to die—first in the French Army, and then in the Czecho-Slovak Legion—the land that he was now to see free. He was traveling in his favorite mode, by airplane.

At half past 11 o'clock in the morning, when over Vajnory—within the sight of capitol city of Slovakia—Bratislava, where a huge crowd, including his aged mother, had gathered to welcome him, the Army, active under the Prague government orders, fired a sharp gun salute as a result of which the Caproni plane suddenly burst into flames and spun to the ground and ended the life of one of the greatest sons of Slovakia. When rescuers reached the plane, they found his face to the ground, as though he were kissing his homeland a last farewell.

He came back to Slovakia, but he did not see the joy of the people. He did not live to see his country free. Slovak people were never free under Czechoslovak Government.

Milan Rastislav Stefanik—may he rest in peace on the hilltop of Bradlo—Slovakia's most venerated shrine. On the anniversary of the day of his tragic death, Slovaks from far and near, make an annual pilgrimage to his resting place, not in that time—Czechoslovak Government is ruling under communism, and in commemoration of the emancipator of the Slovak people light fires on the four pillars of his tomb.

The immortal Stefanik once wrote to a friend: "I am a Slovak, body and soul; I have no divided affection."

With the untimely passing of Stefanik went the balance wheel of the Czecho-Slovak movement. Had Stefanik lived, the deadly mistakes of the first Republic under Masaryk and Benes never would have happened—he was a Slovak nationalist and never would have tolerated the attempted fusion of the Slovaks with the Czechs. Never would he have tolerated the Czecho-Slovak ideology. Stefanik was truly one of Slovakia's greatest sons.

VIKTOR NESNADNY,
Vice President, Slovak Liberation Committee in U. S. A.

Teachers as Informers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, uncertainty builds hysteria and gives rise to bad legislation or oppressive regulation. I was pleased to note New York State Commissioner of Education James E. Allen views clearly fundamental principles.

An editorial in the New York Times of April 30, 1958, commenting on Commissioner Allen's ruling on Teachers as informers proves valuable and interesting reading:

TEACHERS AS INFORMERS

In March of 1955, the New York City Board of Education authorized the superintendent of schools to require teachers to reveal the names of any of their associates who ever had been Communists. Reiterating our belief that adherence to communism was "an automatic disqualification for teaching in the schools of a free democracy," this newspaper protested the resolution forcing teachers to act as informers, on the ground that it would be immoral as well as ineffective, would be more likely to ensnare the man with a conscience than the one trying to protect Communists and would, in short, do the entire school system more harm than good.

This point of view was shared by State Education Commissioner James E. Allen when, the following year, he was called on to rule on an appeal by five New York City school employes dismissed under the Board's regulation. In an admirable opinion, Commissioner Allen then pointed out that "this type of inquisition has no place in the school system." It was obvious to him, as it is to us, that a requirement that a teacher be an informer "engenders an atmosphere of suspicion and uneasiness" and, without proving anything, merely opens the way toward a spirit of mutual mistrust fatal to the morale of any teaching body. None of this affects the duty of a teacher to tell about himself; it is the idea of being forced, on pain of dismissal, to tell about others that is morally repulsive.

Commissioner Allen's ruling was upheld by Justice Donald S. Taylor in the State supreme court; but the New York City Corporation Counsel and Board of Education, with a persistence worthy of a better cause, appealed the decision. Now, the five-man appellate division of the State Supreme court has unanimously upheld him again. The city can appeal once more, but doggedly to go on with further efforts to overrule the State commissioner's eminently just and sensible determination of policy would probably be futile and certainly demeaning. The school system is not going to become one whit purer by continuing the persecution of five employes who have refused to be informers. There are infinitely better ways to fight communism than that.

Andrew Johnson, Man of Indomitable Courage and Incorruptible Integrity—An Address Delivered at the Dedication of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, Greeneville, Tenn., in Connection With the Completion of the Restoration of His Home, by Carroll Reece, the Representative from Andrew Johnson's Old District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address I delivered at Greeneville, Tenn., April 26, in connection with the dedication of the Andrew Johnson National Monument:

On January 3, 1935, I had the honor to introduce in the House of Representatives a bill to acquire the Andrew Johnson homestead as a national monument. The bill, after amendment, passed the House; passed the Senate; and was approved by the President, August 29, 1935. The bill, in its final form, provided not only for the acquisition of the homestead proper, but likewise for that of the tailor shop as well as for the burial place of Johnson to be combined as a national monument.

So you can understand, this is a gratifying occasion for me today. The dedication of the house and tailor shop of Andrew Johnson, with tomb on yonder hill, draws us, as it were, around the hearth fires of remembrance and makes us, the sons and daughters of Tennessee, which Johnson loved and where he now sleeps, feel as one family, bound together in the bonds of fraternal kinship and spiritual affiliation.

It is well that we have these visible monuments to remind us of an illustrious life. Man is, and always has been, greatly dependent upon symbols, the outward and visible tokens of his inspiration and his reverence for the past. That is why men build beautiful churches; that is why they erect splendid memorials to commemorate those who have gone before and have deserved well of their fellow men; that is why they seek out the birthplaces and homes of great men of the past, that they may be preserved for future generations. That is what we are doing here today.

As we gather to dedicate as a national shrine—this home, this tailor shop, this beautiful cemetery where he requested to be buried—we are moved not only to reflect upon the record of an illustrious life, but we can also have the satisfaction of saying to ourselves: Here this man lived; here he

labored; within these walls he dreamed and meditated and worked out his philosophy of life; here his character was formed; here he worked out the pattern of his career; here he determined to devote his life and his career; here he determined to devote his life and his energy—regardless of cost to himself—to the Constitution and the Federal Union.

So it is good that we should gather here today amid these scenes, recalling a life of which every Tennessean, every American, regardless of party or traditional affiliation, is now proud, and in a feeble way make amends for the lack of appreciation that was shown him during his lifetime. Even to this day, there is no memorial—not even a bust—of Andrew Johnson displayed in the Nation's Capitol, and this despite the fact he is the only President who also served in the House, in the Senate, and as Vice President, and then again elected to the Senate after serving as President.

Like the garment which, long after its wearer has divested himself of it, yet retains in its folds the lines and lineaments of the owner's figure, so this homestead and this humble tailor shop still form the mold of Andrew Johnson; and we shall ever prize and cherish them.

As one reviews the story of that stormy and tumultuous life, one is reminded of the perspective afforded by a vast mountain chain, serrated, range upon range, with towering peaks, with few and far the quiet valleys between. Our own Great Smokies might well constitute a magnificent illustration of what I have in mind.

Johnson's whole life was composed of just such violent contrasts; he rose to towering heights of moral grandeur and political triumph; he plumbed the depths of political defeat and abysmal personal humiliation.

His successor in the Senate, David M. Key, described his mental operations as follows: "The very unequal distribution of advantages doubtless appeared to him in the aspect of a wrong. A restless and longing mind, shackled and imprisoned, is not apt to be always reasonable and just when it discovers, in the pathway through which its aspirations lead, obstacles which seem to be insurmountable, and beholds beyond them those who have been favored by fortune."

As one reflects upon his life, three salient characteristics strike the mind instantaneously, with the swiftness of light: First, the implacable, unconquerable courage of the man; second, and more important, in those stormy times in which he lived, his incorruptible integrity; and, third, his complete, sacrificial devotion to duty as he saw his duty. The life of Andrew Johnson should teach us all a vital lesson—a lesson those of us who have journeyed far enough along life's pathway to see honest effort ripen into human achievement have already observed—that hard work, high courage, unfaltering energy and indestructible integrity will, in the end, bring success over all obstacles.

Shakespeare has Mark Antony say in the hour of his disillusionment:

"My fortunes have corrupted honest men."

Never, never, never in this world, could Andrew Johnson have been corrupted; such a thing was impossible in his nature. What a priceless endowment. What an imperishable tribute. What a heritage to his countrymen. What an example for men in public life in these trying times.

During his impeachment trial, his chief defense counsel offered a compromise which, if accepted, would have resulted in immediate acquittal and Johnson indignantly refused it: "I regard the proposal as dishonorable and insulting. Before I will sign an order contrary to law and against my conscience, and be driven by coercion to that end, I'll suffer my right arm to be torn from its socket. I denounce the course you advise me to pursue, for I will not purchase my acquittal at the cost of my integrity. It is my pleasure to accept your resignation."

In the long perspective of time the true Andrew Johnson slowly but surely emerges. Bit by bit, the mud drops off; the old insults and vilifications have died down.

Andrew Johnson is the greatest martyr and unsung hero in American history, a thing former President Truman, doubtless, had in mind when he recently declared that he was "the most mistreated and maligned man who ever occupied the White House."

But an interesting little sidelight upon the innate prestige and majesty of the Presidency, by whomsoever it may be temporarily occupied, and the ultimate dependence upon it, by Congress no less than by the public at large, is furnished by the late Harry Thurston Peck in his book, Twenty Years of the Republic.

"When President Johnson was at the very ebb of his popularity in 1867," wrote Dr. Peck, "and when House and Senate were over-riding his vetoes and treating his recommendations with contempt, he once said to a personal friend: 'Even now if I really wish anything very much indeed, I can get it done' ". In other words, if Johnson, as President, demanded something of Congress as absolutely imperative to the Nation's interests, Congress would give him what he asked for.

There is something, it seems to me, heartening about this incident. It seems to bring reassurance that, no matter how strained our political passions may become, the heart of the Republic still beats strongly, or, to change the metaphor, the timbers may creak a bit in stormy weather, but the Ship of State still rides serenely on. May it be ever thus. As Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, still the most universally beloved of American poets because he kept his finger ever on the American pulse, so beautifully put it at the very time Andrew Johnson was struggling to preserve the Union—and Johnson, probably read the poem:

"Sail on, O Ship of State.
Sail on, O Union, strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope.
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale.
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea.
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee."

How Andrew Johnson would have echoed every word of that.

It is not my purpose, to review Johnson's career in detail. You are familiar with its main outlines—how could you live in Greeneville and be otherwise? I shall attempt merely a brief summary of that career insofar as such summary may serve to throw light upon the mental, moral, and spiritual development of the man. For today, amid these scenes of his early struggles, it is the man rather than the statesman which concerns us.

Born in Raleigh, N. C., on December 29, 1808, the younger son of Jacob and Mary McDonough Johnson, he faced a world with more than his share of handicaps. His father was a bank porter and a sexton in Raleigh, but he was described as an honest man, loved and respected by all who knew him. "An honest man. How one's thoughts leap to the future of the infant born on that December day of long ago. It is pleasant to know that this honesty was not only inherent in the future President of the United States but was likewise a legacy bequeathed by a father who had nothing else to leave. One of the duties of Jacob Johnson's simple life was to toll the bells for those who had passed on. While thus engaged one day in the year 1811 he collapsed from exhaustion and a few days later he died. Johnson's biographer, Lloyd Paul Stryker, thus comments: "The boy Andrew, at the age of 4, was thus left fatherless, penniless, and friendless."

"Childhood," continues the same biographer, "Andrew never knew, youth passed him by. At the age of 10 necessity took him roughly by the hand and apprenticed him to one Selby, a tailor in his native town. Poverty is a grim and cruel master. He teaches his lessons with long hours, sour looks, and hard knocks. Andrew Johnson had a thorough knowledge of this tutor. Many years later he told his fellow Congressmen: 'If being poor was a crime * * * I should have to plead that I was guilty; that I was a great criminal; that I had been born a criminal; and that I had lived a criminal a large portion of my life. Yes, I have wrestled with poverty, that gaunt and haggard monster. I have met it in the day and night. I have felt his withering approach and his blighting influence.' "

An unschooled tailor's apprentice at the age of 10, where was there any hope for the future? But, happily for the sons of men, Providence is prepared to intervene when least it might be looked for. There was in Raleigh in those lean and bitter years a gentleman whose influence upon the poor apprentice was to make history. Dr. William G. Hill, the town physician, was one of those born philanthropists whom nature seems to produce at exactly the right moment. He would come to the tailor shop where the boy worked and read to him and his fellow apprentices masterpieces of English literature—by preference, the great orations of British statesmen. The mind of the boy took fire like flax from the spark of a tinder. Here was a new, and undreamed of, world. Here was a vast, limitless horizon offering boundless exploration, boundless riches. There was one volume in particular. The title of this incendiary book, was The American Speaker. It contained some of the greatest forensic efforts in the English langauge. The orations which struck home were those of Charles James Fox and the younger Pitt. It was by poring over them that the boy slowly and painfully learned to read and spell. Could a future orator and statesman have a better exercise book? One is inevitably reminded of another boy over in Kentucky, at this time, also painfully learning his letters, only, unlike the young Lincoln, Johnson had not yet learned the mysterious art of writing and ciphering "to the rule of three."

In 1826, Johnson, with his mother and stepfather, decided to try to mend their fortunes by moving to Tennessee and, after some wandering, he settled here in Greeneville. Tailoring was the only trade he knew, and here he opened this little shop.

The family is described by an early biographer, John Savage, as arriving in town in "an old wooden cart drawn by a worthless horse (which) carried all their worldly goods." Again, one thinks of the Lincoln family in its wanderings. Mr. Stryker who wrote brilliantly of Johnson says:

"Dust-laden, on a Saturday afternoon they arrived at their destination. It could not have been a dramatic entrance and yet there was one who noted it with approval. Andrew, if he observed at all a little knot of giggling girls standing by the roadside,

doubtless turned hastily away, recalling his travel-worn and unimpressive equipage. There was, however, in that feminine group 17-year-old Eliza McCardle; she had seen Andrew Johnson as he passed in his creaking cart, dust-laden and travel-worn as he was. She liked him and then and there to her friends she confessed that fact." "It was," remarks Mr. Stryker dryly, "an un-Victorian method, but this was 1826. Eliza was 17 and Johnson was less than 2 years older, but on the 17th of May 1827, by Mordecai Lincoln, a magistrate of the town and an uncle of Abraham Lincoln, they were married."

That marriage was the turning point, the golden milestone, of Johnson's life as he would unquestionably assure us, could we evoke him into our midst today from where he sleeps over yonder. Eliza McCardle was the daughter of a Scotch shoemaker and her opportunities for education had been greater than those of her young husband. She took him mentally in hand. She taught him to write; she taught him arithmetic. The familiar scene has come down to us of the young tailor sitting cross-legged on his bench while his wife read to him. Again to quote Mr. Stryker, "As a tailor he was debarred from equal association with the 'aristocratic coterie' ruling the community, so he spent his evenings and late nights in company with Eliza and his British statesmen."

And so the busy years passed, with gaining a livelihood and acquiring an education going hand in hand. Five children were born of Andrew's and Eliza's marriage, and Johnson was assured of the greatest solace of his life—a happy home. It never failed him. To it, and to the loving embrace of a remarkable woman, who thoroughly understood him, who never failed him, Johnson could always turn. It was the sheet anchor by which he was enabled to ride out every storm.

It was not long before Johnson's natural aptitude for a public career made itself manifest. Indeed, from the days he had learned to read and spell sitting, as it were, at the feet of Burke and Fox and the younger Pitt, it would seem as if he had been shaped for no other purpose. He was drawn to it by an overpowering instinct. His first venture into politics was in 1829, when he was elected an alderman. Reelected the following year, in 1831, he was chosen as mayor, and the one-time tailor's apprentice was on his way. He served, respectively, in the lower house of the State legislature and then in the State senate. In 1843, he began the first of five consecutive terms as Congressman. Returning home, he was elected governor of Tennessee in 1853, and 2 years later, reelected. By the year 1857, the great issue unionism, of the slaveholding agricultural South versus the antislavery and industrial North, was being ever more tightly drawn; the state of the Union appeared ominous indeed. The following year, the leader of the newly formed Republican Party, William E. Seward, was openly to proclaim an irrepressible conflict. Fortunately, at this juncture, Andrew Johnson was elected a Senator from the State of Tennessee. His colleague was John Bell, later to be an unsuccessful presidential candidate on the Constitutional Union ticket in the fateful year 1860.

Southerner and slaveholder though he was, there never was any question as to Johnson's position: he was, first and last, absolutely, inflexibly, eternally for the Federal Union. There was never a flicker or shadow of doubt in his mind: that mind was four-square; for him, the issue was made up, and his choice was irrevocable. That he was a southerner and a slaveholder, made, to his mind, not the slightest difference. In an interesting article in the New York Times Magazine of March 16 last, foreshadowing the ceremonies being held here today, the author, Pierce Fredericks, remarks:

"The gradual rehabilitation of (Johnson's) memory is progressing. It will reach a new climax next month when the Department of the Interior opens his home in Greeneville, Tenn., as a National Shrine. The timing seems particularly appropriate. Most of the mud slung at Johnson resulted from his notion that the Southern Negro problem was not to be solved overnight. From the perspective of 1958 it would appear that there was a great deal to be said for his point of view."

One thing alone was paramount, as expressed in the immortal words of his political idol, Andrew Jackson: "Our Federal Union. It must and shall be preserved."

On December 18, 1860, and the following day, Johnson delivered in the Senate of the United States what was undoubtedly the greatest speech of his career and, I think, the greatest speech ever made on the floor of the United States Senate.

The only comparable speech was another made by him in the Senate on February 5 and 6, 1861.

These two speeches constitute a magnificent utterance of faith—faith in America, faith in his countrymen, abiding faith in the Union he was sworn to preserve "against all enemies, foreign and domestic." The impact on the country and upon the Government was unbelievable. His analysis and discussion of the great constitutional issues involved sounded more as if they had come from the lips of John Marshall than from the lowly tailor of Greeneville, Tenn. He spoke extemporaneously. He stood there among the great men of the times and amazed them with his analysis of the Constitution and the principle of government which must be preserved if the Union was to survive.

Lincoln had already been elected. South Carolina was about to secede from the Union. The atmosphere in Washington was tense as if charged with electricity. Johnson rose from his seat in the Senate,

"Sir," he exclaimed, addressing the Chair, "I will stand by the Constitution of this country as it is, and by all its guaranties. I am not for breaking up this great confederacy. I am for holding on to it as it is, with the mode and manner pointed out in the instrument for its own amendment. It was good enough for Washington, for Adams, for Jefferson, and for Jackson. It is good enough for me. I intend to stand by it, and to insist upon a compliance with all its guaranties, North and South."

Senator Morton, an arch radical from Indiana, was a bitter opponent of Andrew Johnson and voted for his impeachment. Yet when Johnson died and resolutions of respect were offered in the Senate, Morton arose to pay tribute. Confessing that Johnson was a man with remarkable traits of character, Morton not only eulogized him but also read excerpts from Johnson's great speeches which Morton said he had taken pains to hunt up. Then commented the Senator from Indiana: "Those were brave words to be uttered by Andrew Johnson under the circumstances. I admired and honored him at the time; I do so now, and ever shall. He was a brave man, and he encountered risks and subjected himself to dangers of which we of the North knew scarcely anything. Perhaps no other man in Congress exerted the same influence as Andrew Johnson on the public sentiment of the North at the beginning of the war."

Unquestionably, these two speeches of Johnson's did more to clarify and crystallize the thinking in the North on the questions involved than the word or actions of any other one man.

The terrible war came, and when the legislature of Tennessee finally voted to leave the Union, Johnson stood adamant as one of the eternal hills in his refusal to follow his State into secession. When all other southern Senators withdrew, Johnson alone remained. The enormous importance of his stand was at once recognized by President Lincoln, who in the second year of the war appointed him military governor of Tennessee.

By the irony of fate the eastern portion of the State, which was strongly pro-Union and whence Johnson himself came, remained under Confederate control until the summer of 1863; and Johnson actually began his work of reconstruction in western Tennessee after Grant's capture of Fort Henry and Fort Donelson and the subsequent flight of the Confederate State Government to Memphis. I shall not attempt to enter into a discussion of his course as a military governor; suffice to say that in circumstances of peculiar difficulty in which he was forced to exercise arbitrary power, Johnson acquitted himself with great courage and wisdom, and with the collapse of the Confederate armies in Tennessee, was able to bring about the restoration of civil government and restore Tennessee into a practical working relation with the Union. At Johnson's request, Lincoln exempted Tennessee from the Emancipation Proclamation because, adhering to his deep convictions on States rights, Johnson wanted Tennessee to free the slaves within its own border.

Meanwhile he paid a bitter price for his loyalty:

Harried day and night, in hourly danger from ambush, with a price on his head, he had been forced to leave his family behind the Confederate lines here. Their home was seized and they would have starved but for the food smuggled to them by loyal mountaineers. Patriotism sometimes exacts a high fee.

With the approach of the campaign of 1864, Lincoln decided to appeal to the country on a National Union ticket. This meant that loyal Democrats were invited to support the administration which, in turn, meant that a pro-Union Democrat would be invited to be Lincoln's running mate, and Johnson was the obvious choice. The President was triumphantly reelected and on March 4, 1865, Andrew Johnson became Vice President of the United States. The awful tragedy of the President's assassination the following month placed Johnson in Lincoln's chair and one of the grimmest chapters of United States history began.

As Johnson entered the Presidential Chair Senator Key describes the emotions of the South:

"I remember well the alarm of the people of the South when the sad news was borne to them of President Lincoln's assassination. Mr. Johnson's denunciations of those who had opposed the Federal Government, and the punishment and penalties he had invoked and threatened, justified the gravest apprehensions. But when he came to be President; when his enemies had laid down their arms and furled their flag, and after the power to pardon as well as to punish had passed into his hands, satisfied, as he must have been, that the great mass of the southern people had been honest, though mistaken, as he believed, in the motives which had impelled their action, all his bitterness and acrimony toward them were dissipated. The man sank himself out of sight, and the President of the powerful Nation shielded his late foes by clemency, though the liberal policy he exercised toward them contributed powerfully to lose him the support of the party which had placed him in office. He who could exercise such magnanimity under such circumstances had a great heart and unflinching fortitude. Those who think Mr. Johnson was cold and very selfish never understood his inner nature.

In many respects he was strange and peculiar so that it is no matter of surprise that many who did not fully comprehend him had an unfavorable estimate of some of the qualities of his mind and heart."

Immediately after taking the oath of office in the old Ebbitt Hotel, upon being notified of Lincoln's death, a small delegation of radical Senators headed by Senator Thad Stevens called upon him and proposed a course of harsh action, later referred to as carpet bag rule, toward the South which they expected him to follow. Johnson's reply was:

"I shall carry out Lincoln's policies as I understand them. I am sorry." When he uttered those words Johnson know the opposition which he was to encounter in Congress.

As President he was standing by his duty as he saw it regardless of threats and opposition, just as he had done as a United States Senator. It was there that the radicals resolved to contrive his impeachment and have him succeeded by a man who would do their bidding.

It is not my purpose, even if time were not lacking, to enter into that dark and somber record. As I said earlier, it is not the statesman we are considering primarily today, but the man. I shall, therefore, content myself with the brief but admirable summary as set forth in the pamphlet issued last year by the Department of the Interior.

"Johnson lacked Lincoln's prestige as a victorious war President, and he did not have Lincoln's political finesse in handling opposition groups. His liberal policy was soon frustrated by Congress. Seeking to regain political control of the country and curtail the powers of the Presidency, which had increased during the war period, the leaders in Congress, known as radicals, denied seats to newly elected Representatives from the Southern States. This prevented the natural combination of northern and southern Democrats and insured radical control of the legislative branch. With radical influence extending to two-thirds, thus destroying the effect of the President's vetoes, Congress enacted its own reconstruction program. This featured military rule of the Southern States, enfranchisement of the Negro, and disenfranchisement of the Confederate veterans. On the whole, the program proved a failure. Based on force, it collapsed in 1877 with the end of bayonet rule."

The struggle between a resolute Executive and equally unyielding Congress led almost inevitably to impeachment.

The radicals had only been biding their time. The issue was joined on the Tenure of Office Act, which limited the power of the President to remove officials whose appointments had been approved by the Senate. In 1867, in defiance of this act which he regarded as unconstitutional, President Johnson removed from office, a disloyal member of his Cabinet, Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton, who was conspiring with the radicals for his impeachment.

Johnson was then impeached by the House of Representatives. The trial was held before the Senate from March to May 1868. The final vote was found to be one short of the two-thirds necessary for conviction, and Johnson was acquitted. This is the only time in our history that a President has been impeached. The Tenure of Office Act, modified during Grant's administration and repealed in part in 1887, was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1926. And, thus, Johnson was at last vindicated by the Supreme Court. After the fateful years of the Presidency, Johnson returned to his home here, his courage unshaken, his head bloody but unbowed. He continued his interest in political affairs and, after an unsuccessful candidacy he was chosen Senator in 1874. On March 5, 1875, he took his seat once more in the Chamber he had quitted 13 years before. The session lasted merely a few weeks and Johnson left the scene which had witnessed so many triumphs and defeats. Before the Senate adjourned he had made one more memorable address in which he displayed all of his old fire and eloquence. On March 22, 1875, he delivered a severe attack on President Grant whom he could not forgive for having declined the appointment as Secretary of War to succeed Stanton, and on the administration's policy in Louisiana, and closed with the plea in which his spirit and life's philosophy may be said to be forever enshrined:

"Let peace and prosperity be restored to the land. May God bless this people; may God save the Constitution."

May these words linger in our own minds and hearts as we turn over today this hallowed dwelling, this humble but precious workshop, this cemetery where his head lies pillowed on the Constitution, to the people of the United States and their posterity as a National Monument to America's great commoner, Andrew Johnson.

Law Day, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, May 1, 1958, having been designated as Law Day, U. S. A., by Presidential proclamation, the governing body of the School of Law of Seton Hall University has appropriately urged its faculty and student body to carry out and support the objectives of the proclamation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herein the greeting addressed to the principals of schools under Catholic auspices in New Jersey by Rev. Thomas M. Reardon, regent, and Miriam T. Rooney, dean of the School of Law of Seton Hall, together with the text of the Presidential proclamation:

To the Principals of Schools Under Catholic Auspices in New Jersey, Greeting:

The enclosed proclamation of Law Day U. S. A., by President Eisenhower is an historic document. It marks the first time that official recognition has been given to the tremendous importance our great common law system has upon our lives. Please read, or otherwise inform all students about it on May 1, 1958, and, if possible, explain something of the history of the common law, from its formulation by the priest-judges in the Middle Ages to our own day, and point out how essential it is to the development of true liberty.

This request is made upon the recommendation of the president of the American Bar Association, Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., who believes that one of the best ways of overcoming the current widespread disrespect for law is to make our legal system better understood. The fields of traffic-safety laws, crimes of violence by youthful offenders, and the attempt to settle international disputes by war instead of law, he mentions as particularly flagrant areas of disrespect at present. The first day of May was chosen designedly to emphasize the need to strengthen law instead of force.

Seton Hall University School of Law supports this nationwide program strongly. As the first and only law school under Catholic auspices in New Jersey, it is undertaking to ask the cooperation of all other schools under Catholic auspices in the State in making our great legal system better understood and appreciated by our citizens generally.

At the beginning of the month dedicated to our lady, it also urges that as many as possible say a prayer for the restoration of our law in Christo, thereby joining with the court criers who, before requiring those who speak in court to call God to witness to the truth of what they say, have, day after day for centuries never failed to say, in one form or another: God save our country and this court.

A brief note to the dean of Seton Hall Law School, Newark, N. J., or to President Rhyne of the American Bar Association, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Ill., reporting the way in which your school has observed the first Law Day, U. S. A., May 1, 1958, would be much appreciated.

(Rev.) THOMAS M. REARDON, *Regent.*
MIRIAM THERESA ROONEY, *Dean.*

THE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION: LAW DAY, U. S. A.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 3, 1958.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas it is fitting that the people of this Nation should remember with pride and vigilantly guard the great heritage of liberty, justice, and equality under law which our forefathers bequeathed to us; and

Whereas it is our moral and civic obligatiton as free men and as Americans to preserve and strengthen that great heritage; and

Whereas the principle of guaranteed fundamental rights of individuals under the law is the heart and sinew of our Nation, and distinguishes our governmental system from the type of government that rules by might alone; and

Whereas our Government has served as an inspiration and a beacon light for oppressed peoples of the world seeking freedom, justice, and equality for the individual under law; and

Whereas universal application of the principle of the rule of law in the settlement of international disputes would greatly enhance the cause of a just and enduring peace; and

Whereas a day of national dedication to the principle of government under law would afford us an opportunity better to understand and appreciate the manifold virtues of such a government and focus the attention of the world upon them:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Thursday, May 1, as Law Day. I urge the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and I especially urge the legal profession, the press, and the radio, television, and motion-picture industries to promote and to participate in the observance of that day.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Factory Worker's Purchasing Power Down in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on purchasing power in Los Angeles by the State of California Division of Statistics

and Research, which is a sober pronouncement in the face of the cheery statements that the American people are being handed. After all, what is important to prosperity is consumer ability to buy not just the mainstays of life, but such hard goods as appliances and other durable articles. This summary, from an official State source rather than a political source, is proof positive of the decline in purchasing power for a great mass of people.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
DIVISION OF LABOR
STATISTICS AND RESEARCH,
San Francisco, April 27, 1958.

FACTORY WORKER'S PURCHASING POWER DOWN IN LOS ANGELES

Purchasing power of the take-home pay of factory workers in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area fell in March to the lowest level in 2½ years, Ernest B. Webb, California director of industrial relations, announced today.

Gross earnings before deductions averaged $94.36 per week last month, the highest March on record. This was nearly $8 per week above the September 1955 average of $86.49.

Despite this gain, the purchasing power of the average factory paycheck is no higher than it was 2½ years ago.

After allowing for increased tax deductions and the rise in consumer prices the buying power of the factory worker's net take-home pay is back to the level of September 1955.

Peak purchasing power of factory earnings in the Los Angeles area was recorded in December 1956. Since then the trend has been generally downward.

Measured from a year ago March, purchasing power of the average factory worker's paycheck is down more than 3 percent.

Lines on the Washington National Cathedral by the Honorable Robert B. Anderson

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a very inspiring statement was made at a recent meeting of the Washington National Cathedral Association. Not only was the content of great significance but the form, blank verse, was both original and creative. The author of this religious verse was none other than the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson. The ability of a man of affairs to write such beautiful poetry and express himself with majestic utterances is in the best tradition of the Founding Fathers, who were men of many accomplishments. His sentiments reflect great insight into the character of America and keen awareness of our need to abide by the rule of law to reconcile our many differences. I am pleased to share Secretary Anderson's reflections with my colleagues, under leave to extend my remarks, as follows:

LINES ON THE WASHINGTON NATIONAL CATHEDRAL

(By Robert B. Anderson)

A nation needs to pray;
For things it has—for things it has not earned,
For gifts from men now dead, some dead
So long ago we never knew they lived.
Their hopes and dreams, their genius and their sweat
Now molded into wood and sculptured stone,
Iron and steel and countless things we cannot sense
But by awareness of an ordered scheme
That had to come from minds and plans and hopes
And struggle to reality.

A nation needs to pray:
For what will come out of a time unknowingly beyond,
Obscured by present tasks and inabilities,
Scarcely glimpsed by imagination,
Yet struggled toward and with a certainty
Beyond our reach except for fragments,
Parts of patterns, tossed into our paths
That lead us to believe we view the whole;
And viewing, pray that we may be
Spared confusion, and avoid futility;
That we may dream of the inaccessible,
And touch the possible.

A nation needs to pray:
That in humility we see that greatness
Is not measured by industrial grandeur,
Or destiny achieved by things we touch,
By things produced, nor things consumed,
Nor things we set afloat upon the sea,
Nor send into the air,
Nor delving down, gouged out of earth;
Nor is it known by tower set on tower
Groping for a finite place in infinity
Nor by any other things
That man may proudly say
Were made by mind or hand.

All these we take, or make
In gratitude—with thanks
For what was added to us by the past,
Or by our contemporaries,
Out of substance that was part of earth
As we, before we became articulate.

These things we do that men
May eat and sleep—may work and rest,
And have a separateness.
And yet when all is done, we still shall seek
To yet define that which is humanity,
That quality that makes of mass,
And flesh, and good and bad,
A nation: That needs to pray.

What occupies our time?
What thoughts fill our minds and make innumerable demands
On limited intelligence?
What thoughts come in the darkness of the night,
When sleep evades us, and spectres march
Down mental avenues of thought,
To challenge what our place on earth may be?

How brought to awe are we by history's wars!
Fought for causes that men hold dear yet still dispute;
Wrought by power, ambition, expansion, or the need
To hold these in abeyance that others may survive.

How we cling to things called institutions;
So frequently the name assumed by rationality;
How we are bound to customs of long use,
Defying what we know is best for now,
And blinding us to that which would enlarge
The quality that makes us each distinct,
Yet part of all—new faiths and new beliefs.

How preoccupied is man with progress;
With new homes and factories, devices that spare work,
Machines that humble speed and challenge light,
And a hundred thousand things to use, or be used by.
How right it is to give a proper place
To those material things which free the mind,
And point indeed to other worlds beyond,
Yet all man's goods have value only in regard
To man's real worth as man.

How greatly we concern ourselves with change;
Cling to the old chair—keep with sentiment
Each remembrance of vanished youth.
Ground becomes hallowed by age and experience,
And each new building tears away a part
Of history's accumulation, left
Wherever men have put their mark on time.
Still every space that we advance
From antiquity to eternity is change.
What forces challenge the constancy of our march!

How many things divide us!
Color, creed,
A different faith or tongue, geography;
The customs and the habits of our land,
A heritage as much a part of us as flesh and bone;
Yet all the time we seek to find the things
That will unite us; some universality
That spans our differences.
We labor to produce by rule and plan,
By treaty and documents, what we fail
In practice and in precept to lay down.

And in our search for common truths,
So frequently we translate these truths to mean
That others must conform to what we hold is best,
Regardless of their own inheritance.
Even that which we most highly prize:
Our freedoms, our democracy, our way of life
We would export neatly packaged,
As we use it, and fail to understand
That others would adjust that which we see,
Only in the trappings of our fathers,
To fit their own accustomed usages.

From out of all that troubles us,
Toward solutions that clarify and not confound us
Where shall we seek the answer?
How shall peace be made a practice and not a principle?
How make justice a world reality?
How minimize the frailties of man's rule
And live by the rule of law?

How shall we reckon with the forces of energy,
When for the first time in man's history,
We have in sight the possibility of
Freeing man to exert his own creativeness,
Rather than to toil under the dictatorship
Of need and want?

With such enchanting possibilities
Have we the means and the ability to
Avoid the use of energy to destroy?

No other question has this urgency;
No other men have faced the fearful choice
That history, pausing, places in our hands.
Yet first must come our own assured defense,
Not merely of our land and of our ways,
Not merely to protect our lives or what we hold as dear,
But in the knowledge that our free world holds
The sanctuary of the hope of man,
For freedom on this earth,
For the avoidance of world dictatorship,
Against the forward drive of ruthless power,
Of godless men, denying human worth.

So for all its awesomeness,
For all its destructiveness,

There is a moral purpose for the bomb;
There is a reason for its terror,
There is a need that will exist
Until we find the yet obscured
Concern of man for man.

Time might provide the leaven for us all,
But we do not have the time to wait;
Too closely press the possibilities of destruction;
Too cumulative are the consequences of continued waste;
Too fragile are the qualities of mortality.

With all these imponderables,
Beyond the scope of mind and hand,
Our greatest need is:
For a wisdom that transcends our own;
For a devotion that insures
There is no instant of neglect
For that, wherein is held
The fate of all. This Nation
Needs to pray.

Throughout our most enlightened past,
When needs were great,
Men built retreats where they might be
Alone with Diety. Today, they
Stand as monuments to moments
When we reached for that beyond
Our grasp. They are our shrines.

Today, we build an altar:
A great cathedral,
Where on bended knee,
With bowed head,
And reverent heart,
We search for the Divine
And for immortality.

Here there is no creed to exclude us;
No doctrine denys us
Access to the threshold,
Where even human voices penetrate
The secrecy of eternity.

How overpowering to contemplate
Man talks with God.

Is there one to say this temple
Should be less imposing, and enduring,
Less magnificent?
Then let him define the limits
Of factory size, or towers and buildings,
Where commerce reigns;
Or stadiums and pleasure palaces;
Let him measure the limits of finite things,
Lest anyone should say we should do less
In building things for God than man.

Here the widow's mite,
The sums of kings of industry,
The labor, and the dreams
Of all who give a thing of value,
Are melded into one:
A nation's shrine of Trinity.
And each, who gives, may know the
Whole is part of his own offering.

So may it be that we, and all the host
Who follow on, find here the solace,
And the way through man's recurring doubts,
To peace, and what endures in souls,
That make of us the children of immortal heritage;
And here come to believe that earth
Will know its destiny, and man his purpose,
When each shall pray
"Thy will be done."

May 1—Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial concerning the proclamation by the President to observe Thursday, May 1, as Law Day. This editorial entitled "Law and Loyalty" appeared in the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, on May 1, 1958.

The editorial follows:

LAW AND LOYALTY

President Eisenhower by proclamation has called on the people of the United States to observe Thursday, May 1, as Law Day. In his proclamation the President urges the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies and activities and especially urges the legal profession, the press, radio, television, and motion picture industries to promote and to participate in the observance of that day.

President Eisenhower points out that the people of this Nation should remember with pride and vigilantly guard the great heritage of liberty, justice and equality under the law which our forefathers bequeathed to us.

He further states in his proclamation that the principle of guaranteed fundamental rights of individuals under the law is the heart and sinew of our Nation, and distinguishes our governmental system from the type of government that rules by might alone.

It so happens that in order to combat communism, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conceived the idea a good many years ago that May 1 would be a good day on which to demonstrate to the world the ideals on which our country was founded and to set forth our loyalty to those ideals and all which we hold true in our endeavor to live peacefully with all nations, but to let the world know, also, that our faith in those ideals will not permit us to lose the courage to uphold them.

Fortunately the ideas do not conflict. Dedication to the principle of government under law and loyalty to our country go hand-in-hand. Proper observance of the law brings of itself loyalty to the country and loyalty to the country must result in recognition of law which governs the people.

Both ideas may be observed by the citizens of the United States with proper ceremonies and a national observance of these ideas can only result in better citizenship. Good citizens obey the law and good citizens are always loyal to their country.

America is being challenged by a ruthless world power, without decent principles but only the will to conquer—a power which has dedicated itself to world domination.

Never before have we needed in the United States of America the unity of purpose to withstand any onslaught from this common enemy of freedom.

This thought of a special day for our citizens to set aside as a day in which to proclaim our faith in our country and our will to withstand any attack upon it proved to be an excellent one.

State by State and city by city the suggestion set forth by the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been accepted and scarcely a spot in the Union has not taken up the challenge to Russia on May 1 to show the world that we are united in our determination to oppose any encroachment on our freedom.

Loyalty Day has now become a part of our yearly ritual as governor after governor proclaims May 1 as the day on which all citizens of the Nation join in patriotic exercises to show the world, friendly and inimical, that we are really one, united and indivisible.

It is important that we mark this day, May 1, and join in the pageants and processions to prove to all the world that despite our profession of peace, which is an honest one, we are still ready to defend ourselves and, if necessary, our friends against inroads which might deprive us and them of the right to live in freedom and to pursue the quiet way we seek "with malice toward none and charity to all."

It is a good thought to realize that Loyalty Day was the idea of a veterans' organization—an organization whose members had fought the good fight on land and sea—individuals who knew the horrors of war and who were determined to see to it that their fellow countrymen might understand the sacrifices of their fighting men and dedicate themselves to a love of country which these same fighting men had shown when need arose.

More than 30 years ago the leaders of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars pledged their separate organizations to the support of a common definition of Americanism. They agreed that:

"Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undividad allegiance to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity."

Believing fully in that definition of Americanism, the leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars decided that, if possible, the people of our country might be made to understand just what America and Americanism stood for, in order to counteract the bombastic show of might paraded by Russia, and they chose May 1, the big day in Russia, to see that the Red demonstrations no longer went unchallenged.

Our American patriots made no move to put down any show of communism in the United States by those deluded followers of this false gospel. They decided, however, that we must show the world that millions of Americans are proud of their allegiance to the United States.

Thus the VFW adopted the idea of counter-demonstrations—parades of loyal Americans that would be big enough to capture the headlines from the Communists.

The idea was a success from the start and today, on May Day, May 1, hundreds of thousands of loyal Americans are marching to show their allegiance to the flag and the country which they call their own.

Except in time of peril we are not a particularly demonstrative people when it comes to showing our patriotism. We all know that deep down within us it exists and we are inclined to let it go at that.

For this reason Loyalty Day as sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars was a splendid thought. It brought home to all of us the realization of the greatness of our Nation and what we owed to it. If for only 1 day it made us feel that if the time came when we must defend ourselves we would be as ready as our forefathers from 1776 to the present and even in the future.

We commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for its sponsorship of Loyalty Day and we recommend to all our people to join in its recognition, if only for a few short moments, on May 1, in order that our hearts may swell again in the love of country which is a part of us and to let the whole world know that, bewildered as we may seem by the problems at home and abroad which beset us, we are one in proclaiming our loyalty to our country no matter what the cost—that we are willing to fight and die, if need be, for the freedom which we feel is our just due as citizens of the United States of America.

So also do we commend the American Bar Association for sponsoring Law Day and the President of the United States for setting aside this particular day to recognize our moral and civic obligation as freemen and Americans to strengthen our heritage.

As we have endeavored to point out, law and loyalty to country go hand in hand. Where the one is observed the other will be

found and we urge that all our citizens join in observation of May 1 with respect for the law of our land and love of its patriotic traditions.

The Missouri School of Journalism

SPEECH
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, this year of 1958 is the 50th anniversary of the University of Missouri School of Journalism. The University of Missouri, which I had the honor and opportunity of attending, was the first State university established west of the Mississippi. The University of Missouri School of Journalism was the first school of journalism in the world. We of Missouri are proud of our university and proud of the fact that the Missouri School of Journalism is known and honored by the free press throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the record the following article printed in the Los Angeles Times, April 20, 1958:

THE MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

Journalism is something like motherhood: It is neither a trade nor a very formal profession, yet it requires great skill and understanding from its superior practitioners, and these are hard things to teach. Consequently journalism schools, with a few honorable exceptions, are vacuous places, manipulated by teachers with little newspaper experience, much flam and no flair, who stand in the same relation to their students as the spinster social worker to the troubled bride.

Today we wish to salute one of the honorable exceptions, the University of Missouri School of Journalism, which has just weathered its first 50 years. Even disenchanted old editors show a gleam of interest when a Missouri alumnus comes along and some newspapers operate a sort of futurity stakes, picking their entries before they graduate.

The school is making quite a thing of the anniversary—a 10-month celebration beginning in August with a noble theme: "A Stronger Free Press for a Better Free World." President Elmer Ellis of the university and Dean Earl F. English of the School of Journalism said in their joint announcement:

"We believe that today the free world is confronted with the most serious threat to its existence since the dawn of western civilization, and that—more than ever before in history—the preservation of this free world depends on the ability of its citizens to exchange information and opinions openly without fear of retribution.

"We believe that the primary responsibility for keeping these avenues of expression open lies not with the Government or with any other agency or group, but with the journalism profession itself * * *.

"We believe that the immense contributions of the communications field are too often 'taken for granted' in democratic societies and that there is a need to emphasize these contributions through a series of events which can earn worldwide attention."

The United States has some pretty poor newspapers along with the great ones and good ones, but the lot of them averages out as the best of the free presses of the world. The Missouri School of Journalism has surely done as much as any single instrumentality of education to help the American press; and if it can, during its golden jubilee, teach a larger part of the public to believe what President Ellis and Dean English believe, it will do more for newspapering—and the free world—than it, or any other school, has ever done before. The enterprise has promise, for the Missouri school has the prestige to make itself heard.

The Plight of Our Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks today to the Members of Congress who are vitally affected by the present plight of our American railroads.

Legislation is now pending to relieve the Nation's railroads of some of the restrictions heretofore, perhaps necessarily, imposed on them by the Congress as a result of which they find themselves in serious straits, particularly as to their ability to compete under present conditions.

Much water has gone over the dam since the railroads were rich and powerful both financially and politically.

Today we have to recognize the facts, and the facts are such that both management and labor are deeply concerned over the railroads ability to survive under present conditions.

The proper defense of our country, the maintenance and expansion of its productive capacity and the economic well-being of our people require the sound maintenance of at least the existing network of national railroads. They are not now being properly maintained. The Pennsylvania Railroad alone admits that essential maintenance in terms of money of close to $200 million has been permitted to go undone. What this has already meant in terms of disruption of commerce and public inconvenience was illustrated by the almost total collapse of the Pennsylvania system for several days at the end of February this year and again in early March.

Over and beyond the damaging amount of deferred maintenance already accumulated, the Pennsylvania Railroad proposes to discontinue all heavy repair work on freight and passenger cars, to discontinue 12 percent of its normal railroad renewal program and one-third of its normal tie replacements.

The employees of the railroads, for the most part excluded from the improving benefits of unemployment insurance, have been the most immediate and most serious sufferers from the railroad crisis. In the last 6 months the Pennsylvania has laid off 18,600 employees. Men with 20 years and more of railroad service have exhausted their unemployment benefits under the railroad retirement act and, with their families, are now the public concern of the railroad communities. And the Pennsylvania now announces the impending layoff of 3,000 more. The plight of these employees is also the immediate and pressing concern of Congress.

Spokesman representing over 25,000 railroad employees urges prompt congressional action to revive the railroads.

For years the people of western Pennsylvania have been talking about the overregulation that has made the Nation's railroads the poor relatives in our industrial economy. For the past year the whole country has been talking about this alarming situation. And for the past few months, since the start of hearings by a Senate subcommittee, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Florida, the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, the talk has intensified.

Almost every newspaper in this great land has urged the Government to take action before bankruptcy overtakes some of our leading railroads and turns this recession into a full-fledged depression. Thousands of well-authenticated news articles and editorials have appeared, pointing to the deteriorating situation.

Despite this universal call for action, the White House has procrastinated. Three years ago the famous Cabinet committee report was published, but nothing came of it. The Secretary of Commerce recently, on two occasions, postponed scheduled appearances before the Smathers committee—the last time being March 31.

With the Congress eagerly awaiting administration proposals, and looking for some semblance of leadership, the Secretary last week finally acted, but he only tossed an anchor to a drowning man. The administration proposals are five watered-down recommendations that sound noble but mean little.

The mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse.

This recession is real—make no mistake about that. Unemployment is so widespread in my area of western Pennsylvania that we think in terms of depression, rather than recession. John L. Lewis once made a good distinction between the two terms when he said: "When the man next door loses his job, it's a recession. When you lose yours, it's a depression."

One of the quickest and surest ways to get the national economy back on its feet is to permit the railroads—our second largest industry—to earn the money they need to call back furloughed employees and buy the billions of dollars worth of materials they need to rehabilitate their plants and equipment.

It is not only the railroad industry that is suffering. All the industries they buy from are suffering. I am worried about these railroad people, and the unemployed railroad suppliers as people. Because so many railroads are losing money, more railroad maintenance workers have been furloughed. Track that should have been renewed has not been laid. Because those new rails were not purchased, more steel workers are

without jobs. Because those railroad and steelworkers have been furloughed, their planned purchases of automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and television sets have been postponed. So more workers are jobless, and the vicious circle grows while the administration does nothing.

Surely the plight of the railroads is not a partisan issue. It is true that Senator SMATHERS, who has taken the lead in getting something done about the deteriorating railroad situation, is a Democrat. But the New York Herald Tribune agrees with him. Let me quote from an editorial appearing in that Republican newspaper on April 24:

No other single national asset is more vital to the security and the future growth of the United States than its 221,000 miles of railroads, the largest system in the world.

Were enemy paratroopers dropped to destroy it, the Army would be called out to prevent it.

Nevertheless, it is now being destroyed, just as effectively as if paratroopers were demolishing it.

Speaking of the White House proposals, the editorial continues:

All this is needed.

But much more is needed.

What is needed, above all, is the creation of a national transportation policy. Here are some of the urgent needs of such a policy:

It should combine all the regulatory agencies into a single Department of Transportation.

The entire concept of regulation should be changed. Instead of being based on the obsoleted concept of monopoly, it should be aimed at creating the maximum possible growth and efficiency.

The editorial concludes:

An adequate railway system is absolutely indispensable, as World War II proved, to national defense.

Without it, a growing nation faces economic strangulation.

Let's quit strangling ourselves.

Let's put the railroads on the track—on new tracks, with new wheels.

To which I would like to add, amen.

In an editorial of the same date, entitled "Crumbs for the Crumbling Railroads," the Cleveland Plain Dealer, a politically independent newspaper, had this to say:

Once again the Nation's railroads have received a roundhouse, and we don't mean the kind used for the care and feeding of locomotives.

This was a punch—of pure disappointment.

It came from an administration which for 6 years has talked sympathy for rail ills. But the cure as set forth in Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks' recommendations to Congress, sound more like sugar pills than penicillin.

The editorial went on to say:

The closest Weeks came toward getting at the heart of this thing was when he urged revision of Federal rate making policies to encourage more service and price competition while providing adequate minimum regulation.

Nothing specific, of course. Only a broad generalization that something should be done—sometime, somewhere.

Again I add, amen.

I have seen similar strong editorials, extremely critical of the weak-kneed White House proposals, in such newspapers as the New York Times, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Wall Street Journal, the Philadelphia Bulletin and the New York Journal of Commerce. But nowhere have I been able to find favorable comment.

Just as the White House has vacillated with a wavering wait-and-see policy during this depression, as millions of men plod the streets in a vain search to find a job, so has the administration's feeble and timid approach failed to offer a prescription that would cure the ills of the tottering railroad industry.

The situaiton is frightening. Just last Friday the Nation's two largest railroads reported combined losses for the first quarter of this year of more than $32 million. How long can this go on? Must we wait until these roads are bankrupt before we act?

It is readily apparent that we cannot look to the White House for help in solving this serious situation.

It is apparent, too, that if the industry—and the vitally interested public—is to get any relief, the leadership will have to come from the Congress. In the near future we will have the recommendations of the Smathers committee. I trust they will reject the caution and timidity of the administration's recommendations. And when we get the report, let us not then start long hearings on this side of the Hill. The time for study is over. Now is the time for action.

The latest figures from the Pittsburgh Press show that the 18,600 unemployed railroaders in Pennsylvania far exceeds that of any other State. I note also that Ben Fairless, in testifying before the SMATHER'S subcommittee, said that railroad purchases of steel had been cut in half and that more than 20,000 steelworkers were unemployed because of this cutback. I do not know what proportion of the 20,000 are Pennsylvania unemployed, but it must be at least one-third. Therefore we already have accounted for better than 25,000 of the Pennsylvania unemployed. All directly attributable to the deteriorating plight of the railroads.

The point is this, no State in the Union has as much to gain from a solution of the railroad problem as the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

A very interesting angle on this subject is residual oil. It is seldom considered as being of interest to the railroads and yet the importance of residual oil has a great bearing on the loss of income and labor work days.

For instance, between residual oils and refined waste some 50 million tons of coal is replaced with this import. Setting aside the millions of man-hours and loss of income to mine labor and management the figures on railroad losses are astounding.

At an average carloading of 60 tons of coal the rails lost approximately 83,000 carloadings of freight last year and will lose even more this year.

The average tonnage freight is $3.50 per ton making a loss in railroad revenue of $175 million for 1 year.

One can imagine the millions of man-hours and paycheck dollars lost by labor.

Sometimes one wonders whether we have taken enough time to evaluate this problem both internally and externally.

Evidently some of our communities are awakening to the danger to both the community and the country.

In closing and under leave granted, I submit for insertion in the RECORD an editorial typical of the many editorials in my local newspapers that reflects the serious consideration every community is giving this problem and the resolution unanimously adopted by the City Council of New Kensington similar to resolutions passed by the cities and towns in my district.

The editorial and resolution follow:

[From the Vandergrift (Pa.) News of February 28, 1958]

THE RAILROAD'S PLIGHT

It is difficult to feel sorry for any person who has brought a host of troubles on himself through shortsighted, greedy policies. That is why the railroads are today having so much trouble presenting their case to the public. They asked for it. They got it. And now they are suffering.

Railroads are essential to our present economy. Particularly in a time of war they are essential, as no other overland means of moving freight has proved economically feasible. But the railroads are being choked by a lack of profits, and, when and if the point of no return is reached, only one alternative will remain. That is Government operation of the freight arteries.

The unfortunate part about the suffering of the railroads is that, unless something is done, all of us will suffer. The fact that railroads at one time were monopolies and misused their power is no longer revelant. What was done to curb the railroads' misuse of power no longer applies, yet the Interstate Commerce Commission is still hamstringing the railroads as if they were monopolies.

When the railroads were new, the Government subsidized their building. But the men who actually constructed the roadbeds used the taxpayer's money for dividends and graft rather than for building or improvement of the rails. Then a mad scramble began, with powerful groups fighting to control important roadways. Eventually power concentrated in the hands of a few, and these few gave rebates to favored customers, upped the price to midwestern farmers when crops were good, even indulged in stock watering and manipulation to such a shocking degree than an aroused public finally put a stop to the nonsense.

Once Government control was established, about the turn of the century, those in charge failed to keep pace with the times. Private automobiles have taken over 90 percent of the Nation's passenger traffic. The other 10 percent must be divided between trains, buses and airplanes, and the trains are the losers. At one time losses in passenger service could be made up in profit from freight, but today even the freight profit is dwindling.

Profits are down because of two reasons. First, the railroads were not farsighted enough to keep up with technological advancements. Second, Government regulations do not allow them to follow normal good business practices. Railroads are forbidden to bid for mail, as trucks do. They must maintain duplicating, unprofitable lines. They are taxed and taxed from every side. They are not allowed to raise rates. And all the while they maintain and pay taxes on their roadways, and build their own stations, they watch their competitors being subsidized by the Government.

So, if the railroads asked for their present troubles, who is the loser? We can't say they made their bed and they should lie in it.

For if we do, we suffer too. The only thing the railroads need now is the chance to compete on equal footing. That fact was brought out at recent congressional hearings. Now it's up to Congress to chart a sensible course midway between absolute free competition and Government regulation.

Whereas the railroad industry, which has served as the backbone of the Nation's transportation system during times of war and peace, faces a crisis and threatens to have serious and far-reaching effects on the economy of the United States; and

Whereas the effects of the railroad's plight has resulted in a steady decline of employment with thousands of railroad workers unemployed in western Pennsylvania alone; and

Whereas the railroads have been large users of steel, aluminum, and glass and the cutbacks in purchases have meant curtailments in these various industries which are vital to this area; and

Whereas the sound financial condition of railroads is a prerequisite to the industrial development and future industrial progress of New Kensington, Westmoreland County, and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, 1. That the Mayor and City Council of the City of New Kensington go on record as commending the purpose of the current hearings before Congress and urge that every effort be made to reestablish the competitive position and financial health of the railroad.

2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, chairman of the Subcommitee on Surface Transportation of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.; to the members of this committee; and to Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK and EDWARD MARTIN, and Representative JOHN H. DENT.

Capital: Antirecession Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Nation's Agriculture, May 1958 issue, by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, is most timely.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial entitled "Capital: Antirecession Medicine":

The strength of the United States economy is in its productivity. We produce more goods, more services and more farm products per worker than any other nation in the world. What are the reasons for this high level of production which is the envy of the world?

Other nations have equal or superior natural resources, scientific knowledge or skilled craftsmen. However, no other nation has accumulated and invested as much capital in the tools and machinery for production as have we in the United States.

The real difference between the workers in India, for example and those in this country is that we have earned and saved the necessary capital to buy tools and machines to replace hand labor.

The free choice capitalist system which has worked so well for us is founded on private sources for capital funds. The socialist nations depend upon public sources for capital funds. Private capitalism succeeds because the people have incentives to work and to save. They are compensated for the risk of investment and the delayed use of their lands by interest and dividend payments.

Public sources for capital are often inadequate and unreliable because investment decisions are made on a political bias rather than on the basis of the greatest need. Furthermore, the Government depends primarily upon high taxes on income and profits for its source of investment funds.

High taxes on the income of individuals reduces their incentive to work harder to secure more income. Thus Government financing of capital needs is self-defeating—it results in inadequate funds to purchase tools and machines, lower production, and a gradually declining standard of living. Freedom of choice in the investment of private funds stimulates the flow of capital while Government collection tends to dry up the source of these capital funds.

Industrial payrolls—jobs of all kinds—depend upon a steady flow of new capital from private savings. Government tax and fiscal policies influence the amount and rate of savings and investments made by individuals. Continuous inflation, such as we have had during the last several years, depreciates the value of savings.

Heavy Government spending which results in a high level of taxation reduces the incentive to earn and also the ability of business corporations to accumulate capital from earnings. Perhaps the current recession is the result of inadequate capital investment—a product of inflation and excessive Government spending. If this is true, the remedy for this recession is not more spending by Government. Reduced taxation would help speed up the capital accumulation that is needed to buy more tools and machines to make more jobs. The way to lower taxes is to reduce Government spending.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Public Works and the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article appearing in the April 1958 edition of the American Public Works Association News Letter. The article is authored by Mr. Harry L. Severson.

The article follows:

PUBLIC WORKS AND THE RECESSION

(By Harry L. Severson)

Following the close of World War II, traffic jams, double shifts in the public schools, breakdowns in mass transportation, and inadequate water and sewer facilities combined to dramatize the essential nature of public works. To some extent everyone was inconvenienced by these shortages, and in certain instances business expansion was impeded. Gradually there came to be a wide recognition of the fact that inadequate public works are a deterrent to economic and social progress. Consequently, the pressures upon State and local governments for large improvement of their capital facilities became very great.

In spite of the fact that the construction of large public works increased the demands for the types of labor and capital which were in short supply, due to the large volume of new construction which was also taking place in the private sectors of the economy, many business groups threw their active support behind the campaigns for such improvements as: better highways, extension of water and sewer facilities, improved ports, and additional schools. Some civic leaders, however, were disturbed because these great public works programs, although badly needed, were contributing to inflationary pressures, which continued except for two very short periods to be a serious national problem until the middle of 1957.

In the past few months, however, the storm clouds of a gathering recession have placed the situation in a different light. As the volume of unemployment began to rise to a point generally regarded as a danger signal, more and more attention has been directed to the possibility of using this large volume of needed public works as a stabilizing force. In a period of recession, it is argued, necessary projects should be speeded up, thereby offsetting to some extent the declining volume of business in the private sectors of the economy.

THE PRESENT DIFFERS FROM THE 1930'S

The discussion of the possibility of using public works to moderate an economic slump recalls the great depression of the 1930's, when the role of public works as an antidepression measure was argued at length, and faltering steps were taken belatedly to develop projects in an effort to stimulate the lagging volume of business. This experience was far from reassuring, but it does not mean that there is not much to be learned from it. Three obvious conclusions stand out: (1) Public works alone are not enough to turn the tide or even to be very effective in moderating the decline. To be effective an acceleration of public works must be accompanied by appropriate fiscal and monetary policies. (2) The earlier in the business decline that such programs (or any other antidepression measures) are started, the more likely they are to be successful. One difficulty with using public works in this connection is that it often takes a long time to get a project under way. (3) Local administration of public works is much more efficient than Federal control.

The situation today is different in many respects than it was in the 1930's. The built-in stabilizers about which we hear so much provide a more favorable environment for combating an economic slump than was the case 30 years ago. Another important difference is the fact that the population is presently expanding at a much more rapid rate. At that time the advocates of public works were to some extent plumping for make-work projects. There were serious reservations on the part of large groups about the worthwhileness of many of the projects which were advocated and in certain cases later undertaken. This was unfortunate, as it tended to induce a still further loss of faith in the future. When laborers believe that they are engaged in a make-work endeavor, cynicism develops which undermines morale and this in turn contributes to the downward spiral.

At the present time there appears to be a strong underlying feeling of optimism, sometimes more implicit in behavior than expressed openly in discussions. The economy is growing rapidly, and the younger generation in particular is acting in a manner which indicates great confidence in the future. Under these circumstances there is no reason for promoting a project which has any hint of a make-work character. The prob-

lem is rather which ones should have priority, and the political leaders who hope to use public works as a stabilizing force merely wish to reduce the lead time and push badly needed improvements through to completion somewhat more rapidly than would otherwise be the case.

THE VOLUME OF PUBLIC WORKS IS LARGE AND STILL INCREASING

The volume of public works has become so great that it must be considered in any evaluation of the business situation. From the extremely low level of $1.5 billion in 1946 construction expenditures of State and local governments have increased steadily. In 1957 they had reached an estimated total of $11 billion. As already indicated, the demand for the services provided by these improvements is also expanding rapidly and even at this rapid rate of construction (the highest on record) very little headway is being made in reducing the backlogs held over from World War II. If a substantial proportion of the needs of our expanding economy are to be met, construction expenditures of these governments must continue to expand. This upward movement is expected to carry on to a level of around $18 billion by 1962, and still higher to $25 billion by 1968. New capital facilities in approximately these amounts must be built if the hopes of individuals and communities for a continued improvement in the standard of living are to be realized.

POSITIVE ACTION REQUIRED TO KEEP PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS FROM DRAGGING

Inasmuch as a recession tends to feed upon itself for a considerable period of time, some positive action will be required to prevent these public works programs from dragging. The recession psychology tends to make voters and public officials alike more conservative. The optimism which prevailed so generally only a few months ago seems to belong to a past and perhaps somewhat naive era. The inconveniences involved in getting along with existing capital facilities do not seem quite as great as they did earlier and smaller increases to capacity are more appreciated by the public. Furthermore, the financing of the new projects is becoming increasingly difficult for the local subdivisions to arrange in spite of the easier credit policies of the Federal Reserve System and lower levels of interest rates generally. A recession causes the current expenditures of most governments to increase, while higher taxes become even more distasteful. Under these circumstances it is extremely difficult to arrange for the servicing of additional long-term debts and investors begin to scrutinize the credit quality of new offerings more sharply. When there is an upturn in business, the attitude of the voters again becomes favorable toward public works, and there is apt to be a spurt at the very top of the cycle.

A BROADER MARKET IS NEEDED FOR STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

To add still further to the problems of State and local governments in selling their bonds, the benefit of tax exemption to them has been eroding. At the close of World War II the total debt of State and local governments was approximately $16 billion, but by the middle of 1957 the large volume of new bond offerings had raised this total to over $50 billion. As the volume of new offerings continues its upward trend, the total of outstanding debt of these governments will continue to mount. It now appears that this total will cross the $100-billion mark in less than 10 years. In 1946 when tax-exempt bonds were in such short supply there was a sellers' market. The issuers enjoyed very substantial advantages at the bargaining table. If certain investors did not like a particular bond issue, there were others who were anxious to get the bonds with only minor concessions in price. But as the new offerings poured out, the portfolios in which tax exemption is very valuable gradually filled up, and as this occurred, the issuers were forced to make substantial concessions. Currently it is the investors who are in the most advantageous position in the bargaining. The issuer who wishes to get the best price must adjust his offering very carefully to conditions in the capital market. Since the portfolios which value tax exemption very highly are not growing as rapidly as the total supply of tax-exempt securities, this process will continue—except to the extent that new markets for State and local bonds are found.

One simple proposal for attracting additional funds into the tax-exempt sector of the capital market is the so-called pass-through which would allow investment companies to purchase the bonds of State and local governments and pass the interest to their shareholders without the loss of its tax-exempt status. This proposal in its broad form, such as embodied in H. R. 8702, would tap large pools of funds over the years.

CONCLUSION

After an economic slump has started, the problem of bolstering the economy to a point where the number of unemployed will begin to decline is an extremely large undertaking. This writer is firmly convinced that this cannot be done with one type of program. Rather there must be a bold approach on many fronts simultaneously. There is more than 1 way of combating a recession; in fact, since no 2 recessions are likely to run the same course, an effective plan for 1 may not be entirely feasible for another. The most promising focusing point for an antirecession program under existing circumstances appears to be a series of coordinated fiscal and monetary policies which will provide more purchasing power and easier credit. These policies should be supported by measures to stimulate the rate of construction of public works, particularly those already on the drawing boards, or which can be started quickly.

The volume of construction of capital facilities by State and local governments is so large that it cannot safely be ignored in formulating economic policies. There is a very real danger that in the absence of positive action on this front the recession psychology will result in a slowing down of plans already under consideration, thereby contributing still more to the downward spiral. One way to encourage public works is to provide State and local governments with a readier access to the accumulating pools of savings, such as would be provided by the broad pass-through. This has the advantage of costing the Federal Government very little in the way of lost revenue. Furthermore, it does not alter existing Federal, State, and local relationships. The complete control of these projects would be left at the local level, where it can be exercised most efficiently and economically.

Israel Is 10 Years Old

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, reviews Israel's 10-year progress.

We all hope that this bastion of democracy in the Middle East will continue to expand and progress and enjoy self-government and peace.

The editorial follows:

ISRAEL IS 10 YEARS OLD

The Jewish community in Gary, along with some 300 others in the United States and many in other countries throughout the world are celebrating the 10th birthday of the State of Israel (Medimet Yisrael)—"God strives," or rules.

The timing of the celebration in Israel may seem somewhat confusing. The Jewish state in Palestine was proclaimed on May 14, 1948. That was the 5th day in the month of Iyar in the Jewish calendar. The corresponding date in the Christian calendar this year was April 24. Thus the observance now.

The new state actually came into being at midnight on May 14, the moment the British mandate over Palestine ended. Two minutes later Awni Khalidy, of Iraq, paused in a United Nations Assembly debate in New York over an American trusteeship plan for Jerusalem, to declare, "The game is up." Another 9 minutes later in Washington, President Harry S. Truman issued an unexpected United States defacto recognition of the new state, acting on an appeal from Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the late Zionist leader who was to be declared the first president of Israel.

The American gesture threw the special U. N. meeting into a turmoil and caused some bad feelings between the United States and Britain. But de jure recognition was held off until the following January 31 after the first elected Israeli Government took over.

As British troops left the new Israeli nation, five Arab countries joined in an attack. The Israelis won that war, amazingly in view of the odds against them. They have more than held their own in the intermittent fighting that has followed.

Tragically, there has been much such fighting and there still is only an uneasy truce in the Holy Land. The world cannot be happy over that phase of the last decade in Palestine, nor can the blame for it be assessed entirely against either side. The problem of establishing peace is a thorny one that must still be worked out.

Aside from that, however, there is reason for great satisfaction in Israel, and in the world's Jewish communities, for what has been accomplished in the new nation. Jews and non-Jews can join in applauding a tremendous development.

Israel had a population of only 650,000 when it was established in May 1948. In the decade it has tripled in numbers. An insurge of Jews from all over the world, in addition to normal growth, brings the total today to just under 2 million, plus 214,000 Arab residents.

Most of the new immigrants to Israel have gone to work in the fields. They have literally made the desert bloom again. In 1948 some 412,000 acres were under cultivation; the latest figure is 956,250, with production tripled. Settlements have been built up in wastes that had been desolate for centuries.

New industries have been established, electric output has more than tripled. The government has built more than 180,000 apartments and established 430 new communities.

All this has required an outlay of about $3 billion. From the United States has come $469 million in official funds. In addition Americans have been heavy buyers of Israel state bonds and contributors to voluntary aid funds that together with other aid have given the new state more than $1 billion in funds.

As it starts its second decade, Israel's great internal problems are absorption of the remaining Arab population, irrigation, the readjustments to a socialist, welfare state. The many immigrants must be integrated into the population, and further immigration

must be absorbed. One of the first major tasks will be completion of the Jordan River project, so its waters will flow to the south and the Negev to provide new agricultural land.

But all of Israel's internal problems are both conditioned and dwarfed by the huge external problem of Arab enmity. There can be achievements in the second decade of the Jewish Nation far surpassing those of the last 10 years if a solution to this problem can be found. The whole Western world, not only the nations of the Middle East, have an important stake in what is done about it.

Proposal for a World Youth Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the battle of ideas and the effort to influence the minds of men is of greatest importance today. In the ideological struggle now going on in the world it is imperative that we apply boldness and imagination, if we desire to refute Communist propaganda whose primary aim is to confuse the minds of people everywhere. In the interest of world peace and the survival of mankind, it is our task to get the truth across to the nations of the world, to keep them informed and alert, and to build greater international amity and understanding.

In order to help develop a bold and imaginative program on our part, I am suggesting that the United States take the initiative in calling together an international convention of youth and youth leaders who have demonstrated an interest in science, scientific progress, and their application toward peaceful uses. It is my conviction that youth representatives of Iron Curtain countries be likewise included in this world youth convention, so that they too may have the opportunity to see for themselves that we desire peace and not the destruction of humanity.

For this reason and to achieve this aim, I am today introducing a Concurrent Resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a call for an international convention or conference of youth and youth leaders of all countries of the world, which is to be held in the very near future. The time and place of such convention is to be left to the discretion of the President.

The purpose of this international youth convention would be to obtain the views and opinions of world youth on the following and related problems:

First. The development of science for peaceful uses, rather than for war or for destructive purposes.

Second. The need for agricultural, industrial, and commercial development of the underprivileged and underdeveloped countries of the world, and how youth can be helpful in promoting this growth.

Third. Seek specific ways and methods to raise the standard of living in all countries, including health and education standards.

Fourth. Seek specific ways and methods to provide an incentive and a future for youth everywhere, including greater opportunities for education, an appreciation of scientific knowledge, and a desire to cooperate with the youth of other nations toward better international understanding.

My resolution also provides that this youth convention should set up specific recommendations for an international designed to encourage the youth of the world to take up scientific projects and research for peaceful uses and of benefit to all mankind, so that the present and future generations may be able to live in peace and without fear of destruction.

I should like to add this one stipulation: When and if such a convention is held, we must take every precaution to make certain that the delegates of all countries without exception be given full opportunities to express their views on the problems to be considered.

It is my belief that the convocation of an international youth convention would give us the opportunity to take the leadership in a stroke of world-wide propaganda for the cause of freedom. It would enable us to prove beyond any doubt to the undecided and the uncommitted peoples of the world that we are genuinely seeking peace, that we are sincerely interested in the peaceful application of science for the benefit of mankind.

I think that the youth of these nations, through their representatives at this international convention, would understand our earnest desire to live in peace and to eliminate all fear of human destruction.

In short, a bold step of this kind on our part would help to put the Soviet Union on the defensive in the eyes of freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples all over the world. I urge the Congress to take fast action on this proposal and to request the President to put it into practice. We stand to gain a great deal by quick action.

Dangers of the Present Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress the following speech by Mr. Blackmore, who is making every effort to warn America of the dangers of the present foreign trade policy:

REMARKS BY A. H. BLACKMORE, PRESIDENT, THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER SPARTANBURG, SPARTANBURG, S. C., BEFORE THE POLICY LUNCHEON MEETING OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 30, 1958

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my remarks pertain to policy declarations adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and to the proposed policy declaration relating to foreign commerce now before this assembly.

These remarks are justified by the yardsticks suggested by Senator Dirksen yesterday. You will recall the Senator admonished local groups to curb pleas for selfish, individual purposes. He declared presentations would best merit the interest and concern of the lawmakers and other agencies in Washington which would affect:

1. The survival and security of our Nation;
2. The solvency of this country;
3. The preservation of the free enterprise system; and
4. The need to keep abreast of progress.

Today I should like to point out that the foreign trade program of this country has been so completely modified and so drastically revised from the original concept of reciprocal trade in the past decade that it demands the immediate, serious reconsideration of the Congress, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and all champions of the free enterprise system.

The United States textile industry was America's first major industry to be affected adversely by this country's revised foreign trade policies in recent years.

The slow strangulation, crippling and discouraging retrenchment of the domestic textile industry started about 1954.

Calls for caution by industry spokesmen since that time provoked no realistic remedies, but some irritation, in Washington. Industry spokesmen were, in effect, rebuffed for trying to call the Nation's attention to what these businessmen felt was a dangerous practice and precedent and a critical trend if we are to preserve our American free-enterprise system.

While the dilemma of the textile industry continues unabated, there is now before this country a dire threat to several other important industries and major employers of American workingmen and women.

The only consolation today is that the textile industry is not alone now in its fear of ultimate destruction less the extremely liberal foreign trade program is reconstructed on a true reciprocal trade basis. The free flow of goods in a sound foreign trade program can be most beneficial to the free world when such trade is to the mutual advantage of the countries concerned.

Today we, who continue to be gravely concerned about the textile industry, can point finally to other industries which are suffering—and dying—from the effects of current operations of the foreign trade program.

Take a good look at the economic stability and employment levels in the domestic camera and watch industries, the pottery and chinaware industries of California, many coal producers of West Virginia and Tennessee, the wood screw manufacturers in Hartford, Cleveland, Cincinnati and many other cities, the typewriter and sewing machine manufacturers, the tuna fish industry on the west coast, the chemical industry and independent oil producers in this country, to name but a few.

The wholesale importation of these foreign-made products or substitutes thereof, produced in most cases by workers who are paid less than one-tenth the pay scale of American workingmen in comparable industries, will gradually bring a greater and more severe challenge to the very existence and survival of these and—in the not-too-distant future—many more American industries.

While these several industries are keys to the economic security of hundreds of communities throughout the country, let me remind you that the great American textile industry, and related apparel industries, employs one out of every seven persons in manufacturing.

Can we continue to practice the preachments of theorists, or is it about time to examine our general policies in this important field which appear to be leading to

the very bankruptcy of these key domestic industries?

My only hope today is that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States accept our words of caution as sincere suggestions, worthy of consideration. The foreign trade program of the United States must be reappraised in the light of what is happening to industry today throughout the country. These industries are important to our economy today; they will be even more important in the event of war.

We also beseech the National Chamber to re-examine its current concept and support of practices in the field of foreign commerce and to consider the desirability of restating and effectuating a practical, realistic policy to recreate a true reciprocal foreign trade program that will be mutually advantageous to the United States and the free world.

In closing, let me state that I am in no way connected with the American textile industry. However, the State of South Carolina is one of America's foremost producers of textiles. I am an electrical contractor who has a fierce sense of fair play and champion the three-enterprise system that has made America great. We must not jeopardize it.

Dispel the Gloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it would be disastrous if we permitted continuous pessimistic talk to bring about a depression in the United States.

This would be a case of talking our way into something from which no amount of talk would extricate us.

I believe that positive action, positive talk will lead to a rapid recovery in this country. If the negative is emphasized, a negative situation will result.

In view of the current economic situation, I am convinced that our talk should be directed toward what our dynamic economy can do to take up the present slack with a view to promoting greater expansion of this economy so that no one willing to work will be out of work.

I fully believe that our economic frontiers are limited only by our own ideas, our own initiative, and our own energy.

I was, therefore, very interested in a recent speech sent to me by a friend wherein George Hammond, president of Carl Byoir & Associates, told an executive group of his public relations organization that private enterprise can do much to help in righting the economy through positive talk and positive action. This is the approach that I subscribe to.

Mr. Hammond made the point in his speech that Ralph Cordiner, president of General Electric, is bothered considerably because "when we lay off 300 people, people seem to forget that we still have 275,000 employed."

Mr. Hammond's antidote is to let people know what is on the good side of the economic ledger, which far outweighs the other side, as a major step in rebuilding our confidence in the economy.

This is Mr. Hammond's prediction: "In 1958, the people of our country will forget there is a recession—and there soon won't be any because they'll have the inclination to buy again—if they have an opportunity to read the affirmative news that exists all around us."

That is a sound prediction, and one which is based on confidence in the American people.

I Believe in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows an address by the distinguished dean of the Michigan delegation, the Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN, representing the Fourth District. The address was given on Tuesday, April 29, 1958, at the Michigan Congressional Dinner Association Executives of Michigan at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

The address follows:

I BELIEVE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The honor of appearing before you tonight is due to the fact that my term of service in the House is longer than that of any of the other present Michigan Members, either Democrat or Republican.

Placed in the position of speaking for the Members of the House, nothing that may be said should be construed as in any way partisan.

In years gone by, the 2 great parties, Democratic and Republican, and their leaders have had in mind but 1 objective, the welfare of the people, the security of the Republic.

Party methods may have varied. Some of our policies may have been characteristic of the party to which we owed allegiance.

There was a time when he who advocated a high protective tariff or spoke in favor of and worked for a tariff for revenue only or for free trade, by his words and his actions labeled himself as a member and adherent of 1 of the 2 great parties.

But, to a great degree that day of demarcation has gone.

In a month or two on the Hill a real fight will be waged on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Members of both parties will be found on both sides of that issue, as they have been and are found from day to day on opposite sides of many issues.

No longer can the individual Member's party alinement be determined by scanning the record of the rollcall votes.

What has been said does not mean, however, that the future will not have need for the two-party system. Each major political party of today is split by deep, sincere convictions on issues which will become more important as the future unfolds.

On more than one occasion, on a teller vote, in the House, the Speaker, who hails from Texas, the majority leader who comes from Massachusetts—both Democrats—have walked down the aisle, one supporting a nay, the other a yea vote.

A similar situation exists on the minority side of the aisle, where no great surprise is evidenced if minority leaders vote contrary to what the press has stated to be the administration's viewpoint. Nor do Members on either side blindly follow their chosen leaders on a sometimes basic issue.

Many of us believe that a two-party system is vital if we are to have sound government and many believe that a new political alinement is coming—an alinement under which the so-called liberals and progressives in both parties may unite, while the conservatives, or as they are sometimes disparagingly referred to, reactionaries, may be found in opposition.

But be all this as it may, it may truthfully be said that as long as the people, by secret ballot, select their representatives, those representatives will reflect the wishes, the desires, and the convictions of the people themselves.

If, in the future, the people are misgoverned, the fault will lie not with the women and the men they send to Congress, but with the people themselves—the people who, because of their lack of vigilance and the nonexercise of their voting privilege, have surrendered their right to govern.

To put it in a few brief words, this is the people's Government and, be it good or bad, the responsibility for what it does or fails to do rests upon the shoulders of the people themselves.

It is altogether too much to expect the agent to disregard the wishes of his principal; the servant to act contrary to the interests of the master.

So, we reach the conclusion that, this being the people's government, a government established by our forefathers, its efficiency, its durability, and its desirability having been demonstrated by time and experience, the future welfare of our people and the security of our Nation depend not upon the action of the Congress but upon what you, and others in similar situations, think and do.

This Government of ours will continue to make progress and to succeed—to guarantee opportunity for prosperity, the enjoyment of freedom, as you—this because each of you is an outstanding individual, a leader in your community—and those among whom you live—assume and exercise your responsibility.

The Members of Congress are but your representatives, your servants.

This is not an attempt to shirk or to shift responsibility. If, speaking for all Members of Congress, one thought may be expressed, it is this:

Regardless of party affiliations, and however devious may seem the path, each of us sincerely desires to carry out the wishes of the people he represents insofar as they do not conflict with his convictions of what is best for the Republic.

If he fails, then—as time rolls on, in November of each even-numbered year—the people have opportunity to attempt to select a better servant. Once again, the immediate responsibility is yours.

FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A previous speaker expressed his faith in Michigan. He gave some of the reasons upon which he based that faith.

Permit me to express my confidence in our Nation. To give some of the reasons for my faith in the United States of America—for my loyalty to the Flag and to the Republic for which it stands.

First, the Founding Fathers who established this Government of ours knew what tyranny and depression were—their effect upon a people. Our forefathers knew the value of liberty, of security, of opportunity.

And because our forefathers knew of the things to which reference has been made, they were willing not only to sever all homeland ties, but to courageously face the un-

known, to endure whatever hardship might be necessary, to establish here in a new land a new and an unprecedented form of government.

Today, to some a trip to the moon presents no more of a mystery, or a hardship, or impossibility of attainment, than did the situation confronting Columbus when he sailed west. At least, we know there is a moon. Columbus thought the world was round—not flat. He had never dreamed of an America.

It is almost impossible for us today to visualize the hardships which our forefathers faced, the sufferings which they endured, the sacrifices which they made—not only that they might have a better government, but that those who came after might enjoy the blessings which they sought.

That they built not only wisely, but for endurance, as well as for success, when they divided the powers of the Government which they established into 3 separate and distinct branches, has been demonstrated time and time again.

The progress which has been made under the Constitution, to which some seem to refer apologetically, has astonished an envious world.

Today, we have no reason to be ashamed, or humiliated, because of the achievement of any other nation or nations. True, Russia launched the sputnik. But what was it? A showpiece, built at the sacrifice of the Russian people of many a blessing enjoyed by the humblest of our citizens.

Today, those in whom we have every reason to have confidence have told us time and again that we have no reason to fear the military might of any other nation.

And who is there among us who would become the subject of the greatest military power on earth, if, with it, went the loss of liberty, a denial of the blessings which we now all here enjoy?

DO SOMETHING—NO MATTER WHAT

Today's situation calls to mind my memories of Kipling's description of the Bandarlog—the monkeys of the animal world.

All other animals seemed, as described by Kipling, to have a definite place, a definite purpose—but the monkeys were continually running about, chattering, drifting from place to place, finding something new to do but never finishing anything they undertook, although all the time hurling missiles of some kind in the path of whatever animal they might encounter.

Today, a vocal few seem obsessed with the idea that, because the Constitution is old, it has outlived its usefulness as a guide—that there is some power in legislation which will enable it to solve all our problems, real or fancied—ignore all of nature's laws, perhaps cause the earth to turn from the East to the West to greet a rising sun.

From day to day, we discover a new fear. With it, a new panacea.

We forget the great truth uttered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 4, 1933, when he said:

"This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself: nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

Let us forget our fancied fears, adhere to the principles which have brought us so far along the road of progress and contentment. Let us quit seeking quack remedies.

The rapid and tremendous increase in the public debt, our inability to meet necessary current expenditures, indicates we are following a dangerous course.

On July 30, 1932, President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave us some sound advice, among other things saying:

"Revenues must cover expenditures by one means or another. Any government, like any family, can for a year, spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse."

And again in October of 1932, he called attention to the fact that—

"Now, the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

"If, in some crisis, it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

"But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy."

Apparently, many have forgotten that the Federal Government has no dollars except as it acquires them through taxation.

In October of 1932, President Roosevelt, at Pittsburgh, advised us that—

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and, hence, in hordes of the hungry, tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

"Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or, as now, in broad cessation of employment."

Today's immediate problem grows out of unemployment—of what some term a depression, others a recession.

As a remedy, many proposals have been made, most of which are based upon the thought that those who have should assume the care of and provide for, temporarily at least, the needs and the desires of those who have less. For the unfortunate, that we must do; but those who are able should at least make some effort to help themselves.

Perhaps the remedy for one of today's problems was given us by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on September 9, 1931, when he said:

"This depression is today's problem. We cannot and must not borrow against the future to meet it. We must share now out of what we have, but not out of what we expect to have some day in the future."

That advice is as sound today as when given.

But limitation of time brings us back to the basic issue. So, permit me to add that, for the average, healthy, and mentally competent individual, opportunity is all that anyone is justified in seeking.

Dependency is a fool's paradise, and will ruin not only he who accepts it but, ultimately, all of us.

Chew that one over—digest it—and, if there be a substitute for individual responsibility, for free enterprise, for the greatest possible degree of individual liberty consistent with the general welfare—let us have it, citing first, however, a proven example in the world's history. The world's junkyard is filled with the wrecks of nations which sought prosperity and enjoyment through socialism or tyranny.

Viewed in the light of tradition and of history, judged by experience, under the Constitution, under the Stars and Stripes—not under a one-world flag—measured by the world's standards, we are the most powerful nation on earth. Our people—as individuals and as a whole—have more of everything man considers enjoyable and good than do the people of any other country.

None of this is due to accident. It all exists because those who founded this Government thought wisely, planned well. Those who followed adhered to true principles—the good Lord was merciful to us and blessed us far beyond what we have earned.

This is our Government. The Members of Congress will, sincerely and to the best of their ability, attempt, through legislation, to translate your desires into action. We are, however, no more than your servants.

This is the people's Government. As you and your associates at home use your ability, exercise your judgment, and actively participate in the selection of your representatives, the future of this Nation will be determined.

The responsibility is yours—the word "yours" means the individuals who have opportunity to go to the polls. As that opportunity and responsibility is used and assumed, so the future welfare of our people and of our Nation will be determined.

Thank you and God bless you.

Testimony of Brig. Gen. H. A. Boushey Before Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, all of us are vitally interested in the current hearings of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. The committee is conducting these hearings for the purpose of enabling it to recommend action which the Congress should take on astronautics or interplanetary travel and communications and the exploration of the vast expanse of space between the earth and other planets.

I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the statement presented to the committee on April 23, 1958, by Brig. Gen. H. A. Boushey, deputy director of research and development, Office of the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Development.

General Boushey has focused to a possibility of realization what to a layman would seem fantastic and imaginary dreams for the control of space. Of especial interest are his remarks on the possibility of establishing an inhabited lunar base useful for civilian and military purposes. General Boushey's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and counsel, man's future is inevitably linked with the problems which this committee is considering. Thus I feel honored that you have requested me to appear before you today to present my views—views which I recognize may be controversial, but nevertheless, ones which I believe sincerely, and which I shall attempt to present clearly and concisely.

We in the military services sincerely pray that weapons of space may never be used—but rather, that peaceful benefits of space may be freely enjoyed by all men. However, I have been called before your committee as a military witness, and thus I shall try to limit my remarks to those which are pertinent to the military potential of space.

But at the outset, I would like to make one observation. Past experience has shown that some of our most respected thinkers have failed to appreciate new concepts. Typical expressions of our military and

scientific past come to mind—"Steam will never replace the sail," "the airplane can never sink a battleship," "power can never be obtained from the atom," "a jet engine will always be too inefficient to be useful," and fairly recently, "the hydrogen bomb won't work."

So I feel we should analyze proposals with intelligence and imagination—for again and again, the "absurd impossible" of today becomes the reality of tomorrow.

From a military consideration, the debate of the space age can be narrowed to two questions. These are:

1. Can space power provide significant military advantage? and

2. If this be true, what specific military applications of space power will give us the greatest advantage?

Now, without claiming to be the only persons who have considered these critical questions, we in the United States Air Force, on the basis of actual military experience, feel we can answer the first question in terms of plainest commonsense. For years our job has been to achieve—and at times to exercise—a dominant capability to deliver firepower against an enemy by military operations above the surface of the earth. In doing this job we have been and still are guided by one major premise—that a decisive margin of advantage goes to the nation whose delivery vehicles can attain the greatest speed, the greatest range, and the greatest altitude.

The battle-tested validity of that premise has impelled the Air Force to continue its efforts to fly higher, farther, and faster. The technical endeavors that have been accelerated and intensified by this program have produced truly spectacular results. For example, the improvements in rocketry, guidance, and hypersonic aerodynamics which are incorporated in our intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles are truly major technical advances. But these, and other achievements are well known to this committee and need no elaboration.

It is a fact that the first military space weapons will be the Air Force intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles Atlas, Titan, and Thor. To these should be added the Army's Jupiter and the Navy's promising Polaris. While these missiles only remain in space a relatively short period of time, they do leave the sensible portion of the atmosphere and during this time they respond only to astronautic laws, the basic laws which control the motion of the bodies of our solar system. Such weapons are space weapons, and they produce tremendous improvements in the range, speed, and reaction time of our Nation's deterrent force.

It thus becomes obvious that the answer to our first question, "Can space power guarantee significant military advantage?—is a decisive, yes.

This brings us to the second question, "What other specific military applications of space power will give us the greatest advantage?" And by other specific military applications of space power I refer to space vehicles which can operate above the earth's sensible atmosphere for longer periods of time and which are not earth-based. These space vehicles include primarily manned and unmanned satellites, piloted, maneuverable spacecraft, and eventually even an inhabited lunar base.

Nobody at this time can present a fully detailed chart of future space operations. There is too much still to be learned, and there are too many theories still to be tested to submit a bill of particulars. But I do have several firm convictions regarding our development of spacepower.

First of all I do not believe that machines alone, controlled from earth, can establish a capability to dominate space. I do believe that piloted vehicles are also essential to insure that our space systems can respond flexibly and promptly to unforeseen changes. I also believe that on-the-spot exercise of human intelligence, judgment, and discrimination will be needed for effective control of space.

Undoubtedly various types of earth-circling satellites will prove useful, not only for military needs, but for peaceful purposes as well. I am sure the committee already appreciates many of the valuable functions which such satellites can perform.

One of the most attractive features of an earth-circling satellite is the tremendous improvement in telescopic and photographic resolution which is possible because of the total absence of atmosphere. What may not be widely recognized is the degree of detail which could be distinguished from, say, a 500-mile orbit. With only a 40-inch diameter telescope, it is estimated that objects on the earth of a size less than 2 feet could be detected.

If a 200-inch-diameter telescope, the size of the present Palomar reflecting mirror, were located in space at the "stationary orbit" distance of roughly 22,000 miles, objects on the earth approximately 17 feet in diameter could be viewed. I believe man will be an essential element for such an observation platform. Even the problem of deciding where to look is a formidable one, and if left to a mechanical device the chances of profitable search and detailed scrutiny would be far less than if under the direct supervision of an intelligent operator who could immediately exercise the faculties of suspicion, comparison, and reason.

Such an orbiting reconnaissance platform might very well improve earth-based ICBM warning times by a factor of two. Enemy missiles as they rose above the atmosphere during launch could be detected clearly and warning transmitted to the free world in half the time of our best earth-based early warning systems.

Another function which I believe only man can perform effectively, is that of interception and midspace rendezvous. At first, such missions probably would be for the purpose of refueling, thus permitting a manned, maneuvering space vehicle to receive fuel from an uninhabited tanker satellite which might have been circling in orbit for months or years. If such refueling operations were not utilized, the size and costs of vehicles for true space exploration would be vastly greater, and our timetable for manned flight to the Moon or Mars and Venus would be extended greatly.

Eventually, the capability to control space would be augmented by the ability of manned military spacecraft to make interception or rendezvous in space.

Various other types of unmanned earth-circling satellites will undoubtedly prove useful but a frequently overlooked requirement, that of maintenance and resupply, will require the use of manned spacecraft. Malfunctions of automatic equipment do occur. Periodic replenishment of parts and fuel will be desirable and preferable to the alternative, uneconomical use of "one-time disposable vehicles." It is inconceivable to me that any method other than by manned maneuverable spacecraft could effectively perform this vital maintenance function.

But man's usefulness in space becomes most apparent when considered in relation to our only natural satellite, the moon.

My conviction is that ultimately the establishment of an inhabited lunar base will provide numerous advantages, both civilian and military.

Materials synthesized from matter obtained from the moon itself could be used for construction, and the support of human life. Oxygen could be extracted from the ores of the moon, and even water could most probably be obtained from its minerals.

As the Russians recognize and so stated in their space movie Blazing Roads to the Stars, rocket fuels could be synthesized from lunar material. The cost is great, in both dollars and energy, to place any material at a location having only one-sixth earth's gravity. Since the moon abounds in material, it is destined to become the launching site for further explorations of our solar system—and perhaps even the best supply base for lower orbit, earth-circling satellites.

Lunar conditions would offer unparalleled advantages for astronomical observation. For example, today from the earth, using present telescopic and photographic equipment, it is possible to detect an object approximately 1 mile in diameter, or not a great deal larger than the Pentagon, including its parking lots, for the Pentagon building alone is over one third mile in diameter. Even assuming no improvement, a lunar station having no better optical resolution would be very useful. Worldwide weather surveillance needs resolutions of many miles—not feet—and would be undisputed military advantage as well as peacefully benefitting mankind throughout the world. But the optical resolution would improve considerably once beyond the earth's atmosphere. There would be a fivefold improvement in seeing, and thus the diameter of an object which could be detected on the earth's surface from a lunar observatory would then be approximately one-fifth of a mile, or close to 1,000 feet. During the next 15 to 20 years, with the inevitable improvements in optics, photochemistry, and especially electronic amplification of light, it would seem quite conservative to expect great improvement over present day astronomical detection capabilities. Such improvement would then permit detection from the moon of objects on the earth of the order of less than 100 feet, or sufficient to distinguish individual aircraft or missiles.

And last, as regards the moon, I personally believe it could, at some future date, be used as a secure base to deter aggression. Lunar launching sites, perhaps located on the far side of the moon, which could never be viewed directly from the earth, could launch missiles earthward. They could be guided accurately during flight and to impact, and thus might serve peaceful ends by deterring any would-be aggressor.

But as regards the entire subject of space control, one thing is certain, the inevitable advancement of technology. As General Putt stated last week, we in the Air Force do not expect to marry present-day concepts and weapons to future space vehicles. We do not know what precise form these future weapons may take, but advances, in other branches of science, will surely keep pace with space technology and provide in the future defensive weapons of undreamed effectiveness.

Above all else, we must be bold and imaginative about the future of astronautics. We cannot be inhibited by the lack of imagination or our inability to foresee the exact application of each element of our national space program. We must support a broad program of basic and applied research. We cannot be overly fearful of failures, and thus attempt only the sure things which result only in a short-term gain. The cost of testing radical ideas and techniques to the point of determining their feasibility is small indeed when compared to the price of step by step small gain advancements to existing equipment.

Simultaneously, we must not let our deterrent power deteriorate by concentrating too great a proportion of our research and development efforts in astronautics. Because we are a peaceful Nation and will never strike except in defense of freedom, we must keep our present deterrent power strong and improve it simultaneously with our advance

into the space age. The cost will be high, but it is a price which we must accept if our way of life is to prevail.

The Russians do not appear to doubt the desirability of obtaining Soviet, manned space capability, nor do they discredit the worth of manned exploration of the moon.

My own views are that we can win the race to space if we so desire. And I feel we must win it so that all humanity can profit from these benefits which God has surely placed within the reach of man.

"Medinat Yisrael": The State of Israel, 1947–58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last week the 10th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the State of Israel was celebrated all over the world. Mr. Al S. Waxman, an influential and outstanding publisher in my district, has written an editorial which appeared in his newspapers. Because I feel it will be appreciated by my colleagues and others, I consider it a privilege to bring it thus to their notice:

"MEDINAT YISRAEL": THE STATE OF ISRAEL, 1947–58

Throughout the world Jews and non-Jews are observing the 10th anniversary of the State of Israel. The observance celebration began with sundown Wednesday, April 23, and is to last 1 full year. This is the 10th anniversary, proclaimed worldwide.

To give the chronology of this valiant little nation would almost be impossible. Time, since it has been recorded, spoke of the Promised Land; the Bible devotes great space to the subject of Yisrael; post-World War I gave hopes that this would become a reality; post-World War II did likewise.

It was on November 29, 1947, that the United Nations General Assembly voted for the the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish State, an Arab State, and an International Zone of Jerusalem, joined by economic union.

Bloodshed followed this announcement. Arabs drifted in and assassinated Jews. The member nations of the Arab League directed attacks on the Jewish population.

So it went into 1948. A small handful of Jewish pioneers fighting for the existence of a land which they had sought for thousands of years. With rifle in one hand and spade in the other they began to till the soil and fight their way to freedom. Thousands upon thousands of Arabs began to evacuate Palestine for the purpose of expediting the advance of the Arab Armies, to disrupt service and to demonstrate that Jews and Arabs could not live side by side.

In April 1948 the United Nations Palestine Commission reported to the U. N. that it was unable to implement the 1947 resolution because: "Powerful interests both in and outside Palestine are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged therein. Armed Arab bands from neighboring Arab States, together with local Arab forces, are defeating the purpose of the resolution by acts of violence."

Shortly after this report was issued the British formally ended their mandate and completed the withdrawal of their forces from Palestine. This left the tiny Jewish State to fend for itself; and that it did.

On May 14, 1948, the provisional state council proclaimed from Tel Aviv the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine, to be called Medinat Yisrael (the State of Israel).

Three pledges were contained in the proclamation of independence. They were:

1. "The State of Israel will be open to the immigration of Jews from all the countries of their dispersion, will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants, will be based on the principles of liberty, justice and peace, as conceived by the prophets of Israel, will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of religion, race, or sex; will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, education, and culture; will safeguard the holy places of all religions, and will loyally uphold the principles of the United Nations Charter."

2. The proclamation calls "upon the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve the ways of peace and play their part in the development of the state on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its bodies and institutions—provincial and permanent."

3. The proclamation extends its "hand in peace and neighborliness to all the neighboring States and their peoples" and invites them "to cooperate with the independent Jewish nation for the common good of all."

On May 14, 1948, the Government of the United States was the first nation to give recognition to the State of Israel.

The following day the regular armies of Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria proclaimed their intention to the Security Council of the United Nations to launch an organized attack on Israel—and did so immediately. Simultaneously, the Arab League initiated a blockade against Israel, including a ban on all trade with Israel, as well as a denial to it of the right to use the Suez Canal.

Significantly enough, on that same day—May 15—Israel opened its doors to the survivors of Hitlerism who were still in DP camps and elsewhere. Fulfillment of its pledge of free immigration to all Jews seeking it had begun.

So began the lilfe of Israel. In the face of adversity, the people opened their doors and their hearts to fellow sufferers throughout the world. Despite the fact that war had been declared against them, that complete annihilation had been threatened, this band of pioneers thought first of giving help to their fellow Jews.

Ten years are long. Ten years are short. It all depends upon what happens during the decade. Israel's "long" 10 years have been filled with constant threats, snipings, actual bitter warfare; Israel's 10 "short" years have been those devoted to expansion, tilling the soil, building the land, growing with dignity to maturity.

All of the help has not been within. Much has come from other shores. Immigration of people has helped to build the nation; sale of bonds for Israel has helped meet financial needs; prayers and kind words from abroad have helped build Israel's morale.

Hardships have not departed; just lessened; freedom is more secure than ever before, but still threatened; progress has been tremendous, but not yet near fulfillment; dignity, and only dignity, started at the acme and has been retained there.

Resolution of the Independent Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which I received from Howard Bell, of the Independent Bankers Association, dated April 10, 1958, together with a copy of a resolution adopted at the 24th annual convention of that association in Dallas, Tex., on March 8, 1958:

THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Sauk Centre, Minn., April 10, 1958.

Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MULTER: The proposed Financial Institutions Act provides that the Comptroller of the Currency is to be a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Board of Directors. This provision guarantees that national banks are represented on the Board, a privilege that is not granted to State banks.

The attached resolution, adopted at the 24th annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association in Dallas on March 8, calls your attention to this provision and suggests that the proposed Financial Institutions Act shall not provide mandatory representation of the Comptroller on the FDIC Board.

Sincerely,

HOWARD BELL,
Assistant Secretary.

Whereas the proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957 provides mandatory representation for national banks by provision that the Comptroller of the Currency be a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Board of Directors; and

Whereas said bill fails to give equal mandatory representation for State-chartered banks on said Board of Directors; and

Whereas equal representation and recognition of State and National banks will preserve and strengthen our dual banking system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Independent Bankers Association, in convention assembled, requests that the proposed Financial Institutions Act shall not provide that the Comptroller of the Currency be a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Board of Directors.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Banking and Currency Committee in the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

